

To: Public Utilities Commission State of South Dakota
Meeting: Ramkota - Sioux Falls SD - 1/22/2015
RE: Energy Transfer Partners L.L.C. Dakota Access Pipeline Project

Prepared by: Betty Strom - farm owner/operator - Lake County SD

Thank you for the time to present my concerns about the proposed Dakota Access Pipeline Project. I hope you will listen carefully.

I believe we should be working on renewable energy, instead of building pipelines to transport every drop of crude oil that can be squeezed out of the earth by environmentally questionable and damaging methods.

I am not in favor of the Dakota Access Pipeline Project. A rosy picture has been painted by the representatives of Energy Transfer Partners. The number of jobs, the tax revenue generated, the relief of use of rail cars and how safe there pipeline will be.

In the big picture these promises may be short lived or non-existent. Once the construction is finished there will only be 12-15 permanent jobs in SD. I cannot find information on how they plan to generate the property and sales taxes they predict. They control the amount of crude that runs through the pipeline so any taxes based on the volume of crude transported will affect the funds generated. When the oil sources run out or the amount transported is cut, what will the compensation be then? Exactly what property is being taxed? Note the differences in SD tax income compared to Iowa.

This pipeline is now proposed to go completely through my best cropland for 3/4 mile. I realize I will be compensated for the crop lost for one year during the construction and for lesser amounts for two years following the construction. Nothing after that. A big concern is after the pipeline is in place and transporting approximately 450,000 barrels a day through my land. There is no guarantee it will not leak. Pipelines do leak. Almost every week we hear of another pipeline spill. If this pipeline leaks it will spill thousands of gallons. Even with safety shut off valves and pressure detection there is still all of the crude that is in the 30 inch pipe between the shut off valves. I have not seen any agreement that will require ETP to do a complete clean-up and restoration of the land and water exposed to

the spill or any guarantee of compensation of lost crops or use of cropland during and after a spill.

Furthermore, once the pipeline is in place, it is there forever. There are no plans or legal requirements to remove it when it is no longer being used or has become obsolete or unusable. Deteriorating pipe and crude oil residue are a serious safety and environmental concern even then. We must consider not only the potential dollars that might come in during the upcoming years, but the cost of having this pipeline in the future. Has an environmental impact study been requested or completed?

What does this do to my property value? At some point my land will be sold. Who wants to buy farm land that has a pipeline running through it? The new owner will not get any compensation or protection.

I, along with my organic farm neighbors, requested that ETP relocate the pipeline route away from our land. We showed them two possible options. Instead of choosing one of these options, they moved the pipeline plan to cross my entire property instead of just a portion.

I cannot afford expensive lawyers to protect me, but ETP will put their legal forces to work to make sure they are protected.

ETP has made it perfectly clear, that if I do not sign to cooperate with this pipeline project, they will use eminent domain and complete the project anyway. So I am really forced to cooperate and accept the terms and conditions decided by ETP.

That is why I am here tonight. The PUC must evaluate carefully if this project should proceed. If you decide to allow this pipeline, it is your responsibility to have requirements in place to not only protect South Dakotans now during construction, but also from damage and losses from leaks, spills and other problems with the pipeline in the future.