

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

**From:** Ron Schaeffer

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 26, 2007 7:57 AM

**To:** Johnson, Dustin (PUC)

**Cc:** Gary Hanson; Kolbeck, Steve

**Subject:** TransCanada Keyston Pipeline

Dear Commissioners,

I applied for party status and should be on file.

I am a farmer in Hutchinson & Yankton County. I live on the county line and farm in both counties. I am on the Township board of Molan Township in Hutchinson County and the proposed pipeline is intended to cross one of my fields in Yankton County, Jamesville Township, East 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of Section 3 (T96N-R56W). The pipeline company was also considering passing to the east of this field which would also cross a field of mine.

I oppose the current route of the Pipeline. Before I have heard or read any info on it, I have been concerned about the issue of tiling. I have intents to tile both of these fields. The placement of the tile could be adversely affected by the pipeline. It could make it substantially more expensive to complete the tiling project or make it impossible to do at all. I discussed this briefly with several TransCanada officials at one of the informational meetings. I believe two were friendly and cooperative and the third got quite excited when I asked about having the line placed deeper under my land - siting much greater expense as well as it only being a plan on my part. It did not appear that they would be cooperative on this matter.

Also, before reading any opposing information, I am greatly concerned about the excavation for the pipeline. I have had a 16 to 20 inch waterline placed under my land and landlords land. The agreement was for them to restore all drainage to the original condition. First off, it is very difficult with more dirt coming out of the hole than going back in. The extra dirt must be properly placed in the landscape by someone who understands the landscape. I needed to spend significant time (and expense) reconditioning the contour to properly drain the area. The water company also placed a valve that provides a large obstruction on the surface, permanently causing me to drive around and mow around on my landlords property (probably without consultation of him or extra compensation). I am not transferring ill will from the waterline company to TransCanada. I only have experience as to the difficulties involved. It takes time for the dirt to settle so that it can be shaped back to the original contour. The black dirt is never fully placed back onto the surface and is mixed with the subsoil or vice versa. In addition, I spent numerous hours picking up trash and rocks (which were exposed) from the project.

Since the time of the initial meeting, I have heard that the ground temperature is warmer in the area of the pipeline due to the friction. Probably the ground will never freeze in this area. This distorts insect cycles, as well as the natural freeze/thaw cycle controlling disease and improving soil structures. The absence of a freeze cycle could allow insects and diseases to overwinter in this area providing early infection of area crops. Currently, many diseases and insects must blow in from the South on a yearly basis. Early infection could cost South Dakota a massive amount in lost crop or increased pesticides. In the cases of drought years, I expect there to be significant yield loss over the pipeline area due to the increased soil temperature.

I understand that the current easements do not free the landowner from liability. There is no easement payment that is large enough for me to take on liability for soil contamination of a neighbor and no payment that is large enough that would encourage me to risk contamination my own fields.

I feel at a loss to negotiate an easement with these people when they have the possibility of condemnation. If I were to sign an easement, I would be motivated by fear of getting nothing rather than what is fair.

This field has been in my family for over 30 years. I take a huge pride in caring for this land as best I can. I don't want to limit myself as to future tiling, I can't have my current drainage distorted, and I can't take any liability for an oil spill. These are risks one should not have to make for a foreign company.

I encourage the board to force the company to consider an alternate route down the I-29 corridor which would be on public land, already unusable for cropland. The effects of the distortions due to excavation in a grass roadway right of way would be far less than in highly productive farmland. I believe the agronomics changes due to the lack of freezing would be far less also. Please consider this. Yes, traffic would temporarily be disrupted, but it would soon be back to normal. The cropland over a pipeline may never be back to normal. Please, take this option.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Ron Schaeffer  
43656 291st St  
Menno SD 57045