-----Original Message-----
From: Ann Harjes [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:17 AM
To: Hanson, Gary (PUC); Nelson, Chris; Fiegen, Kristie
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Permit

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

No matter how they spin it, this is a BAD choice for South Dakota, for our people, livestock, water, and wild life. The risks are too high, the data shows the irreparable and inevitable damage that lies ahead if we allow this toxic pipeline to pass through our beloved State.

We have been called a "third world State that will follow a dollar straight to hell". This angers me and breaks my heart at the same time. And why? Because sadly, it is true. I'm asking you to stand up and say, "NO THANK YOU" loud and clear to this company of bullies and their toxic pipeline! Not now, not ever. Let them take the most direct route to the sea through their own country. We do not need to play the fool this time!

I'm proud to say I'm a born and raised South Dakotan. My roots run deep, as does my love for our State. And though we are not without our own struggles and issues, I always declare that we are one of the best kept secrets when it comes to a place to live, raise a family, and have a healthy natural outdoor lifestyle. As an adult I have lived coast to coast and abroad, but I CHOSE to come home, to make significantly less money, and pay higher taxes merely to live in the land I love.

Stand up, speak up, and say ABSOLUTELY NOT! We need you to rise and stand with all of us and protect our way of life not only for ourselves, but for our children, and the generations to come.

Thank you for your kind attention to my letter.

S. Ann Harjes
[redacted]
Rapid City, South Dakota
57702

-----Original Message-----
From: jean heisler [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 1:17 PM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THE KEYSTONE XL PERMIT. TOO MUCH IS AT STAKE! WE NEED TO TAKE THE LONG VIEW ON HOW THIS COULD AFFECT FUTURE GENERATIONS, NOT LETTING SHORT TERM GAINS CLOUD OUR THINKING.

jean heisler
[redacted]
garretson, SD 57030

-----Original Message-----
From: Brenda Loew [redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 11:42 PM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing in strong opposition to the potential certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota. Please vote no.

We have better, cleaner, safer alternatives for energy. We have alternatives that will produce more jobs and benefit our economy. KXL is a devastating project, intending to transport a river of toxic and dirty tar sands oil from Canada through America's heartland to the Gulf coast for export. Tar sands oil is one of the dirtiest fossil fuels on the planet, releasing dramatically more carbon pollution than conventional oil. Ramping up dirty tar sands oil production means a giant step back in the fight against climate change. To promote such a venture is another nail in the coffin for our future on this planet.

In the shorter term, TransCanada cannot and will not adequately protect South Dakota's land, water and people, and has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit and puts people in South Dakota, as well as the rest of us, at risk. The only sane choice is to deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Thank you for your consideration, please make the right decision.

Brenda Loew
[redacted]
Seattle, WA 98107

-----Original Message-----
From: Laura Marciniak [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 1:41 PM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

As a veteran working to relocate to South Dakota I find the thought of a leaking pipeline in my future to be highly disturbing.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Laura Marciniak
[redacted]
Clayton, NC 27520

From: Casey Snyder [redacted]
Date: November 2, 2015 at 1:03:55 PM CST
To: <chris.nelson@state.sd.us>
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL
Reply-To: [redacted]

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristing grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

As a future farmer and student at South Dakota State University, I feel it is my duty to reach out to protect my future and the future of my family in South Dakota.

Thank you.

Casey Snyder
[redacted]
Sioux Falls, SD 57110

From: PUC
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 3:47 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: HP14-001

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 document 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

From: Alberta Rouse [redacted]
Date: November 2, 2015 at 1:32:09 PM CST
To: <chris.nelson@state.sd.us>
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL
Reply-To: [redacted]

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

Please vote no!!! I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristin grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

It is common sense in my judgement--deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Alberta Rouse
[redacted]
Pierre, SD 57501

From: PUC
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 4:24 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: HP14-001

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 document 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

-----Original Message-----
From: Lisa Canning [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 11:26 AM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no. I am in solidarity with South Dakotans and the world who realize pollution really knows no borders.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Lisa Canning
[redacted]
San Diego, CA 92126

-----Original Message-----
From: Jill allison [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:54 AM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristing grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Without clean water, life cannot continue. No matter how much oil provides a 'richer' lifestyle to those far away from the environmental disaster that this pipeline will cause, the disaster will be felt by all of us. Our earth is a closed system and it has reached capacity. If you pollute water anywhere, you are killing yourselves as well as the folks considered expendable in the local area. Vote no on this travesty. Sincerely, Jill Allison

Jill allison
[redacted]
port townsend, WA 98368

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Johnson [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:45 AM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristing grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

The pipeline is only a piece of this overall problem we are confronted with - the tar sands use the equivalent of two barrels of oil to produce three and the resulting product is much dirtier than US crude oil

Jim Johnson
[redacted]
Sioux Falls, SD 57109

031323