

*Steve Kolbeck  
Commissioner  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501-5070  
Ph. 605-773-3201*

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

**From:** Curt Hohn [mailto:chohn@webwater.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 25, 2007 11:26 AM  
**To:** Smith, John (PUC)  
**Subject:** FW: TransCanada Fargo Forum Editorial

The clip I was given didn't have the date on it but I assume it was recent.

# The Forum

Published since 1878

A Pulitzer Prize-winning newspaper

**William C. Marcil**  
Publisher

**Matthew Von Pinnon**

Editor

(701) 241-5579

mvonpinnon@forumcomm.com

**Jack Zaleski**

Editorial Page Editor

(701) 241-5521

jzaleski@forumcomm.com

## OUR OPINION

# Canada's double standard?

Canada, which is environmentally hyper-sensitive about cross-border issues with the United States, seems a tad casual about an oil pipeline that would run from Alberta to Illinois. The buried 30-inch line would cut into scenic forests and close to bodies of water in eastern North Dakota.

At this point, it appears the governments of Manitoba and Canada – and North Dakota regulators – have been less-than-diligent in addressing

**Today's issue:**  
*Canadian oil pipeline route cuts through North Dakota.*

**Our position:**  
*Slow down the process in order to better assess potential damage.*

the risk of pollution from leaks and the certainty of environmental damage due to construction. Certainly the potential benefits of the line to North Dakota are substantial: tax revenue, construction jobs, speeding the flow of North Dakota crude.

But so is the potential for damage to North Dakota's water and landscape.

Trans Canada's Keystone Pipeline would enter North Dakota from Manitoba in the northeast corner of the state, where landowners fear leaks and a negative effect on land values. The

beautiful, forested Pembina River Gorge could be affected.

Proceeding south, the oil line (buried four feet) would slice through some of the state's scenic forested lands near the Sheyenne River in the area of Little Yellowstone State Park and Fort Ransom State Park. The pipe would run close to the river and eventually come within two to three miles of Lake Ashtabula. The proposed route was moved west to avoid the Fordville Aquifer. Which raises the question: What about the river and the lake?

The Canadian rush to gain approval for the line (the North Dakota Public Service Commission has refused requests from North Dakotans to delay hearings until a federal environmental impact statement is completed) seems to contradict Canada's environmental ethic. After all, Manitoba and Canadian government officials have been extreme in their political opposition to a trickle of water from a flood control outlet at Devils Lake, N.D., despite scientific evidence – some of it gathered by Canadians – that the outlet will have no detrimental effect on Canada. Yet, they don't seem concerned about the probability of environmental damage in the United States from a Canadian company's crude oil pipeline.

Canada's environmental double standard is no surprise, but the North Dakota PSC's responsibility should go beyond a rubber stamp. The legitimate concerns of North Dakotans seem to have been dismissed. Some of those citizens will air their concerns at meetings today in Oriska and Thursday in Fort Ransom. PSC route permit hearings are scheduled for July 23 in Valley City and July 24 in Park River.

Maybe PSC commissioners should use the hearings to send a message that they won't allow a Canadian oil pipeline to degrade, destroy or pollute North Dakota's landscape, rivers and ground waters. Maybe the way to accomplish that is to delay the permit process until an environmental impact statement is completed.

Forum editorials represent the opinion of Forum management and the newspaper's Editorial Board.

Margo  
Down

Jay Taylor  
Durbin, N.D.

## Pipeline threatens woodlands and river

A pipeline to be built through eastern North Dakota will carry Canadian crude oil from Alberta to Illinois refineries. This is a significant development of great benefit to the United States and pipelines are necessary to meet our petroleum needs. What the public needs to be aware of is the proposed route of the pipeline.

First area of concern is where the route runs between Wahalla and the spectacular Pembina Gorge. This is truly a very beautiful, unique area of rough, forested terrain.

Another area of equal beauty is where the pipeline crosses the Sheyenne River between the Little Yellowstone Park and Fort Ransom State Park, cutting through the heart of this precious, wooded valley. The route parallels the Sheyenne River for 35 miles and comes within two or three miles of Lake Ashtabula at one point, which someday will be an important source of water for all the cities in the Red River Valley.

The route will be grubbed out through these unique, scenic areas, of which we have so few. And vehicle access must be maintained indefinitely. Think of trying to minimize and contain a leak in the rough, forested terrain of the areas mentioned.

The route was moved once to avoid the Fordville Aquifer. Wouldn't the Sheyenne River be

exposed to the same perils? The state has several highways running north and south through it. Would it be too simple to use the right of way already established for them? It sure would provide good access for maintenance and also containment of a possible leak. The old adage "where there's a will, there's a way" could prevail if the Public Service Commission is willing to stand up and serve the public as they are expected to. The PSC will be holding hearings before considering a route permit. Hearings are July 23 in Valley City and July 24 in Park River.

I encourage all interested to view the proposed route on the Keystone Web site: [www.transcanada.com/keystone/](http://www.transcanada.com/keystone/) and to voice your opinion to the Public Service Commission soon at [ndpsc@nd.gov](mailto:ndpsc@nd.gov).

Margo  
Down

Buel Sonderland  
Fargo

## What about big oil's enormous profits?

Ahh, those oil refinery problems ... again!

And the price of gas in our area shoots up to \$3.19 per gallon.

Whether it's the problems with those pesky refineries, the ongoing threat of terrorism, the fact that Americans can't/don't change their driving habits, that good old excuse of supply and demand or any of a growing number of lame excuses, it always amazes and angers me that the enormous profits made by the oil companies rarely, if ever, show up as one of the problems, or is even mentioned in the press or on TV.

When I complain to friends, they say there's nothing we can do about it, so we must accept their abuse like lemmings headed for a cliff. Apparently, it's all our fault!

They're right. There is nothing I can do. If I could afford one of those expensive energy-saving vehicles, I'd buy one, but for as great as they may be, they're well out of my budget.

So what's left? I can complain and keep on complaining and keep pointing out the misdirection that the major oil companies use while bathing in an utter sea of cash (not oil).