

Kellie Martinec

From: rrcwebcontact@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2014 5:11 PM
To: rulescoordinator
Subject: Comment Form for Proposed Rulemakings



Comments Form for Proposed Rulemakings

Date Submitted

Wednesday, August 20, 2014 5:11:03 PM

Submitted By

John R Strawn, M.D. board TEXAS PIPELINE WATCH

3783 Ingold
Houston, TX 77005

Phone: 713-410-4505

Fax:

Email: [REDACTED]

I request my e-mail address remain confidential

§3.70: Amend T-4 pipeline permit procedures

§3.70: Amend T-4 pipeline permit procedures

comments:

Paragraph 3.70 Pipeline Permit Requirements

Sections (a) and (b) are straightforward except for (b) (3). Is there a penalty for a false sworn statement specifically criminal perjury and will the individual making the false statement be referred to the Attorney General?

And should (b) (3) read a sworn statement from the individual representing the pipeline applicant and should that person be the same as (b) (1)

(c) (3) Any other information requested by the commission including change in the material to be transported.

Add (4) notify affected landowners and first responders of any change in the type of material transported with specific cautions as to hazards.

(d) Okay

Add (e) hold a public hearing by county or region for affected land owners and first responders for public comment prior to the final decision by the Commission similar to the PUC.

(-e-) (f) Once an application is determined to be complete and sufficient and after the public hearing and comment period the commission shall issueand its own review [investigation] and considering the public comments, that the proposed line is

The pipeline permit, if granted.....determines that an application is complete. The commission's determination of common carrier status does not preclude a challenge in district court by interested parties.

(-f-) (g) Okay

(-g-)(h) Delegate to whom? This delegation must be specific.

(-h-)(i) Okay

General comments: In the RRC proposal page 2 lines 23, 24 and page 3 line1 Mary (Polly) Ross McDonald says " that for the first five years the amendment will be in effect, there are no anticipated significant fiscal implications to state or local governments as a result of enforcing or administrating the proposed amendments". The process of checking all the requested documentation will entail substantially more clerical time =, effort, and expertise than the former method of "just checking the T-4 box". Nowhere in the RRC proposal is there any request for or admission of a need for additional funding.

On page 3, lines 2-8, Ms McDonald says " the public benefit expected.....will be greater confidence in the Commission's classification of pipelines as common carriers.....and the assurance that there is a review of the pipeline operator's assertion of a particular classification. The permitting process will include a more developed inquiry into the issue of a pipeline's public use, thereby providing more credibility to the Commission's process with respect to the ultimate classification of the pipeline, as well as increased certainty for both pipelines and landowners". (Italics mine) Without more resources and funding to do these reviews the "confidence" and "credibility" of the process will not materialize.

Pipelines should pay a fee that covers the cost to have this review process.

Texas Pipeline Watch
Julia Trigg Crawford
Jessica Ellison
Isom Ramsey
John R. Strawn, M.D.

Railroad Commission of Texas | (877) 228-5740 | 1701 N. Congress, Austin, Texas 78701