

**Kellie Martinec**

---

**From:** Suzanne <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 24, 2014 11:30 AM  
**To:** rulescoordinator  
**Subject:** RRC Common Carrier Amendment

To Whom It May Concern:

Re: Gas Utility Docket 10366  
Amendment to 16 TAC 3.70

I wish to comment on the above-referenced attempt by the Railroad Commission to amend the Common Carrier rules.

While I appreciate the effort to more clearly define the term, "common carrier," the amendment proposal is far too vague and lacking in specifics to have the strength and authority it needs. Following are a few examples.

Re: p. 1, Line 20 What "certain additional information" will the RRC ask for when an entity applies for common carrier status, thus obtaining the power to exercise eminent domain over land owners? This needs to be spelled out.

Re: p. 1, Line 23 What additional information is referred to by "any other information" the Commission may request? Again, this needs to be spelled out.

Re: p. 2, Line 8 What does it mean that the RRC will conduct "its own review" of the applicant?

By keeping the language vague, the proposed amendment still seems to be giving carte blanche to for-profit businesses desiring to build a pipeline along the property of an individual landowner, regardless of whether such a pipeline will actually benefit the public good.

A pipeline company should be made to prove its good intentions, not just answer a few more questions than before. Our water supply is our most precious commodity, and the fact that a pipeline company can refuse to identify the chemicals to be used in this pipeline is more than unfair to landowners who have to suffer the consequences of a breach in the pipeline. It is dangerous to entire communities. This has been proven again and again in the recent past.

Finally, a process for adequate public hearing should be provided for in the amendment, and a fee should be assessed to pipeline companies applying for permits; a considerable one, to be sure that the cost of a thorough review and investigation can be conducted by the RRC and its staff.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Suzanne Morris  
3581 FM 241 S.  
Rusk, Texas 75785