Kellie Martinec

From: Linda Curtis <info@independentleaguetx.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 6:53 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Linda Curtis
info@independentleaguetx.org
150 South Shore Road
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Amy Klein <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:08 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Amy Klein
[redacted]
12101 fm 678
Whitesboro 76273

Kellie Martinec

From: scott kirkham <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:12 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
scott kirkham
[redacted]
1115 magnolia
rosenberg 77471

Kellie Martinec

From: Claud Bramblett <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:17 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Claud Bramblett
[redacted]
4612 Duval St
Austin, Tx 78751

Kellie Martinec

From: Anne Tindell <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:44 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Anne Tindell
[redacted]
426 Cody
Nacogdoches 75964

Kellie Martinec

From: charles philips [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:59 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
charles philips
[redacted]
417 west blum
alvin 77511

Kellie Martinec

From: Gerardo Cardenas [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:01 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Gerardo Cardenas
[redacted]
4806 Running Deer Dr.
Austin 78759

Kellie Martinec

From: James Ralston [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:05 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
James Ralston
[redacted]
287 levi
victoria 55904

Kellie Martinec

From: Herbert Blount [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:08 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Herbert Blount
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: James Tatum <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:24 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

—
James Tatum
[redacted]
221A Peach Creek Rd
Rosanky 78953

Kellie Martinec

From: Lenard Nelson [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:24 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Lenard Nelson
[redacted]
1716 16th st
Rockport 78382

Kellie Martinec

From: Lee Loe [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:27 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Lee Loe
[redacted]
1844 Kipling
houston 77098-1610

Kellie Martinec

From: Karel Riley [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:30 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Karel Riley
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Betty J Gerald <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:35 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Betty J Gerald
[redacted]
1415 F M 2336
McDade 78650

Kellie Martinec

From: Mariah Holton <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:39 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Mariah Holton
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Robt Scouras [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:56 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Robt Scouras
[redacted]
1770 County Road 411
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: DG Symmank <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 9:57 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
DG Symmank
[redacted]
POB 308
Giddings 78942

Kellie Martinec

From: Margo Nielsen [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:00 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Margo Nielsen
[redacted]
1501 Myrtle Street
Fulton 78358

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Breed [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:02 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Mary Breed
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Rex Nunnally <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:15 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Rex Nunnally
[redacted]
3431 N Hills Dr
Austin 78731

Kellie Martinec

From: Madeleine Crozat-Williams <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:23 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Madeleine Crozat-Williams
[redacted]
4394 Fiesta Lane
Houston 77004

Kellie Martinec

From: Gordon MacAlpine <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:25 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Gordon MacAlpine
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Donna Thorne [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:27 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Donna Thorne
[redacted]
1826 FM 141
Giddings 78942

Kellie Martinec

From: Grover Shade <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:37 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Grover Shade
[redacted]
8427 W. Old Lockhart Rd.
Muldoon 78949

Kellie Martinec

From: kathryn melton [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:39 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
kathryn melton
[redacted]
3209 brookmeade
deer park 77536

Kellie Martinec

From: Jack Battle [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:39 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Jack Battle
[redacted]
Pasadena 77501

Kellie Martinec

From: Marni Lowenthal <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:49 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Marni Lowenthal
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Marsha Story [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:54 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Marsha Story
[redacted]
508 Pacific Ave
Terrell 75160

Kellie Martinec

From: Margaret Hutchinson [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:56 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Margaret Hutchinson
[redacted]
2513 Lazy Oaks Dr
Austin 78745

Kellie Martinec

From: Charles Cutshall <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 10:57 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Charles Cutshall
[redacted]
6810 FM 713
Dale 78616

Kellie Martinec

From: john adams [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:00 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
john adams
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Margaret Forbes [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:04 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Margaret Forbes
[redacted]

Kellie Martinec

From: Kerry White [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:06 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Kerry White
[redacted]
Weatherford 76086

Kellie Martinec

From: Kenneth Casper <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:07 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Kenneth Casper
[redacted]
3205 Country Club Rd
San Angelo 76904

Kellie Martinec

From: Russell Scheinberg [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:11 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Russell Scheinberg
[redacted]
8214 SW 2nd Ave
Portland 97219

Kellie Martinec

From: Steven Vaughan [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:19 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Steven Vaughan
[redacted]
10268 Chesterton Dr.
Dallas 75238

Kellie Martinec

From: B. L. Melton <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:25 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
B. L. Melton
[redacted]
1611 Longfellow Road
Orange 77630

Kellie Martinec

From: Carol Miller [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:31 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Carol Miller
[redacted]
4122 Emory Rd.
El Paso, 79922

Kellie Martinec

From: Sabrina Laumer <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:32 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Sabrina Laumer
[redacted]
2104 Tom Miller St
Austin 78723

Kellie Martinec

From: Marie Day <[redacted]>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:51 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Marie Day
[redacted]
77984

Kellie Martinec

From: basil abbott [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:53 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
basil abbott
[redacted]
223 bella vista
riyse city 75189

Kellie Martinec

From: Nancy Hoffman <[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2014 11:54 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@Independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

I appreciate the Commission's attempts to develop rules for granting common carrier status to pipeline companies. Because common carrier status in turn authorizes companies to greatly affect private property rights through the exercise of eminent domain, the rules should be explicit, comprehensive and capable of being enforced. However, I think the draft rules do not go far enough and need to be strengthened.

The draft rules should be clarified to:

1. Establish standards for proof that the applicant is in fact a common carrier, before the right to use eminent domain to seize private property is granted.
2. Establish standards for revocation of common carrier status.
3. Provide neighbors notice of application since many of the parties affected by pipeline construction and threatened by leaks of toxic materials are tenants or neighbors and not landowners over whom the pipeline passes.
4. Require public comments to be considered and responded to prior to issuance of the permit.
5. Require regional or county public hearings and comment periods similar to PUC process.
6. Assure that landowners and other affected parties may request hearings on the pipelines before the State Office of Administrative Hearings, in order to address their concerns before litigation is required.
7. Assess applicants a fee to assure that staff resources are available to thoroughly review applications and to rigorously enforce these rules.

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Nancy Hoffman
[redacted]
6311 Mesa Dr.
Austin 78731