

Kellie Martinec

From: Doug Young <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:12 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--
Doug Young
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Adrian F. Van Dellen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:12 AM
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.

--

Adrian F. Van Dellen
[REDACTED]

120 Campers Cove Rd.
Woodville 75979

Kellie Martinec

From: Heidi Allen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:13 AM
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.

--
Heidi Allen
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: William Ballard [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:26 AM
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.

--

William Ballard
[REDACTED]

2874 FM 1704
Elgin 78621

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Campbell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:33 AM
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.

--
Barbara Campbell
[REDACTED]

5945 CR 302
Grandview 76050

Kellie Martinec

From: Ray Marr <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:56 AM
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.

--

Ray Marr
[REDACTED]

3801 Aspen Creek Pkwy
Austin 78749-6915

Kellie Martinec

From: bernice luppino <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:19 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

—
bernice luppino
[REDACTED]

4285 chestnut ridge rd apt.45a
amherst 14228

Kellie Martinec

From: Roger Choate <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:38 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Roger Choate

[REDACTED]
1203 Crocker
Houston 77019

Kellie Martinec

From: Robert Gartner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:53 AM
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.

--

Robert Gartner

[REDACTED]
6319 Sheringham
Houston 77085

Kellie Martinec

From: Jenaro Estrada [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:42 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Jenaro Estrada

[REDACTED]
8993 Willow Springs Ln
Conroe 77302

Kellie Martinec

From: STEVE BANYAI <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:46 AM
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.

--
STEVE BANYAI
[REDACTED]

818 MAMSFIELD BOX 94
PORT MANSFIELD 78598

Kellie Martinec

From: SUSAN WASKEY <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:55 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
SUSAN WASKEY
[REDACTED]

6230 FM1830
ARGYLE 76226

Kellie Martinec

From: Benjamin Sweet <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:06 AM
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.

—
Benjamin Sweet

[REDACTED]
1026 Private Road 7022
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Norman Tobleman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:53 AM
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.

--
Norman Tobleman
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: John Schwoeble <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:13 AM
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 Schwoeble
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: margaret tatum [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:23 AM
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 tatum

[REDACTED]
214ood trail
kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Jerry Sassman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:26 AM
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.

--

Jerry Sassman
[REDACTED]

5891 HWY 77N
Lincoln 78948

Kellie Martinec

From: Robert Langston <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:34 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Robert Langston

[REDACTED]
1106 W. Magnolia Ave
San Antonio 78201

Kellie Martinec

From: James Arthur Strohm <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:38 AM
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 Arthur Strohm

[REDACTED]
10905 Meadgreen Ct
Austin 78758

Kellie Martinec

From: Rebecca Jenkins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:54 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Rebecca Jenkins
[REDACTED]

10345 Woodland Estates Rd
Terrell 75160-8741

Kellie Martinec

From: Diane Blackburn <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:54 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Diane Blackburn
[REDACTED]

5013 Tree Top
Garland 75044

Kellie Martinec

From: Eric Grose <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:56 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Eric Grose
[REDACTED]

201 Hunters Crossing Blvd #10-113
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Steve Dinscore <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:04 AM
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.

--
Steve Dinscore

[REDACTED]
1402 fayette
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Jimmy Arnett [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:07 AM
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.

--

Jimmy Arnett

[REDACTED]
1402 Gribble Street
Gainesville 76240

Kellie Martinec

From: Paul St Louis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:07 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Paul St Louis
[REDACTED]

141 Old Piney Trl
Paige 78659

Kellie Martinec

From: Cheryl Scott [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:16 AM
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.

--
Cheryl Scott
[REDACTED]

77381

Kellie Martinec

From: James Klein <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:25 AM
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 Klein
[REDACTED]

3501 Monterrey St.
Corpus Christi 78411

Kellie Martinec

From: Ed Fiedler <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:29 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Ed Fiedler
[REDACTED]

12325 Limerick Ave
Austin 78758

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Ratliff <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:40 AM
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 Ratliff
[REDACTED]

112 Poinsetta Ln
Highlands 77562

Kellie Martinec

From: Greg Bodovsky <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:43 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Greg Bodovsky
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Ann Harasimowitz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:45 AM
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.

--
Ann Harasimowitz

[REDACTED]
133 Shoreside Drive
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Veldhuizen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:47 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Barbara Veldhuizen
[REDACTED]

500 West Jefferson Street
Kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Wanda Schertz <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:48 AM
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.

--

Wanda Schertz

[REDACTED]
126 Black Hawk Trail
New Braunfels 78130

Kellie Martinec

From: Ronald W. Hull <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:49 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--

Ronald W. Hull

[REDACTED]
11830 Spring Grove Drive
Houston 77099

Kellie Martinec

From: grady kimball <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:50 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--
grady kimball
[REDACTED]

3447 River North Dr.
San Antonio 78230

Kellie Martinec

From: Susan Wallace [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:04 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--
Susan Wallace
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Norris Banks <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:06 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

—
Norris Banks

[REDACTED]
9227 FM 195
Paris 75462

Kellie Martinec

From: rody whitfield <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:08 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
rody whitfield
[REDACTED]

123 Not given
Georgetown 78628

Kellie Martinec

From: O.D. Otte <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:11 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

O.D. Otte
[REDACTED]

P.O. Box 383
Covington, Tx. 76636

Kellie Martinec

From: Jennifer Fischer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:14 AM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Jennifer Fischer
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: harry noyes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:18 AM
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.

--
harry noyes
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Charles Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:22 AM
To: ruiescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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 Smith

[REDACTED]
2313 Birkdale Lane
Kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Rita Clarke [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:24 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Rita Clarke
[REDACTED]

75234

Kellie Martinec

From: Charles Dixon [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:40 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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 Dixon
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Yvonne Hansen [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:41 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Yvonne Hansen
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Deenie Tallant <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:44 AM
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.

—
Deenie Tallant
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Rebecca Williams <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:44 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddlck, 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.

--

Rebecca Williams
[REDACTED]

134 Elm Grove Dr.
Cedar Creek 78612

Kellie Martinec

From: Marsha Cramer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:47 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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 Cramer
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Julia Trigg Crawford <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:57 AM
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.

--

Julia Trigg Crawford
[REDACTED]

690 CR 37500
Sumner 75486

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Long <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:00 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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 Long
[REDACTED]

620 S 1st St #111
Austin 78704

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Mendieta <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:01 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

Barbara Mendieta
[REDACTED]

1703 E 38th 1/2 St
Austin 78722

Kellie Martinec

From: Jerell Lambert [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:17 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--

Jerell Lambert
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Ann E. Smith <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:18 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Ann E. Smith

[REDACTED]
1005 Meadowbrook Dr
Corpus Christi TX 78412

Kellie Martinec

From: Clinton embry <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:23 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
Clinton embry

[REDACTED]
1001 minter lane apt d
Abilene 79603

Kellie Martinec

From: Denise Snyder <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:23 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Denise Snyder

[REDACTED]
College Station

Kellie Martinec

From: jennifer anderson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:35 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
jennifer anderson
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Janelle Murphy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:38 AM
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.

--
Janelle Murphy
[REDACTED]

77551

Kellie Martinec

From: Ed' Greer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:46 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Ed' Greer

[REDACTED]
3808 Melstone Drive
Arlington TX

Kellie Martinec

From: Susan Baerst <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:48 AM
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.

—
Susan Baerst

[REDACTED]
P.O. Box 58
Waller 77484

Kellie Martinec

From: richard thompson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:58 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguext.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.

--
richard thompson
[REDACTED]

76 spring lake dr
san antonio 78248

Kellie Martinec

From: Jana DeGrand [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:04 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Jana DeGrand
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Lea Harlow [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:10 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Lea Harlow
[REDACTED]

112 Hunters Branch
Shavano Park 78231

Kellie Martinec

From: Michael McMurtrey [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:13 AM
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.

--
Michael McMurtrey

[REDACTED]
Carrollton 75007

Kellie Martinec

From: Susan Garry <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:15 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--

Susan Garry
[REDACTED]

2200 CR 458
Coupland, TX 78615

Kellie Martinec

From: Phillip J Crabill [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:16 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentieaguetx.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.

--

Phillip J Crabill
[REDACTED]

430 Copperas Trail
Highland Village 75077

Kellie Martinec

From: andy lamon [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:18 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
andy lamon

[REDACTED]
401 n saint mary st
carthage 75633

Kellie Martinec

From: Ellen McFarland <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:24 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
Ellen McFarland
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Robert DeJean - [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:25 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Robert DeJean
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Darlene Ray [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:30 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Darlene Ray
[REDACTED]
1306 High Mesa
Wimberley 78676

Kellie Martinec

From: rj marsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:35 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
rj marsh

[REDACTED]
731 Lindsay Stret
Gainesville 76240

Kellie Martinec

From: Charles Kunkel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:44 AM
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 Kunkel
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Martha Estes [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:49 AM
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.

--

Martha Estes
[REDACTED]

35240 F 1488 Road
Hempstead 77445-7568

Kellie Martinec

From: Hugh Sistrunk [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:51 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--
Hugh Sistrunk
[REDACTED]

173 Rocky Creek Way
Elgin 78621

Kellie Martinec

From: bill leman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:54 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

bill leman
[REDACTED]

4269 cr 306
navasota ,tx 77868

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Mills <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:57 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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 Mills
[REDACTED]

78957

Kellie Martinec

From: charlotte Wells [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 10:59 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
charlotte Wells
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Ron Schuler [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:01 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Ron Schuler
[REDACTED]

5305 Brougham Ln.
Plano 75023

Kellie Martinec

From: Danielle Baker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:13 AM
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.

--

Danielle Baker
[REDACTED]

4404 Wilson Ln.
Fort Worth 76133

Kellie Martinec

From: John LaTemple [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:16 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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 LaTemple
[REDACTED]

15206 Bowling Lane
Lakeway 78734

Kellie Martinec

From: Allen Penn [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:25 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
Allen Penn

[REDACTED]
Bastrop, TX 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: vella reilly <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:26 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
vella reilly
[REDACTED]
205 westminster
kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Judith McGeary [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:33 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--

Judith McGeary
[REDACTED]

PO Box 962
Cameron 76520

Kellie Martinec

From: Alice Leuchtag [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:34 AM
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.

--

Alice Leuchtag
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Robert Hummel [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:35 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentieaguetx.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.

--

Robert Hummel
[REDACTED]

11703 Sweetwater Trail
Austin 78750

Kellie Martinec

From: Judith Sikora <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:42 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

—
Judith Sikora
[REDACTED]

Fort worth

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Mueller <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:46 AM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Barbara Mueller
[REDACTED]

8058 Broadway 135M
San Antonio 78209

Kellie Martinec

From: Nancy Edwards [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:02 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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 Edwards
[REDACTED]
10601 Bassoon Drive
Houston 77025

Kellie Martinec

From: John Mikus <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:16 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 Mikus
[REDACTED]

8118 Neff St.
Houston 77036

Kellie Martinec

From: Evelyn Connaway [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:33 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.

--
Evelyn Connaway
[REDACTED]
7520 Circle Drive
NRichland Hills, TX 76180

Kellie Martinec

From: Henry Bohnert [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:37 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Henry Bohnert
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: mr. g. willis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 12:54 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

mr. g. willis
[REDACTED]

pob
austin 78713

Kellie Martinec

From: Emily Gross [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:06 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

Emily Gross
[REDACTED]

411 W Gaywood Dr.
Houston 77079

Kellie Martinec

From: Katy Hall [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:09 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

Katy Hall
[REDACTED]

1913 David
Austin 78705

Kellie Martinec

From: susan andrews <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:18 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.

--
susan andrews
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Victoria Fairchild <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:43 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

Victoria Fairchild
[REDACTED]

115 Golden Crown
San Antonio 78223

Kellie Martinec

From: Geraldine Mongold <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:47 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.

--
Geraldine Mongold
[REDACTED]

78745

Kellie Martinec

From: Susan Cummings [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 1:49 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.

--
Susan Cummings
[REDACTED]

4200 Queenswood
Baytown 77521-2851

Kellie Martinec

From: Kat Shield [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:05 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Kat Shield
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Janell Jenkins [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:44 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Janell Jenkins
[REDACTED]
1913 Ridgecrest
Garland 75042

Kellie Martinec

From: Tom Sherman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:45 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleaguextx.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.

--

Tom Sherman
[REDACTED]

544 Front Street
New Ulm 78950

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Hiller [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:54 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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 Hiller
[REDACTED]

2031 Pipestone Drive
San Antonio 78232

Kellie Martinec

From: Margery Race [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 2:58 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

Margery Race
[REDACTED]

6008 Club Terrace
Austin 78741-3302

Kellie Martinec

From: Charlotte & Spencer Gilman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:15 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Charlotte & Spencer Gilman
[REDACTED]

187 River Oaks Dr.
Cedar Creek 78612

Kellie Martinec

From: Rhonda Reichel [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:16 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.

--
Rhonda Reichel

[REDACTED]
106 Colton Dr
San Antonio 78209-1710

Kellie Martinec

From: Sheril Smith [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:34 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.

--

Sheril Smith

[REDACTED]
4875 county road 309
lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: BRENDA YOUNG [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:41 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleaguets.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.

--
BRENDA YOUNG
[REDACTED]

1802 w.beauregard
san angelo 76901

Kellie Martinec

From: Sheldon McCranie <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 3:51 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Sheldon McCranie
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Jeni Dunn [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:09 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.

--

Jeni Dunn
[REDACTED]

1608 Juanita Ave
San Angelo 76901

Kellie Martinec

From: T Bell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:24 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.

--
T Bell
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Sue Hains [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:30 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--

Sue Hains
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Joni Groom <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:40 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueta.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.

--

Joni Groom
[REDACTED]

251 Pine View Loop
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Carly Rose Jackson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 4:41 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Carly Rose Jackson
[REDACTED]

Austin 78741

Kellie Martinec

From: Lana Hampton [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:16 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.

--

Lana Hampton
[REDACTED]

6057 N. Lincoln Ave.
Chicago 60657

Kellie Martinec

From: Peggy La Point <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 5:59 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Peggy La Point
[REDACTED]

1900 Highland Park Circle
Denton 76205

Kellie Martinec

From: J Turner [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:08 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.

--
J Turner

[REDACTED]
Porter
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: M Mertz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:33 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--

M Mertz

[REDACTED]
601 Page
Hallettsville 77964

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Hopson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:40 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.

--
Barbara Hopson
[REDACTED]

P.O. Box 1753
Wimberley 78676-1753

Kellie Martinec

From: Greg Sells <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 6:41 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

Greg Sells
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary A Leon [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:02 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 A Leon

[REDACTED]
5 Loop Street
San Antonio 78212-4231

Kellie Martinec

From: David Bigwood [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 7:28 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
David Bigwood
[REDACTED]
211 Leghrand Ct
League City 77573

Kellie Martinec

From: Cherie Gorman [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 8:32 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Cherie Gorman
[REDACTED]

Houston 77098

Kellie Martinec

From: Doris Shields [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:02 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleague.tx.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.

--
Doris Shields
[REDACTED]

2809 Lawrence
Irving 75061

Kellie Martinec

From: elvin slette <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:05 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleagueutx.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.

--
elvin slette

[REDACTED]
smithville 78957

Kellie Martinec

From: Derrall Frost <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:14 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguex.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.

--
Derrall Frost
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Charlene Jordan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 9:55 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.

--

Charlene Jordan
[REDACTED]

1361 C. R. 464
Elgin, TX 78621

Kellie Martinec

From: Oscar Vela Jr <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2014 11:16 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguextx.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.

--
Oscar Vela Jr

[REDACTED]
1216 N 21st
McAllen 78501

Kellie Martinec

From: Judy Landress [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 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.

--
Judy Landress
[REDACTED]