

Kellie Martinec

From: Rick Riddle [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 7:50 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.

--

Rick Riddle
[REDACTED]

3721 Desert Ridge Dr
Fort Worth 76116

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Buxton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 9:12 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.

--
Barbara Buxton
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Gary Gerdes <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 10:43 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.

--

Gary Gerdes
[REDACTED]

716 S Knox Ave.
Giddings 78942

Kellie Martinec

From: Pamela Hornby [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 10:45 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.

--

Pamela Hornby
[REDACTED]

Caldwell 77836

Kellie Martinec

From: Dorothey Gerdes [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 10:46 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.

--

Dorothey Gerdes
[REDACTED]

716 S Knox Ave.
Giddings 78942

Kellie Martinec

From: alicia thornton <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 12:47 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.

--
alicia thornton
[REDACTED]

443 royal dr
dale 78616

Kellie Martinec

From: Jay Doubleday [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 1:34 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.

--

Jay Doubleday
[REDACTED]

Kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Gary Hogan <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 1:56 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

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

The draft rules should be clarified to:

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

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Gary Hogan
[REDACTED]

2117 Rolling Creek Run
Fort Worth 76108

Kellie Martinec

From: Nelda Calhoun [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 2:10 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.

Nelda Calhoun
[REDACTED]

7528 old Hearne Rd
Hearne 77859

Kellie Martinec

From: Charles Dreyfus [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 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.

--
Charles Dreyfus
[REDACTED]

2416 Park Place AV
Fort Worth, TX 76110

Kellie Martinec

From: Richard Guldi [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 2:55 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.

--
Richard Guldi
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Dan Holt [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 2:56 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

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

The draft rules should be clarified to:

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

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Dan Holt
[REDACTED]

6713 Santiago Av.
Fort Worth 76133

Kellie Martinec

From: Lonnie Yeary [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 4:05 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

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

The draft rules should be clarified to:

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

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Lonnie Yeary
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Elaine Horobec <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 5:01 PM
To: rulescoordinator; Info@independentleaguertx.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.

--
Elaine Horobec
<[REDACTED]>

Kellie Martinec

From: Brian Schill [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 5:52 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.

--

Brian Schill
[REDACTED]

1760 Spring Branch Rd.
Spring Branch TX 78070

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara LaRue [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 6:48 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.

--

Barbara LaRue
[REDACTED]

16953 FM 1280
Crockett 75835

Kellie Martinec

From: Jerry Lobdill [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 6:50 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.

--
Jerry Lobdill
[REDACTED]

6336 Darwood Ave
Fort Worth 76116

Kellie Martinec

From: Michele Gangnes [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 8:34 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.

--
Michele Gangnes
[REDACTED]

1290 County Road B
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Linda Lang [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 9:03 PM
To: rulescoordinator; info@independentleaguetx.org
Subject: Railroad Commission Rules Related to Common Carrier Permits, Docket #10366

Dear Commissioners Craddick, Porter and Smitherman

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

The draft rules should be clarified to:

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

Thank you for your consideration.

--
Linda Lang
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary Buttram [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 9:04 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.

--
Mary Buttram
[REDACTED]

2704 Rogers Ave
Ft Worth 76109

Kellie Martinec

From: joanne cipolla-dennis [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 9:45 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.

--
joanne cipolla-dennis
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Norman Palmer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 9:46 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.

--

Norman Palmer
[REDACTED]

1021 PR 3143
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Curtis Chubb [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 10:42 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.

--
Curtis Chubb
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Robert Horton [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2014 10:44 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.

--
Robert Horton

[REDACTED]
9104 Autumn Falls Drive
Fort Worth 76118