

Kellie Martinec

From: Devin Coryell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 12:10 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.

--
Devin Coryell
[REDACTED]

Rock Creek Dr
Kerrville 78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Leah Waters [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 12:16 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.

--

Leah Waters
[REDACTED]

PO Box 65
Hico 76457

Kellie Martinec

From: Gerald Cole <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 12:39 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.

--
Gerald Cole
[REDACTED]
15004 crosscreek drive
Austin 78737

Kellie Martinec

From: R C <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 12:41 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.

--
R C
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Travis Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 1:04 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.

--
Travis Brown
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
1139 PR 7009
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: George & Joan Hardy [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 1:08 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.

--
George & Joan Hardy
[REDACTED]
130 Night Hawk Dr.
Elgin 78621

Kellie Martinec

From: Barbara Perkins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 1:34 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 Perkins
[REDACTED]

4017 Rosa Road
Dallas 75220

Kellie Martinec

From: Raymond Naivar - [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 2:47 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.

--
Raymond Naivar

[REDACTED]
1251 FM 3349
Taylor 76574

Kellie Martinec

From: GARY WILLIAMS <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 2:58 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.

--
GARY WILLIAMS

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
75459

Kellie Martinec

From: Paula Egger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 3:34 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.

--

Paula Egger

[REDACTED]
1501 FM 2048
Boyd 76023

Kellie Martinec

From: Mary marr Porterfield <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 3:36 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 marr Porterfield
[REDACTED]
1429 Highway 71west
bastrop tx. 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: Edward Bunch <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 3:47 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.

--
Edward Bunch
[REDACTED]
9608 Schmidt Lane
Manor 78653

Kellie Martinec

From: Pat Butler <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 4:54 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.

--

Pat Butler

[REDACTED]
581 Dresden Wood dr.
Boerne 78006

Kellie Martinec

From: christine bluemel <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 5:17 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.

--
christine bluemel

[REDACTED]
78028

Kellie Martinec

From: Donna Hanna-Calvert <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 5:33 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.

--
Donna Hanna-Calvert

[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: john smith <[REDACTED]@cmaaccess.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 7:12 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.

--
john smith

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@cmaaccess.com

johnson
giddings 78942

Kellie Martinec

From: Debbie Wahrmund <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 7:27 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.

--
Debbie Wahrmund

[REDACTED]
P.O. Box 781
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Sara Reckelhoff <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 8:44 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.

--
Sara Reckelhoff
[REDACTED]
4734 Brownfields Dr.
Houston 77066

Kellie Martinec

From: Amy Quigley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:21 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.

--

Amy Quigley

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2244 Hurstview
Hurst 76054

Kellie Martinec

From: Yvonne Dawson Roberts <vonniedawson@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:27 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.

--

Yvonne Dawson Roberts
vonniedawson@yahoo.com
104 Roosevelt Ave
Groton 13073

Kellie Martinec

From: Wendell Geigle <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:54 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.

--

Wendell Geigle

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@gmail.com

Victoria 77904

Kellie Martinec

From: Kathy Geraghty <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 10:05 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.

--
Kathy Geraghty
[REDACTED]
geraghty.kathy@gmail.com
1564 Sayers Road
Bastrop 78602

Kellie Martinec

From: william cabaj <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:00 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.

--
william cabaj
[REDACTED]
5006 Bayport circle
rowlett 75088

Kellie Martinec

From: Jody Tengberg <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:42 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.

--
Jody Tengberg
[REDACTED]
18303 shireoak dr
Houston 77084