

Kellie Martinec

From: Andrew Meyer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 2:00 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.

--

Andrew Meyer

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

144 Lee County Rd
Paige 78659

Kellie Martinec

From: bette brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 4:48 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.

--
bette brown
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
1386cr411
lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Georgia Canfield <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 5:19 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.

--
Georgia Canfield

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1139 PR 7009
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Lisa Shell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 6:09 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.

--

Lisa Shell
[REDACTED]
1004 pr 3143
Lexington 78947

Kellie Martinec

From: Sandy Murphree <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 6:46 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.

--

Sandy Murphree

[REDACTED]
P.O. Box 1243
Elgin 78621

Kellie Martinec

From: Liz Wally <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 8:40 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.

--

Liz Wally

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

5528 Victor
Dallas 75214

Kellie Martinec

From: Lauren Wiggins <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 8:46 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.

--

Lauren Wiggins

[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Kathy DaSilva <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:19 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.

--

Kathy DaSilva
[REDACTED]

Kellie Martinec

From: Ramsey Sprague <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 9:49 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.

--

Ramsey Sprague

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

2320 Edwin St.
Fort Worth 76110

Kellie Martinec

From: Perry Graham [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 10:14 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.

--

Perry Graham

[REDACTED]

1556 Telephone Rd
Houston 77023

Kellie Martinec

From: Agnes Voes [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:09 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.

--

Agnes Voes

[REDACTED]

4522 S FM 2184
Rogers 76569

Kellie Martinec

From: Debra Medina <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:49 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.

--

Debra Medina
[REDACTED]
1446 Caney Trail
Wharton 77488

Kellie Martinec

From: Gary Stuard <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 11:59 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.

--

Gary Stuard

[REDACTED]

6133 Reiger
Dallas 75214

Kellie Martinec

From: Jonathan Coppinger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2014 12:00 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.

--
Jonathan Coppinger

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]