Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Franco	April 4, 2013	The midwest is the breadbasket of our nation. Any threat to the water supply in the midwest is a threat to our food supply and therefore to our nation. The Ogallala Aquifer is shallow and huge. It is mostly in Nebraska but extends to other states and supplies about 30% oif all ground water used for irrigation in the US. Why risk a source of incredible strength for our country - food independance - by running this pipeline over such a valuable resource. The recent history of oil industry related maintaince issues with Alaska pipelines, the recent Arkansas event and the BP oil platform catastrophe make me very uncomfortable with the Keystone Pipeline proposal.	RISK 07
Jim Hewins	April 11, 2013	It is not in the national interest, it will be devastating to our environment and will be the worst sort of legacy that this administration could possibly leave for this nation and its people.	PN 08
Jim Johnson	March 6, 2013	Transportation of oil by pipeline is the safest method.	PN 09
Jim Johnson	March 6, 2013	Building the pipeline will further cement our relationship with Canada and prevent them from selling the oil to China.	PN 10
Jim Kremer	April 12, 2013	The No Action Alternative section of the SEIR is seriously deficient, and should be further revised to include this meaningful, plausible No Action scenario of actually NO ACTION.	ALT 09
Jim Kremer	April 12, 2013	the environmental analysis of consequences for GHG Emissions and Climate change minimizes (ignores) the case where WCSB harvest is totally stopped or substantially reduced.	CLIM 13
Jim Kremer	April 12, 2013	The SEIS undervalues the significance of the low energy quality of the WCSB petroleum resource. EROI (Energy Return on Investment, which is the same as Energy Return on Energy Invested, EROEI) is 2–4, compared to 25 for other petroleum.	PN 02, CLIM 07, PN 05
Jim Kremer	April 12, 2013	“under a No Action Alternative, production and transportation of WCSB … crude would remain unchanged.” And “Given that production of WCSB … will proceed with or without the proposed project …” In fact, this assumption is biased against real social/political alternatives in Canada.	PN 06
Jim Kremer	April 12, 2013	TransCanada’s record for estimating pipeline costs, spill rates, and other long-term environmental and societal costs is not good.	RISK 25
Jim Lamb	April 18, 2013	The International Energy Agency, an organization set up to improve the transparency and security of oi1 markets, not an environmental group, stated in its 1atest annual report that to achieve climate change goals, at least two-thirds of proven fossil fuels must be left in the ground. Climate scientists argue that it should be more like 80 percent.We've got to leave this bitumen in the ground. If we build this pipeline, it won't get left in the ground	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Lamb	April 18, 2013	In 2012, a full 60 percent of gasoline produced at Texas Gulf Coast refineries was exported. This export boon is not something all U.S. refineries share equally in. It is, in fact, the same refineries that will receive Keystone XL oil that are the leading export refineries in the country.	PN 07
Jim Lamb	April 18, 2013	I've been studying the tar sands in this pipeline for over five years. And I can tell you the Keystone XL Pipeline is a pipeline through the United States, not to the United States. The pipeline's major purpose is not to provide energy security for America but to enable access to international markets in order to maximize returns to tar sands producers and refiners.	PN 07
Jim Lieberman	April 6, 2013	Pipeline spills in recent years have proven that the Keystone XL pipeline is dangerous for our environment, including our water supplies.	RISK 13, RISK 07, WRG 01
Jim Lovestar	March 8, 2013	20-year-old Isabel Brooks and two of her friends locked themselves inside a segment of the Keystone XL pipeline -- a controversial pipeline being built to carry toxic tar sands oil to the US coast for export -- to protest its construction. While inside the pipe, they discovered something shocking: there are already holes in the Keystone XL pipeline, created by faulty welding.	RISK 23
Jim Maxmin	April 3, 2013	ARKANSAS shows what will happen all over Stop this now	RISK 14
Jim Nichols	April 21, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline would not create 20,000-100,000 temporary jobs, as some have said. It would create 3,900 temporary ones, and only 35 permanent jobs.	SO 04
Jim Palmer	March 6, 2013	The energy derived from tar sands is the dirtiest you can use. It is estimated that utilizing that energy will serious[y]compromise any efforts to curtail global warming. This will impact every person & species on the planet.	CLIM 05
Jim Palmer	March 6, 2013	The intent is to sell the product of the pipeline overseas, so this will not help our own energy needs in the US.	PN 01
Jim Palmer	March 6, 2013	It sends the wrong signal for our country. At a time when we should be developing new, cleaner sources of energy, the pipeline embraces the very type of energy that is wreaking havoc with our environment and our economy.	PN 03
Jim Palmer	March 6, 2013	Given the track record of other pipelines, it will pose a serious threat to the environment, since tar sand slurry is one the most difficult substances to contain/clean up.	RISK 08
Jim Palmer	March 6, 2013	The pipeline project will employ very few people and hence not be a substantial creator of new jobs.	SO 02
Jim Ragsdale	March 15, 2013	What is the oil company scenario (with response times) to a pipeline break that is flowing over 100 million gallons per hour directly over the aquifer that lies beneath the proposed pipeline right of way.	RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Redmond	April 9, 2013	TransCanada asks for a two year grace period operating XL before their Pipeline Spill Response Plan would be submitted for approval by the Pipeline Safety Agency.	RISK 05
Jim Redmond	April 9, 2013	Congress has allocated hundreds of millions of dollars to recover the endangered pallid sturgeon. If there is a tar sands spill on the Yellowstone, MIlk, or Missouri, it would wipe out the wild pallid population in the Williston Reach.	RISK 07
Jim Redmond	April 9, 2013	No need to envision future impacts from Tar Sands Oil spills. Major spills are occurring with awesome regularity.	RISK 14
Jim Redmond	April 9, 2013	Environmental Impact Statement issued March 1, 2013, TransCanada has not followed Clean Water Act guidelines requiring the study of the worst case scenarios. Dr. John Stansbury of the University of Nebraska's Water Center identifies 8 to 9 times more risk of spills than the pipeline company projects. The XL crossing of the Missouri, Milk, and Yellowstone Rivers in Montana qualify as worst case scenarios.	RISK 22
Jim Reynolds	March 14, 2013	short-term benefits created by construction of the pipeline will quashed by the negative effects of extracting, transporting, refining and burning the dirtiest form of fossil fuel.	PN 05, PN 02
Jim Rolka	March 11, 2013	I might support the Keystone XL pipeline project IF you demand an energy tradeoff for new solar and wind energy projects on an equal energy basis. That is, for every barrel of oil pumped, an equivalent amount of energy is produced by new solar and wind energy.	ALT 01
Jim Sirch	March 7, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is also a disaster for endangered species, including whooping cranes, American burying beetles, pallid sturgeon and others.	TES 01
Jim Steitz	March 10, 2013	The land-scalping operation now descending on the Canadian boreal forest is akin to the burning of the Amazon rainforest in its biological impacts and consequences for the stability of our planet's life-support system. In addition, the Canadian boreal forest is the primary breeding ground for most of the migratory songbirds that grace the American landscape. Mining of Canadian tar sands is snuffing out this chorus of life, progressively denuding the American spring with each passing year.	CU 03, CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	March 10, 2013	The Keystone pipeline, regardless of route, is especially gratuitous in is destruction of American interests, because the Canadian tar sands oil is far more carbon-intensive than even conventional petroleum. The extraction and burning of tar sands represents a backwards regression toward even greater emissions per unit energy produced, exactly the opposite of the fuel source changes America must make. The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application. American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years. Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy.	PN 05
Jim Steitz	March 15, 2013	American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years. Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy.	CLIM 18
Jim Steitz	March 15, 2013	This pipeline is irreconcilable with US policy on carbon dioxide pollution	CLIM 18
Jim Steitz	March 15, 2013	The land-scalping operation now descending on the Canadian boreal forest is akin to the burning of the Amazon rainforest in its biological impacts and consequences for the stability of our planet's life-support system. In addition, the Canadian boreal forest is the primary breeding ground for most of the migratory songbirds that grace the American landscape. Mining of Canadian tar sands is snuffing out this chorus of life, progressively denuding the American spring with each passing year.	CU 01
Jim Steitz	March 15, 2013	The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application.	PN 06
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	In the spectrum of possible transportation fuels and their impact on the atmosphere and other planetary life-support components, tar sands ranks near the very worst.	CLIM 05
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	The Administration's own chief climate scientist has warned that the construction of the pipeline would be "Game Over" for our climate,	CLIM 14
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	he land-scalping operation now descending on the Canadian boreal forest is akin to the burning of the Amazon rainforest in its biological impacts and consequences for the stability of our planet's life-support system. In addition, the Canadian boreal forest is the primary breeding ground for most of the migratory songbirds that grace the American landscape.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	Therefore, the extraction and burning of tar sands represents a backwards regression toward even greater emissions per unit energy produced, exactly the opposite of the fuel source changes America must make.	PN 02
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	Industry officials and analysts have stated plainly that Keystone is extremely important to their long-term plans for moving tar sands through the US to export, and recent developments within Canada support this conclusion. Canadian local jurisdictions have recently rejected several proposals for East-West pipelines to the British Columbian coast for export, based on the same types of ecological objections that Americans have raised domestically, leaving southbound pipelines as a key conduit for Canadian oil companies to move their carbon bombs to coastal ports. Therefore, the State Department's assertion that Keystone will not affect the ultimate disposition of the tar sands is a patent, naked, mathematical lie, and you must retract it.	PN 06
Jim Steitz	March 16, 2013	The Keystone pipeline would facilitate a trade of oxygen and songbirds for oil as Canada's export to the US, substantially depressing our quality or life and snuffing out the spring songbird chorus that makes our Appalachian spring beautiful.	WI 09
Jim Steitz	April 5, 2013	The stripping of the Canadian boreal forest for the tar sands would also proceed apace, regardless of the pipeline's route. The land-scalping operation now descending on the Canadian boreal forest is akin to the burning of the Amazon rainforest in its biological impacts and consequences for the stability of our planet's life-support system. In addition, the Canadian boreal forest is the primary breeding ground for most of the migratory songbirds that grace the American landscape. Mining of Canadian tar sands is snuffing out this chorus of life, progressively denuding the American spring with each passing year.	CU 01
Jim Steitz	April 5, 2013	The revised route proposal for the northern leg, in combination with the southern leg from Cushing to the Gulf Coast, clearly constitutes a collective "Keystone XL" pipeline in its original, mind-numbingly misguided conception, with only an altered route.	CU 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	April 5, 2013	American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years. Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy. In the spectrum of possible transportation fuels and their impact on the atmosphere and other planetary life-support components, tar sands ranks near the very worst. Tar sands is a catastrophe that the US must not facilitate, whatever the route that TransCanada tries to weave through the American permitting process. You must reject Keystone XL in its essential substance, as contrary to US national security interests that depend on a stable atmosphere and stable North American ecosystems.	PN 05
Jim Steitz	April 5, 2013	The Keystone pipeline, regardless of route, is especially gratuitous in is destruction of American interests, because the Canadian tar sands oil is far more carbon-intensive than even conventional petroleum. The extraction and burning of tar sands represents a backwards regression toward even greater emissions per unit energy produced, exactly the opposite of the fuel source changes America must make. The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application.	PN 05, CLIM 05
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application.	ACK
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	Although the Administration correctly denied permits for the original pipeline application, the either the revised northern leg or the southern leg, and particularly the combination of both that TransCanada plainly envisions, would facilitate the primary catastrophes of Keystone XL, namely the scalping of the Canadian forest and the acceleration of global warming.	CLIM 06
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	Instead, the heat and drought that is scorching the Great Plains this summer is a minor preview of what Keystone would unleash on American agriculture as a whole, by driving global dependence upon Canadian tar sands oil.	CLIM 16
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years.Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy.	PN 05
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	The construction of the Keystone pipeline, whether in one project across Kansas or in segments that ultimately connect to Texas refineries, would commit America to several decades of Canadian tar sands oil consumption	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	The construction of the Keystone pipeline, whether in one project across Kansas or in segments that ultimately connect to Texas refineries, would commit America to several decades of Canadian tar sands oil consumption This would nullify anything your Administration has done or could do for a clean energy economy,	PN 05
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	This pipeline is irreconcilable with US policy on carbon dioxide pollution, and would help to foreclose the possibility of the US substantially shifting away from carbon-intensive transportation fuels.	PN 05
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	This pipeline is irreconcilable with US policy on carbon dioxide pollution, and would help to foreclose the possibility of the US substantially shifting away from carbon-intensive transportation fuels.	PN 05
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years. Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy.	PN 08
Jim Steitz	April 6, 2013	The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application.	PN 11
Jim Steitz	April 10, 2013	The land-scalping operation now descending on the Canadian boreal forest is akin to the burning of the Amazon rainforest in its biological impacts and consequences for the stability of our planet's life-support system. In addition, the Canadian boreal forest is the primary breeding ground for most of the migratory songbirds that grace the American landscape. Mining of Canadian tar sands is snuffing out this chorus of life, progressively denuding the American spring with each passing year.	ACK
Jim Steitz	April 10, 2013	the heat and drought that is scorching the Great Plains this summer is a minor preview of what Keystone would unleash on American agriculture as a whole, by driving global dependence upon Canadian tar sands oil.	CLIM 14
Jim Steitz	April 10, 2013	American policy calls for a reduction in gasoline consumption, and this reduction indeed is already underway for three consecutive years. Therefore, there is no purpose for the Keystone pipeline but to frustrate US energy policy.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	April 10, 2013	Industry officials and analysts have stated plainly that Keystone is extremely important to their long-term plans for moving tar sands through the US to export, and recent developments within Canada support this conclusion. Canadian local jurisdictions have recently rejected several proposals for East-West pipelines to the British Columbian coast for export, based on the same types of ecological objections that Americans have raised domestically, leaving southbound pipelines as a key conduit for Canadian oil companies to move their carbon bombs to coastal ports. Therefore, the State Department's assertion that Keystone will not affect the ultimate disposition of the tar sands is a patent, naked, mathematical lie, and you must retract it.	PN 06
Jim Steitz	April 10, 2013	The facilitation of Canadian tar-sands mining is an overwhelming indirect impact that must be incorporated into the environmental impact analysis, and provide a clear grounds for rejecting the permit application.	PN 11
Jim Steitz	April 13, 2013	Industry officials and analysts have stated plainly that Keystone is extremely important to their long-term plans for moving tar sands through the US to export, and recent developments within Canada support this conclusion. Canadian local jurisdictions have recently rejected several proposals for East-West pipelines to the British Columbian coast for export, based on the same types of ecological objections that Americans have raised domestically, leaving southbound pipelines as a key conduit for Canadian oil companies to move their carbon bombs to coastal ports. Therefore, the State Department's assertion that Keystone will not affect the ultimate disposition of the tar sands is a patent, naked, mathematical lie, and you must retract it. Human survival depends on keeping the Canadian tar sands in the ground, and preventing Keystone from connecting to those tar sands is a necessary element of that.	PN 06
Jim Steitz	April 19, 2013	Industry officials and analysts have stated plainly that Keystone is extremely important to their long-term plans for moving tar sands through the US to export, and recent developments within Canada support this conclusion. Canadian local jurisdictions have recently rejected several proposals for East-West pipelines to the British Columbian coast for export, based on the same types of ecological objections that Americans have raised domestically, leaving southbound pipelines as a key conduit for Canadian oil companies to move their carbon bombs to coastal ports. Therefore, the State Department's assertion that Keystone will not affect the ultimate disposition of the tar sands is a patent, naked, mathematical lie, and you must retract it	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jim Steitz	April 20, 2013	Industry officials and analysts have stated plainly that Keystone is extremely important to their long-term plans for moving tar sands through the US to export, and recent developments within Canada support this conclusion. Canadian local jurisdictions have recently rejected several proposals for East-West pipelines to the British Columbian coast for export, based on the same types of ecological objections that Americans have raised domestically, leaving southbound pipelines as a key conduit for Canadian oil companies to move their carbon bombs to coastal ports. Therefore, the State Department's assertion that Keystone will not affect the ultimate disposition of the tar sands is a patent, naked, mathematical lie, and you must retract it.	PN 12, PN 06
Jim Walts	April 9, 2013	There is more to consider than the problems of just transporting tar sands crude. There are the impacts of getting it and burning it. You know this is not the direction we MUST go in. I'm willing to pay considerably more for fuel but I am not willing to destroy the future for my children and grandchildren.	PN 05
Jim Wierima	April 22, 2013	It would create very few permanent jobs,but the process of extrating it from the ground is very harmful to the environment along with the potential for spills	PN 05
Jimmie Young	April 2, 2013	We must break our connection with Middle Eastern Oil Interests!	ACK
jimmy fike	March 4, 2013	I am also concerned about global warming, and think we should put our emphasis into transitioning to less toxic and carbon laden forms of energy.	PN 02
jimmy fike	March 4, 2013	I believe the potential for spills and leaks poses too great a risk to the water, land, animals and people who live in its path.	PN 05
Jin Emerson-cobb	April 9, 2013	Immoral TransCanada has been factually reported as using bribery, intimidation, violence, and land seizure to make the pipeline a done deal before approval.	LEG 02
Jin Emerson-cobb	April 9, 2013	public comment is only allowed until April 22, 2013. This is inexcusable and underhanded	PRO 04
Jin Emerson-cobb	April 9, 2013	The Keystone XL would carry ca. 10 times the amount of acidic tar sands crude as the ExxonMobil pipeline that failed and put rivers of acidic crude into streets and yards in Mayflower, Ark. That spill shows what will happen if the lethal XL is approved.	RISK 07
Jin Emerson-cobb	April 9, 2013	The EIS does NOT adequately consider the effects of spills along the XL route, even though TransCanada and its partner Enbridge are KNOWN for spills. Get another EIS, one that FACTUALLY considers all aspects.	RISK 10
Jin Emerson-cobb	April 9, 2013	ransCanada is KNOWN for spills due to consistently DEFECTIVE pressure indicator valves etc., and is highly lax in cleaning up its ecocides. Moreover, the extremely corrosive tar sands crude makes it even more likely that pipes will crack and burst. The EIS and U.S. government have failed to address these factors.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jmwilson Tds.net	April 22, 2013	This oil is not for energy security for the United States but for export only,the oil is being shipped to Texas to be refined and subsequently exported.	PN 01
Jmwilson Tds.net	April 22, 2013	The issue with the Keystone pipeline is the lack of control and concern for ground water as well as a comprehensive cleanup plan.	WRG 01, RISK 29
Jo Ann Wright	April 3, 2013	MY PERSONAL OPINION IS THAT ANY INDUSTRY CREATING TOXIC BY PRODUCTS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO DEVELOP SAFE DISPOSAL PRODEDURES BEFORE THEY CAN START PRODUCTION OF THEIR PRODUCT. JUST LIKE NUCLEAR WASTE, TOXIC PONDS ARE NOT A SAFE DISPOSAL SOLUTION. LET'S START GIVING PRIORITY TO THE ENVIRONMENT RATHER THAN CORPORATE CARTELS.	ACK
Jo Anna Hebberger	March 28, 2013	Approving the Keystone XL Pipeline would be the wrong thing to do if you are really concerned about curbing the pollutants in the air that contribute to climate change.	PN 05
Jo Anna Hebberger	April 13, 2013	Because the tar sands are so heavy and corrosive, the export pipelines are more likely to spill than conventional pipelines.	RISK 11
Jo Day	April 4, 2013	Please pay attention to the recent spill in Arkansas...one more lesson why transporting tar sands through our country is not a good idea. It is harder to clean up and the company has no liability for clean up because of some additive.	SO 15, RISK 03
Jo Magnusson	April 19, 2013	I AM HOPING THAT THIS LAST SPILL (Mayflower) WILL FINALLY GET THE BALL ROLLING TO MAKE EVERYONE REALIZE THAT THE KEYSTONE PROJECT MUST NOT BE ALLOWED ONCE AND FOR ALL! IT MUST BE STOPPED BEFORE ANYMORE SPILLS!	ACK
Jo Payne	April 11, 2013	Please realize that this pipeline affects our air & water, such as is the case of the Rifle, Co leak that no one can find where the leak is coming from and the noxious fumes are over powering, my eyes burning every day.	RISK 07
Jo Reid-smith	April 22, 2013	Oil is not the dominant concern here. Water is the dominant concern. If we continue to abuse this sacred trust, water, no amount of oil and the profits therefrom will be worth anything.Tearing up the land, polluting the water, wasting the water, cannot be reasoned away by any profit making project by any corporation.	ACK
Jo Zeimet	April 11, 2013	We need to accelerate our use of renewables,	PN 02
Joan And Wallace Macdonald	April 9, 2013	Why should we take the risks, bear the burdens when the resulting refined oil will be exported	PN 05
Joan And Wallace Macdonald	April 9, 2013	puts drinking water supplies along the pipeline route at risk.	WRG 01
Joan Anderson	April 21, 2013	The risk of polluting the underground water with tar sand is too great to permit the pipeline to go across the aquifer.	WRG 01
Joan Anderson	April 22, 2013	Do not risk pollution of the aquifer for the benefit of one company.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joan Bartin	March 10, 2013	This will do harm to our middle american farmers passing thru the largest aquifer in our country. The first pipeline had up to 12 or 15 plus breaks and leaked many gallons of this very dirty and toxic crude oil, Imagine this happening and the damage that would accrue to our farmers and citizens' drinking water also.	RISK 26, RISK 07, WRG 01
Joan Beer	March 20, 2013	[The DSEIS] presents a worldview of a global economy inevitably dependent on dirty fossil fuels that is entirely at odds with the expressed views of Secretary of State John Kerry.	PN 05
Joan Beer	March 20, 2013	Now we are learning that this document was not prepared by any neutral government officials, but rather by a private company in the pay of the pipeline's owner. So it's hardly surprising that the statement came out strongly in favor of the pipeline.	PRO 01
Joan Dio	April 9, 2013	Please do not support this project at this time as it does not help our economy in any way shape or form as much as ExxonMobil would like you to believe.	PN 09
Joan E. Savage	March 22, 2013	I won't lay out the details of the narrow scope of the SEIS, which misses the crux of negative consequences.	LEG 04
Joan F Wilson	April 22, 2013	Obtaining this kind of oil is extremely damaging to the environment and refining and use of this oil will contribute to global warming.	CLIM 14
Joan Gravel	March 15, 2013	The environmental impact to climate change should be the only consideration for dealing with the keystone pipeline proposal. I want my innocent grandchildren to have a future, so for all the children deny the pipeline.	CLIM 14
Joan Jackson	April 22, 2013	Anything we do is unethical if it encourages Canada to destroy boreal forests and swamps (carbon sequesters) for energy we can do without (conservation is rarely even mentioned in this context)	CU 01
Joan Lichterman	April 21, 2013	I think it is unconscionable to encourage production of greenhouse gas-spewing oil, which is so extremely destructive to the planet -- especially as we move toward a clean energy future.	CLIM 14
Joan M/ Decker	March 20, 2013	If we are to have energy independence, then we must develop many sources, some renewable and some using available natural resources, however we must include in the costs of developing oil shales and tar sands ensuring that the environment of our planet, its fauna and flora, waterways, and climate are protected for future generations.	LEG 04
Joan Mckeown	April 9, 2013	As we move forward to a clean energy future, THERE IS NO ROOM FOR THE MOST DESTRUCTIVE OIL ON THE PLANET, and a thorough environmental review will make that abundantly clear	ACK
Joan Miller	April 15, 2013	One spill can cause catastrophic damage for decades, this has been proven time and time again.	RISK 08
Joan Schieber	April 11, 2013	This is not the way to adds jobs to help our economy. Look at the long-term costs to health, communities along the route, and the environment for all.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joan Tardif	March 10, 2013	I have written to you President Obama in the past regarding climate issues and have asked you to lead this country in reducing energy consumption. I expect you to uphold your campaign promises and trust you to ensure a future for your daughters, my granddaughter, and all future generations. You are in the position of power. You must do the right thing. Reject Keystone XL. I am counting on you yet again.	PN 02
Joan Walker	April 5, 2013	it's dangerous and destructive to our air and water and would lead to further tar sands development. Because of the total emissions caused by tar sands and the refining processes it would equal putting 9 million cars on the road.	ACK
Joan Wehr	April 11, 2013	There is no reason to jeopardize the clean water and agricultural problems for the profit of the few.	PN 05
Joan Wehr	April 11, 2013	we need to emphasize our food supply requirements in this area, as they can be greatly impacted by the spills that will occur.	RISK 09
Joann Brown	April 22, 2013	Please stop the XL Pipeline. Protect our fragile aquifer and our environment.	ACK
JoAnn Dolan	March 12, 2013	This DEIS ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills and leaks.	ACK
JoAnn Dolan	March 12, 2013	This DEIS ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate.	CLIM 14
Joann Durfee	April 11, 2013	another ecological disaster to our aquifers on the horizon.	ACK
Joann Durfee	April 11, 2013	the willingness to act without proper planning/review, scientific understanding,	ACK
Joann Durfee	April 11, 2013	[what can go wrong] the willingness to risk our water and land to expedite the increased production of a fuel that we know adds to our climate changes.	CLIM 14
Joann Durfee	April 11, 2013	the long-term and far-reaching impact of oil spills from a pipeline in this incredibly important heart of our agricultural production area --the slip shod response by the corporations involved.	RISK 08
Joann Fries	April 4, 2013	We can do without this oil and live with sun, wind and our own oil. Please say no.	ALT 01
Joanna Clark	March 10, 2013	Inside Climate News reports that State "relied on EnSys Energy and ICF International, two companies with deep ties to the oil and pipeline industry," to write the report.	PRO 01
Joanna Hanes-lahr	April 2, 2013	AND, After the spills in Arkansas and Minnesota, no pipeline should be approved that does not pay into the spill-insurance fund, as I understand XL doesn't. I head up the OFA Climate Change issue group in Annapolis, MD, and we urge you to reject the XL Pipeline.	SO 15, CLIM 14
Joanna Solins	April 4, 2013	No short-term economic gain could be worth the long-term, irreversible harm it will do to the entire planet.	PN 05
Joanne Bauer	April 8, 2013	spills in the past weeks have clearly demonstrated the dangers to humans and to the living environment. Reject the pipeline!	RISK 13
Joanne Clarke	March 10, 2013	Climate change aside, we must protect our water. The pipeline crosses over one of the largest aquifers in the country. A pipeline rupture is too great a risk to take. What good will cheap oil or energy be if we haven't got a drop of water to drink?	WRG 01
Joanne Dixon	March 14, 2013	the oil transported will not even stay in the US	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joanne Dude	April 13, 2013	I'm afraid of another oil spill by another non-American company again	ACK
Joanne Dude	April 13, 2013	How can a Canadian company declare eminent domain over American property?Are you thinking another country can force our landowners to sell their land?	PN 05
Joanne Mainiero	April 5, 2013	The only way we can handle this is NON TOXIC solutions and faux alternatives....	ACK
Joanne Williams	March 3, 2013	Why would the U.S. put money towards a project that doesn't move us any closer to a clean energy future?	PN 02
Joanne Williams	March 3, 2013	This project, in particular, would bring an especially dirty form of oil across the country for the sake of construction jobs.	PN 05
Joanne Williams	March 3, 2013	Any clean energy project also creates jobs, why choose a dirty project?	SO 05
Joby Mcclendon	April 15, 2013	Let's focus on renewable energy.	PN 02
Joby Mcclendon	April 15, 2013	Petroleum contaminates. Instead of continuously giving permission for more and more drilling and shipping and spilling and contaminating, just stop the cycle.	PN 09
Joby Mcclendon	April 16, 2013	let's use the energy sources that do not rob us of our health and life: the sun, the wind, the waves	PN 02
Jocelyn Moore	April 2, 2013	It's not only the potential for spills but the transportation effects, land use impacts, local community spikes and peaks and fugitive air emissions which will impact all areas along the length of the pipeline.	PN 05, CU 15
Jodene Glaesemann	April 22, 2013	Please deny the pipeline and look to other energy sources such as solar and wind.	PN 02
Jodi Devine	March 28, 2013	We must begin developing alternate energy sources instead of subsidizing big oil companies.	ALT 01
Jodie Adams	March 11, 2013	Equally environmentally damaging is the actual process of tar sands extraction. Thousands of pristine wilderness critical to the water and wildlife of the far north will be compromised and potentially eradicated.	CU 01
Jody Kocsis	April 22, 2013	I value our clean water, and theres no guarantee that the XL pipeline wont leak. The risk is NOT worth it! We need to protect our land and water.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Jody Meyer	April 22, 2013	It's time to commit to putting the health and welfare of our citizens and our environment ahead of the interests of the few and invest in areas that will improve the health of our economy, our citizens and our nation as a whole for the long term.	PN 09
Jody Meyer	April 22, 2013	[The added jobs and improvement of some local economies due to the Keystone XL Pipeline Project] will be temporary.	SO 04
Joe Beverly	April 9, 2013	Tar sands oil production causes far more global warming pollution than regular crude oil production,	CLIM 05
Joe Beverly	April 9, 2013	its chemical properties increase the likelihood of pipeline leaks and spills.	RISK 11
Joe Chasse	April 12, 2013	Going against multiple scientific studies outlining the harms of burning tar sands and the KXL Pipeline itself, the EIS states that the pipeline is not expected to cause any “significant environmental impact.” First problem: the State Dept. did not write the EIS: it was prepared by a consulting firm that works for TransCanada.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joe Delich	April 22, 2013	This oil pipeline is short term thinking and will desecrate the most beautiful part of our state.	PN 05
Joe Lazenby	March 20, 2013	The wording in the findings indicates that the study was approached within the wrong parameters. The concern is not whether a string of connected piping across the United States wil be harmful but whether the intended contents of that string of piping will be harmful.	PN 05
Joe Lendvai	April 20, 2013	The question I ask is, will this pipeline, if built, improve our health and well being our economy as well as our environment as a nation or simply enrich a relatively few investors over the short term, before some catastrophic damage to our water, air and soil?	PN 05
Joe Lynch	March 10, 2013	I'm a long time windsurfer living in…Texas...There is currently an excess of natural gas here. It is being burned off at the well heads to keep prices from collapsing. Permits are being applied for to liquify nat gas and sell it abroad. Let's find a way to utilize this resource in America. America does not need energy from tar sands.	PN 02
Joe Mclaughlin	March 15, 2013	[General green house gas emissions, climate change issues. How can govt. shut down coal fired plants, then accept a environ.risky pipeline? President must honor promise to our children's future, invest in alternative energy.]	PN 02
Joe Mcphee	April 5, 2013	THE TARS SANDS IS REALLY DIRTY, DIRTY OIL. MOST OF IT WILL BE EXPORTED FROM U.S. TO OTHER COUNTRIES.	ACK
Joe Michael	April 20, 2013	We should not be willing to sacrifice the safety and health of our country and our people,…	ACK
Joe Michael	April 20, 2013	Any pipeline this long is bound to cause one or many disasters over a period of time.	RISK 14
Joe Michael	April 22, 2013	I am totally opposed to the pipe line and if it goes through its a matter of timer when we will be stuck with spills that will totally distroy our under water system due to polution that cannot be rectified,	RISK 07
Joe Momberg	March 11, 2013	Your State Department just released their latest report on the pipeline, and it's reckless beyond belief. The draft is outrageous malpractice that refuses to acknowledge Keystone XL's huge impact on the climate. And get this: State actually used one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write the report! What a bunch of incompetent morons you have working for you! Are you the Bush administration?	PRO 01
Joe O'steen	April 13, 2013	The vulnerablility of a major aquafier to an oil spill could make vast stretches of the United States uninhabiltable, at the cost of untold trillions of dollars to the inhabitants and businesses, who could nor find any clean water.	RISK 07
Joe Pardee	April 22, 2013	It is time to reject the current review, the report was written by a contractor on the payroll of TransCanada, the oil giant that’s building Keystone and undertake a review that takes into consideration the environmental consequences of this project.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joe Pardee	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is a threat not only to our environment thru providing the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet, it also will create a danger to our water supply and other environmental damage do to the guaranteed pipeline spills.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Joe Pleasant	April 16, 2013	we can cut dependence on foreign oil while not compromising ou rown soil and air.	PN 05
Joe Pleasant	April 16, 2013	I worry about leaks which would enter into our clean water supplies, and the pollution caused by the use of the oil in gasoline.	RISK 07
Joe Ratliff	April 13, 2013	This will be an environmental disaster just waiting to happen. It will also promote the development of even more tar sands extraction sites in Canada, which will lead to even more destruction of pristine boreal forests and their related natural resources.	CU 01
Joe Rawlings	March 6, 2013	the true cost to wildlife and the environment	ACK
Joe Rawlings	March 6, 2013	It has been estimated that a major leak of the XL pipeline could pollute up to one third of the nations fresh water supply, poisoning not only the water, but everything that depends upon it including human beings.	WRG 01, RISK 24
Joe Thomas	March 28, 2013	We need work in this country at least it should put money in working peoples pockets	PN 10
Joe Tichenor	April 6, 2013	we need to Nationalize the petroleum industry in order to break up this corrupt institution and convert our energy system over to a renewable one that SERVES AVERAGE AMERICANS.	PN 02
Joe Touchette	March 11, 2013	I have heard the the Keystone XL pipeline will be for oil eventually exported from the US. I have also heard the Keystone XL pipeline will be for oil for internal US use. Which is it? Or, is it for both purposes?	PN 07
Joel And Lucinda Wingard	March 14, 2013	Making us "energy independent" by encouraging the mining and transporting of fossil fuels is a true threat to human civilization--we know that burning these fuels leads inexorably to more climate change.	CLIM 14
Joel Easton	April 1, 2013	the published plans for the tar sands diluted bitumin pipeline reveal the urgent need to cancel this proposal. The negtive repercussions FAR outweigh the claimed benefits to the public and economic windfall to a comparatively few over the needs of the United States.	PN 05
Joel Easton	April 1, 2013	They just claim that leaking 1.5% of its capacity each time the pipeline fails won't hurt or nations water table, farms, and communities.	RISK 07
Joel Easton	April 1, 2013	And they don't discuss so called small spills of less than 1.5% because their system can't detect those.	RISK 15
Joel Easton	April 1, 2013	Spills are inevitable. The pipeline developer admits it.	RISK 21

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	2. We endorse the principles and facts contained in the Statement from the Indigenous Environmental Network as Initial Response to the US Department of State Keystone XL Pipeline Draft Supplemental EIS 2013, dated March 6, 2013, http://www.ienearth.org/docs/IEN-Statement-on-draft-SEIS-KXL.pdf, especially: a. “Appendix E, Record of Consultation of Indian Tribes and Nations: Appendix E of this Draft SEIS the Record of Consultation is a table with a list of the names of the Indian Tribes and Nations who were consulted...with only dates within the respective columns and rows identified with the name of the Tribe and State. What this section, nor any other section in this Draft SEIS, does not provide, is the statements from these Indigenous and sovereign nations in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and rejection of the xpansion of the tar sands, of which the KXL will facilitate.”	CR 01
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	2. We endorse the principles and facts contained in the Statement from the Indigenous Environmental Network as Initial Response to the US Department of State Keystone XL Pipeline Draft Supplemental EIS 2013, dated March 6, 2013, http://www.ienearth.org/docs/IEN-Statement-on-draft-SEIS-KXL.pdf, especially: b. “The lack of comprehensive consultation with Native Nations and lack of meaningful participation with indigenous traditional societies, spiritual leaders and tribal grassroots on the protection of sacred areas, and cultural and historical resources is an environmental justice and treaty right issue and is unacceptable.”	CR 01
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	2. We endorse the principles and facts contained in the Statement from the Indigenous Environmental Network as Initial Response to the US Department of State Keystone XL Pipeline Draft Supplemental EIS 2013, dated March 6, 2013, http://www.ienearth.org/docs/IEN-Statement-on-draft-SEIS-KXL.pdf, especially: c. There is substantial documentation of the devastation of the environment, ecosystem, water, air, and more recently the health of the Native people living in the national sacrifice zone of the tar sands. Evidence of rare cancers linked to petroleum contamination is on the increase. The Alberta tar sands are far away, in another country, but the Obama administration could be making a decision that can directly affect the health and future of the Dene, Cree and Metis' First Nations people. The U.S. Department of State addresses human rights issues worldwide, however, in this report; it completely ignores its responsibility to apply U.S. policy on environmental justice and its commitment to address human rights.	CU 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	Chief Allan Adams, of the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN), Fort Chipewyan, Alberta, Canada, IEN, states: I must stress my extreme disappointment with this report. The fact that the Keystone XL pipeline is deemed as non-consequential simply paves the way for its approval and is directly connected to the unabated expansion of Tar Sands in my peoples' traditional lands .... and the Keystone is a vital pipeline for expansion. Expansion of the tar sands means a death sentence for our way for life, destruction of ecosystems vital to the continuation of our inherent treaty rights and massive contributions to catastrophic global climate change, a fate we all share.	CU 05
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	3. We further support and cite the principles in letter dated March 1, 2013, by Alexei Avtonomov, Chair of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, which enumerated many violations of US Federal and State Laws, Acts and protections afforded to the Kikapoo Traditional Tribe of Texas, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo (Tigua) and the Lipan Apache (Ndé) indigenous communities in relation to the construction of the Texas-Mexico border wall. Similar violations appear in the analysis for the proposed XL Pipeline due to the failure of the authors to take a “hard look” and summarily discount the associated impacts caused by the construction, maintenance and the sourcing of the oil supply from tar sands extraction. Http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/docs/early_warning/USA1March2013.pdf a. Citing violations of various federal laws, the Chair of the Committee found: “Subsequently, the border wall has allegedly been built on sensitive environmental areas and lands inhabited by indigenous communities, without sufficient and effective prior consultation with the affected population, and apparently continues to damage the land, the ecosystem, and the cultural and traditional way of life of indigenous communities. It has also been reported that while the wall has been built on the lands of indigenous peoples, it has skipped border areas with lucrative properties owned by business, such as the River Bend Golf Resort.”	LEG 01
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	4. The proposed pipeline does not comply with the Department of State Purpose and Need requirements for the National Interest mandate as enumerated in Section 1.3.2…..Our energy security is undermined by the expansion of fossil fuels infrastructure. We cannot afford to risk our collective future by promoting climate chaos caused by the increased use of fossil fuels. The proposed Keystone XL pipeline undermines foreign policy objectives and displaces the potential of energy efficiency, conservation and renewable energy systems.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joel R. Kupferman; Annie Wilson	April 22, 2013	1. In accordance with its interim guidance, the Department of State selected Environmental Resources Management (known as "ERM") to serve as an independent third-party contractor for its environmental review of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline project. ERM is assisting the Department in conducting a thorough analysis of both the new route in Nebraska and any other relevant information that has become available. ERM has proven itself biased and in favor of industry with a history of being primarily hired by large firms that have produced much environmental degradation.	PRO 01
Joel Yoder	March 10, 2013	The latest research involving climate chang revealed that, in the cycles of Ice Age and Earth re-warming, has accelerated. What once took 10,000 years to raise the Earth's tempertaure one(1) degree, now has happened in only 100 years; directly related to carbon added to the atmosphere. We WILL NOT survive as a species, if we don't STOP and create a new paradyme.	ACK
Joelle Robinson	April 22, 2013	Climate change is my top priority issue and the Keystone XL pipeline would make our climate situation that much more dire.	CLIM 14
Joellen Gilchrist	March 22, 2013	For you, as a president who said no to the tar sands pipeline once, and John Kerry who has repeatedly showed concern about global warming, to approve the Keystone pipeline now would be beyond comprehension.	CLIM 18
Joey Firman	April 23, 2013	Climate Change is a dominating, major factor, not just one of several to be considered. I would like to argue that concerns about emissions and impacts on climate change need to be held to an extent above certain issues (relations with Canada, job creation) Jobs and a relationship with Canada will depend on a stable climate in the long run. … This project will tap into one of the largest holds of carbon on the planet and encourage it to be burned and burned. It needs to be stopped, because we have come too far as a species to stack any more chips against our survival.	CLIM 14
Joey Firman	April 23, 2013	Tar sands are a particularly problematic fossil fuel: They require a more intensive production process. If any fossil fuels are to be developed, all else being equal, the less carbon-intensive production processes ought be prioritized. This pipeline will lock us into tar sands. The pipeline's very existence incentivizes production of the item at the other end. It will remain that way for years if not decades. We can not afford that amount of carbon. Rejecting the pipeline offers an opportunity to send a major signal to the world about the United States priorities. China, India, and others in this country and beyond need to know that it is time for a major shift. Tar Sands will not be developed nearly as extensively without the KXL pipeline. Rail is too expensive and risky and the western nor the eastern routes will not be constructed.	CLIM 18, CLIM 05, PN 03, PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joey Firman	April 23, 2013	The hardest argument to debunk for the pipeline is the job creation. It will only create 35 jobs you say, and thousands of construction jobs, and those are real. If we were at a time when we were absolutely out of ideas of how to create jobs, then I would say you know what, maybe, maybe this pipeline needs to happen, and we can dig really deep into some other way of carbon savings. But this is simply not the case, not even close. First of all, a massive number of jobs have been created in the last few years, without this pipeline. The entire economic recovery has been taking place without this pipeline. But there is still further to go. Thankfully there is an excellent answer to this question: jobs in energy efficiency, jobs in public transit, jobs in composting, jobs in renewable energy. State ought counter the KXL proposal with a push on the President to take real action to begin training legions of workers in the green jobs trade, along with a cultural shift towards more respect towards resources. All at once would be naive, but to not take this into the long term plan of the United States is very dangerous and reckless.	SO 05
Johanna Sayre	March 30, 2013	Most of all, it is yet another pretense of creating 'energy independence for this country, forever'.	ACK
Johanna Sayre	March 30, 2013	The arguments of vast numbers of jobs in first building, then operating the pipeline are not only spurious for their content and dubious time tables.	SO 02
Johanna Startzman	April 17, 2013	I would also like to ask if hemp is being considered as an alternate fuel? It seems as though there are many uses of hemp that would be much more environmentally efficient and sound.	ACK
John	March 14, 2013	Keystone can…be used to transport oil from North Dakota. Presently rail and truck are used. Isn't a pipeline less likely to result in spills?	ACK
John	March 14, 2013	Keystone can also be used to transport oil from North Dakota. Presently rail and truck are used. Isn't pipeline shipping less energy intensive than rail or truck?	ALT 09
John	April 18, 2013	The March 13, 2013 Keystone Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) specifies the influence of Alberta, Canada's tar sands heavy crude oil on climate change. Tar sands oil produces 17% more greenhouse gasses than the average barrel of oil. (1) While the EIS assessed "Climate Change Effects on the Project," the impact of increased greenhouse gasses on citizens of United States was not addressed. This impact is the essence of any national interest determination that examines Keystone XL and similar projects.	CLIM 12
John & Gwen Wages	March 10, 2013	Instead of allowing this foolhardy project to go forward, the US should invest for the long term in renewables. Only renewable energy, by definition, will be available for the good of our society and our economy, for generations to come. Invest in solar technologies, wind power, and advanced biofuels--not the hardest-to-reach, dirtiest sources of fossil fuels.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John And Ann Kadyk	April 20, 2013	We all know, don't we, that we need to make every effort to put our efforts into renewable energy, which is the main tool to mitigate climate change. Putting further investment in oil is the opposite direction, and should be opposed on this basis alone, but the XL pipeline and tar sands are far worse due to the high potential for spills, leakage, and other environmental disruptions. We should put the money and efforts elsewhere.	PN 02
John And Barbara Freund	March 28, 2013	In case you didn't know, a person protesting the pipeline climbed into a section of it, discovered it had holes in it from bad riveting, and was arrested for 29 days. The same day she was arrested, that section was sunk in the ground! I would say that's all you need to know. But there are also the 12 oil spills already in Canada from that awful project!	RISK 23
John And Linda Blackwell	March 17, 2013	I have read articles about the horrible results to surrounding properties where tar sands drilling has taken place. Pollution from the chemicals has ruined farm lands in North Dakota. People who have owned the land for generations are suddenly left with no value to their property and no way to economically retrieve the former value of their property due to other investors who have applied and been granted the right to drill on or under someone else's property, because it is about the search for minerals under ground.	CU 14
John And Linda Blackwell	March 17, 2013	Since I am originally from Nebraska and grew up hearing about the underground aquifer that was of major importance to the Midwest, I am appalled that this has been allowed to happen to the proud people who have managed the land that feeds many in the USA. Aquifers are important to everyone, and the land itself must not be polluted.	WRG 01
John And Sandra Walker	March 28, 2013	The XL pipeline is providing eminent domain status for our lands to Trans-Canada, with no promise of anything good for the US.	LEG 02
John Andes	March 14, 2013	If an EIS is to contracted it must be prepared by firm(s) whose examination of those impacts must be objective; this EIS is not, having been contracted out to firms with ties to the oil industry. This document is plainly bogus and an insult to the NEPA process and the interests of the American people.	PRO 01
John Andes	April 14, 2013	The State Department MUST completely redo the EIS using firms with absolutely no ties in any manner with the oil, tar sands, and pipeline industries. Which ever contractors are used to prepare the next EIS must be completely independent and instructed and required to evaluate the entire range of effects of the pipeline construction and operation, ongoing tar sands development, and the effects of those construction, operation, and development on the accelerating global climate change situation.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Bails	March 10, 2013	The tar sands were talked about a lot in the 70's and 80's as alternatives. The biggest problem I see is the amount of water used for processing. Water is to scarce to use it this way.	CU 07
John Bamberger	April 17, 2013	IT IS ABOUT TIME WE STOP MUCKING AROUND WITH OBSOLETE FOSSIL FUELS AND MOVE ON TO MORE REALISTIC METHODS OF ENERGY GENERATION - OR OUR CIVILIZATION WILL COLLAPSE BY THE END OF THIS CENTURY~	CLIM 14
John Barson	April 9, 2013	Please do whatever you can to delay implementation of the potentially environmentally destructive XL Pipeline Project before a more comprehensive examination and report has been conducted.	ACK
John Bartels	April 15, 2013	And if the question of jobs comes up, it has come to my attention that this pipeline will only create 35 permanant jobs, aside from the distinct possibility that there will always be some sort of clean-up operation involved with this entirely too risky development.	PN 05
John Bisbee	April 17, 2013	We should be investing in renewable fuels, not these terribly dirty ones.	ALT 01
John Bisbee	April 17, 2013	Alberta Tar Sands contain enough carbon to dramatically alter our climate--they are three times as carbon intensive as other fuels.	CLIM 12
John Bisbee	April 19, 2013	I ask you to reject the Keystone pipeline because it will increase air pollution from refineries on the Gulf Coast. We should be investing in clean, renewable fuels, not creating more pollution.	CU 04
John Bito	April 22, 2013	This Environmental Impact statement is flawed because it was developed by contractors with a vested interest in the development of oil-pipelines.	PRO 01
John Borowski	April 17, 2013	Boreal forest is clearcut and damaged beyond repair	CU 01
John Borowski	April 17, 2013	Why not invest our future in wind/solar and use natural gas as a transition fuel?	PN 02
John Borowski	April 17, 2013	Most of this oil is going to end up on foreign markets	PN 07
John Brauner	April 2, 2013	Climate change is caused by our excessive burning of fossil fuels. We cannot continue burning at such a high rate and we definitely should not be using forms of fuels that generate much carbon dioxide in their acquisition. That means tar sand oil, specifically. If the Keystone pipeline would be built, it would cause this most highly polluting source of oil to be used at an even higher rate, accelerating climate change to our detriment.	CLIM 14
John Brauner	April 16, 2013	Arguments that its construction would provide many needed jobs is a non-starter because even more jobs would be created by the development of clean energy sources, especially wind and solar photovoltaic.	SO 05
John Bremer	March 28, 2013	It seems peculiarly irrational to proceed with more and larger dilbit pipeline construction, when our best engineering has so far failed to contain the results of this one failure of a dilbit pipeline [in Kalamazoo].	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Brennan	April 19, 2013	Fracking is just another example of how the big energy companies arrogantly "make progress!" Whether it's Pennsylvania, North Dakota or Utah, the destruction accrues and the U.S. taxpayers are left to clean up the mess.	ACK
John Brennan	April 19, 2013	I doesn't make any difference to the gas companies nor to the oil companies that also own the gas companies, they're not going to improve their technology to protect our environment, nor are they going to improve their very poor record of safety. Like the coal companies that originally started the book on how to lobby Congress and the U.S. Senate with money and election results, they just ignore the $400 billion dollars in subsidies they get each year and move on to pollute and destroy our environment and lives just to make a bigger profit.	PN 05
John Brennan	April 19, 2013	TransCanada's pipeline will not hire all that they claim that they will and if they do, they'll pay coolie wages and benefits. And then they'll tell the public how good you have it as you head for the hospital with another strange ailment that the judges that have been bought and paid for will rule in the coroporation's failure.	SO 04
John Bristow	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores... clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
John Bristow	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores… catastrophic impacts on our climate,	CLIM 12
John Bristow	April 4, 2013	he latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills,	RISK 07
John Britton	March 11, 2013	Numerous spills have already occurred causing great damage and exposing our citizens to some of the most poisonous sludge ever to come out of the earth.	RISK 13
John Burke	April 9, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, and all our fossil fuel use should be 'scrapped' for a renewable energy policy, based on wind and solar power ... for the sake of the environment and the future generations.	PN 02
John Calabrese	April 5, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
John Canepa	April 15, 2013	Why doesn't Canada just build a refinery within their borders? or on one one their coasts?	ALT 08
John Carpenter	April 9, 2013	We really don't need to risk our health this much for a few jobs, even if they were American instead of Canadian jobs and certainly not for big oil companies who are being given too many gratuities by governmental bodies already.	PN 05
John Cherry	April 22, 2013	Id love to see wind and solar utilized for for public power, Id also love to see hemp legalized for use in biofuels (and other materials) as its a renewable resource with a plethora of uses.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Condon	April 18, 2013	A long-term, stable, supply of energy from a close ally should ceratinly be a part of the Presiden's "all of th eabove" strategy.	PN 10
John Corrent	March 28, 2013	The State Department's recent draft environmental review should be reviewed by FERC	PRO 05
John Craig	April 9, 2013	Environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline MUST include…Even more importantly the long term cost and threat to the planet as a whole from burning this much more dirty tar sands hydrocarbons.	CLIM 10
John Craig	April 9, 2013	Environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline MUST include .. 1. Short term environmental hazards if the pipe breaks.	RISK 10
John Cruz	April 13, 2013	It makes more sense to invest and encourage the development of wind and solar power, not tar sands which is some of the most polluting energy we can produce	ALT 01
John Curtis	April 15, 2013	If it cannot be rejected due to political considerations, make it environmentally safe. Double walls, pressure monitoring devices, expansion elbows and any other device to ensure that failure can be minimized.	RISK 14
John D. Linhardt	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is a resource put in place by Almighty God to provide water for our daily needs and for crops. The very idea that any group of humans would want to endanger that sacred resource is an offense.	WRG 01
John D. Stickle	April 15, 2013	There is no way possible that this Keystone Xl will not leak and when it does, it will dwarf the BP Gulf Oil spill.	RISK 18
John Deltognoarmanasco	March 28, 2013	At a bare minimum, if you are going to allow this, then the companies involved need to put forward a 300 billion dollar bond that would enable the government to repair any issues or build a water purification system for all of the towns whose water systems had been contaminated by this process.	SO 16
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	Additionally, Section 1.6 Tribal and SHPO Consultation and Appendix E Record of Consultation Table of the DSEIS does not specify who were the tribal recipients of e-mails, mail, and faxes from the Department's outreach efforts.	CR 01
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	Finally, it is of significance to note that the Project navigates extremely close to off-reservation trust lands of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation.	CR 01
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	The DSEIS has not yet effectively integrated tribal consultation and feedback that has been consistently requested by tribal nations.While the Department of State has noted an ongoing process to engage with tribal nations, the Department has still not developed an extensive and sufficient tribal consultation plan and has instead relied on its Executive Order 13175 implementation plan.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	In Montana, the pipeline passes extremely close to and could have catastrophic impacts on the natural resources related to the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation. Additionally, there are off-reservation trust lands of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians near the pipeline in Northern Montana.	CR 02
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will also pass through or near burial grounds and other sacred places that are not held in trust by the federal government, but exist in traditional and historic tribal territories that have clear and ongoing tribal interests.	CR 02
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	While consultation has been documented by the Department of State in the DSEIS (Section 1.6 Tribal and SHPO Consultation, and Appendix E Record of Consultation Table) it is unclear how the Department has engaged with the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) to ascertain impacts to off-reservation sacred and cultural places. Furthermore, it is unclear how and if tribes were involved in these Department discussions with SHPOs given that tribes have Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or other similar designees. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) affords these protections to tribes to ensure that consultation with tribal governments or THPOs occurs.	CR 02, CR 01
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	Tribal leaders strongly believe that the pipeline project is not in the national interest, that it violates longstanding treaties and agreements between tribal nations and the federal government, and that domestic energy should be met by developing energy resources responsibly to protect vital natural resources.	LEG 01
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	However there is no indication as to the potential impact HDD will have in these two major water crossings, nor have indications been made regarding any contingency alternative.	PD 07
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	National Congress of American Indians Re: Comments of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Keystone XL Pipeline April 22, 2013 Pg.1-17	REF
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	As indicated by the DSEIS the impacts of the Project to surface water and groundwater have the potential to be significant during the construction and operations phase of the Project.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	It is of serious concern, given the potential environmental impacts outlined in the DSEIS that in the section Appendix I Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure Plan and ERP , there is no reference to measures in place to contact and coordinate with tribal emergency management authorities or engage with tribal governments regarding remediation funding in the event of a significant spill. It is the advice of NCAI to include this information in the final version of the SEIS. If further consultation is required the federal government should engage in this immediately as pursuant to Executive Order 13175.	RISK 23, RISK 05
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	The Project has the potential to have significant impacts on critical water supply services for the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Rosebud Sioux Tribe of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, and Lower Brule Sioux Tribe of the Lower Brule Reservation.	WRG 02
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	[Impacts on the Assiniboine & Sioux Rural Water Supply System (ASRWSS)] The Cheyenne River crossing of the pipeline occurs near the Southwestern most edge of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation at milepost #430.07 and is approximately 1,600 feet wide. Within the report there is no reference to any study of the potential environmental impacts to the surface water, ground water, fisheries, and water rights, or the cultural impacts of a spill to this tribal nation. It is the advice of NCAI to include this information in the final version of the SEIS.	WRG 02, FISH03, WRS 13
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	However, the DSEIS provides no impact assessment related to the potential impact to tribal nations with regard to surface water, ground water, fisheries, and possible water rights issues.	WRG 02, FISH03, WRS 13
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	The Missouri River crossing will take place at the Missouri River near the Southwestern most edge of the Fort Peck Reservation at milepost #89.6 and will be approximately 1,000 feet wide. Other than records of contact in the Appendix E Record of Consultation Table within the DSEIS, there is no mention or reference to the any study of the potential environmental impacts to the surface water, ground water, fisheries, and water rights, or the cultural impacts of a spill to this tribal nation.	WRG 02, FISH03, WRS 13
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	the proposed project crosses two major waterbodies which, in the case of a spill, would have significant impact on surface water, ground water, fisheries, and possibly water rights of the Fort Peck Tribes of Assiniboine - and Sioux Tribes – along the Missouri River - and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe – along the Cheyenne River.	WRG 02, FISH03, WRS 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	[Impacts on the Assiniboine & Sioux Rural Water Supply System (ASRWSS)] Additional stress to this region's water supply, specifically to the Missouri River, brought on by "Large Spill" would result in unknown stress to the ASRWSS – though it is clear this is a direct threat to the water supply system which draws water from Missouri and is downstream of the crossing point. There is no mention of this situation in the DEIS and it is a significant omission. Evaluation of the impact of the Project to the tribal nation and the state efforts related to the ASRWSS must be addressed.	WRS 13, RISK 07
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	[THREATS TO TRIBAL WATER SYSTEMS: THE MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (MWRWSP)] In section 3.3 (page 3.3 – 33), the DSEIS identifies that the Project would cross the MWRWSP distribution infrastructure – indicating that the BOR and tribal partners may have requirements for the crossings. While tribal nations, specifically the Oglala Sioux Tribe, have put forward concerns through official correspondence, beyond this reference the DSEIS fails to fully evaluate the risk posed by these crossings. It is our understanding that if the project is permitted, the tribe will insist that design requirements for crossings be developed cooperatively with BOR (pg.11 of17)	WRS 13, RISK 14
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	[THREATS TO TRIBAL WATER SYSTEMS: THE MNI WICONI RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROJECT (MWRWSP)] There are two concerns raised by crossing water and oil pipelines: first, the pipeline could be damaged by corrosion and second, the water supply could be interrupted by a hot oil spill. The metal pipes could corrode more quickly due to their interaction with the soil and one of the crossings is near a section of the water line that includes PVC pipe that could be damaged by a hot oil spill.	WRS 13, RISK 14
John Dossett, National Congress of American Indians	April 24, 2013	Specifically the DSEIS does not indicate the potential environmental impacts to the surface water, ground water, fisheries, and possibly water rights of the Fort Peck Tribes of Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes (Fort Peck Tribes) – along the Missouri River - and the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe – along the Cheyenne River. While the Draft DSEIS partially addresses the potential impact to the The Mni Wiconi Rural Water System it does not address the potential environmental impact to the Fort Peck Tribes' Assiniboine & Sioux Rural Water Supply System.	WRS 13, WRG 02
John Dukovich	April 15, 2013	We need clean, renewable energy sources now. We could install wind and wave turbines off of the East Coast now. We could demand every office building, retail store, and shopping mall install solar panel now.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Earl	March 19, 2013	In your State of the Union address you vowed to tackle catastrophic climate change. So I am deeply disappointed that your State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. In the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other deadly weather events, our government should not be whitewashing the very real and disastrous effects of climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL. Please reject the State Department's review and direct Secretary of State Kerry to undertake the kind of comprehensive analysis that you have long promised. That review should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development, the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States Please make sure that this first major climate decision of your second term protects our planet, rather than fueling destruction of our climate. As we move toward a clean energy future, it is unconscionable to encourage production of greenhouse gas spewing oil, so extremely destructive to the planet. Please send your State Department back to the drawing board.	ACK
John Earl	March 19, 2013	As well, any review should acknowledge that financial analysts and oil executives agree that the Keystone XL decision will make or break tar sands development in Canada.	PN 06
John Earl	March 19, 2013	and the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills.	RISK 07
John Elwood	April 15, 2013	the EIS seems to ignore all risks to any other tar sands transportation proposal. We're essentially saying that our analysis is over the impact of something that can't – by our assumptions – have any meaningful climate impact, because we assume that the impacts will be made by alternative means, if not by this pipeline. If we assume that it is, then of course, there's nothing to lose by capitulation, since all is lost anyway. This assumption flies in the face of the fact that the KXL is the biggest and furthest advanced in the application process, the trailing proposals face political and legal obstacles, and the alternative mode of transportation is almost nonexistent.	PN 11
John Fitzpatrick	April 5, 2013	We hope you noticed the disastrous spill that occurred this last weekend in Mayflower, Arkansas with Exxon's tar sands oil pipeline as a testament to the safety issues that this project involves.	RISK 14
John Foreman	April 2, 2013	If creating jobs is the most important consideration in whether to approve Keystone XL, the fact is only a miniscule number of jobs would be created, unless, of course, the intention is to create jobs cleaning up the inevitable spills that would occur.	RISK 17, PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Fowler	March 23, 2013	Keystone XL should be denied because of environmental issues that will be caused by its continued construction. Aquifers, personal property and land must be protected from destruction and contamination risks.	WRG 01, RISK 06
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	Failure to consider a scenario in which rail and other transportation alternatives are insufficient to pick up the slack if Keystone XL and other pipeline projects are rejected. For example, can rail infrastructure realistically transport 6 to 9 million barrels of tar sands oil daily? The final SEIS must analyze the benefits of not extracting, transporting and burning the tar sands oil if the train transport or other alternatives are not financially or otherwise feasible as projected in the draft SEIS. In such a scenario, denial of the pipeline permit prevents all impacts, with no consideration of unlikely alternative transport mechanisms.	ALT 09
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	The projection of CO2-equivalent gas emissions per year of 5.3 million tons 2030 is just 23% of the 23 million ton estimate made by EPA. The final SEIS must consider the significance of catastrophic climate change impacts at the rate of emissions projected by EPA, which would be equivalent to adding 4 million cars to the road per year.	CLIM 11
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	The Draft SEIS does not consider the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions. The final SEIS must calculate the social cost of greenhouse gas emissions, including use of EPA's estimate of CO2 emissions that would be generated by the pipeline	CLIM 16
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	The final SEIS must explain how delaying the transition to clean power and fuels, adding to the already unsustainable concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere, and endangering precious water supplies along the proposed pipeline route is in the national interest of current – and future -- generations.	PN 03
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	The final SEIS must disclose whether firms conducting analysis have ties to oil and pipeline companies with a vested interest in the outcome. Firms with no such conflicts of interests must be utilized.	PRO 01
John Friedrich	April 22, 2013	The final SEIS must adequately examine the risk for toxic spills and the threats these would pose to water supplies, human healthy, wildlife, migratory bird populations.	RISK 07
John Fritz	March 11, 2013	Use the power of your office to empower sustainable wind, solar, wave and geothermal energy systems, which will create long term jobs and help heal the planet.	ALT 01
John Gluth	April 6, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
John Gregg	April 4, 2013	but critics have said that the experts in the report have a vested interest in the pipeline's success	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Grillo	April 5, 2013	a major oil spill likely to occur from carelessly newly installed, and, older, prior equipment are found to be defective that bursts; and there are afterward signs of deliberate negligence; or, unintentional ignorance that are factors found to be the contributing causes as indications of safety violations as a result of "tar sands" oil consequences; that it is highly toxic to humans, animals, vegetation, and threatens our water tables and ground water with contamination.	RISK 14
John Harding	April 18, 2013	I think the pipeline would be safer and more environmental friendly than tank cars on rail or tank trucks.	ACK
John Hessler	March 14, 2013	Who plans to answer the questions raised about possible collusion, conflict of interest, even fraud in the State Department's having farmed out the writing of this Draft SEIS to a series of contractor firms whose major clients include those that stand to benefit most directly from the pipeline?	PRO 01
John Hessler	March 14, 2013	http://readersupportednews.org/opinion2/277-75/16462-fraud-at-state-taxpayers-take-pipeline-	REF
John Howard	April 9, 2013	I have visited several of the mines where tar sands are extracted in northern Alberta. These are huge operations that have massive impacts on the land, water and wildlife	ACK
John Howard	April 9, 2013	Moreover, mining, refining and burning tar sand oil releases enormous amounts of carbon into the atmosphere.	CLIM 05
John Irwin	April 5, 2013	We should block this pipeline and shift effort to building our clean energy economy.	ALT 01
John Jongen	April 3, 2013	The OGLALA aquifer and America's breadbasket that depends on it, must not be put at risk of a tar sands spill.	RISK 07
John Kloetzel	April 14, 2013	We DON'T NEED this pipeline to pump the dirty tar sands sludge to the Texas gulf coast for refining, to be sold overseas. WHY risk the inevitable leaks across America's midriff to facilitate the increased harvest of this particularly dirty fossil fuel? And from another country at that, which stands to profit the most. As for American 'jobs': they'll be few, and temporary.	PN 05
John Krotchko	March 26, 2013	We need ACTION and NOT JUST WORDS on U.S. policy addressing climate change	CLIM 18
John L Pappan	April 22, 2013	We stand against yet another Injustice to our people we were never consulted on this matter. We look to protect our homelands, water and future generations.	CR 01
John L. Ward	April 18, 2013	Internal corrosion caused 218 (46.5%) of comparable spills on the Alberta pipeline system, or over 16 times the rate of American spills due to corrosion. And that is despite the fact that American pipes carrying hazardous liquids are 20 years older on average than hazardous liquid pipes in Alberta!	RISK 13, RISK 11
John Laing	April 9, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	RISK 20, CU 04
John Lamb	April 21, 2013	the oil releases more CO2 than regular oil when burned	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Lamb	April 21, 2013	thousands of square miles of forest are being destroyed to release the tar	CU 01
John Lamb	April 21, 2013	PROBABLE REDUCTION IN US JOBS - pipeline construction adds a few hundred jobs for a year or two, and maybe 30 in the long run. The economic benefit t o China is likely to take away many more US jobs than those.	PN 05
John Lamb	April 21, 2013	global oil companies, Canada and China will get almost all the economic benefit, as most of the products from this pipeline are intended to go directly to China.	PN 07
John Lamb	April 21, 2013	INADEQUATE SAFETY PLAN - tar oil needs more water to keep it moving, so leakage risk from corrosion is greater, however (as we have seen from the spill two years ago) no effective clean up techniques have been developed	RISK 05
John Lewis	April 2, 2013	As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas), several major rivers (including the Missouri, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers), and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland.	ACK
John Lewis	April 2, 2013	Moreover, tar sands oil produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than crude oil, which would make our climate change problem worse. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that Keystone XL would increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	ACK
John Lewis	April 2, 2013	Please put public health and safety first and revise your Environmental Impact Statement to include the full hazards the pipeline represents.	RISK 07
John Lewis	April 2, 2013	The dangers from tar sands oil were made vividly real last Friday when thousands of barrels of tar sands oil gushed out in Arkansas, forcing residents to flee their homes. A similar accident in North Dakota spilled 21,000 gallons of oil and in one year, Keystone I, which runs from Canada through Illinois, had 14 reported leaks.	RISK 26
John Lewis	April 9, 2013	Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	PN 06
John Licata	April 23, 2013	The draft Environmental Impact Statement is incredibly biased. It was completed by a consulting firm selected and paid for by the owner of the pipeline. There are more complete reviews of the full environmental, economic and climate impact of the pipeline.	PRO 01
John Licata	April 23, 2013	The construction of the pipeline would NOT create the 20,000-100,000 temporary jobs claimed by energy groups. As a matter of fact, it would create only 3,900 temporary ones and only 35 permanent ones.	SO 02
John Lynch	March 14, 2013	The oil people can build their own refinery in Canada,	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John M Petruncio	April 9, 2013	Alternatively, consider assisting the Canadian government and private interests in constructing appropriate refinery needs in Canada near the tar sands deposits and spare territorial US from any further spill threats.	ALT 08
John Manahan	April 15, 2013	The argument that this pipeline creates jobs is, at best, short-sighted.	SO 04
John Marshall	April 22, 2013	Would the refineries that got this tar sands oil, pledge to only sell it in North America and not to anyone else who does not abide by that?	PN 07
John Mccormick	April 3, 2013	The XL pipeline break would be a break on a monumental scale. Why would we invite disaster of that magnitude.	PN 05
John Melland	April 2, 2013	We can and we should be looking into and using alternative and renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
John Miller	March 21, 2013	While I was previously a doctoral candidate at MIT I was contracted by a national petroleum corporation to do a study on the projected consequences of shale oil extraction inwwstern Colorado, for which the corporation had leased. It was a holistic study that covered all the possibilities othe consequencescosequencies of shalev oil development. ON RECEIPT OF THE STUDY THE CORPORATION GAVE UP THEIR LEASE BASED ON LESS THAN WHAT IS NOW KNOWN ABOUT T HE EXTRACTION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTALLY DANGEROUS MATERIAL.	ACK
John Milton	April 20, 2013	Just look at the cost in lives from air pollution alone. One Holocaust of deaths EACH & EVERY YEAR. Don't you care about that?	ACK
John Morgan	April 17, 2013	tar sands take more energy to extract the petroleum than is present in the final product. It cannot be economically produced at current gasoline prices and will guanatee higher prices become permanent.	PN 05
John Mowen	April 2, 2013	Please move towards cleaner energy now. I feel it is time to put profits second and the health of our environment and people first and foremost.	ALT 01
John Munter	April 9, 2013	You would be violating the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court regarding 'crimes against humanity' in approving a tar sands pipeline since the Alberta and Canadian governments have nothing to prevent the poisoning of the Athabasca Delta and its First Nation Peoples who have dying for a decade	LEG 01
John Murdoch	March 5, 2013	It doesn't make sense to pipe foreign caustic oil all the way down the United States to refine in Texas and ship over seas. It is Canadian oil and they can pipe it to the west before it enters the US. The few jobs (welding, hydrology, engineering etc.) that came from this project are just about done.	ALT 05
John O'brien	March 11, 2013	Recent news that the EIS was accepted virtually verbatim as written by an XL pipleline employee is outrageous evidence of pandering to special interests to the exclusion of real science.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John O'connor	March 21, 2013	Every day we continue to delay this important piece of U.S. energy infrastructure inhibits our economic growth and weakens American security.	PN 10
John O'connor	March 21, 2013	Please approve the Keystone XL pipeline within the next 30 Days or SOONER. It has been in this never ending review and approval process for several years now costing millions of dollars, mostly wasted and preventing thousands of badly needed jobs.	PN 10
John P. Davis	March 29, 2013	As a supporter, Mr. President, I also must ask you to explain how your State Department can rely on an impact assessment regarding the Keystone XL project conducted by persons who formerly were employed by Trans-Canada (which will build the pipeline).	PRO 01
John Phillips	March 21, 2013	The reality is that the oil carried by the pipeline will be sold to other countries. So, as usual, the project is about profit for oil companies, not benefitting our country.	PN 07
John Pick	March 14, 2013	Tar sands oil mining will drastically worsen global warming.	CLIM 07
John Pick	March 14, 2013	Tar sands oil is hard to extract, and for each barrel produced, miners contaminate two to four barrels of freshwater in order to separate the oil from the sand.	CU 07
John Pick	March 14, 2013	If built, Keystone XL will lock us into a future in which our nation is dependent on one of the dirtiest and costliest fuels in the world	PN 05
John Pollack	April 22, 2013	As a meteorologist, I am opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline because of the enormous climate impact of the project. This was covered in an analysis by Neil C. Swart and Andrew J. Weaver in Nature Climate Change, Vol 2 No. 3 (Mar. 2012) pp. 134-6. This analysis was not referenced in the SEIS. In the SEIS, the climate change impact was minimized by considering the incremental impact of the project only, and downplaying that through a dubious economic model.	CLIM 12
John Polo	March 14, 2013	http://www.salon.com/2013/03/14/obama_keystone_xl_pipeline_wouldnt_be_a_major_job_creator/	REF
John Polo	March 14, 2013	The risk of this dangerous and corrosive material moving through 1600 or 1700 miles of pipeline and breaking the pipeline and causing enormous pollution is too high.	RISK 11
John Pribramsky	April 21, 2013	The State Department's SEIS Market Analysis clearly states that rail can transport the raw bitumen and meet all market transportation demands…Let oil companies negotiate with railroads for shipping the bitumen to the Gulf Coast. Let's keep any spills limited to railroad right-of-ways, and rely on the proven safety record and superior spill record of America's railroads and not a foreign pipeline company.	ALT 04
John Pumilio	April 7, 2013	First, to suggest that the pipeline would have no significant climate impacts in wholly inaccurate. The science is clear and unequivocally telling us that we need to leave two-thirds of known fossil fuel reserves in the ground to avoid the worst of climate impacts.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Pumilio	April 7, 2013	I have reviewed the Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL pipeline. I do not agree with several aspects of the State Department report and find it inadequate for a number of reasons.	LEG 04
John Pumilio	April 7, 2013	Canadian Tar Sands are destined for export and foreign markets. As a result, building the pipeline will have no perceivable impact on oil prices or American dependency on foreign oil.	PN 04
John Pumilio	April 7, 2013	Third, building this pipeline and bringing the tar to market will have long-term negative impacts for our economy, our public health, and our natural resources.	PN 05
John Pumilio	April 7, 2013	Second, the 42,000 jobs is a very high estimate. Other independent studies put that number well-below 10,000 and some around 2,000. All studies conclude that almost all of those jobs are temporary. Nevertheless, all new jobs are important and must be taken seriously. It is this reason alone, why the pipeline should not be built. Many more jobs can be created by focusing our national resources and effort entirely on energy efficiency and conservation, alternative transportation, and on smart grid and renewable technologies.	SO 04, SO 02, SO 05
John R. Cobb	April 19, 2013	the safety of pipelines can be managed to minimize exposure to the public and environment. The alternative transportation methods, tanker truck and/or railroads, would be much more riskier to the public and environment as they require greater human intervention to manage the transport of oil to the processing destinations around the country. The pipelines are being routed to avoid populated areas where possible. However, highways and railroads pass through many heav	RISK 14, ALT 07
John Ransom	April 16, 2013	Approving Keystone would cast considerable doubt on ours, and the world's commitment to phase out carbon-based energy. A strong statement can be made by 1) disapproving Keystone while 2) calling for heavy investment in solar, wind, other renewable resources, and grid improvements.	CLIM 18
John Rath	April 16, 2013	this is NOT a good long term endeavor based on higher than acceptable risk of spill, lack of real long term economic impact, controversial issue of where the product will be sold (US or exported), air quality destruction from processing/burning and negative impact on personal property rights.	PN 05
John Redmond	April 17, 2013	there are better, cleaner and safer ways to meet our energy needs.	ALT 01
John Reed	March 30, 2013	The energy required to extract, refine, transport, and market this fuel is more than the energy returned by these sands. EROEI (energy returned on energy invested) for the raw tar sands is about 3 to 1 (http://altenergysources.webs.com/oilshaletarsands.htm) the conventional oil "gushers" in Saudi Arabi were about 140 times, and current oil wells in the US are 15 times. http://oilsandstruth.org/understanding-energy-return-on-energy-investment-eroei	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Reed	March 30, 2013	The XL is just the wrong direction, it's more of the same, trying to sustain the unsustainable.	PN 07
John Ritter	April 6, 2013	We need to invest in clean energy harvesting, storage & use; rather than invest in a means of delivering North American fossil fuel, in one of its dirtiest & most expensive to refine forms, to an international market, where it will surely drive up the price of gas, and whereby it can poison the Oglala Aquifer.	PN 07, ALT 01
John Roosmann	April 22, 2013	You know and we know that there is going to be a break in this pipeline, anything from human error, to parts supplied by the lowest bidder. You know and we know that this pipeline is going to cross all of Nebraskas river systems and the Ogallala aquifier.	ACK
John Sanford	April 19, 2013	I urge you not to allow Keystone XL to transport any known carcinogens or substances that cause birth defects through their proposed pipeline. Substances like benzene and toluene (often used to dilute tar sands) should be prohibited. The rivers here in Nebraska and the Ogallala aquifer need to be protected from tar sands which contain these toxic substances.	WRG 01
John Sarter	March 7, 2013	We are at the turning point in SO many ways... If we fail to rework and retool our entire energy paradigm, we LOSE technical advantage as a Nation, long term energy independence, and world stature overall.	CLIM 18
John Sass	April 3, 2013	I managed to wade through the executive summary, which doesn't address the climate change issue.	CLIM 12
John Sass	April 3, 2013	The draft report is a political document, largely ignoring science	LEG 04
John Sassr	March 11, 2013	why build a pipe line across canada and the entire USA? why not build a refinery in North Dakota ? the 3 affilated tribes have sought federal approvel for 20 years to build this refinery . they have the money to build it they have the land	ALT 08
John Schivell	April 22, 2013	Extraction is damaging and dangerous to the environment	CU 01
John Schivell	April 22, 2013	We need to use LESS fossil fuel, not more. Therefore, investment should be in more installations to collect renewable energy, like wind and solar, rather than in equipment for fossil fuels.	PN 02
John Schmittauer	March 16, 2013	Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Seamon	April 4, 2013	I have an idea....why don't you just check and see what oil companies had to say about the pipelines that have already failed back when they wanted permission to construct them. I have a suspicion that they were singing the same tunes about how safe and reliable those failures were way back then, if anyone challenged them at all. The bottom line is that you need to look at the big picture...environmentaly , financially (do we really want to sell all of that nasty dirty oil to the Chinese to help their economy and destroy the planet since they have no regulations ?) and the US gets exactly nothing out of this unless you consider campaign contrbutions a benefit? The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts.	RISK 14, PN 05
John Seymour-anderson	April 2, 2013	Now is the time to advance climate solutions, not commit a greater social investment in developing what appears to be yet the dirtiest oil extracted from the earth, which will accelerate and compound the impacts of climate change we are already witnessing.	PN 03
John Shelby	April 20, 2013	It seems to me that there is a shortage of refineries in this country. Why not build one closer to the source of the oil instead of a very expensive and vunerable pipeline? If the exportation of our domestic crude was sstopped we in this country could enjoy the benefits of our own resources.	ALT 08
John Shipley	April 4, 2013	…why not build a refinery in northern Montana, near the Canadian boarder? That area is economically depressed and would welcome the job opportuniteis and boost their local economy.	ALT 08
John St. Clair	March 28, 2013	The environmental damage being done at the tar sands mining site is devastating and heartbreaking.	CU 01
John St. Clair	March 28, 2013	The risk of pollution of water supplies in the USA caused by pipeline spills is too high to justify supplying tar sands oil to Gulf Coast refineries for export.	WRG 01
John St. Clair	April 22, 2013	It is not in our national interest to allow TransCanada, which has a poor safety record building the first Keystone pipeline, to build the Keystone XL pipeline through tornado alley and over the Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground source of water in North America.	PN 08
John Steves	March 19, 2013	Canadian Companies are taking American's land through eminent domain. That is wrong.	LEG 02
John Steves	March 19, 2013	I understand from Congressman Fred Upton that most of the oil will end up being exported out of the US. There's not much in it for Americans.	PN 07
John Steves	March 19, 2013	I live near the Kalamazoo River and saw the horror of a million gallon Tar Oil spill 3 years ago. It is still not cleaned up.	RISK 29

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Strauss	March 16, 2013	America's energy future lies with clean, green, renewable energy and not with Canadian tar sands.	ALT 01
John Strauss	March 16, 2013	Even the State Department report affirms that tar sands generate more greenhouse emissions than other forms of petroleum	CLIM 12
John Strauss	March 16, 2013	and that the job creation potential of the pipeline will be far less than originally promised.	SO 02
John Strauss	March 28, 2013	This dirty, dangerous pipeline remains one of the largest threats to our climate	CLIM 14
John Strauss	March 28, 2013	The pipeline would also… increase air pollution from refineries on the Gulf Coast.	CU 08
John Strauss	March 28, 2013	The pipeline would also threaten Midwestern communities' fragile aquifers…	WRG 01
John Taggart	March 26, 2013	The way that the oil companies intend to configure the route will enable U.S. oil companies to syphon off enough product from our midwest refineries to claim shortage of product and raise prices	PN 04
John Taggart	March 26, 2013	In the very first place it is Canadian product intended for export to China.	PN 07
John Tatum	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer and Sandhills are too precious and crucial to our states identity to risk for a few million. Putting the water supply for over a million people at risk is out of the question.	WRG 01
John Teagle	April 5, 2013	Impossible to guarantee safety. Terrorism target thousands of miles long, impossible to guard. No way. And who profits? And who bears the expense of cleanup? My guess is private sector and government of the people, respectively.	RISK 04
John Thoma	April 4, 2013	With all the spills which will occur with the Keystone XL pipeline, it would be wise to reject it, if you care about the environment and the health of your loved ones.	RISK 07
John Thomas	March 4, 2013	Approve the building of the pipeline.	ACK
John Thomas	March 4, 2013	Given the obvious science that no increased co2 gases will be produced, why the ridiculous delay?	PN 10
John Tiffin	March 10, 2013	A better project would be to invest in a smarter power grid - able to transmit the energy gathered in the western plains from solar power arrays and wind farms to the east and west coast users. That would be renewable.	PN 02
John Ventre	April 5, 2013	Solar and wind can give us all the energy we need with an effort that is more in harmony to the Garden of Eden	ALT 01
John Vogel	April 22, 2013	Theres no reason to risk long-term food security for short-term oil jobs and oil taxes.	PN 05
John W. Cochran	April 6, 2013	But the cumulative effect of harvesting and refining the oil from the tar sands is a large negative. The process take at least a ton of sand for one barrel, uses massive amounts of water, create toxic water reservoirs that will flood and pollute, and releases at least 3 time more global warming pollution than conventional oil.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Ward	April 13, 2013	Between 2002 and 2010, internal corrosion caused 13.6 (18%) of the spills per 10,000 miles greater than 26 gallons in the United States' onshore hazardous liquid pipeline system. Internal corrosion caused 218 (46.5%) of comparable spills on the Alberta pipeline system, or over 16 times the rate of American spills due to corrosion. And that is despite the fact that American pipes carrying hazardous liquids are 20 years older on average than hazardous liquid pipes in Alberta! How can we explain this enormous discrepancy?	RISK 13, RISK 11
John Watson	April 18, 2013	A Presidential Permit should come with an important condition: significantly increase inspection and verification of all TransCanada activities in this country.	RISK 23
John Wegg	April 21, 2013	Only through investment in clean energy industries will we be able to create jobs AND protect our planet	PN 02
John White	March 29, 2013	Aren't enough of our rivers and lakes, or our soils, filled with toxic residue that is killing them or making them unsafe for human use?	ACK
John White	March 29, 2013	As well, as the demand for gasoline continues to decline - as it has for the past two years - due to more efficient cars and more conservative driving by the public, the need for additional oil will also decrease.	PN 12
John White	April 13, 2013	During my tenure as an engineer I witnessed disaster after disaster when there were pipeline breaks or other oil spills.	ACK
John Wiesner	April 5, 2013	Given the projected surplus of domestic oil, leading to applications for U.S. export, we don't even need the expensive, carbon intensive tar sands oil from Canada.	PN 12
John Wiesner	April 16, 2013	will not create large numbers of good, well-paying jobs and the oil itself will have little or no positive impact on U.S. energy needs.	PN 05
John Wiesner	April 16, 2013	Moreover, the U.S. actually does not need, and is unlikely to benefit from, tar sands oil from the Keystone XL. Further, there are actually very few permanent jobs likely to be created by this project.	SO 04, PN 08
John Wiley	April 22, 2013	The pipeline is a bad idea that puts the aquifer in danger and all who depend upon it.	WRG 01
John Williams	April 19, 2013	The United States of America should not facilitate the destruction of Canadian Arboreal Forest Land to bring this dirty and expensive unconventional oil to the market .	ACK
John Williams	April 19, 2013	this EIS is inadequate. It does not include the full effect or scope of the project. It doesn't include the Southern portion of the Pipeline and ignores 300 miles of pipeline in Canada and the Gulf of Mexico. Also it ignores the obvious connection with the exploitation of Bakken Shale Oil in Montana	LEG 04
John Williams	April 19, 2013	This will worsen the effects of Global Climate Change and this is inconsistent with a goal stated by President Obama in his recent inaugural address.	PN 02, CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Williams	April 19, 2013	Also the EIS doesn't address impacts on Human Health and Wildlife that are not understood or are ignored intentionally, especially in Canada and on migratory birds.	RISK 07
John Williams	April 19, 2013	I think the EIS understates the potential negative impact of spills and the difficulty of cleaning up this heavy oil and it's additives.	RISK 08
John Wilson	April 4, 2013	I saw the beginning of Environmental Impact Statements and the sad inadequacy of the first efforts. We demanded that they be done properly and we saw a great improvement. The work done in preparation for review of the XL is a return to that earlier level of inadequacy. We demand better work.	LEG 04
John Worster	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow the TransCanada Pipeline to endanger the Ogallala Aquifer	WRG 01
John Worster	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow the TransCanada Pipeline to endanger the Ogallala Aquifer, by being built in Nebraska.	WRG 01
John Wrede	March 11, 2013	Our aquifers are already being depleted by mining operations and there is little question that it won't be long before the Bakken Oil Fields will begin depleting the surface water we have in the Missouri River Reservoir System, to say nothing of how much water it pollutes and leaves standing above ground to leach into the ground or poison birds and other wildlife.	RISK 07
John Wrede	March 11, 2013	According to the Keystone XL routing plan, the pipeline will dissect what is left of South Dakota's sage brush biome nearly in half, creating an energy corridor through it that will fragment the sage steppe community even further, degrade the land and add just one more negative influence that will cause already declining populations of the sage grouse species and other sage brush obligates to disappear from my state.	WI 04
John Wrede	April 17, 2013	It has been calculated that any spill from the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline will be at least 9 times larger than the Arkansas Spill and carries huge risk of contaminating large acreages of prairie grasslands and private ranches that provide this nation with abundant native wildlife, domestic cattle and sheep. This environment is no less important or sensitive than a domestic neighborhood in Arkansas and any thoughts about spills being more tolerable in the open spaces of Eastern Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska is utter foolishness. A spill from the Keystone XL carries with it an enormous risk of polluting not only precious underground aquifers but also scarce surface water supplies in a region with less than 17 inches average precipitation per year.	RISK 18, RISK 07, WRG 01
John Zeiger	March 26, 2013	Allowing the tar sands pipeline will be "game over" for the climate.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
John Zipeto	April 4, 2013	Energy company proponents say that pumping diluted bitumen is no different than pumping regular crude oil. There are many who differ on this point. According to published accounts, the Global Labor Institute at Cornell University concluded that bitumen pipeline spills are three times more likely than crude oil pipeline spills. The prospect of greater internal pipe corrosion and leaks is a major concern. The US Congress, in responding to this concern, has directed the U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration to help address the question of pipeline integrity and safety and report back by July, 2013	RISK 14
Johnson	April 18, 2013	The National Response Center database reports all of the nation's spills. In 2010, after filtering railroad releases to only include oil, there were 18 instances of a train spilling out oil. After doing the same thing for pipelines in 2012, there were 435 cases of a pipeline spilling out oil. When pipelines spill, they spill big. According to a new study by the Association of American Railroads, from 2002 to 2012 pipelines released 474,441 barrels of crude, while railroad transport released only 2,268 barrels.	ALT 04
Johnson	April 18, 2013	Every single EIS that has been done on this pipeline has been done by a company selected and paid for by TransCanada. It's no surprise that these companies have deep ties not only to the oil industry but with companies that will directly benefit from this pipeline, including TransCanada…...For too long TransCanada has been allowed to select the firm that is conducting its own environmental review. It's no wonder that all of these reviews conclude there will be no significant environmental impact. Not only does the pipeline company get to pick their reviewer, but the third party reviewers are not subject to the same conflict of interest scrutiny as federal employees. There is an inherent conflict of interest in allowing pipeline companies to select the body that will conduct the environmental review for its own project, and holding these reviewers to a lower standard makes it worse.	PRO 01
JohnsonC	April 18, 2013	Increasing trade with Canada would help us become more energy secure. We will have to rely less on imports from those countries that can be politically and economically unstable at any time.	PN 10
JohnsonF	April 18, 2013	XL put pumping station within 1/2 mile of 5 homes- they guaranteed no homes within this radius.	LU 01
JohnsonS	April 18, 2013	The pump house was to be 1/4 mile from our son's young family and three other homes.	LU 01, AQN 05
Johnston	April 18, 2013	I am in support of added valuation and tax receipts for - County, Nebraska, and the nation.	SO 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jojoann	March 7, 2013	The review's conclusion that the pipeline is "unlikely to have a substantial impact" on the tar sands or climate change is incredibly narrow sighted and shows a complete lack of understanding of environmental issues.	CLIM 13
Jojoann	March 7, 2013	With all due respect, the Keystone XL Pipeline environmental statement is far too narrow in scope to represent anything of the real impact of this pipeline and the devastating environmental destruction of the Canadian tar sands it will cause.	LEG 04
Jolene Darnold	March 27, 2013	Please sign and lets get this work project back on track and help our nations economy.	PN 10
Jolene Gardner Ph.d.	March 30, 2013	The authors of the study previously worked for TransCanada -- the company behind the tar sands project and that stands to gain the most from the pipeline!	PRO 01
Jolene Gardner Ph.d.	March 30, 2013	It has a significant risk for toxic spills which have not been addressed! Why???? The DSEI Statement has IGNORED this!!	RISK 07
Jolie Lonner Egert	April 22, 2013	Tar Sands is causing…...fish deformities through massive contamination of wate.	CU 01
Jolie Lonner Egert	April 22, 2013	Tar Sands is causing cancer deaths in native communities.	CU 05
Jolie Lonner Egert	April 22, 2013	We need to focus on alternative, carbon free sources of energy if we are going to stem global warming.	PN 02
Jolie Lonner Egert	April 22, 2013	Toxic spills are likely with this project. I am concerned about the threats to the Ogallala aquifer and destruction of Farmland.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	Landowners have been bullied by TransCanada into signing easement agreements under the threat of eminent domain before the Presidential Permit has been determined.	LEG 02
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	The State of Nebraska has no state regulatory body in Nebraska that addresses interstate oil pipelines. Please refer to LB 1016 and 1054 both of which have been postponed indefinitely. TransCanada is taking full advantage of this situation.	LEG 13
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	In the event that TransCanada sells or transfers the XL Pipeline and the pipeline breaks, leaks, or spills all bets are off as to who would be held responsible for clean up and compensation.	PD 01
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	TransCanada will use pipe imported from China which only has 75% of the strengh of US steel.	PD 06
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	1. The purpose of the TransCanada XL pipeline is to provide transport of crude tar sands oil to meet the demand of China--not the United States.	PN 07
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	The Enbridge Alberta Clipper crude oil pipeline and TransCanada's Keystone crude oil pipeline supply enough tar sands crude oil from Canada to meet the demand of the United States. The TransCanada XL pipeline is not needed	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	The purpose of the TransCanada XL pipeline is to provide transport of crude tar sands oil to meet the demand of China--not the United States. Articles have been written including "Canada looks to China to exploit oil sands rejected by US." Some estimate that a full 41 percent of the expected pipeline capacity in the United States will stand empty by 2013	PN 07
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	Demand in the United States for crude oil has fallen 10% and there is a surplus of refining capacity.	PN 12
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	http://nebraskalegislature.gov/FloorDocs/102/PDF/Intro/LB755.pdf	REF
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	http://puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2007/HP07-001/Disk/Exhibit%20C/5March07/RiskAssessment/4DNVReportRAAppendixAdeliverable.pdf	REF
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	http://www.sierraclub.org/environmentallaw/tarsands/pipeline-keystone/usdot-special-permit/PHMSA%20Keystone%20I%20Special%20Permit%202007-04-30.pdf	REF
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	In the event that TransCanada sells or transfers the XL Pipeline and the pipeline breaks leaks or spills all bets are off as to who would be held responsible for clean up and compensation.	RISK 03
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has failed to develop a Site Specific Emergency Plan. TransCanada has failed to provide Emergency Response Training.	RISK 05
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	We cant risk an oil leak in our water.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has also shown themselves as a company that is not reputable in dealing with the Seward City Council in Seward Nebraska. In asking the City Council for permit to cross the Seward Municipal Well-Head Protection Area TransCanada set forth provisions in a letter to the Seward City Council that met the provisions of the 09/18/2007 City Council resolution concerning the Keystone Pipeline. As of this date May 5 2010 the following Provisions in that agreement have not been fulfilled: 1. TransCanada has failed to develop a Site Specific Emergency Plan. 2. TransCanada has failed to provide Emergency Response Training. 3. TransCanada has failed to fulfill their $50 000 Community Investment commitment to the Seward Community. TransCanada has given the City $35 000. TransCanada is withholding $15 000 because they will not approve the Groundwater Protection Project submitted by committee of citizens appointed by the City Council. The Groundwater Protection Project is for the implementation of nests of detection equipment that would detect crude oil or other pollutants in the soil within the well head protection area of the municipal water supply for the City of Seward. TransCanada has refused to release the $15 000 for this project because 'We have already proven to the City of Seward and to the City Council that our pipeline is safe and our detection system is adequate to detect a leak from our crude oil pipeline."	RISK 25
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	85% of Nebraskans get their drinking water from the Ogallala Aquifer. Many farmers depend on the aquifer to irrigate their crops that puts food on our tables. We cant risk an oil leak in our water. We cant risk our economic livelihood and the health of our families	WRG 01
Jon and Bonnie Kruse	April 22, 2013	The route for the TransCanada Keystone pipeline crosses the Ogallala Auqifer challenging the supply of drinking water for 2 million people in 8 states	WRG 01
Jon Beck	March 15, 2013	The environmental damage caused by extraction of the oil in Canada, the certain pipeline problems and environmental damage in the U.S. from leaks, etc over the years, the cost, the likelihood that once in place it will be impossible to end politically, and the sale of much/all of the oil to foreign nations which won't even in the short run end our dependence on foreign oil, make it unwise to allow this. We should be putting our resources into safe, non-polluting forms of energy development.	ALT 01
Jon Benguiat	March 1, 2013	I am trying to get some information about the proposed pipeline project as it may to petroleum product export.	RFI

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jon Krueger	March 6, 2013	At the least an insurance policy ought to be managed per state (if Nebraska has an aquifer that could be damaged, TC ought to put up all they have invested in that state as collateral against an unrenewable resource (permanently degraded water, for example)), charged to TC and all their subsidiaries that contains the funds necessary to clean up any contingency; further, until pipeline technology has improved beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is effective in transporting tar sands crude, no permits should be issued.	PD 01
Jon Krueger	March 6, 2013	Perhaps accommodation could be made for an alternate plan of installing juncture monitors at each and every pipe juncture (i.e. when one piece of pipe is conected to another).Powering these juncture detection systems will be wind/solar installations off the grid in case of severe weather knocking out the existing power grid.	PD 05
Jon Krueger	March 6, 2013	Enbridge [Energy] is a subsidiary of [TransCanada]. Since 1998 when reports of this sort were first observed, leakages of at least 3,000 gallons of tar sands crude have been observed at various points in Michigan and difficult to clean up after. The most severe leakage was in 2009 in the Kalamazoo River (one million gallons) and this occurrence has proven to be most difficult to clean up, with the community bearing the brunt of the efforts.	RISK 29
Jon Lund	April 22, 2013	I know that in 1998 Congress recognized that utilities had little to no incentive to upgrade their decaying infrastructure, much of which was 40 - 50 years old. Money to repair lines was often made available through insurance and disaster relief when lines were taken out by storms, so why spend on upgrades. Never mind the cost to businesses and consumers when extended outages occur. Congress assigned FERC come up with some incentives, upgrading transmission first, then deal with distribution. What the utilities came up with was an electrical superhighway which does a lot for investors and energy traders, but in the long run will probably save little or no money for consumers and still leaves much of the transmission and distribution systems in need of billions in upgrades. I would not be surprised if a somewhat analogous situation exists with the pipeline system. Electricians unions support the construction of at least some of the high voltage transmission lines that I am aware of, just as pipe-fitters support the construction of Keystone. By indication of recent accidents, and the testimony that the lines that ruptured were around 50 years old the pipeline infrastructure is also in need of an upgrade. What position might be the rank and file of the unions be on a choice between an effort to build a brand new line to facilitate tar sands mining for the benefit of largely foreign corporate interests versus rebuilding the existing infrastructure to mitigate risks to communities and the environment.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jon Lund	April 22, 2013	. To have your property violated by a pipeline passing through it against your will is bad enough. If that happened to me, I would feel inclined to not look at it, as I would well up with resentment. This is then compounded by the fear of a spill and the fact that eminent domain is being applied on the property of US citizens for the benefit of a foreign owned company, to transport a product of foreign origin, to be sent to foreign markets. Eminent domain always hurts, but is grudgingly accepted when it is clearly for the greater good. It was stated by at least one proponent in the hearing that the pipeline would also carry Bakken crude. That may assuage some resentment, but how much Bakken oil? Is a pipeline of this magnitude necessary here to handle Bakken crude which might be utilized for domestic consumption? Or is tar sands dil-but the primary driver, and the Bakken component just to sweeten the deal to sell to an oppositional public?	LEG 02
Jon Lund	April 22, 2013	Given an assumption of the probability of an eventual spill, what are the planned containment and cleanup procedures? What are the financial structures in place to mitigate and compensate victims? I learned that purveyors of tar sands dil-but don't pay into the fund to deal with spills. This cost, I understand, is born by the crude oil fund, and if that runs out, will be born by the taxpayer. While in line, a person from Arkansas showed me pictures of the recent spill there, and in one photo he pointed out the hundreds of sheets of paper towel that had been placed on the dil-but because there was no other means available to deal with the mess.	RISK 08, RISK 03
Jon Lund	April 22, 2013	Much of the testimony of those opposed to the pipeline project focused on the danger of ruptures and seeps, and the threat to the groundwater and all that relies on this resource. That is a real threat and the fear is reasonable, especially in the context of recent disasters in Michigan and Arkansas. Perhaps if the pipeline is approved and constructed, it's risk of rupture will be less than the risk was for the recently ruptured lines preceding those disasters, because the lines that ruptured were old. For the present time, I would give the proponents of this pipeline some credit on this point. However, this is not a short term project. It has a long life expectancy. As it ages, the threat to its structural integrity will increase - as this occurs with any infrastructure project. Eventually, and no one can know when, there will be a failure. It may be useful to examine the difference in magnitude of a potential spill with the proposed line and those that recently occurred. It is of a greater diameter and hence the volume it could carry and spill would be much greater than that of a smaller pipe given a similar distance to a stop valve and pressure.	RISK 13
Jonathan	April 22, 2013	What I am curious about is how is it helping and why are my tax dollars paying for it.	PN 07
Jonathan	April 22, 2013	Pipes leak everyone knows this.	RISK 21

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jonathan Allen	April 5, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 26
Jonathan Bogan	March 10, 2013	Build a Refinery on the US side of the border in N Dakota and supply thousands of needed Jobs to the area - which will cause more and better roads to be built and will open up the area for more people to live?	ALT 08
Jonathan Gorham	April 17, 2013	Renewables and conservation will never be able to compete with "low-cost" fossil fuels. Without the true environmental costs figured in to their full price, fossil fuels will continue to dominate our energy mix. We need a price on carbon so that future generations don't suffer and we hand off a planet that is liveable. I urge you to reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Please live up to your promises to promote energy conservation, wind, solar, geothermal, etc. We need a level playing field.	SO 16, ALT 01
Jonathan Gottlieb	March 28, 2013	please drop [Keystone XL] with any more oil and move towards investing in renewable and clean sources of energy.	ALT 01
Jonathan Tetherly	March 29, 2013	Creating jobs is not worth the cost of the only plant we have.	PN 05
Jonathan Wittman	April 18, 2013	Pipelines are the safest method of transporting product and have te lowest impact on emissions.	ALT 07
Jones, Bradley	April 21, 2013	Your new evaluation should acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	CLIM 13
Jones, Bradley	April 21, 2013	Moreover, at the tail end of Keystone XL, the processing of this same resource will add to the burden of already disproportionately-polluted communities on the Gulf coast.	CU 04
Jones, Bradley	April 21, 2013	the DSEIS concludes that the Keystone XL pipeline will make a contribution to climate change, by facilitating the movement of tar sands oil, but concludes that Canada's oil resources will be developed regardless...there is certainly no guarantee that tar sands development will remain as economically viable for developers, or more so, if Canada is forced to seek a new shipment route through its own ports,	PN 11
Joni Boettcher	April 22, 2013	.IT WILL LEAK INTO OUR WATER	RISK 07
Jonnel Covault	March 17, 2013	It is time to invest in clean Green energy technology. Keystone is a step backward, not forward. We need to stop the devastating affects of Climate Change NOW.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Jordan Johnson	April 22, 2013	I am deeply worried about the conversation surrounding KXL and deeply opposed to the construction of KXL, particularly because of the way it situates rural communities as collateral for profits that we know we won't ever see. Dead end industries are not our only option as rural communities, and they do not help us establish healthy economies, environments, or families.	EJ 03
Jordan Kratz	April 20, 2013	How about if it spills into our Water ?	ACK
Jordan Kratz	April 20, 2013	How would you like to have an ugly Polluting Oil Pipeline go up right next to your wonderful property ? Why are you Supporting a real potential Ecological Disaster ?	ACK
Jordan Kratz	April 20, 2013	How are you going to pay out the Bills when this Pipeline spills ?	PD 01
jörg Parschau	April 4, 2013	the killing of vast forests and the contamination of terrestrial, aquatic, and atmospheric ecosystems which we all depend on, to the disruption of the social fabric of local communities, both indigenous and non-indigenous.	CLIM 16
jörg Parschau	April 4, 2013	At a time when your government and the nation have worked so hard in partnership to reduce climate-changing emissions over the last four years, why would you now erase those efforts with further opening up this extra dirty source of fuel by means of the planned Keystone XL Pipeline? It makes no sense and it supports no legacy.	PN 03
Jorge Gonzalez	April 4, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet	CLIM 05
Jorge Samayoa	April 22, 2013	I urge you not to sign a permit that will jeopardize our way of life and most precious natural resource, which is our water.	ACK
Jose Gonzalez	April 22, 2013	Energy independence for the U.S. is an immediate necessity—absolutely. Said concern, however, is nothing if it does not expedite a global transition to clean energy. Speeding up humanity's adoption of new, clean energy sources is the key to unlocking powerful new technologies and even the next stage of humanity's evolution. The U.S. should jump at the opportunity to take the lead on clean energy.	PN 02
Jose Griego	March 20, 2013	The study regarding the Keystone pipeline is flawed because it was created by interested parties to its construction. You need to have a neutral scientific study commissioned to get the real truth of the matter.	PRO 01
Josefa Vincent	March 10, 2013	Why is there no discussion regarding Solar Energy! It's clean, efficient, and the technology has been available for decades. This current plan for the Keystone XL is reckless and and only serves Big Oil & Gas and their investors (viz., the 1%).	PN 02
Joselyn VanCleave	April 22, 2013	We need to take this opportunity to invest in clean energy. We do not need dirty tar sands oil we need sustainable clean energy.	ALT 01
Joselyn VanCleave	April 22, 2013	85% of Nebraskans get drinking water from the Ogallala Aquifer and if it were contaminated our state economy not to mention international food supply would be threatened.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joselyn VanCleave	April 22, 2013	The transcanada plan does not have adequate ecological protections in place for the Sandhills which overlay this countries largest source of groundwater the Ogalala Aquifer. Allowing this pipeline opens up Nebraska farmers and ranchers and residents to……. catastrophic damage.	RISK 14
Joselyn VanCleave	April 22, 2013	85% of Nebraskans get drinking water from the Ogallala Aquifer and if it were contaminated our state economy, not to mention international food supply would be threatened	WRG 01
Joseph Caggiano	March 10, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline not only fosters America's dependence on fossil fuels and imported fuel supply, but the course extends above the Ogallala aquifer, an already threatened and depleted aquifer that supplies drinking and irrigation for much of the midwest. Accidents, which will happen, could only lead to degradation of this vital resource and restrict/prohibit its use.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Joseph Candela	March 16, 2013	... direct the EPA to stop carbon pollution... he [Obama] promised to lead on climate.	CLIM 18
Joseph Fraser	April 17, 2013	The State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact; the heavy oil product generates more & more pollution.	CLIM 12
Joseph Fraser	April 17, 2013	The production of the oil carried by the pipeline [is] a horribly inefficient process that squanders our MOST precious resource - water.	CU 07
Joseph Hewgley	April 15, 2013	The company that wants to build and operate the Keystone pipeline, TransCanada, does not have a good track record when it comes to pipeline spills. The proposed Keystone pipeline will bisect this nation across its heartland, crossing numerous rivers, streams, and the invaluable Oglala Aquifer. It is not a question of "if" the Keystone Pipeline will leak. It is only a question of "when" and "how often."	WRG 01, RISK 25
Joseph Holmes	April 5, 2013	The damage to Alberta is beyond obscene. It's the worst single rape of the surface of the Earth in history. Unimaginable destruction.	ACK
Joseph Miller	April 22, 2013	Has little, if any, economic benefit to the vast majority of US citizens. If fact, studies show that southwestern users will likely wind up with higher energy cost. Does nothing to improve US energy independence, since this crude will be refined in Texas and shipped to China. Does not create lasting jobs for American workers.	PN 04
Joseph Miller	April 22, 2013	Will carry highly toxic oil shale crude over a wide swatch of the western US. There will be spills and scarce, precious western water reserves will be impacted.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joseph Murphy	April 21, 2013	...evidence indicates that it only produces many jobs at the beginning, and then falls away to only about 30-40 to maintain it. In exchange for that, we are subjecting ourselves to a much higher risk of oil spills of a type of oil that the industry doesn't know how to clean up. And even if the pipeline were to be built, the impact on the availability and cost of energy for American consumers would be affected minimally, if at all.	RISK 08, PN 04, SO 02
Joseph Richardson	March 24, 2013	We should absolutely do nothing that will increase the emissions of greenhouse gasses thereby subjecting us to the national security challenges presented by climate change.	CLIM 18
Joseph Richardson	March 24, 2013	I do not believe that the benefits will outweigh the risks in having the Canadian Bitumen tar sand oil transported by pipe through the U.S. to the tax free refineries in Texas and then, likely, off to Asia.	PN 05
Joseph Richardson	March 24, 2013	Why should we serve as the conduit for Canadian oil when they can't build such a pipeline across their own territory because of popular resistance? Let the Canadians serve their own interests and despoil their own land and water resources. Let the Canadians have the benefit of the jobs inherent to the pipeline and in building their own super heavy oil refinery on the West Coast. If they can't do it, why should we be their patsy?	PN 05
Joseph Richardson	March 24, 2013	The corrosive nature of the Bitumen coupled with chemicals to allow it to flow properly provide for increased risks of breach of the pipe. Such a breach, one could argue, will increase pipeline related jobs. It also may cause extensive and irreparable damage to fresh water resources and cropland.	RISK 11
Joseph Saucier	March 26, 2013	We ask that you think about the jobs that it will create and the prosperity for America.	SO 02
Joseph Siry	March 10, 2013	The State Department's recent report must be an embarrassment as well for the new Secretary of State, the Honorable John Kerry, who has promoted action to reduce our risks to abrupt climate change due to global warming. Because clean energy and especially geothermal energy will never be exhausted as viable sources of electrical supplies, the construction of this pipeline is a serious retreat from reducing our pollution. More US residents will be employed if the federal fleet was now made of electric cars and trucks than using this costly fuel. Tar sands costs in terms of water (scarce on the Great Plains), air pollution, and exporting our incomes and jobs to Canada. It is time to put the United State's workers and water conservation ahead of corporate welfare. Stop the pipeline, save jobs in clean fuels and protect the planet's water and air resources.	PN 02
Joseph Smith	April 22, 2013	And to allow a foreign country to use imminent domain to force US citizens to allow their poison to ruin our environment is pure treason.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joseph Smith	April 22, 2013	To sacrifice an area that is the only environment of its kind in the world for a few temporary welding jobs is insane, not to mention the construction itself will damage the environment beyond repair.	PN 05
Joseph Smith	April 22, 2013	We mustnt allow TransC anada to risk our drinking and irrigation water for their bottom line. And to allow a foreign country to use imminent domain to force US citizens to allow their poison to ruin our environment is pure treason. Jobs will be temporary and the majority of the high paying jobs will go to Canadians and their contractors. To sacrifice an area that is the only environment of its kind in the world for a few temporary welding jobs is insane not to mention the construction itself will damage the environment beyond repair.	PN 05, LEG 02, SO 03, SO 04, WRG 01
Joseph Smith	April 22, 2013	Jobs will be temporary, and the majority of the high paying jobs will go to Canadians and their contractors	SO 03
Joseph Smith	April 22, 2013	We mustnt allow TransC anada to risk our drinking and irrigation water for their bottom line.	WRG 01
Joseph Wasserman	March 11, 2013	This is a very dangerous proposal that will keep us dependent on fossil fuels at a time when we need to be investing in energy efficiency , wind and solar, due to the rapid onset of global climate change.	ALT 01
Joseph Wasserman	March 11, 2013	I am also concerned about the fact that tar sand oil is heavily polluting. The the threat to water sources along the route of the pipeline is very real.	RISK 07
Joseph Weinstein	April 2, 2013	Tar sands oil production would worsen the climate crisis precisely because it creates far more global warming pollution per fuel value than does usual oil. Ironically it would do this without even compensations such as lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	PN 05
Josephine Lopez	April 19, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would carry tar sands oil, which is more toxic and releases more global warming pollution than regular oil.	CLIM 05
Josh Rollins	March 2, 2013	To top it off, you're not taking into account that Transcanada does not care about safety.	RISK 25
Joshlyn White	April 22, 2013	The pipelines risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill. This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joshlyn White	April 22, 2013	The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production.	ACK
Joshlyn White	April 22, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04
Joshlyn White	April 22, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 03
Joshlyn White	April 22, 2013	Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources. Only 10% of the created jobs would be filled by local people living in communities along the route.	SO 05
Joshua Budden	April 22, 2013	Canadians oppose piping the tar sands over their own land, which is why the Northern Gateway also faces considerable political hurdles. According to Canadian Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver "If we don’t find new markets, the resources will be left in the ground and the legacy will be lost."	PN 06
Joshua Stancer	March 28, 2013	The intention is to sell this oil to other countries and not use it in the US. This does nothing to make us self sufficient it just encourages other countries to use dirty fuel.	PN 04
Josiah Ronco	April 22, 2013	Please I beg you to reject the Keystone Pipeline XL. There are so many clean energy sources available that we could tap into!	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Josiah Torvik	April 10, 2013	Bacon bacon bacon

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joy Sujecki	April 9, 2013	Finally, it is my understanding that this pipeline's product is to be exported, not to lower our domestic gasoline prices. On all fronts, this pipeline would be a huge mistake!	PN 04
Joy Sujecki	April 9, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	RISK 20, CU 04
Joy Walker	March 15, 2013	We must protect our environment. We must be progressive in energy production. Everything I have read on the Keystone Pipeline is that it is more environmentally safe than the alternatives of moving the oil from Canada. This is a win-win-win because it also provided jobs to Oklahomans. Let’s get going with it.	PN 10
Joyce Anderson	March 26, 2013	Thirty-six jobs do not justify the potential environmental damage	PN 05
Joyce Anderson	March 26, 2013	Between the carbon content and the worst possible kind of pipeline leak (leaked tar sands are exceptionally disastrous) Keystone XL is an environmental time bomb	RISK 06, CLIM 14
Joyce Banzhaf	March 11, 2013	Tar sands are the dirtiest possible fossil fuel option. Now already with only 10 sites active they have the biggest dangerous waste dumps on earth--seen from space.	ACK
Joyce Berg	April 13, 2013	Existing Keystone Pipeline Has Poor Safety Record.TransCanada insists that there is little risk of a spill from the Keystone XL pipeline, and that it is prepared to contain leaks quickly and effectively. But TransCanada gave similar assurances about the current Keystone pipeline.	RISK 25, RISK 03
Joyce Cochran	March 15, 2013	It is more pollution (e.g., refinery areas in Texas and air, in general), more destruction of natural environment (from Canada to Texas), more chemicals, more heavy carbon foot print, more global warming, more expensive extraction of oil, just MORE OF THE SAME OLD, SAME OLD. And, who gets the oil, anyway? It will probably be shipped out of the country.	CU 08, CLIM 14, PN 07
Joyce Condon	April 5, 2013	We need to develop renewable energy.	ALT 01
Joyce Coppinger	April 22, 2013	Ogallala Acquifer. Its waters are an invaluable and precious resource for the Nebraska Sandhills and all other parts of the state. It supports agriculture, water needs of humans and nature, and needs to be maintained and protected. It is the largest remaining acquifer in the United States	WRG 01
Joyce Coppinger	April 22, 2013	Perhaps you do not understand or value the natural resource in Nebraska called the Ogallala Acquifer. Its waters are an invaluable and precious resource for the Nebraska Sandhills and all other parts of the state. It supports agriculture water needs of humans and nature and needs to be maintained and protected. It is the largest remaining acquifer in the United States - others have been tainted drained by various uses and otherwise compromised.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joyce Greenberg	April 9, 2013	As the mother of someone whose business was crippled by the negligence of BP in the Gulf, I can tell you from first-hand experience that fossil fuel companies care absolutely nothing about people or the planet. They are interested only in making $$$$$$$. If you can't drink the water, and can't breathe the air, all the money in the world won't matter.	PN 05
Joyce Hansen	April 22, 2013	THIS PIPELINE IS OWNED BY CANADA AND CHINA OWNS 52% OF IT. WHERE DO YOU THINK THE OIL WILL BE SHIPPED TO? THE TEXAS REFINERIES , INCLUDING THE NEW SAUDI REFINERY WANT KEYSTONE XL, NOT THE PAYING US CITIZENS!	PN 07
Joyce Jurgens	April 17, 2013	As for the employment they supposedly produce remember that it is temporary and that all the small towns along the way will be pushed hard to provide the schools & roads and other infrastructure which is very expensive and then the employees move on leaving that area with the bill for its continuation without the various tax income to pay for it	SO 10
Joyce Loving	March 18, 2013	There is no excuse for the US enabling Canada & the countries to whom it will export the pipeline's "dirty" tar sands oil. Our friendship & geographic ties with Canada are not good reasons for our acting against our (& their) own long-term interests. The short-term benefits of a few jobs being created are far outweighed by the degradation to the environment. We WILL NOT BENEFIT FROM THIS PIPELINE! Support of the pipeline is tantamount to climate-change denial.(…..)	PN 07
JOYCE OLINGA	April 22, 2013	Please focus your energy on alternative energy sources!!!	PN 02
Joyce Petit	April 22, 2013	It would create very few American jobs and the tarsands oil will be refined and shipped out of Texas to the world market with no benefit to the U.S.	PN 07
Joyce Petit	April 22, 2013	In the case of our farms , the pipeline would actually be sitting in our water of the Ogalalla Aquifer, because the water level is so high. So any leak we would have in the pipeline of dirty oil would immediately be in our ground water and all of our water supply, drinking water, water for crops water for our animals would be contaminated.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Joyce Polyniak	April 20, 2013	Don't have the US be an accessory to the destruction of the native Americans in Canada and their way of life as well as the poisoning and deforestion of aboreal forests. There are crimes against humanity - stop it by not allowing the piplines through the US.	ACK
Joyce Raye	April 13, 2013	Please think of the health of our future generations of children, that will suffer negative health results, if this project is approved.	RISK 30

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Joyce Roper	April 22, 2013	Bisecting the United States across farmlands, rivers and streams as well as towns like Mayflower and Kalamazoo to reach TX refineries for global export is detrimental to the people of America and the air, land and water on which they depend.	RISK 07
Joyce Shea	April 15, 2013	People are losing their land & farms. They are being seized to make a way for this pipeline. Americans will not benefit from the oil. It is a convenience to Canada so they have no season of frozen export ships. They have NO PLAN for a serious clean up. NO PLAN for real safety.	RISK 05, LEG 02
Joyce Thibodeaux	March 11, 2013	We must transition to clean, renewable forms of energy	PN 02
Joyce's E-mail	March 14, 2013	The environmental impact of extracting and developing tar sands is HUGE. To begin with, the area of extraction must be cleared and the area water resources will be appropriated to develop and ship the extracted oil.	ACK
Joyce's E-mail	March 14, 2013	Here we are, as a nation trying to reduce our energy dependence, reduce our use of both coal and oil, and trying to develop both energy efficiencies and green, renewable energies as much as possible. Why are we even thinking of joining with the big oil companies to develop, ship and deliver a very dirty oil?	ALT 01
Joyce's E-mail	March 14, 2013	this tar sands “energy” will not go to U.S. domestic use. It’s to be transshipped in the pipeline and exported. We already export quite a lot of our western and northwestern oil production; the Cherry Point refinery and terminal here in the Bellingham, WA area serves as a transshipment point for Alaskan Western Slope oil for export.	PN 07
Joyce's E-mail	March 14, 2013	The most jobs the U.S. will see from this XL Pipeline will be in the construction of the pipeline, not in reaping income from the product being shipped. Always a huge bonanza of jobs is promised; always the actual number of sustainable jobs is far below the number promised.	SO 04
Jozef Oud	March 17, 2013	the report on environmental impact is deeply flawed, it leaves out any assessment of the impact of tar sand expansion on the climate as well as the extra pollution and destruction it will cause in Canada. This expansion will be the direct result of the pipeline, therefore the pipeline has an enormous effect on the climate.	CLIM 13
Jozef Oud	March 17, 2013	I don't want to run my car on dirty tar sand oil! It's bad enough having to use oil at all when there could be plenty alternatives if only they were made available.	PN 02
Jp [oa	April 3, 2013	In light of what has occurred recently in Arkansas, we really need to make sure our country's environment is protected from any further irrepairable damage.	ACK
Juana Celia Djelal	April 17, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete; It ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar sands development.	ACK
Juanette Cremin	April 2, 2013	Despite assurances [KXL construction] endangering the lives of the people and wildlife dependent on the areas effected	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Juanita Peters	March 16, 2013	* examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada;	ACK
Juanita Rice	April 22, 2013	the mining of tar sands is a desecration beyond imagination. I challenge any member of the state department to visit the sites where this "diluted bitumen" is –manufactured is a better word than mined. Imagine a pit mine 50 square miles by 100 yards deep. That a football field deep. Use your whole brain to try to grasp this. This manufacture bulldozes virgin boreal forest and all the layers of peat—both of which SINK carbon, act as sponges for our junk waste products, and destroys soil, air, and water so that you have to have a haz-mat suit to come near enough to see the toxic tailing ponds. The "process" burns enough natural gas to heat three MILLION homes. It uses as much fresh water daily as the city of Houston TEXAS. This water is contaminated, but it is stored in unlined ponds.	CU 01
Juanita Rice	April 22, 2013	Why was an Environmental Impact Report farmed out to industry specialists, and not objective or disinterested scholars and scientists? I submit to you that your analytical process was flawed and skewed, and that this pipeline is not in the national interest, but counter to it.	PRO 01
Juanita Scott	April 17, 2013	Our fresh waters are being destroyed and our lands poisoned for greed of profit from big oil companies and now it seems you are handing over American's rights to live in a healthy environment, with clean water and clean land, free of oil spills.	ACK
Judd Glenn	April 18, 2013	Please don't allow another oil pipe to be built that we don't need and will have negligible impacts on oil prices short term but has significant risk for natural disaster like we just saw in Arkansas.Fines and lawsuits are often too little too late, and are no deterent for oil companies to be self-policing.	PN 05
Jude Jussim	April 9, 2013	First, It concedes the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, but claims they need not be considered. Really? I would think that was the crisis of our generation.	CLIM 13
Judi	March 18, 2013	he oil in the Keystone pipeline could poison drinking water	ACK
Judi	March 18, 2013	The oil in the Keystone pipeline could…wreck the climate.	CLIM 14
Judi	March 18, 2013	The oil in the Keystone pipeline could… threaten the communities it runs through	RISK 06
Judi Olivetti	April 22, 2013	I am opposed to the pipline being planned through the Ogallala Aquifer in Nebraska	WRG 01
Judie Montoya	April 22, 2013	Tar sands oil spills have already despoiled various part of the United States, even three in the span of only one week recently. That has also affected neighborhoods and individuals whose health and property were affected. These, the Kalamazoo River spill, and others have also made clear that the industry has not invested in solutions to the potential problems that they create.	RISK 21
Judie Keithley	April 7, 2013	the science and safety of extracting oil from tar sands has not been thorough enough. It takes time to do real science and we need to give this topic that time.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judith A. Hutchinson	April 22, 2013	As a trained environmentalist with close to 30 years in public service, I favor sustainable solutions to our energy needs. Wind, solar, and ETS (electric thermal storage heaters) are proven alternatives to fossil fuels!	PN 02
Judith Clark	April 2, 2013	The massive Exxon Mobil spill of 500,000 gallons of dirty tar sands oil and water spilling out of a ruptured pipeline in Arkansas, this past week, provides a tragic reminder of the types of risks we run if the Keystone XL pipeline is allowed to be built.	RISK 07
Judith Felker	March 7, 2013	were impacts of oil spills to the land and water from Alberta, through the states to the Gulf, and across the ocean taken into consideration?	CU 14
Judith Felker	March 7, 2013	Were projected costs of clean-ups included in total costs?	PD 01
Judith Felker	April 5, 2013	Saying yes will also light the fuse of the anger and fear so many of us feel as we watch helplessly while our planet is being destroyed beyond its ability to support life. We are huge in numbers and solid in determination to do everything we can to stop this madness. This isn't a threat; it's a promise.	ACK
Judith Hildinger	April 11, 2013	I am writing to encourage you to revise your review and acknowledge that the Keystone XL pipeline is taking our country down a path toward physically damaging our climate-- the world's climate-- for future generations.	CLIM 14
Judith Kokura	March 10, 2013	he tar sands oil is by far the most environmentally destructive oil ever extracted. Have you seen the photos of the moonscape like devastation left behind after they remove the oil. The Canadians should be ashamed that they allow this to continue but I know that the culture of 'money first' has gone on for so long in Alberta it would be hard to change. Let's work as hard and as fast as possible to get off oil. If the nasty tar sands oil is going to get shipped south for many more years until we do so, so be it. But let's not also wreak even more destructive and irreversible damage by building this pipeline.	ACK
Judith Kokura	March 10, 2013	I understand that the tar sands oil will head south whether it goes via a pipeline or rail, but I've also heard that this super thick oil actually travels better via rail, and the rail already exists.	ALT 04
Judith Lane	March 10, 2013	If you do, it seems to me that the least you could do in the area of environmental momentum is to see that an independent party would prepare an independently environmental impact report on the Keystone XL Pipeline construction. How could anyone believe that an agent contracted by the pipeline builders would send in an unbiased, honest report?	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judith May	April 3, 2013	The oil companies do not know how to drill for or transport oil, safely without horrible spills. They are the wealthiest corporations in the world yet they don't invest in their own infrastructure, eg., fires and shutdowns in refineries, leaking pipelines, no advances in clean-up methods or blow-out preventers. These companies do not act responsibly and have no personal or corporate commitment to the welfare of people or this planet. Money rules--money for the few at the top of this dirty business.	RISK 14
Judith Rinesmith	April 13, 2013	The oil companies should NOT be allowed to drill anywhere for oil until there are very stringlent rules and punishments for violations of those rules in place!!	LEG 11
Judith Sims-barlow	April 9, 2013	The Obama administration has a chance to lead the world in slowing global warming by bravely moving ahead beyond fossil fuel use to focus on renewables.	PN 02, ALT 01
Judith Walprale	April 18, 2013	First, Keystone XL will contribute dramatically to climate change. The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production.	CLIM 14
Judith Walprale	April 18, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 02
Judith Walprale	April 18, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not chnaged at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and Ogallala aquifer, and will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	WRG 06
Judith Wester	April 4, 2013	It's not worth our health and well being to have it	ACK
Judith Wolfe	April 9, 2013	Can not believe the US is planning to implement this huge mistake..The Canadians have banned this in their own country....Why are we involved	PN 05
Judth Margerum	March 24, 2013	We cannot afford to slowly address climate change. We need to take strong and decisive stands about how to reduce global warming. The country needs you to lead Mr. President. We need you to take on Global Warming and make it a priority.	CLIM 18
Judy	April 22, 2013	The Tar Sands has already destroyed vast areas of forest and hurt many local communities.	ACK
Judy	April 22, 2013	The expansion of the Tar Sands will severely impede our country’s and the world’s efforts to transition to a more sustainable economy	PN 03
Judy	April 22, 2013	According to the Cornell Labor Institute, the real number of permanent jobs created by the pipeline is likely to be about ... 50 not 25, 000 jobs not to mention that they would all be Union Jobs.	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judy Abel	April 21, 2013	this climate-damaging fuel will be refined into diesel and jet fuel and shipped abroad. Harvesting sludge from tar sands, as I am sure that you know, is itself damaging to the climate (and the land) and the fact that it threatens our fragile water supply and even our health makes the problem even worse.	RISK 07, CLIM 14
Judy Begin	April 13, 2013	I live in Michigan and want to protect our water	ACK
Judy Beyer	March 11, 2013	We know that you are thinking jobs, jobs, jobs, but that will be temporary and the damage will be PERMANENT. Please put your money where your mouth is. Let's invest in renewable sources of energy.	ALT 01
Judy Bloom	March 11, 2013	This product will not benefit our country and puts it at risk of leaks. The jobs created after the pipeline is built are extremely few in number. If a pipeline was low risk and a real job creator, Canadians would want it for their country.	PN 05
Judy D'amore	March 28, 2013	Please stand with the people who elected you and make the right decision for our children's and grandchildren's future instead of protecting the short-term profits of the fossil fuel industry.	PN 05
Judy Farris	March 21, 2013	please reject the Keystone XL permit, and instead help us pursue a clean, sustainable energy future.	ALT 01
Judy Farris	March 21, 2013	The SEIS does not consider the fact that tar sands oil is three times as carbon intensive, and the pipeline would hasten its extraction.	CLIM 12
Judy Farris	March 21, 2013	The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is woefully inadequate in that it only seriously investigated the regional climate change impacts of the pipeline itself and not how the increased use of carbon-intensive oil would impact global climate change.	CLIM 12
Judy Farris	March 21, 2013	The United States government has spent $8 billion dollars over the last four years to support climate research across 13 federal agencies (including the State Department). This research has been compiled into The National Climate Assessment. This assessment warns that staying on our current fossil fuel energy course will result in the worst-case scenario predicted.	CLIM 14
Judy Fox-perry	April 3, 2013	Our current climate crisis cannot be addressed by pouring on more gas and oil. The XL pipeline is the perfect example of how the oil and gas corporate interests have overcome the wisdom of the people and protecting what we can of the environment for future generations.	PN 05
Judy Holtan	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous, dirty, and destructive -- and the latest Environmental Impact Statement was both flawed and incomplete. It ignores the pipelines significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree the pipeline will be a conduit for oil and refined products to be exported, making the United States less energy secure and driving domestic gas prices higher.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judy Holtan	April 22, 2013	Rather than providing the U.S. with more Canadian oil, the Keystone XL pipeline will increase the amount of gasoline exported, raising prices for American consumers. The firms involved have asked the U.S. State Department to approve this project, even as they've told Canadian government officials how the pipeline can be used to add at least $4 billion to the U.S. fuel bill. US farmers who spent $12.4 billion on fuel in 2009 could see those costs rise to $15 billion or higher if the pipeline goes through and millions of Americans will spend 10 to 20 cents more per gallon for gasoline and diesel fuel	PN 04
Judy Houdeshell	April 15, 2013	We need to invest in clean energy-- it takes courage to change! Be courageous, and continue to vote for clean energy sources-- not for tar sands and fracking that are not clean and/or safe-- much less accountable! We need accountability, and we need to invest in clean energy sources, now! We need sizeable clean energy infrastructure - and it can happen	PN 02
Judy Jolin	April 22, 2013	Stop the Pipeline and concentrate on clean energy and energy independence!	ACK
Judy Le Blanc	April 20, 2013	Please recommend against Keystone XL due to the report released by the State Dept. being based on on biased information as provided by a consulting firm with ties to Trans Canada and because of the contribution to climate change.	PRO 01
Judy Leblanc	April 7, 2013	We would benefit little from the oil produced with much of it being exported from the gulf. Thought jobs would be created for construction of the pipeline, few jobs would be long term. Clean energy would provide more jobs and ones that would continue.	PN 05
Judy Lord	March 29, 2013	Not to mention our continuing dependence on fossil fuels that this pipeline will encourage, when our dollars should be going toward alternative energy.	PN 03
Judy Lynn	April 22, 2013	We should invest in solar power. German Solar Power Plants produced a record 22 gigawatts of electricity per hour, equal to 20 nuclear power stations at full capacity.	PN 02
Judy Lynn	April 22, 2013	Just 35 jobs: The Keystone Pipeline would not create 20,000-100,000 temporary jobs, as some have said. It would create 3,900 temporary jobs, and only 35 permanent.	PN 05
Judy Morgan	March 31, 2013	At the very least, we need an unbiased environmental assessment and should not expand this pipeline system until then.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judy Morgan	March 31, 2013	This information needs to be scrutinized:ARTICLE: "EXCLUSIVE: State Dept. Hid Contractor's Ties to Keystone XL Pipeline Company, Andy Kroll, 3/21/13. [...] But when it released the report, State hid an important fact from the public: Experts who helped draft the report had previously worked for TransCanada, the company looking to build the Keystone pipeline, and other energy companies poised to benefit from Keystone's construction. State released "http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/admindocs/index.htm"documents in conjunction with "http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/draftseis/index.htm"the Keystone report in which these experts' work histories were redacted so that anyone reading the documents wouldn't know who'd previously hired them. Yet unredacted versions of these documents obtained by Mother Jonesconfirm that three experts working for an outside contractor had done consulting work for TransCanada and other oil companies with a stake in the Keystone's approval. [...] (http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/03/keystone-xl-contractor-ties-transcanada-state-department)	PRO 01
Judy Mullally	April 22, 2013	lets go to work on those renewable and alternative energys ideas	PN 02
Judy Mullally	April 22, 2013	Oil is not the answer, it is not renewable and creates a limited dependence of something that is contributing to bad environmental management and global warming	PN 02
Judy Mullally	April 22, 2013	Jobs will not stay in Nebraska, at least not permanently;	SO 03
Judy Mullally	April 22, 2013	Do not let this dirty pipeline carrying tarsand oil into Nebraska and the Ogallala aquifer.	WRG 01
Judy Mullally	April 22, 2013	I have great concern for the the Ogalalla aquifier that lies under the majority of our fine state, Nebraska	WRG 01
Judy Munro-leighton	April 13, 2013	The Oglala Sioux Nation in South Dakota opposes the Keystone XL pipeline on their lands -- which are protected by the 1868 Treaty.	CR 02
Judy Niemack	April 22, 2013	Our water is our most precious resource.	ACK
Judy Pang	April 5, 2013	A Canadian company (not U.S.) will reap the profits Something like 35 permanent jobs will be gained.	PN 07
Judy Peel	March 14, 2013	The project would contribute tremendously to the disastrous consequences of global climate change.	CLIM 14
Judy Schrader	April 19, 2013	Just say NO to oil and gas. We need to be concentrating on clean and renewable energy.	PN 02
Judy Sears	April 11, 2013	And aren't you committed to CLEAN ENERGY? How can continued devastating enterprises like tar sands extraction or fracking even be entertained when you look at the Arkansas suburb	PN 05, ALT 01
Judy Simons	March 25, 2013	Please DENY THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PERMIT. This is an important issue for the future of climate change!	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Judy Skog	April 11, 2013	I call on you to revise your department's review and faithfully report the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate.	CLIM 14
Judy Skog	April 11, 2013	It fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	RISK 13
Judy Vohland	April 22, 2013	Please consider the environment and water supply.	WRG 01
Judy Warren	April 6, 2013	This pipeline will destroy the environment.	ACK
Judy Whitehouse	March 2, 2013	The US State Department must recognize that it is too late to weigh economic interests against environmental interests, because they are interdependent.	PN 05
Judy Zlatnik	April 22, 2013	The risk of irreversibly polluting public and private land, underground aquifers, and air is too great.	ACK
Julane Hill	April 22, 2013	I oppose TransCanada building a pipeline through the Nebraska aquafer! Water is so much more precious than oil--it is crucial to our survival as well as all living creatures.	WRG 01
Julia	April 22, 2013	No WATER = No US!!!!!	ACK
Julia Bartlett	March 21, 2013	We should be investing our time and money and other national resources into renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Julia Bartlett	March 21, 2013	I am against it -- would like to spend what money we have in this field towards developing alternative energy sources.	PN 02
Julia Bent	April 15, 2013	Doing anything to facilitate the further extraction of petroleum precursors from the Alberta Tar Sands threatens the climate balance of our planet.	CLIM 13
Julia Broccado	April 9, 2013	As someone who grew up in the midwest where oiil wells were placed on farmland in the 1960's, I saw first hand how the oil spills contaminated lakes, whick in turned coated the migrating ducks to an oily death, polluted land where the wells and holding tanks sat, oil leaking into the drainage pipes and on and on. There is no current technology that will prevent spills and the containment currently proposed is woefully insufficient. Please pause and use better technology before you allow this pipeline to potentially destroy acres of farmland and aquifers.....there has to be a better way. If the pipeline is so safe, why is it not traversing Canada to Van Couver and being refined in Canada?	RISK 14, PN 05
Julia Coker	April 17, 2013	Also, just how much of the oil projected to run through the Keystone Pipeline is GUARANTEED to be used in the United States?	PN 07
Julia Coker	April 17, 2013	It would provide jobs for a year or two for US citizens, no long term jobs for Americans	SO 04
Julia Francis	April 11, 2013	that assessment simply does not take into consideration the risks of spills. The dangers by a single look in the direction of Arkansas and recognizing the significance of that spill.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Julia Grace	April 4, 2013	It's logically absurd to encourage the private capital at stake to be spent on the Keystone XL pipeline instead of on developing affordable manufacture of solar technology, practical geothermal systems, and right-size wind power systems - apart from installing or rebuilding hydro-electric energy systems in rural areas.	ALT 01
Julia Kennedy	April 22, 2013	One thing that we do have in western Nebraska is wind. Rather than back this horrible toxic oil why cant we begin to think and act green by backing clean, renewable energy (in a serious way) .	PN 02
Julia Kennedy	April 22, 2013	How will the discovery that the inevitable leak has occurred be handled? This is the very life blood of this entire region, for humans and livestock. How do you clean an underground aquifer?	RISK 07
Julia Lee	April 5, 2013	the people affected by tar sands accidents aren't faceless or nameless numbers. They are Americans and persons. It could easily be your families' backyards flooded with crude next time.	RISK 10
Julia Maher	April 9, 2013	For now give jobs to truckers or train engineers.	ACK
Julia Maher	April 9, 2013	Present day pipeline leaks are unacceptable.	ACK
Julia Maher	April 9, 2013	Terriorists have too easy access and will create havoc.	RISK 04
Julia Meisel	April 21, 2013	[The] peer-reviewed data reveals that the tar sands oil that the pipeline would produce more carbon emissions [leading to climate change] than other types of fossil fuels, would corrode infrastructure, and would pollute land and water along the length of its route.	RISK 11, CLIM 05
Julia Mortenson	April 16, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	By tapping into the United States pipeline network, TransCanada will be able to cheaply bring their massively polluting product to market at a fraction of the cost of their current operations. The risk this easy transportation poses to local ecosystems and global climate is absolutely unacceptable.	CLIM 14
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	The environmental impacts of global warming are already beginning, and will intensify in the coming years and decades. Events such as the 2011 Texas drought and Hurricane Sandy will become more frequent, causing social, economic, and human destruction on a growing scale.	CLIM 16
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	Furthermore, if the environmental risks described in the SEIS are not enough to demonstrate that this project is insupportable, then the small number of long-term jobs that the pipeline will create (only 50 jobs) prove that the KXL pipeline is a losing proposition whose alleged economic benefits cannot outweigh its environmental and social costs.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	I strongly disagree with the SEIS's conclusion that "approval or denial of the proposed [KXL pipeline] Project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development in the oil sands." Producing crude oil from tar sands will be much more expensive if the pipeline is not built, which will clearly discourage oil sands extraction.	PN 06
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	I urge the US government to reject the claim that building the KXL pipeline will not have significant negative environmental impacts. Construction of this pipeline is critical for maximum exploitation of the Tar Sands petroleum deposits in Alberta, Canada. The tar sands are the most energy-intensive large-scale fossil fuel source currently being developed on Earth, and therefore represent a massive accelerant in the process of anthropogenic climate change.	PN 06
Julia Voss	March 6, 2013	The draft SEIS…documents many of the serious threats that simply constructing the KXL pipeline will directly pose to wildlife, farming, aboriginal communities, agricultural soils, and ground and surface water in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska, through habitat destruction, light and noise pollution, and waste disposal.	RISK 07
Julia Williams	March 10, 2013	Please. This is my water table.	WRG 01
Julia Winston	April 5, 2013	I am a federal worker and know first hand the harm done when important policy is based on faulty research.	ACK
Julia Wynne	April 22, 2013	Please don't allow big oil to push this through. continue to put emphasis and more funding into clean energy souces.	ALT 01
Juliana Barnet	April 15, 2013	The pipeline should be stopped. It will go over the Trail of Tears which should be preserved to respect the people who walked the trail in the 1800s. It will also cut through Indian reservations	CR 02
Julianna Dailey	March 29, 2013	I lived in South Dakota...for four years [near] where the Niobrara River flows and the beginning of the Sandhills in Nebraska. It is a huge area. When driving through the Sandhills, you take Hwy. 83 down to North Platte. This drive is one of the most beautiful routes in the US. You think the ocean will be just over the next hill. Not too many people live here and it is pristine. The Oglalla Aquifer comes up to the surface in many places and the wildlife is not like anything you have seen in this part of the world. This is a landlocked state and you have swans, pelicans, and many other birds that normally live only along the coast. It would be a sin to destroy this place. It would be a sin to destroy the Oglalla Aquifer. Please, you must not ruin this paradise with something so disgusting as a pipeline that we don't need. It will break, they all do at some point and you will have ruined this paradise forever	RISK 14
Julianne Ramaker	April 10, 2013	I am dismayed by the inadequate draft environmental review your department released last month for the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline ... especially since it was contracted out to three companies with ties to the oil industry.	PRO 01
Julie	April 22, 2013	Granting lifetime easements to a foreign company across our family farms is absurd.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Julie	April 22, 2013	Tar sands is not oil. It does not flow through a pipeline like oil. It is in a catagory other than oil and therefore, does not pay a tax to help clean up a possible spill in the future. The U.S. should not have to pick up the tab	SO 15
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	These oil sands lie under approximately 140,000 square kilometers of the boreal forest in northern Alberta, which is being destroyed for its extraction. The development is the largest source of GHG emissions in Canada, and is sickening the peoples and ecology around it.	ACK
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	The pipeline would enable a 36 per cent increase in oilsands production, the equivalent in annual greenhouse emissions of over 4.6 million passenger vehicles. Currently, no other avenues for oilsands transport are of similar scale or in this advanced stage of development.	CLIM 13
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	Most of the oilsands is destined for export, contradicting the claim that KXL will improve the US's energy independence.	PN 04
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	First, based on the increasing occurrence of extreme weather events and projections supported by a near consensus of the scientific community, the world needs to wean itself off of fossil fuels quickly and dramatically, not continue its development. Notwithstanding a climate crisis, fossil fuels are a finite source, thus this industry will inevitably be a failed business model. Wind, solar, and geothermal are infinite sources which we must rely on in the future, and therefore must point ourselves in that direction.	PN 05, ALT 01
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	The SEIS also does not adequately consider the demonstrated higher risk of pipeline failure due to external corrosion in high temperature pipelines like Keystone XL. The spill of 1.2 million gallons of oilsands into 30 miles of the Kalamazoo River in 2010 tangibly demonstrates the expense ($800 million) and unprecedented difficulty in cleaning up this kind of oil. TransCanada, which would construct the Keystone XL pipeline, is currently under a sweeping audit for systematic violations of minimum safety regulations in the construction of its pipelines. Furthermore, American taxpayers, not oilsands refiners, foot the bill for spills of tar sands oil on US soil.	RISK 14
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	The job creation figures are a pipedream. The SEIS, based on TransCanada's own numbers, shows that at the most 3,900 temporary, construction jobs, only 35 permanent jobs will be created by the pipeline, and that only 10% of the total workforce will be hired locally.	SO 02
Julie Amato	March 6, 2013	Furthermore, American taxpayers, not oilsands refiners, foot the bill for spills of tar sands oil on US soil. An IRS decision exempts tar sands refiners from paying the 8-cents-per-barrel excise tax applied to other crude oil and petroleum products that funds the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.	SO 15, RISK 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Julie Ann Gobbell	April 22, 2013	In addition to the reasons above, it has been determined that the oil in this region is too viscous to be sent effectively through a pipeline and would be far better transported by rail.	ALT 04
Julie Becker Owens	April 22, 2013	If this foreign company is determined to put in a pipeline tell them to do it somewhere else. Not over the largest and most important source of fresh water in the northern hemisphere.	WRG 04
Julie Carda	April 22, 2013	We must REDUCE our dependence on fossil fuels because our childrens lives depend on this reduction.	ACK
Julie Du Brow	April 2, 2013	if gas and freeways were subsidized by the gov't to make us a car culture, why shouldn't clean energy be given the same longterm opportunity and support?	ALT 01
Julie Du Brow	April 2, 2013	Hurricane Sandy… these are the kinds of extreme weather that will continue to occur as climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL are allowed to repeat.	CLIM 17
Julie Du Brow	April 2, 2013	The oil will not stay here, we are just being used as a byway, and it will certainly not lessen the cost of gas.	PN 04
Julie Du Brow	April 2, 2013	It's not a matter of IF an oil spill happens, but when...Transcanada has proven time and again.	RISK 26
Julie Du Brow	April 2, 2013	The jobs originally listed as well over 100,000 provided by this project have been shown time and again to be closer to 3000 or less, and most not permanent.	SO 02
Julie Fugh	April 22, 2013	Please protect our precious aquafir and DO NOT ALLOW the TransCanada pipeline to cross our state.	ACK
Julie Fugh	April 22, 2013	Lets consider alternative forms of clean energy instead of taking the risk of ruining our clean water sources.	PN 02
Julie Fugh	April 22, 2013	Please protect our precious aquafir and DO NOT ALLOW the TransCanada pipeline to cross our state.	WRG 01
Julie Gordon	March 18, 2013	This is Canada's dirty mess - and it does nothing for us other than chance a major environmental disaster with a pipeline leak.	PN 09
Julie Jones	March 16, 2013	Mining tar sands in the Alberta Canada region is already some of the most destructive practice to our climate, to the natural landscape and to the local people. Tar Sands oil takes 3 x the water resources to process then regular oil production	CLIM 06
Julie Kline	April 17, 2013	There are other solutions to our energy needs, please pursue these and let the US be a leader in alternative fuels.	ALT 01
Julie McNally	April 22, 2013	Clean, fresh water is a precious resource that we cannot afford to risk polluting.	WRG 01
Julie McNally	April 22, 2013	eliminates risk to the Ogallala Aquifer and the Sandhills.	WRG 01
Julie McNally	April 22, 2013	Clean fresh water is a precious resource that we cannot afford to risk polluting. Pipeline planners need to look a fresh look at their options because there is a clear compromise available that eliminates risk to the Ogallala Aquifer and the Sandhills.	WRG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
julie mills	April 22, 2013	The water trumps oil every time, we cannot live without water, but oil is not necessary to life.	ACK
julie mills	April 22, 2013	That pipeline will eventually leak as do nearly all pipelines.	RISK 21
Julie Nichols	April 22, 2013	Keystone is another opportunistic company that has no problem using imminent domain	LEG 02
Julie Olimpio	April 2, 2013	The pipeline would carry over 800,000 barrels per day, which will greatly increase US energy security by providing access to Canadian oil and by carrying oil from the Bakken formation in North Dakota and Montana. Rapid growth in production from the Bakken has outpaced existing pipeline capacity and created a situation whereby oil must be transported by rail. Capacity on the Keystone XL pipeline for American producers would ease this bottleneck.	PN 10
Julie Olimpio	April 2, 2013	This draft SEIS and all of the previous reviews of the Keystone XL pipeline have found no significant environmental impact. In fact, the pipeline has performed well on every analysis and review over the last four years, proving that the Keystone XL Pipeline is a safe project that is in the interest of the United States.	RISK 14
Julie Olimpio	April 2, 2013	During our nation`s slow economic recovery, the US energy industry has been one of the bright spots, providing jobs and economic activity at an impressive rate. According to TransCanada, the Keystone XL pipeline itself would create 20,000 jobs, and according to the Canadian Energy Research Institute, the pipeline could support 117,000 new American jobs by 2035.	SO 02
Julie Price	March 14, 2013	The pipeline should not go forward. It is of little benefit to the U.S. in terms of jobs or oil, since most of the oil will be exported, and it will add unnecessarily to air pollution and the greenhouse effect. Clearly its primary beneficiary is the oil industry, not the people of America or the world.	PN 07
Julie Price	March 14, 2013	I wonder why your report on the environmental impact of the XL pipeline did not have significant imput from environmental organizations. The fact that it was written mostly by those who are financially beholden to the oil industry for future consulting contracts calls into question all of the report's conclusions.	PRO 01
Julie Rice	April 17, 2013	A new report released today also shows that Keystone XL would carry the equivalent of 37.7 million cars worth of CO2, but the State Dept. says the pipeline will have no impact on climate change. How can this be?	CLIM 11
Julie Simon	March 11, 2013	Please conduct a thorough and transparent environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline to ensure that our communities, wildlife habitat, waterways, and climate are protected before any decision by the U.S. State Department.	LEG 04
Julie Smith	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is too great to risk.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Julie Thacker	April 11, 2013	If you REALLY want to be part of creating jobs, do it in the wind and solar energy production businesses.	SO 05
Julie Turner	April 11, 2013	It could result in ... the destruction of acres of beautiful prairie[in South Dakota].	VEG 02
Julie Turner	April 11, 2013	It could result in the death of wildlife…	WI 20
Julie Walstrom	April 22, 2013	The federal govt has spent alot of money to give protective scenic waterway designations to both the Verdigre Creek and Niobrara River areas. These designations took much time as well as money, and resulted in a document that consists of several hundred pages. This designation is supposed to protect the flora, fauna, people, and water quality of these areas. It does not make sense that after all this effort to create these protections, that a tar sands pipeline is allowed to encroach on them.	WRS 10
Julie Wasmer	April 14, 2013	We need to focus our efforts on clean energy technologies and not fall prey to big oil.	PN 02
Julie Wickware	April 9, 2013	YOU OWE US integrity, truth, full disclosure & an UNBIASED environmental & economic assessment of the Keystone project. Sadly, such an assessment does not exist-We are not going to stand by as you give away another irreplaceable part of our country-our land- to the highest bidder.	ACK
Julie Zahniser	April 19, 2013	Please note that the revised pipeline route not only gives Canada an even smaller proportion of the risk, but also revises the location of the Sandhill area of Nebraska!	SOIL 08
Julieann Uejio	March 10, 2013	The damage from any leak will be more devastating. The oil will be more difficult to clean then any other other oil spill	RISK 08
Julienne Cross	March 28, 2013	You are doing this without prior informed consent of Tribes and you will no longer steal from our people while you poison our water.	CR 01
Juliet Schor	March 30, 2013	Isn't it telling that the people of Canada will not allow a pipeline out of Alberta?	ACK
Juliet Schor	March 30, 2013	As a social scientist who studies climate change, I believe that the development of tar sand oil is a mistake with civilizational consequences. As you both know, humanity has found itself unable to move off fossil fuels quickly enough to avoid serious climate catastrophe.	CLIM 14
Julio Valentin Medina	April 15, 2013	FROM MY PERSONAL POINT OF VIEW, I THINK THAT WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE ON ATHER TYPES OF ENERGIES DUE TO THE FACT THAT WE NEVER KNOW HOW LONG WILL OUR RECENT RESOURCES WILL LAST & IF WE START THINKING IN THE FUTURE, IF WE START USING OTHER RENEWABLE ENERGY OF ANY TYPE THAT DOES LESS DANGER TO THE ONLY PLANET EARTH THAT WE ALL LIVE ON, WE CAN STILL KEEP OUR RESOURCES ALIVE JUST IN CASE WE NEED THEM FURTHER ON BECAUSE WE ALREADY KNOW HOW THEY WORK.	PN 02
June Calvin	April 6, 2013	Please do not allow this pipeline to be stretched across America, when it will only be refined at further environmental costs and then exported.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Juniper Sundance	April 19, 2013	Bitumen pipelines have a higher rate of failure because of the corrosive nature of the substance, and spills are more difficult to clean up.	RISK 11
Justin Cook	April 22, 2013	I grew up in Nebraska and know that ground water can be hit by merely digging a post hole. This fact alone is scary when considering that the pipeline could at times be subject to being below the ground water level if sufficient rains were to fall.	WRG 01
Justin Cook	April 22, 2013	Water is a valuable natural resource that should not be risked.	WRG 01
Justin G Jones	April 22, 2013	I oppose the Keystone XL pipeline because of the siting in the Nebraska Sandhills. Please require an alternate route which avoids this national treasure.	ALT 06
Justin G Jones	April 22, 2013	I oppose the Keystone project because I am interested in seeing our groundwater resources protected. The Sandhills are the absorption mechanism for the incredibly important Ogallalla aquifer and should not host a pipeline such as this.	WRG 01
Justin G Jones	April 22, 2013	The Sandhills are the absorption mechanism for the incredibly important Ogallalla aquifer and should not host a pipeline such as this.	WRG 01
Justin Gerard	April 22, 2013	The energy independence of America does not hinge on this project and it will not have a beneficial impact on the development of tar sands. The energy produced will be sent overseas and will not benefit domestic production.	PN 04
Justin Godard	March 19, 2013	Please stop this pipeline. The world is slowly weaning itself off oil and non-sustainable fuel and energy. In thirty years the only thing this pipeline will be is a monument to backyard thinking during this time in history and the firm influence of corporations. This pipeline with rip apart the earth and ecosystems it runs through and pose a huge threat to the entire planets health, our health, clean water and create other huge risks. The world needs to stand up for a healthy planet and people over profit and greed. The decision on this pipeline will truly show the direction we take. Same old corporate driven, money obsessed society with no concern for the future, or an evolved people concerned with what we leave for future generations, and what we do to our planet that gives us life. I hope you will make the only decision future and current generations of people, plants and animals will look to as a positive direction and indication of the conscience of our society. Prevent this pipeline from being developed now and in the future. Stop allowing oil companies and corporations decide the fate of the world.	PN 05
Justin Habler	April 20, 2013	We cannot even live a sustainable future with the rate of carbon emissions at this point, how why would you let so many thousands of barrels of low quality oil be burned into our atmosphere.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Justin Hornback	April 20, 2013	The KXL would move 880,000 barrels of oil a day, or approximately the same amount of 4400 tanker trucks. That would equate to a load being delivered by truck every 19.6 seconds. This also equates to 1320 rail cars being delivered and unloaded everyday, that's almost one rail car a minute. The transportation demands of the Canadian tar-sands is more than our current infrastructure can support and environmentally unfavorable to meet the demand by increasing train or truck transporting.	ACK
Justin Hornback	April 20, 2013	"Pipelines are the safest way to transport fuel. Accidents are 3,000 times more likely to occur with a large truck, 38 times more likely to occur by barge, and 25 times more likely to occur by rail. Replacing rail or truck traffic with a pipeline reduces unhealthy air pollution and congestion." (http://www.aopl.org/pdf/Pipelines_Are_Safe__2_.pdf)	ALT 07
Justin Hornback	April 20, 2013	The proof is in the minorities own testimony on tar-sands spills from the 65 year old pipeline in Arkansas and also the 14 train cars that were derailed in Minnesota. They state these leaks prove that we should continue without the Keystone project, which would only continue spill trends as we have seen in the recent past. I believe these spills only reinforce our need for this new Pipeline. The National Transportation Safety Board says that pipelines are the safest mode of fuel transportation, both for the public and for the environment, so why meet the demand for transportation in anyway other than the safest.	ALT 09
Justin Hornback	April 20, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, if built, would supply American refineries with more than 800,000 barrels of oil per day. Studies have shown that this is equivalent to approximately half of the oil we import from the Persian Gulf. America is current sending money overseas to import oil, a good portion of which comes from countries that do not share the same views as Americans, many that despise the US.	PN 10
Justin Hornback	April 20, 2013	The Keystone Project will be privately funded, costing tax payers no money, and in turn increase tax revenue for many communities. This project will provide jobs to thousands of Americans who have been hit hardest with high unemployment rates in recent years, the construction industry. Construction jobs are key to economic recovery and in many recessions throughout history, citizens look to government to increase spending on temporary construction jobs to help boost local economies.	SO 10
Justin Kaput	April 3, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline represents a moment of profound significance for the future of the world, and it sends an indelible message as to where we, as a nation, stand on our commitment to climate change	CLIM 18
Justin Paille	April 10, 2013	Government also needs to create and maintain environmental legislation to protect and conserve the environment and strengthen the environmental assessments of project proposals.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Justin Paille	April 10, 2013	The best way to achieve sustainability is to remove the dependence on non-renewable resources and provide new alternatives that are sustainable, such as Solar Energy.	PN 02
Justin Preikschas	April 10, 2013	If the US is willing to further validate the false claims about this pipeline and the oil it carries by rejecting the project, then the Canadians will just sell it overseas and continue shipping as much as possible to the US by rail, which is proven to be far less safe and environmentally friendly than pipelines.	PN 12
Jutta Helm	April 17, 2013	Canada, long-term research projects have shown ground water contamination and increased occurrence of cancer, especially in children, in the areas where tar sands are being drilled.	CU 02
Jv Cherian	March 6, 2013	There are so many, many anecdotal examples of people, farms, lakes and other bodies of water that are polluted, not to mention the very real danger to our aquifers, and the danger of a spill	ACK
K Acevedo	April 5, 2013	The Keystone EIS ignores the significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree that Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	ACK
K Dixon	April 13, 2013	The money that will come from this pipeline will not come to us after the construction... all we will get is the legacy of terrible land and tribal destruction in our neigboring country. Eventually that pollution and destruction will get into the US also.	PN 05
K. Wood	April 4, 2013	Stop the devastation of our natural environment and consider other forms of energy.	ALT 01
K.g.h. Nicholes	April 1, 2013	It has the potential to do more damage than can be reasonably fixed/cleaned.	PN 05
K.g.h. Nicholes	April 1, 2013	The people who use the aquifers and rivers the pipeline would cross deserve better.	WRG 01
Kacee Buckli	April 22, 2013	Our government should live up to their promises and make more uses of clean energy.	PN 02
Kai Ewert	April 12, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Kaiser	April 18, 2013	What if the pipeline is sold to another company? What if more hazardous or dealdy chemicals are used in the breakdown process of the tar sands?	RISK 03
Kaiser	April 18, 2013	The risks of a pipeline leak is much too risky…	RISK 21
Kaja Rebane	April 22, 2013	spills risk poisoning farmland and the Ogallala Aquifer, which is so important for agriculture and human health in so many states.	RISK 07
KaminskiR	April 18, 2013	the reality is we're not going to be totally energy independent or without the need of fossil fuels in the next 25 years, and use of petroleum will continue to be a component of our national energy needs	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	[developing the tar sands is] putting our beautiful life on Earth in jeopardy	ACK
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	The resulting fuels sicken the communities that live nearby, viz. the natives in the Alberta reservations and the minorities living near the oil refineries in Houston.	ACK
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	The amount of carbon that's buried in Alberta, if released into the atmosphere, will take us quickly past the 2 degree limit, guaranteeing calamitous results for all of life	CLIM 05
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	The process of extraction and refining of tarsands oil is a toxic operation.	CU 01
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is unnecessary	PN 08
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	Pipelines leak. They always do. Detection and fail safety mechanisms fail, as we have learned time and time again. Tarsands oil is especially corrosive and laden with cancer-causing chemicals that we do not want to pollute the ground, water and air with	RISK 14, PD 04, RISK 30
Kannan Thiru	March 26, 2013	On critical evaluation, Transcanada's job estimates are overblown.	SO 02
Kannan Thiruvengadam	March 27, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate and its significant risk for toxic spills.	CLIM 21
Kara Emmons	April 9, 2013	Toxins from potential spills affect the people in the neighborhoods on a greater level - there lungs, there lives, there air, there water and then the global warming.	RISK 30, CLIM 16
Kara Fierstein	April 22, 2013	It is insane to think that any company would be able to guarantee safety to our aquifier and to our cropland.	RISK 14
Kara Lambrecht	April 22, 2013	Live up to your promise of clean energy and energy independence	PN 02
Karen A Endacott	April 22, 2013	Instead of the pipeline we shoud consider the vast source of renewable wind available in the Great Plains. Energy without polluting the world now thats my Pipeline!	ALT 01
Karen A Endacott	April 22, 2013	Instead of the pipeline we shoud consider the vast source of renewable wind available in the Great Plains. Energy without polluting the world	PN 02
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	According to the Energy Information Administration (EIA), petroleum fuels will remain the largest energy source worldwide for decades in the future. As the global economy recovers and developing economies continue to rapidly expand, competition for petroleum and all forms of energy will increase throughout the world.	PN 10
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	According to the EnSys Energy Report (December 2010) conducted for the U.S. Department of Energy on the KXL pipeline project, the projected increase in the U.S. refining of Canadian crudes “would curb dependency on crude oils from other sources notably the Middle East and Africa.”	PN 10
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	As recently reported by Bentek (2012), combined U.S. and Canadian production are expected to grow by over 3,100 million barrels per day by 2016, and Canadian imports to the U.S. could increase by 900 thousand barrels during that period, causing crude imports from outside of North America to drop by forty-one percent. In fact, Bentek expects U.S. imports of crude from outside of North America to decrease to less than ten percent of our oil supply by 2020.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	Due to the deep trading relationship, it is estimated that for every $1.00 spent to buy oil from Canada, $0.90 is returned in the purchase of U.S. goods or services.	PN 10
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	Stable, long-term energy supplies from Canada are critical to U.S. energy security at a time when global supplies are often found in geopolitically unstable regions of the world, and production from once-reliable sources is slowing.	PN 10
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	The Canadian Energy Research Institute (CERI) estimated the impact of this trade on state employment in a June 2011 report.	REF
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	…..are based upon CERI's results….significant benefit that KXL can have for workers in a state like Illinois (13,111 new jobs by 2020) that is suffering from 9.5 percent unemployment, or Michigan (2,996 new jobs by 2020) with 8.8 percent unemployment, and even Pennsylvania (2,201 new jobs by 2020) that has 8.1 percent unemployment.	SO 01
Karen A. Harbert	April 10, 2013	During the operating life of the entire pipeline (including Gulf Coast project), TransCanada will pay $5.2 billion in property taxes to state and local communities.	SO 14
Karen Bates	April 22, 2013	Building the Keystone XL Pipeline would be a destructive path to follow...instead of continuing subsidies and tax breaks for fossil fuel companies at the behest of their lobbyists and other interest groups this country should be investing in non fossil means of satisfying and also reducing the nation's energy needs	ALT 01
Karen Beatty Sookram, Ph.D.	April 22, 2013	As a proud descendant of Nebraska homesteaders, I can think of nothing more egregious than to allow this company access to the ranch and farmlands of this region. There is only one fail-safe way to avoid an oil spill: if no pipeline crosses directly over the Sandhills then there can be no oil or toxic chemicals spilled. Despite TransCanadas carefully crafted messages and polished ads their past actions reveal that they simply cannot be trusted to protect our people or the fragile ecosystem.	RISK 25, RISK 06, WRG 04
Karen Beatty Sookram, Ph.D.	April 22, 2013	Pipeline jobs are temporary and not as compelling as other potential job opportunities	SO 04
Karen Beatty Sookram, Ph.D.	April 22, 2013	Additionally the "create-needed-jobs" argument has little merit in my view. Pipeline jobs are temporary and not as compelling as other potential job opportunities (i.e. rehabilitating aging infrastructure of Nebraska cities and towns)	SO 05, SO 04
Karen Beatty Sookram, Ph.D.	April 22, 2013	[do not] risk destroying the sandhills region and contaminating parts of the aquifer	WRG 01
Karen Burtness Prak	April 9, 2013	I urge you to put our health and climate above oil industry profits, above the short-term and illusory employment gains being touted for this project, and above the perceived gains of collaboration with Canada, and give Keystone XL the in-depth environmental review we all deserve.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Burtness Prak	April 9, 2013	Habitat destruction for sensitive animals of all kinds, global warming from the very use of tar sands, and potential spills which impact the lives of every creature on our planet are among the potential negative effects of this pipeline.	RISK 07
karen calvin	April 22, 2013	I fail understand why TransCanada doesnt run the pipeline through their own country if they could profit so much from their dirty oil.	ALT 05
karen calvin	April 22, 2013	Even the smallest oil spill would permanently contaminate our drinking water and prohibit farming (crops cannot be irrigated with toxic oil and poisonous tar sand elements)	RISK 07
karen calvin	April 22, 2013	endangering the largest underground clean water reserve in the country	WRG 01
Karen Chalfen	March 28, 2013	Canadians did not want this pipeline traversing their land. Why should our land be used by a Canadian company for their profits? This dirty fossil fuel will not increase the supply to the US. It will be sold overseas to increase the profits of a corporation while threatening lives and livelihoods here at home.	PN 05, PN 04
Karen Clark	March 11, 2013	This is the dirtiest and most toxic form of oil being transported. The toxic contamination of our farm and tribal lands is unacceptable and we know that the current history and continued risk of more spills from the pipeline, which are impossible to clean up, is why Canadians have rejected it. We can do no less for our US citizens,, our health, safety, and livelihoods.	RISK 10
Karen Clark	April 2, 2013	I don't want a river of oil running down my street or bubbling up from the sewers in my neighborhood or pouring into the lake my family swims and skis in or into my drinking water.	ACK
Karen Coryell-moore	April 9, 2013	Heed the wake-up call from Arkansas and direct your State Department to conduct a new, comprehensive review that tallies the real costs of the Keystone XL.	RISK 13
Karen Dinkins	April 16, 2013	Let the oil companies build a refinery in Canada that can refine this oil that is going to China anyway.	ALT 08
Karen Dinkins	April 16, 2013	My drinking water comes from the watershed where Exxon pipeline for tar sands oil ruptured here in Arkansas. Now we have tar sand oil in our drinking water. Why does our government allow these oil companies the right to build something so dangerous to our health right under a drinking water watershed?	RISK 14
Karen Douchette	April 13, 2013	There is no advantage in this pipeline other than making the rich so much more richer and Oil not coming down for us poor folks	ACK
Karen E. Jones	April 22, 2013	The Ogllala Aquifer is our Life-Line and should NEVER be risked by dirty, dangerous Oil piplines like the expansion of the Keystone XL.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Eggerman	April 17, 2013	The key to prosperity and stable energy prices in our country is distributed local generation of renewable energy- all types. Reliance on one type of energy has proven problematic and unsustainable. Winning now means an energy strategy that works for the long term not a dominant type of energy source. Put us to work building local energy infrastructures that can support local needs and a larger grid-jobs that stay at home.	ALT 01
Karen Ferguson	April 4, 2013	I feel that any expansion of the Tar Sands is unethical because of ...damage to ...wildlife	ACK
Karen Ferguson	April 4, 2013	I feel that any expansion of the Tar Sands is unethical because of ...damage to … humans.	ACK
Karen Ferguson	April 4, 2013	I feel that any expansion of the Tar Sands is unethical because of climate change	CLIM 14
Karen Ferguson	April 4, 2013	I feel that any expansion of the Tar Sands is unethical because of ...habitat destruction	WI 22
Karen Ferguson	April 4, 2013	I feel that any expansion of the Tar Sands is unethical because of ...damage to rivers	WRS 02
Karen Foster	April 16, 2013	It's dangerous and must not be allowed to further contaminate our communities, land and water.	ACK
Karen Gettert Shoemaker	April 22, 2013	The aquifer is not replaceable, whereas the pipeline route is movable.	WRG 04
Karen Goshaney	April 7, 2013	Why on earth would the US expose our land, WATER, and people to this risk?	PN 05
Karen Gupton	March 30, 2013	Why would we want to accept all the liability mainly to get the oil to the south for Mexico and other foreign countries.	PN 07
Karen Hatfield	April 9, 2013	This dangerous pipeline would also put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk. The massive Exxon Mobil spill in Arkansas this past week provided a tragic reminder of the types of risks we would run by allowing the Keystone XL pipeline to be built.	RISK 13
Karen Hedrick	April 15, 2013	We need to be concentrating our economic resources toward more sustainable sources of energy...solar, wind, geothermal.	PN 02
Karen Hehn	April 6, 2013	I know the Keystone Pipeline is a only a conduit for Canada to a warm climate port area, where their toxic tar sands oil will be refined and exported. The United States will not receive any benefits and must endure all the risks. The pipeline is made of foreign-made pipe, probably inferior quality and integrity, which will undoubtedly leak as has its predecessor.	PN 05
Karen Hehn	April 6, 2013	The recent Arkansas break has proven that the clean-up of this kind of crude is impossible. It is harvested by using questionable solvent technology, and is undoubtedly impossible to clean up using present methods. To mine substances that have no clean-up or counter-measures yet developed IS JUST WRONG! We have no protection to control its threats to the environment and the health of our citizens, in particular our children and families who live in the heartland.	RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Heidman	April 16, 2013	In the Environmental Impact Statement issued March 1, 2013, TransCanada has not followed Clean Water Act guidelines requiring the study of the worst-case scenarios.	LEG 07
Karen Heidman	April 16, 2013	The State Department report identified 35 permanent full-time jobs. Some 4,000 temporary construction jobs would be needed, but only 10 percent of those would be filled from along the route.	SO 03
Karen Hodges	April 7, 2013	[discussing climate change] Some of this is due to the oil and gas industry, which has generated self-serving analyses purporting to be good science and lulling us into a false sense of security - all for the sake of short-term profit. But you have the best science at your disposal and I urge you to listen to what climate scientists are saying.	CLIM 14
Karen Hodges	April 7, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Karen Hunsberger Johnson	April 16, 2013	I think we should build a WATER pipeline rather than an oil pipeline. We can collect the seasonal flood waters from the rivers of the Keystone region and pipe them to drought areas in the southern U.S. This provides jobs, drought relief, prevents seasonal flooding, is safe to regions containing the pipeline, avoids carbon release and thus avoids further climate change and pollution to our planet. It's a win-win.	ACK
Karen K. Miller	March 10, 2013	The State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement will have us believe that the KXL Pipeline dangers are few, with the coming promise of jobs to save our hurting economy. The draft was actually based on TransCanada Corporation's own estimations of risks, not the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's findings. Real analysis concludes that no substantial studies have been done at all to assess the environmental risks.	LEG 04
Karen K. Miller	March 10, 2013	A 2011 briefing paper called "Pipe dreams?", was published by Cornell University's Global Labor Institute. The study concludes that the investment is costly and it is likely to be export only pipeline that will not lower gas prices or create local substantial permanent jobs.	PN 07
Karen K. Miller	March 20, 2013	The draft was actually based on TransCanada Corporation's own estimations of risks, not the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency's findings. Real analysis concludes that no substantial studies have been done at all to assess the environmental risks.	RISK 07, LEG 04
Karen Kearney	March 11, 2013	The direction we want to go in is away from fossil fuels. Please do the job of protecting the planet, the people and all the creatures who live on it. Time is running out. We cannot fix the mess after the fact. Prevent the disasters don't produce them.	PN 02
Karen Kearney	March 28, 2013	Please keep your promise to stop the progress of global warming and destruction of our precious planet. through pollution.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Kirschling	April 4, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	ALT 01
Karen Kirschling	April 4, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04
Karen Knudtsen	March 10, 2013	America's advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if we also develop the tar sands. We need to keep investing in wind, solar, geothermal, and other forms of clean energy.	PN 03
Karen Kolo	April 13, 2013	We've been experiencing temperatures in the 80's in April in NJ- what will it be like in August and the Augusts of the future if we continue to invest in fossil fuel projects?	CLIM 14
Karen Kolo	April 13, 2013	We should not be willing to risk another toxic spill in any neighborhood.	RISK 14
Karen Larsen	March 14, 2013	This type of oil is different than regular crude. Crude floats on the top of the water. Tar Sands oil sinks to the bottom. This oil is too dangerious for enviroment and could easily get into the drinking water we drink and grow crops with.	RISK 07
Karen Larsen	March 14, 2013	The jobs it would create are only temporary. Once the pipe line is built those jobs are gone. There are other and better ways to make jobs.	SO 04
Karen Larsen	March 28, 2013	Crude floats on the water and Tar Sands sinks to the bottom. No one has figured out how to clean up a Tar Sands spill. It could also get into places that provide water for people to drink and that farmers use to water their crops.	RISK 08
Karen Larsen	April 3, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Karen Larsen	April 3, 2013	Canada does not have the Keystone XL Pipeline running across their country. Instead they want to us the US and have it run across our country. That means all the damage that would happen in their country will happen in the US instead. The spill that has happened in Arkansas is the same kind of crude oil that will come thru the XL Pipeline. People have been evacuated from their homes because of the spill. The XL Pipeline may be new and updated- but it will leak. There is no reason to allow the damage from it to happen in this country. Please reject the XL Pipeline and DO NOT allow it to be built in this country.	RISK 07
Karen Lehner	April 9, 2013	Once we screw up our water - no amount of science will stop the dominoes.	ACK
Karen Linn	April 4, 2013	It has also come to the attention of environment groups that there are small holes in the pipeline where it already exists, evidently from bad welds. When the company was informed of this they immediately buried the section WITHOUT INSPECTION.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Lundblad	March 19, 2013	We need further environmental information: facts & figures before there can be any approval of the pipeline. Please slow down the process until all the reports and finding are in. There is not hurry on such a huge environmental impact as this project could be!	PRO 04
Karen Martellaro	March 17, 2013	Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	ACK
Karen McGivney-Liechti	April 22, 2013	Its not good for Nebraska and its not good for the United States.	PN 08
Karen Nelson	March 11, 2013	Please continue to support clean, efficient energy and stop those who would trash our environment to make money short term.	ALT 01
Karen Nelson	April 20, 2013	the risk to our land and aquifers is not worth taking.	ACK
Karen Nelson	April 20, 2013	It will not give us energy independence	PN 04
Karen Nelson	April 20, 2013	will not create a significant amount of jobs,	SO 02
Karen Neubert	March 10, 2013	Please don't let an early defeat with solar power keep you from thinking outside the box. Why let one defeat ruin the whole concept of heat and power from the sun....which is still FREE. There are companies in the US who use all USA solar products...Not Chinese ones, it supports our economy and ultimately will reconfigure power usage in a good way- on the plus $ side.	PN 02
Karen Nocera	March 24, 2013	The "jobs" argument is significant, but other, more productive & respectable initiatives, will give industry ways to create jobs.	SO 05
Karen O	March 15, 2013	NY Times reported, "Mainstream scientists are virtually unanimous in stating that the one sure way to avert the worst consequences of climate change is to decarbonize the world economy by finding cleaner sources of energy while leaving more fossil fuels in the ground. Given its carbon content, tar sands oil should be among the first fossil fuels we decide to leave alone" (3/10/13).	CLIM 05
Karen O	March 15, 2013	…..brightest scientists, engineers, biologists and all environmental supporters and activists can redirect their time and energies to developing sustainable alternatives to fossil fuels. Aren't we trying to end our dependency on fossil fuels? Let's put our energies, talents, knowledge and dollars toward finding and supporting alternative, sustainable fuels.	PN 02
Karen O	March 15, 2013	I am especially worried about the risks to water quality and supplies from tar sands pipeline spills	RISK 07
Karen O	March 15, 2013	Even the State Department acknowledges that extracting, refining and burning the oil from the tar-laden sands is a dirtier process than it had previously stated. Increased greenhouse gas emissions, the destruction of forests growing above the sands, and other environmental damage to streams and watersheds will be the results of building this pipeline.	RISK 07, CU 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Psiaki	April 22, 2013	I am disturbed and surprised to see that the U.S. Department of State is accountable for review of this proposed pipeline, and for overseeing an outside contractor's compliance with EIS study standards. While being responsible for out transnational dealings, don't you think it would have been wiser for the U.S. Department of the Interior to handle this project with regard to environmental impact?	LEG 21
Karen Quaritius	April 15, 2013	PLEASE push our country in the direction of solar, wind and hydro power...something sustainable and less dangerous to us and our planet.	PN 02
Karen Rafferty	April 20, 2013	There are unique risks associated with diluted bitumen spill, yet spill responders have yet to develop methods that will address those risks. The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement released last month does not address the risks of dilbit clean-up. In fact there is no Facility Response Plan in the DSEIS to deal with spills when spills do occur, nor any indication as to who bears the responsibility and cost of clean-up. Bitumen has to be diluted in order to be transported by pipe. Typically the diluent is a proprietary chemical cocktail mix containing benzene and natural gas liquids. The EPA has previously stated that without more information on the chemical characteristics and composition of the diluent it is difficult to determine the fate and transport of any spilled dilbit in the aquatic environment or in the fragile Sand Hills environment, putting clean-up efforts in peril. TransCanada will not reveal the chemical nature of the diluents added to bitumen extracted from the tar sands, citing proprietary claims; nevertheless, without this information an effective Facility Response Plan cannot be developed or deployed.	RISK 05, PD 04, RISK 08, RISK 12
Karen Rafferty	April 20, 2013	Diluted bitumen is a highly corrosive product very different from traditional crude oil. The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration commissioned a study by the National Academies of Science to study the environmental impact and comparative corrosive nature of dilbit on steel pipes. That study commenced June 2012 with a projected duration of 21 months. No decision to even consider approving the Keystone XL should be made before the results of the PHMSA study are known.	RISK 14, PD 04
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	We need to invest more in renewable energies and work toward asecure energy future.	PN 02
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	It isalso disturbing that TransCanada previously employed Environmental ResourcesManagement; there is an obvious conflict of interest, and they should not haveconducted the EIS.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	Once water is contaminated by oil, it is exceptionally difficult toclean up, particularly dirty tar sands oil. It makes no sense to build a pipeline on top of the Ogallalaaquifer, which is already stressed from overuse. A spill or leak that affected the aquifer could becatastrophic.	RISK 07
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	The latest Environmental ImpactStatement did not completely assess the effects of an oil spill or leak uponthe endangered species OR the water resources that would be affected by such anevent from this pipeline.	RISK 07
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	I have also visitedNebraska's Platte River and know that the pallid sturgeon, least terns and pipingplovers occurring downstream from the pipeline would be adversely affected by aspill in that area.	TES 01
Karen Rankin-Baransky	April 22, 2013	The disturbance to whooping crane habitat is completely unacceptable.	TES 15
Karen Ratzlaff	April 22, 2013	...will destroy the farmland and aquifers under it.	ACK
Karen Schwall	March 15, 2013	I am totally mystified as to how the State Department can acknowledge the negative effects of the Earth's dirtiest oil on our climate, but at the same time claim that the proposed pipeline will not likely result in significant adverse environmental effects.	ACK
Karen Smith	March 18, 2013	Clean, green energy is the future. Sun, wind, water, that is the future.	ALT 01
Karen Smith	March 18, 2013	Tarsands are very carbon intensive. I believe that they could be the tipping point on global warming. That means once we reach a certain point, there is no going back. We don't want to go there	CLIM 12
Karen Sookram, Ph.D.	April 22, 2013	Forcing tar sands and toxic chemicals through a pipeline over fragile grasslands in the vicinity of the Ogallala Aquifer should not be approved. Further, the pipeline will traverse much of the Missouri River Basin, cross over the Platte River, and place the environment from Montana to Texas at risk. Breaks in this pipeline are inevitable, given the history of pipelines	RISK 24, RISK 07, WRG 04, WRS 02
Karen Sweet	April 13, 2013	We need to fight climate change. We aren't doing that by investing in tar sands, the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 05
Karen Sylvester	April 15, 2013	If as a nation we take this risk of allowing the Keystone XL pipeline through our soil can we at least stipulate that the oil is used for our nation not as a throughway for exporting to other countries? Otherwise what are we getting from this deal?	PN 07
Karen Sylvester	April 15, 2013	Isn't this tar sand coming from Canada but only partially sold to the U.S.A.?	PN 13
Karen Thaw	March 28, 2013	This is a Canadian project that will pollute America's clean water, i.e. lakes and streams near which the pipeline will run. The Canadians will reap the profits and the Americans will have their land and water polluted.	WRS 01, PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karen Toledo	April 11, 2013	Profit driven, unsustainable practices have repeatedly caused devastating floods, destroyed water and soil quality, and ruined entire biosystems including the lives of the people living there.	ACK
Karen Toledo	April 11, 2013	We should be spending money on job creation in the sustainable industries of alternative, safe energy.	SO 05
Karen Toledo	April 11, 2013	The truth is less than 100 permanent jobs will be created by this pipeline, a considerable number of which won't even be union jobs, so there is no justification in that realm.	SO 06
Karen Van Hoek	April 12, 2013	take a strong stand against climate change	CLIM 14
Karen Wagoner	April 22, 2013	... endangering our water sources with the possibility of leakage.	RISK 07
Karen Wagoner	April 22, 2013	Even if the pipeline is monitored and can be shut down the monitors can only detect a 1½% loss or leak. The potential loss of 1½% of 500 000-900 000 barrels is 7500-13500 barrels of tar sands pumped through the pipe at 1400 to 1600 psi. will be pumped into our soil and water table until noticed and shut down. Theres no way that can be removed or cleaned up.	RISK 15
Karen Weeks	April 22, 2013	My first concern is that a spill will pollute the Ogalala aquifer and the surrounding land areas. Water is a major natural resource.	RISK 07
Karen Weeks	April 22, 2013	My first concern is that a spill will pollute the Ogalala aquifer and the surrounding land areas	WRG 01, RISK 07
Karenjj2	April 19, 2013	Currently bitumen is not subject to contributions to the conventional oil cleanup fund; and, in addition, we will be relying on the goodwill of foreign corporations to cleanup bitumen ruptures forevermore.	SO 15, RISK 03
Karin Prescott	April 2, 2013	If we don't truly stand up to advance efforts to get away from oil now, there will always be excuses in the future to not do it, and we owe it to future generations to try to fix the climate mess that is being exacerbated each day, and not add to it with no thought to the future.	PN 08, CLIM 14
Karla Fredericksen	April 20, 2013	The key point of the State Department's finding that the Keystone XL Pipeline is climate neutral is faulty. The claim is that the construction of Keystone XL will not affect development of the Alberta tar sands one way or the other. It’s just wrong. The Canadian Energy Research Institute has said, “With KXL in place and operating at capacity, bitumen production could increase substantially.”	CLIM 13
Karla Fredericksen	April 20, 2013	Your argument that the bitumen development would happen anyway because it could be shipped on rail is equally wrong. The tar sands are landlocked, rail transport is uneconomical, and communities all around Alberta are blocking shipment of this stuff.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karla Jones	April 22, 2013	Canada, our largest trading partner and a vital strategic ally has exhibited enormous patience and flexibility in seeing this process through. However, our continued failure to issue the Presidential Permit to authorize the Keystone XL Project unnecessarily strains relations with this important friend, which is definitely not in the United States' best interests.	PN 10
Karla Jones	April 22, 2013	Oil sands development is a reality, and Alberta will continue to develop this valuable resource with or without the Keystone XL Pipeline. Fortunately, Canada is an excellent steward of the environment, and all boreal forest land used for oil sands mining is reclaimed once mining operations have ceased. Canada also mitigates its carbon footprint by imposing a carbon cap. Carbon is priced at $15 per ton and these revenues are reinvested into alternative energy projects.	PN 11, CLIM 15
Karla Jones	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is environmentally sound. The environmental impact statement that your Department released in August 2011 observed that the Pipeline will "have a degree of safety over any other typically constructed oil pipeline under current code and a degree of safety along the entire length of the pipeline system similar to that which is required in High consequence Areas." And despite the controversy surrounding the Project, the Keystone XL would add less than one percent of additional pipeline to the 180,000 miles of petroleum transmission pipeline currently traversing the nation. Without the Keystone XL producers would have to rely more heavily on older, less reliable pipelines and other modes of transport such as rail and barge. According to the Department of Transportation's own studies, pipelines are the safest way to transport oil. This fact was underscored by the March 2013 derailment in Minnesota of a train carrying oil from Alberta's oil sands.	RISK 14
Karla Jones	April 22, 2013	Construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline will create American jobs. According to the Draft SEIS when direct and indirect jobs are included, "the proposed Project would potentially support approximately 42,100 average annual jobs across the United States over a 1-to 2-year construction period (of which, approximately 3,900 would be directly employed in construction activities)." Our nation is not in a position to turn away jobs – especially in those sectors suffering disproportionately from high unemployment. The explosive economic growth I witnessed in Alberta as well as North Dakota's current boom provides compelling, real world evidence of the energy sector's power to propel growth.	SO 02
Karlene Ellsworth	March 6, 2013	The pipes will deteriorate over time and will require constant maintenance. It may take 50 or more years, but the pipes will eventually rupture and leak.	CU 17
Karlene Gunter	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will be going through some of our best farmland	LU 01
Karlene Gunter	April 22, 2013	We can't put important …farmland at such risk	LU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Karlene Gunter	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will be going ….across several aquifers. A spill could have tragic consequences and could contaminate an aquifer that is used by thousands of people. Looking at the history of pipelines in the US, at least one spill is certain to occur and likely more than one could occur.	WRG 01
Karlene Gunter	April 22, 2013	We can't put important water supplies … at such risk.	WRG 01
Kat Cantrell	April 22, 2013	PLEASE do not let this pipeline happen over our Aquafer!! Nine states depend on this water! One leak, and its gone.....	WRG 01
Kat Cantrell	April 22, 2013	We must protect the aquafer. Please dont gamble with this most needed treasure of the Great Plains!	WRG 01
Kate Buttles	April 4, 2013	THE TAXPAYERS OF THE U.S. DO NOT WANT THIS PIPELINE. IT WILL BE GOING THROUGH OUR COUNTRY AND DESTROYING OUR WILDLIFE, ETC. AND BEING SHIPPED OVERSEAS. ABSOLUTELY NOT ACCEPTABLE.	PN 05
Kate Chung	April 9, 2013	Too many people on the Athabasca watershed have already died of cancer due to the pollution, and many more are ill and dying. Thousands of birds have died (500 at one time), but people and birds , and caribou and other creatures, have been regarded as "collateral damage".	CU 02
Kate Coffee	April 10, 2013	The American people get no benefit from [the Project] and, yet, we take 100% of the risk.	PN 07
Kate Ellison	April 4, 2013	Part of the data in your report was gathered by researchers paid by those who want the pipeline built. This makes everything they say unreliable.	PRO 01
Kate Eno	April 11, 2013	All experience and past evidence suggests that, eventually, the Keystone WILL leak.	RISK 13
Kate Forinash	March 10, 2013	We all need to learn how to live more carbon-neutral lives. We all need to be willing to forego the current convenience and develop wind-solar-thermal energy sources.	PN 02
Kate Hambley	April 13, 2013	Please consider Keystone's more tangible threat to our (dwindling) water supply	ACK
Kate Hambley	April 13, 2013	Climate change is both a real and imminent threat. It is no longer possible for the State Department to halt climate change, but this does not excuse you from your duty to retard it. Enhancing Americans' access to dirty oil is not only an abdication of this duty, but an affront to it. It will manifest in faster climate change, and faster climate change means more catastrophic impacts on environmentally vulnerable regions.	CLIM 14
Kate Hawks	April 22, 2013	This land does not belong to the Whiteman, it belongs to my Native People, the Lakotas. What right do you have to keep taking land that is not yours?	ACK
Kate Lawrence	April 22, 2013	The Draft Environmental Impact Statement distorts and ignores these facts (Developing the tar sands oil will make climate change much worse). We need to recognize that dealing with climate change is both urgent and difficult.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kate Lottinville	April 22, 2013	The pipeline crosses the Ogallala Aquifer and its not a question of if it will leak, it is a question of where and when. The pipeline is full of a substance that is not crude oil, but bitumen. This substance does not float in water, but contaminates it in a way that it can never be cleaned. Why would you put a national water supply at risk in this way? This decision is not in the public's interest. The entire Aquifer will be contaminated.	RISK 07
Kate Miller	March 28, 2013	Long lasting environmental degradation, potentially catastrophic risks, and increased contributions to the phenomena of global warming are harder to communicate. As much as it is a politician's job to listen to the American people, it is also your job to do what is right on our behalf, especially when what the public doesn't know (or understand) could hurt them.	CLIM 18
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	Is the State Department really going to ignore Tribal Rights again by not properly engaging affected Native American Tribes? Nothing in the Draft SEIS gives indication that the Tribes have been properly consulted.	CR 01
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	Keystone XL tar sands is mostly destined for export, which will not help our economic or energy security; it will increase our dependence on foreign oil and raise oil prices.	PN 01
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	The number of jobs that will be created by Keystone XL are not enough to warrant the risks to existing farming jobs along the proposed pipeline.	PN 05
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will drive expansion of the tar sands. Therefore, environmental and health impacts of the Keystone XL expansion must be part of the environmental impact statement process. They have not been properly addressed in the Draft SEIS.	PN 06
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	Environmental Resources Management (ERM), which was selected by the Department of State to serve as an independent third-party contractor for its environmental review of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline project, is not actually an independent third-party contractor. ERM’s biases affect every word in the Draft SEIS, which should therefore be thrown out and redone by a truly unbiased agency.	PRO 01
Kate Seitz	March 11, 2013	Keystone XL would cross more than 1000 water bodies, including 50 perennial rivers or streams, and several aquifers, including the Ogallala. It also comes within a mile of approximately 2500 water wells. Potential contamination scenarios have not been fully or properly examined, nor have the associated potential and full-scale clean-up actions that would be required.	RISK 07
Kate Williams	April 22, 2013	directly over a natural aquifer that supplies clean water to people, fields, and wildlife	WRG 01
Katelynn Essig	March 12, 2013	It is time to MOVE FORWARD toward RENEWABLE energy.	PN 02
Katelynn Olsen	April 4, 2013	I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katelynn Olsen	April 4, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands.	PN 05
Kateri Kosek	March 28, 2013	YOU CAN'T JUST WIPE OUT THE BOREAL FOREST WITHOUT SEVERE CONSEQUENCES, AS THOSE WHO LIVE THERE KNOW, WHO SUFFER FROM ASTRONOMICAL RATES OF CANCER	CU 01
Katharine Dodge	April 14, 2013	Second, the use of tar sands oil will have a devastating effect upon our climate. This fossil fuel-intensive system of tar sands oil extraction and consumption is utter madness in the face of run-away climate change.	CLIM 12
Katharine Dodge	April 14, 2013	Putting more of our money and resources into oil is delaying the vital move to renewable and sustainable energy.	PN 03
Katharine Dreyfuss	March 15, 2013	I believe we must take meaningful action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prevent catastrophic climate change. Transitioning to environmentally responsible fuels is essential. My Senator, Dianne Feinstein, has declared, "to facilitate this transition, I authored and worked with my colleagues to enact the Ten-in-Ten Fuel Economy Act (Public Law 110-140), which required significant fuel economy increases that will culminate in a standard of 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. I have also championed tax incentives and permitting changes that have allowed the United States to double renewable energy production in just four years. Finally, I strongly support the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to regulate and reduce dangerous greenhouse gas emissions, and I have voted multiple times in recent years to maintain this authority."	PN 02
Kathe Garbrick	April 17, 2013	Tar sands exploitation is almost unimaginably destructive to both the environment and the native communities of Canada. The destruction of another region of our fragile planet and it's human communities can not be compensated for by any short-term monetary gain	CU 01
Katherine A Forrest	April 17, 2013	It is not necessarily true that, even without the Keystone XL pipeline all the tar sands oil will be extracted and sent abroad via other channels. There is active opposition in Canada and the US to sending it to either coast. Any delay we can achieve will give us more time to develop our sustainable energy sources.	ALT 09
Katherine A Forrest	April 17, 2013	I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact.	CLIM 04
Katherine Collett	March 16, 2013	Tar sands oil releases up to three times as much global warming pollution as conventional oil, while the process of mining devastates the boreal forest of Canada, which otherwise absorbs carbon.	CLIM 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katherine Cooper	April 4, 2013	The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts.	CLIM 12
Katherine Dolan	April 9, 2013	not only is this oil harmful in the ways discussed above, but worse, we don't even NEED it. We are becoming so awash in hydrocarbons, with the shale gas/oil breakthroughs, that even if we weren't advancing on clean energy fronts, which we are, we would be in no danger of running out of energy.	PN 12
Katherine Hyde	March 10, 2013	Let's take this as inspiration for innovation in the field of energy. We have so many creative people in this country who hope to make a difference and make their mark. Encourage them to work on our energy problems from new perspectives, and they will create for us an extraordinary spectrum of solutions that do not rely on sacrificing the future of our environment.	PN 02
Katherine Karnopp	April 10, 2013	The actual long term employment with the pipe line will only be about 100 - 300 jobs. I think we can do better with wind and solar jobs.	SO 05, SO 02
Katherine Karnopp	April 17, 2013	With growing demands for more water availability do you really think building an even bigger pipeline that will inevitably leak,spill, squirt, gush and soak highly toxic oil onto the ground is a good idea? Because tar sands is so heavy it will sink rapidly into the aquifers the pipe passes over rendering vast amounts of water unusable, forever, for people, plants, livestock and wildlife. And it gives off deadly gasses that float up into the atmosphere, after is has sickened any thing that breathes, to contribute to global warming by allowing the suns heat rays in but not letting them leave through reflection.	RISK 24, RISK 07, RISK 30
Katherine Kennedy	April 15, 2013	Although the Pipeline may help satisfy the seeming thirst of American refineries, it is laughable to state that this Pipeline will help American energy independence as this Pipeline is for the purpose of crossing international boundaries to import Canadian oil.	PN 04
Katherine Kennedy	April 15, 2013	This leads me to my third point: safety. Although your permit states that TransCanada has over 60 years of experience in reliability and safety, perhaps this requires another “hard look” (page 11) due to the recent spill in Arkansas. The recent Exxon Mobile spill should be a wake-up call that the potential detriments of a large-scale pipeline project outweigh the potential benefits, all seemingly economical in nature anyway, and that mitigation measures only go so far. This recent Exxon Mobil pipeline spill, initially estimated to have released at least 157,000 gallons of crude oil and driven more than 20 families from their homes, represents only a fraction of the regular oil losses from the huge network of pipelines stretching across the United States. It is in the “national interest” to not allow propagation of this horrible paradigm that oil spills simply happen and then they are cleaned up, especially in handling the oil that TransCanada plans to transport through the Keystone XL Pipeline.	RISK 13, PD 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katherine Kennedy	April 15, 2013	The pipeline would cross the Nebraska Sand Hills, a fragile and unique ecosystem that is easily damaged and difficult to repair. Further, the Pipeline is a threat to the Ogallala aquifer, one of the world's largest supplies of groundwater, and the primary source of groundwater for agriculture and domestic use in Nebraska. Surely, America knows from experience that once an aquifer is contaminated, it is expensive and difficult to clean up. Experience has taught us that most clean-up efforts have focused on containment rather than actual removal of contaminants.	WRG 01
Katherine Kleczek	April 4, 2013	I can't believe another pipeline, never-mind a much larger one, is currently being proposed when it is clear existing pipelines are not safe.	RISK 26
Katherine L. Townsend	April 22, 2013	We cannot afford to take such a risk with this major supply of clean water.	ACK
Katherine McFarland	April 22, 2013	potential for a mishap / catastrophic leak in the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Katherine Miller	April 22, 2013	We can develop our own energy supply.	PN 02
Katherine Silverthorne	April 22, 2013	The cyber threat to critical infrastructure continues to grow and represents one of the most serious national security challenges.The statement above, pulled from the first paragraph of the recent Executive Order on Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity, highlights an area of risk that must be managed in order to determine that approving the Keystone XL pipeline is in the national interest…How was the risk of cyber-intrusion assessed and quantified? Did the SEIS reflect the large body of evidence that cyberintrusion into the energy sector, and pipelines in particular, is growing and is a concern for DHS?	RISK 04
Katherine Vance	March 25, 2013	Over and over again we hear from the scientific community the need to move beyond our current energy sources to more sustainable options. It is upsetting to see these warnings ignored by investing further into our non-sustainable, environmentally destructive options -- like the Keystone Pipeline.	CLIM 18
Katherine Walsh	March 29, 2013	The XL Keystone EIS clearly states that WCSB crude is 17% more greenhouse gas intensive on a life cycle basis than other crudes.	CLIM 12
Katherine Walters	March 29, 2013	Canada will develop their oil reserves regardless of your decision about Keystone XL, and the oil will find its way to dirtier refineries in China via less efficient tankers.	PN 10
Katherine Walters	March 29, 2013	Not to mention the fact that Keystone XL will create thousands of jobs here at home and serve as a long-term investment in communities where our energy manufacturers and refineries will be benefit from this vital supply of reliable energy.	PN 10
Katherine Walters	March 29, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would increase America’s energy security and strengthen our relationship with Canada.	PN 10
Katherine Walters	March 29, 2013	The pipeline would bring in an additional 830,000 barrels of North American oil per day, reducing our need to import oil from unstable regimes overseas.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katherine Wyckoff	April 12, 2013	I am very concerned about the amount of carbon emissions that will result if this project proceeds. Please move instead to focus our energy production on renewable sources.	PN 02
Kathi Zelenik	April 22, 2013	The Canadian tar sands that will be carried by the KXL pipeline are the dirtiest oil on the planet. Producing synthetic oils from this substance will generate three times the global warming pollution of conventional production. The U.S. should be a leader on fighting the effects of climate change, not facilitating the creation of additional pollution to harm the planet.	CLIM 12
Kathi Zelenik	April 22, 2013	The U.S. needs to focus on creating sustainable and clean sources of energy. Approving the KXL Pipeline will produce more dirty oil that will increase the threat of climate change and increase the world's dependence on oil. If the U.S. is serious about creating a clean energy economy, we need to lead the world towards the creation of clean energy production.	PN 02
Kathi Zelenik	April 22, 2013	The proposed pathway for the KXL pipeline goes through the Yellowstone River and the Ogallala Aquifer. Both of these water sources are essential to providing drinking water to humans and for irrigating agriculture. A spill along the proposed route would put public health in danger.	WRG 01
Kathie Clarke	April 9, 2013	The Keystone XL would transport a river of the most destructive oil on the planet straight through America's heartland to the Gulf Coast for export. It would threaten countless communities along its route.	PN 05
Kathie Farris	April 21, 2013	In addition, the safety issue of water seems to be ignored. Thousands of people and livestock depend on water which will be endangered by spills of oil from this pipeline. The record of cleanup from this sector has been abysmal	RISK 14, RISK 07
Kathie Gerritzen	April 22, 2013	One of our most precious natural resources is WATER. Over 90% of Nebraskans use the aquifer for their water supply-with droughts already across the state in Nebraska (thus creating a water shortage), what would the people do if their underground water supply was contaminated?	WRG 01
Kathleen Beavin	April 22, 2013	We must not perpetuate this polluting source for oil that will be shipped to China.	PN 07
Kathleen Bird - Pa	April 18, 2013	Why is the State Department is only giving it one official hearing, today in Nebraska??? We need to put people before profits!	PRO 07
Kathleen Cameron	April 1, 2013	Anything that we invest in at this point in human history must have long term advantages not short term gains.	ACK
Kathleen Cameron	April 1, 2013	Just one spill from this pipeline will cause irreversible ecological damage to the land, air, animals, water, and people in the region.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Donofrio	April 22, 2013	The higher concentration of carbon pollution when tar sands are processed is as great a concern,	CLIM 14
Kathleen Donofrio	April 22, 2013	However, information about the heavily polluting characteristics of the tar sands oil to be moved in the Keystone pipeline is a far more serious matter.	RISK 27
Kathleen Donofrio	April 22, 2013	The opportunity to create jobs is a short term focus. Jobs can be created in green industries.	SO 05
Kathleen Geist	April 9, 2013	The recent rupture of the pipeline in Arkansas demonstrates exactly why the Keystone XL pipeline should not be built. Not only were homeowners impacted, but also local drinking water and a sensitive wetlands.	WET 04, RISK 07
Kathleen Gotkin	March 10, 2013	There should be no questioning IF we tell Trans Canada and their Keystone pipelines "NO" but WHEN. We know climate change is happening right before us and we must doall we can to STOP the increase of it. Keep your promises to fight Climate Change and tell TransCanada to take their Keystone Pipeline out of the US	CLIM 14
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	We, in our area cannot understand why the first Keystone route, already in place and functioning, couldn't be used for a second pipe.	ALT 03
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	You can deny the pipeline permit and continue to work towards a diversified and clean energy future. The time is now.	PN 02
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	We know that the oil will be sold on the international market, so it's really not about doing our business with a friendly neighbor, is it?	PN 07
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	An oil spill in a pipeline near this water supply would be disastrous to our livelihood and that of many of our neighbors.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	Our concern is that even though TransCanada says their pipeline is safe and that they have cleanup techniques in place, the Emergency Response plans are inadequate. Specifically, inadequate emergency response training for first responders, lack of disclosure of diluents in the dilbit mixture to be piped, inadequate liability coverage for landowners, and the lack of a basic step-by-step plan to clean up a spill in the aquifer.The integrity of TransCanada has been called into question many times. TransCanada has proven to be anything but trustworthy. One such instance is a report from a former KXL pipeline inspector who said that construction shortcuts were tied to leaks. The civil engineer and former inspector is quoted in the report suggesting that any equipment, no matter the quality, is only as good as the people installing it, and he's convinced that other problems loom on the horizon. He said he came under pressure from his own supervisors to fudge tests designed to ensure that the soil underlying a facility was compacted properly. He said he is now worried that the foundation in sandy soils could slowly settle unevenly, therefore causing pipes to twist. He said and I'm quoting...."This whole process is really very much a science – unless you're going to do it all haphazardly because you figure you're out in the middle of nowhere." This proposed route and our beloved Sandhills in Nebraska ARE the middle of nowhere.There are places along the proposed route where no vehicle would even be able to drive to in response to a leak or a spill, much less navigate the clean up of an actual leak.	RISK 25, RISK 05
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	Blowouts in the hills from even an accidental disturbance to the topsoil can take decades to repair and in some cases a lifetime.	SOIL 06
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	Our meadows are subirrigated by the Ogallala aquifer and in many places the aquifer is above ground level. An oil spill in a pipeline near this water supply would be disastrous to our livelihood and that of many of our neighbors.	WRG 01
Kathleen Gotschall	April 22, 2013	The United States depends on the agriculture from this region to sustain our country. Our jobs here in the heartland are as significant and vital for the national economy as any. And in the future our clean water will be the most valuable commodity. We must be wise stewards.	WRG 01, SO 12
Kathleen Hoffacker	April 9, 2013	WILL WE BE HIRING PEOPLE TO CLEAN UP AFTER SPILLS, TO SOMEHOW FIND AND PURIFY WATER TO REPLACE THAT FROM CONTAMINATED WELLS, TO PROCESS CLAIMS FROM PEOPLE WHOSE PROPERTY AND HEALTH HAVE BEEN HARMED.	RISK 03
Kathleen Hoffacker	April 9, 2013	THE ARGUMENT THAT BUILDING THE PIPELINE WILL CREATE EMPLOYMENT IS A WEAK ONE.	SO 02
Kathleen Hoffacker	April 9, 2013	LET'S FOCUS ON HIRING PEOPLE TO DEVELOP, BUILD, AND INSTALL ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCES.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Holloway	April 22, 2013	oil spills would contaminate our lands and poison our waterways.	RISK 07
Kathleen Holst	April 11, 2013	Pipes leak. Our water supply in the area where I live depends on underground water and we cannot endanger that supply. Water is more important than oil	WRG 01, RISK 24
Kathleen Jaskolski	April 22, 2013	I do no understand why we would build a pipeline to export Canadian petrol to other countries, to no benefit of the US.	PN 07
Kathleen Lichti	April 22, 2013	While Im currently living out of state to attend school my hope is that Ill still have a home in Nebraska to move back to. I grew up drinking well water. I cant imagine raising a family in a place where tar sands oil could contaminate our drinking water at any moment.	ACK
Kathleen Lichti	April 22, 2013	we need to start thinking creatively about our energy consumption. This pipeline should not exist anywhere. It is my fervent hope that we and our elected officials will stand boldly and change our oil consumption.	PN 02
Kathleen Lichti	April 22, 2013	I cant imagine raising a family in a place where tar sands oil could contaminate our drinking water at any moment.	RISK 07
Kathleen Liebau	April 18, 2013	Alternative engergies are already out there and have been for decades; resources should be used to better develop those alternatives and not used to further dependence on dirty, damaging fossil fuels……	PN 02
Kathleen Markus-walczak	March 18, 2013	And it needs to be written by at least an impartial party - NOT BY A TRANSCANADA EMPLOYEE. Time to deny this bad project for what it is, not listeen to more lies.	PRO 01
Kathleen Massara	April 22, 2013	put your focus on clean energy resources, which is a smarter bid for the future.	PN 02
Kathleen Obrien Kenvin	April 9, 2013	We also need to get busy determining alternative energy sources.	PN 02, ALT 01
Kathleen Parish	April 23, 2013	In a letter sent to the State Department yesterday, the Environmental Protection Agency critiqued the very basis of the department's environmental impact analysis. They say the assumption that the same amount of tar sands crude will move to market with or without the pipeline is flawed. The EPA also says the State Department did not use current energy-economic modeling. And, according to the agency, because the pipeline could carry much more diluted bitumen than rail could transport, the net greenhouse gas emissions could be far higher than the State Department estimate. The EPA says the State Department doesn't fully explore alternative routes or adequately address possible spills.	PN 11, ALT 07
Kathleen Phelan	March 11, 2013	We are going to have to make the switch to clean, renewable energy eventually, so why not be the international leader in the production of solar, wind and geothermal energy? We have the resources to produce mass amounts of clean energy! This will increase our energy independence and reduce our carbon foot print.	ALT 01
Kathleen Reed	April 13, 2013	It is time to move from fossil to solar energy. We NEED to leave this oil in the ground.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Reilly	April 4, 2013	Twenty -30 years ago I remember the songbirds--now they have so little habitat strongholds. We need to preserve this mid-west land and keep it and the indigenous wildlife from being destroyed. That will happen if (the KXL pipeline) goes through.	WI 09
Kathleen Reine	March 22, 2013	Please do not legitimize the Tar Sands mining by approving the XL Pipeline. It is time to draw a line in the sand beyond which we will not continue to worsen our climate situation and this is the time and the line!	CLIM 14
Kathleen Reine	March 26, 2013	It is time to draw a line in the sand beyond which we willl not continue to worsen our climate situation and this is the time and the line!	CLIM 14
Kathleen Russell	March 6, 2013	-Tar Sands oil isn't crude oil - it is thick and needs to be heated up to very high temperatures and has to have a lot of chemicals added to it to even be able to flow through the pipeline. Do we really want that spilling into the water of American citizens, for the benefit of a Canadian company?	ACK
Kathleen Russell	March 6, 2013	Most importantly, the mining of Tar Sands and the creation of the Keystone XL pipeline will greatly increase carbon emissions. With scientific reports predicting global collapse due to climate change within the next 40 years coming out every few months, it is imperative that we do everything we can to reduce carbon emissions.	CLIM 14
Kathleen Russell	March 6, 2013	landowners in the path of the Keystone Pipeline who have been bullied and intimidated by Transcanada into giving over their land	LEG 02
Kathleen Russell	March 6, 2013	The oil is intended for export, so there is no incentive for energy independence. TransCanada is a Canadian company, so any profits wouldn't make an impact on the US economy	PN 04, PN 01
Kathleen Sengstock	March 16, 2013	excessive use of oil is having a devastating effect on the climate of our entire planet.	CLIM 14
kathleen stanley	April 22, 2013	We know that Pipelines are a bad idea whose time is past. All old forms of energy give way to new forms. Solar and wind can be harnessed. Why dont the companies throw money into figuring out how to do it instead of slowly destroying our earth and our lives.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Stone	April 22, 2013	The report projects a 100-year life span for the pipeline. It recognizes that the quality of material pumped through it has a higher than average amount of greenhouse gas emissions associated with it. Given international scientific consensus, the world needs to dramatically reduce our greenhouse gas emissions swiftly to prevent a dangerous climactic tipping point from occurring. The U.S. and the world cannot continue along a petroleum-based energy path for the next 100 years. This is suicidal. We cannot continue with the status quo for even the next decade. The United Methodist Church and United Methodist Women, like many religious bodies in the United States and internationally, have strong and clear policies calling upon the U.S. and other wealthy country governments to shift to a more sustainable economic path based on conservation of precious resources and renewable energy. We are a mission-driven institution and as such, we are in ongoing contact with people living in poverty around the world many of whom are on the move and struggling with impoverishment because of climate changes occurring today. Some in the business community argue that it is futile to oppose the pipeline on these grounds – that the tar sands oil will be extracted and consumed regardless. Surely, this line of reasoning is what some plantation owners used to justify owning human beings – if other people are profiting by a certain institution, albeit immoral, then by God, why don't we?	CLIM 14
Kathleen Stone	April 22, 2013	The environmental justice section of the report provides no indication that various communities of color or low-income communities identified in the construction zone will significantly benefit from employment opportunities. Therefore, this project does not appear to offer our nation any positive justice impact. In fact, it would appear that the impact is likely negative, particularly with respect to our indigenous brothers and sisters. The new route of the pipeline disturbs the Ponca's Trail of Tears and numerous other historical as well as pre-contact sites, infringes on various treaties made by the U.S. government with certain tribes, and threatens sacred water sources, among other things. Many indigenous tribes are opposed to the pipeline. In fact, the United Methodist Church's energy policy statement opposes any energy policy that despoils native lands and calls for a halt to current practices that do so. The United Methodist Church has additional policies which call us to repent our historical involvement in the mistreatment of indigenous peoples and to stand in solidarity with them today. This would be sufficient reason in itself for United Methodist Women to strongly object to the building of this pipeline.	EJ 01
Kathleen Stone	April 22, 2013	Ranchers in the area are being told that if they do not agree to the permanent easements on their property for the pipeline, that they will be taken by eminent domain. Is this a fair use of eminent domain? To benefit transnational company's profit?	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathleen Stone	April 22, 2013	The report leaves open who will consume the petroleum products ultimately refined – they may be exported to other countries. If recent trends continue, that is likely to be the case. The majority of the economic benefits certainly will accrue to the corporations involved. Not all of those corporations are U.S.-based, and not all are publicly-held, so the wealth created by this project is unlikely to broadly benefit the U.S. public. Is this in our national interest?	PN 07
Kathleen Stone	April 22, 2013	The report indicates that only 10% of the pipeline construction workforce will be from Montana, South Dakota or Nebraska. It also states that the bulk of their pay will be spent where the workers permanently reside, outside of the states where the construction will occur. It notes that the revenues related to the purchase of various construction inputs will accrue to companies and communities across the U.S. and internationally, with only relatively modest sums going to local communities. In the end, there will be approximately only 35 permanent jobs in the U.S. created as a result of this project. And so, one has to ask: in light of the relatively modest benefit to the states and communities which will be home to the pipeline, and the miniscule permanent job creation – who will reap the majority of the economic benefits from this project?	SO 10, SO 03
Kathleen Wolney	April 12, 2013	We should be subsidizing renewable energy sources. If oil/gas gets really expensive, it will drive innovation in renewables.	PN 03
Kathlyn Gilpin	March 18, 2013	I have had the opportunity to see Caribou and other wildlife in their natural environment and would hate to see their habitat encrouched upon by we fossil fuel guxxling humans. We must get serious about the use of sustainable fuels before it is too late. If we don't, this planet will be destroyed not only for the wildlife but also for our future generations.	PN 02
Kathryn	April 22, 2013	We cannot continue using fossil fuels and nuclear energy. We must start using, improving, and developing clean renewable energy technology now.	PN 02
Kathryn Bellman	April 22, 2013	We should not run the pipeline over land that is above the aquifer.	ACK
Kathryn Carvey	April 11, 2013	This pipeline is a symbol for our willingness to take action on climate change. Let's be a world leader again and make a statement of our intentions. Turn it down!	CLIM 18
Kathryn Duvall	April 22, 2013	Other nations can operate using mostly renewable sources of energy. We all need to support ta cleaner healthier future. Its feasible, we just need the political will to make it happen. KeystoneXL is a retrograde step in energy provision .It makes the us appear old fashioned and ill educated in terms of energy policy.	PN 02
Kathryn Gleason	April 5, 2013	Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, and stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathryn Goddard	March 6, 2013	Until we understand what is being pumped into the earth in order to extract oil; how much of the environment will be destroyed - forest, air, water; exactly what are the implications of the line itself - safety, destruction of animal cycles, soil and plant life; and the refining which will occur on the coastline we should NOT even consider this.	ACK
Kathryn Hiestand	April 11, 2013	In addition to global warming, extracting oil from tar sands is destroying large tracts of boreal forest which are vital to many migrant bird species. Degradation of rivers near to the tar sands exploitation areas has been documented.	CU 01
Kathryn Krasinski	March 10, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is just another way in which Canada will make a huge profit by extractive and destructive technologies. The jobs benefit to Americans is minimal. The environmental damage and additional risk is huge. We simply do not gain enough, let alone contaminate the High Plains, by allowing this project to advance. I strongly urge you to not allow this pipeline to advance	PN 05
Kathryn Lemoine	April 12, 2013	The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	ACK
Kathryn Lemoine	April 12, 2013	In addition, building a new pipeline now will lock us into higher carbon emissions. We should be investing in healthy, safe renewable energy that won't harm human health, won't overheat the climate, cannot be exported, and will provide a secure energy future	PN 03
Kathryn Lemoine	April 12, 2013	Tar sands oil is thicker, more acidic and more corrosive than conventional crude. Transported under high pressure, it poses a far greater risk of leaks along the pipeline route. Tar sands oil pipelines are already leaking and causing serious contamination. The recent rupture of a tar sands pipeline in a residential subdivision in Arkansas provides yet another illustration of how unreliable these pipelines are and how they threaten to contaminate our neighborhoods and our waterways.	RISK 14
Kathryn Lemoine	April 12, 2013	In addition to surface waters, the Keystone XL pipeline threatens vast underground water supplies that, once contaminated, cannot be cleaned. There's no "away" where toxic oil can go once it enters an aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 08
Kathryn Lemoine	April 12, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Nebraska Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer -- the reason that President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	WRG 06
Kathryn Osband	April 13, 2013	We must, as a nation, lead in converting to clean renewable energy as fast as possible.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathryn Posten	March 17, 2013	The wholesale destruction of Alberta's Great Boreal Forest caused by tar sands oil production is heartbreaking; the threat of global warming is real and frightening. For the sake of our children and descendants to come you must take a stand against tar sands development. The State Dept.'s revised report still downplays the effect of tar sands oil on our climate; science disagrees. Please realize the seriousness of your decision; we are at a tipping point in time with the fight to combat climate change.	CU 01
Kathryn Riss	April 4, 2013	Alarming reports are coming from Arkansas on a pipeline break that is releasing thousands of barrels of this same kind of thick, dirty oil into waterways that feed nearby Lake Conway and the town of Mayflower, AR. Oiled birds and other wildlife in the area are being treated, with many more expected to succumb to the toxic oil…(this) incident is a stark reminder that transporting this oil across the U.S. is just asking for trouble.	RISK 07
Kathryn Riss	April 4, 2013	On March 27, a mile-long Canadian Pacific train hauling Canadian crude derailed in Minnesota, spilling 30,000 gallons about 150 miles northwest of Minneapolis. (This) incident is a stark reminder that transporting this oil across the U.S. is just asking for trouble.	RISK 14
Kathryn Tipton	April 15, 2013	Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood...This could happen on a MASSIVE scale if the Keystone XL pipeline is in use.	RISK 07
Kathy	April 22, 2013	Please find an alternate route so it does not go above our water.	WRG 04
Kathy Albert	March 7, 2013	I find [the EIS conclusion that] the Keystone Pipeline would be "unlikely to have a substantial impact" to the environment untenable. The pipeline would enable a 36 per cent increase in oilsands production. Currently, no other avenues for oil sands transport are of similar scale or in this advanced stage of development.	PN 06
Kathy Borey	April 24, 2013	KEYSTONE XL = CONTAMINATED GROUND WATER	ACK
Kathy Burke	April 22, 2013	We must invest in safe fuel alternatives. This pipeline does not even contribute to our potential oil independence as the vast majority of the filthy fuel processed will go to other countries.	PN 02
Kathy Dombrowski	April 22, 2013	We must protect the Ogalalla Aquifer.	ACK
Kathy Dombrowski	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has not shown itself to be a good neighbor or an ethical company. They've lied to the landowners, they've bullied, they've bribed. They tell us they can build a safe pipeline. That doesn't seem possible, even in the best of conditions. Why should we believe them? Their state of the art detectors can't pick up small leaks that could be devastating to our Aquifer. The bitumen sinks, the benzene rises, the Aquifer is permanently damaged. Water tables to the south and east of the leak are contaminated.	RISK 12, LEG 02, RISK 15
Kathy Ellis	April 20, 2013	I thought the pipeline might be a good idea - until I saw the "spill" in Arkansas!	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathy Grinslade	March 1, 2013	In this heavily seismic area a pipeline is completely dangerous.	GEO 01
Kathy Grinslade	March 1, 2013	A pipeline that long is a national security risk too.	RISK 04
Kathy Hall	March 31, 2013	Doesn't it occur to you that this is the LONG way to get the oil out of Canada? The Canadians don't even want it running through their country. Why should we run it through ours?	ALT 05
Kathy Highstreet	April 22, 2013	I depend on the water from the aquifer that this pipeline will endanger and I do not want it to be there!	WRG 01
Kathy Hollander	April 22, 2013	Water is forever poisoned in Northern Canada while the aquifer in Nebraska is threatened, as well as numerous rivers across the USA….	ACK
Kathy House	April 14, 2013	Money spent on energy R&D will have a more positive long term effect than continuing our dependence on oil.	PN 02
Kathy Keller	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow this pipeline to cross thru the only pure water in our nation. Why would you put at risk such a vital, priceless resource that if contaminated would jeopordize our states agrirculture livlihood?	WRG 01
Kathy Kron	March 28, 2013	hear that the state dept. is relying entirely on a report that was conducted by the company that will most profit from this endeavor.	PRO 01
Kathy Maher	March 6, 2013	The biggest threat is the amount of increased greenhouse gases tar sands will release into the atmosphere.	CLIM 14
Kathy Maher	March 6, 2013	including the vast amount of water used to extract the oil	CU 07
Kathy Maher	March 6, 2013	seizure of private land for energy company profit	LEG 02
Kathy Maher	March 6, 2013	clearing our forests and disrupting ecosystems along the long route	VEG 02
Kathy Martin	April 15, 2013	We need to put our efforts into expanding the availability of renewable energy sources	PN 02
Kathy Mc Alister	March 10, 2013	These promised jobs are not very many in number and will have no impact on the economy.	SO 02
Kathy McHenry	April 22, 2013	As far as job creation, the construction jobs will be temporary, not permanent - the hazards are not worth the promised 35 jobs.	PN 01
Kathy McHenry	April 22, 2013	I am writing to submit my opposition to this pipeline and to encourage the State Department and President Obama to deny permission for its construction and operation through the United States, particularly through the fragile Midwest Sandhills over the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Kathy Osborne	April 20, 2013	Invest in green energy. Green energy can boost the economy by providing jobs. The Keystone Pipeline will not.	PN 02
Kathy Osborne	April 20, 2013	This pipeline would cross three aquifers. We cannot accept the risk, especially as the drought continues.	WRG 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kathy S	March 6, 2013	We need the jobs and the boost to our economy that this will generate.And we need the oil from a close ally to decrease our dependence on countries such as those in the Middle East.	PN 10
Kathy Van Dame	April 2, 2013	Enabling tar sands production with its huge environmental footprint is not good for the US.	PN 05
Kathy Wilmering	April 4, 2013	"Beyond the effects on our climate, this dangerous pipeline would also put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk. The massive Exxon Mobil spill in Arkansas this past week provided a tragic reminder of the types of risks we would run by allowing the Keystone XL pipeline to be built. We cannot allow any more of the dirtiest, most toxic oil on earth to spill into our lands and waterways. TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life."	RISK 07, RISK 06
Kathy Wolfe	April 22, 2013	This export pipeline will do nothing to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and nothing to reduce the cost of gasoline, especially in the Midwest.	PN 04
Kathy Wolfe	April 22, 2013	The EIS completed on TransCanada's behalf contains so many factual inaccuracies—and was shown to be so biased by the cozy connection between TransCanada lobbyists and the former Secretary of State, and by Cardno Entrix's relationship with TransCanada—that it isn't worth the paper it was printed on. Further, the Nebraska DEQ report was also written by contractors with business connections to TransCanada. No environmental risk report on this project exists that does not reveal a stunning conflict of interest.	PRO 01, LEG 17
Kathy Wolfe	April 22, 2013	The diluted bitumen slated to be transported via this pipeline is highly corrosive, and the safety precautions that TransCanada promises to put in place have been proven not to work effectively in other projects (see Kalamazoo, Michigan for a glaring example). Even with the slight rerouting of the pipeline project, there is still a very real danger of groundwater contamination of one of the world's largest freshwater aquifers, which makes one of the most productive agricultural economies possible.	RISK 13, RISK 11, WRG 01
Kathy Wolfe	April 22, 2013	I have no trust whatsoever in TransCanadas claims to be able to rapidly detect and mitigate any spill of oil into the Ogallala Aquifer.	RISK 25
Kathy Wolfe	April 22, 2013	I am not insensitive to a need for jobs. However, TransCanada has vastly overestimated the number of jobs the project may create, and fully 99% of those jobs will be gone in two years. To top it off, the project will not even make use of domestic materials, thus taking jobs away from manufacturers in the US.	SO 11, SO 04
Katie Bernt	April 22, 2013	When this pipeline leaks because it will, think of everything that will be destroyed	RISK 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katie Chess	April 9, 2013	And, please don't let parties involved with the oil industry any where near the next effort to provide a thorough assessment.	PRO 01
Katie Cressman	April 22, 2013	we should be focusing on alternative fuels and green energy resources	PN 02
Katie Ford	April 17, 2013	Let us instead focus on wind, wave, and solar energy that we know will provide a real future for everyone.	ALT 01
Katie Jantzen	April 19, 2013	I urge you to consider the authorship of the Draft SEIS, as well as the obvious biased slant of the conclusions, when making future decisions regarding the Keystone XL pipeline.	PRO 01
Katie Jantzen	April 19, 2013	My concerns stem from a variety of reasons, principally the fact that the authors of this report have a clear conflict of interest, as they have direct connections to TransCanada and the oil industry. That seems not only unfair, but unethical.	PRO 01
Katie Jantzen	April 19, 2013	this report blatantly ignores the degree of threat the proposed pipeline poses to our nation's natural resources, namely the Ogallala Aquifer and the fragile and irreplacable Nebraska Sandhills. Despite the new routing of the pipeline, these natural resources are still in grave danger. It is exceptionally short-sighted to risk the health of our water, land, and people for centuries to come in order to make a profit for the next several decades.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Katie Landis	April 9, 2013	I encourage you to stand firmly against the Keystone XL pipeline and instead place your support behind increasing subsidies for solar and wind energy industries. Support new, renewable energy technologies.	ALT 01
Katie Landis	April 9, 2013	this oil does not belong to the United States and we will see very little, if any, in our energy industry.	PN 04
Katie Landis	April 9, 2013	less than 30 permanent US jobs being created by this pipeline.	SO 04
Katie Nelson	March 5, 2013	the pipeline tramples Montanans' private property rights through eminent domain	LEG 02
Katie Nelson	March 5, 2013	it will only exacerbate the excavation of the tar sands in Alberta and all the travesties to human health that have gone along with it	PN 06
Katie Nelson	March 5, 2013	it is not a matter of if the pipeline will spill, it is when...it is going to cost Montanans money to ensure oversight of monitoring the pipeline to ensure that spills do not harm Montana's health and homes…it is going to cost the Montanans money to oversee clean-up when the pipeline spills or leak	RISK 06
Katie Nelson	March 5, 2013	it only provides short term jobs to people who may not be Montanan...it is going to cost Montanans money to improve infrastructure	SO 10, SO 03
Katie Pappas	April 9, 2013	I wish people would take these spills seriously. They keep happening despite assurances taht they won't (the pipelines are safe). We have had 3 pipeline leaks in the Salt Lake area, all courtesy of Chevron Oil.We know that renewable energy is the only way forward if we are to have a livable planet.	RISK 14, ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Katie Quiring	April 22, 2013	I am also concerned about the decrease value in land. The pipeline does not directly go through our property but it passes about 100 yards behind my farm. The pipeline will not only decrease the value of that property but also of our property and we had absolutely no say in it because TransCanada didnt need us to sign an easement to build.	SO 18
Katie Torpy	April 22, 2013	We need to turn to renewable energy	PN 02
Katie Torpy	April 22, 2013	exceptionally little benefit to our local economy	SO 10
Katie Torpy	April 22, 2013	The risk it poses to the High Plains Aquifer is insurmountable and unjustifiable.	WRG 01
Katie W. Zulkoski	April 22, 2013	Please do not approve the newest route proposed for the Keystone XL pipeline. The new route purports to not cross the Sandhills region in Nebraska, a requirement of the first compromise on the pipeline, however, the new route continues to cross environmentally sensitive areas across Nebraska and no plan has been put forth to lessen these risks.	SOIL 07
Katina Williams	April 2, 2013	This type of disaster rivals that of what Enbridge did. These people still after these few years live with the nightmare. The American people are very much against this and a complete review of these businesses and their pipelines needs to happen. To do other wise is a complete slap in the face to every American.	PN 05
Kay Boettcher	April 22, 2013	... considering a leak would contaminate our soil and currently pristine aquifer for decades, maybe centuries.	RISK 07
Kay Capo	April 19, 2013	Let's consider a MASSIVE campaign for conservation instead of this dirty pipeline that poses a threat to the environment, our climate, and American families.	PN 02
Kay Capo	April 19, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	PN 04, CLIM 17
Kay Chism	March 8, 2013	The draft reivew suggests climate impacts of the pipeline are limited because the project will not substantially 'induce growth in the rate of extraction in the oil sands.' [however] researchers now say that the alberta tar sands contain 360- 510 billion tons of carbon, more than double that burned in human history.	CLIM 05
Kay Chism	March 8, 2013	For the record, I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments made by Americans regarding this SEIS for the Keystone XL pipeline. The comments on the initial permit were made public, and these comments should be made public, as well.	PRO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kay Chism	March 8, 2013	Despite the new routing, the northern segment of pipeline still poses a significant risk to water supplies and sensitive areas. According to SEIS the northern segment still crosses the Sandhill and Ollagala Aquifer.. And Yellowstone River…though the route may have changed, the significance of rish from a potential spill to the Ollagala is still great to water supplies.	RISK 07
Kay Chism	March 8, 2013	The tar sands industry considers its dilbit diluent formulas 'proprietary' information and will not share this information with regulators. An EPA letter to the State Department regarding the intial draft EIS stated that the lack of diluent disclosure could be problematic in adequately accessing a spill event and the human health and environmental risks associated with the 'secret' mixture.	RISK 12
Kay Johnson	March 28, 2013	In addition, this will only accelerate the destruction of the boreal forest. The impact of this destruction will affect the climate and wildlife.	ACK
Kay Johnson	March 28, 2013	This oil will no way benefit this country. It will be piped to a port and shipped overseas.	PN 07
Kay Karchevski	March 29, 2013	It's estimated that after it's built, fewer than 50 permanent jobs would be created - fewer than the number of employees at your local grocery store.	SO 02
Kay McGann	April 22, 2013	Its never a question IF there will be a leak, its WHEN	ACK
Kay McGann	April 22, 2013	why not built it next to the other pipeline? less to monitor less to clean up. New route is UNACCEPTABLE.	ALT 03
Kay McGann	April 22, 2013	What are the potential risks? HUGE considering a leak would contaminate our soil and currently pristine aquifer for decades maybe centuries. The damage from Exon Valdez is still occuring. Since we know there will be an accidental spill at some point what is TransCanadas clean up plan? We have seen that major corporations are grossly unprepared. Do they have financial reserves to act quickly effectively and for years? Why not put this pipeline next to the existing pipeline so they would be easier to inspect/monitor?	RISK 03, PD 01, RISK 07
Kay McGann	April 22, 2013	Oil companies have repeatedly shown their complete lack of adequate plans for clean up. DO NOT let this pipeline be built now.	RISK 05
Kay Mcginn	March 11, 2013	Most if not all of it goes to China so that they can continue to pollute in excess of all air standards.	PN 07
Kay Mitchell	April 12, 2013	Please put our responsibility to future generations ahead of short term economic solutions. You, along with the rest of us, have a responsibilty to do all that you can to preserve our planet for our children and grandchildren.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kay Moore	March 10, 2013	Dear Sir: Tar Sand means, the destruction of state size parcel of land. Have you seen the photos, and the tar sands in Canada? What was a livable is NOW, a gaping, hole, that goes and goes on.....and.....on.....and....on, of dead, oily slick, killing fields. Doesn't this, say anything to YOU? It does to ME....WHERE IS THE LOGIC OF MINING OIL OUT OF SANDS? It takes more energy of deal with tar sands, than the PRODUCT.....DIRTY....POLLUTING OIL..... CONTRIBUTING....TO CLIMATE CHANGE....IS WORTH. Question: Does the majority NEED TO suffer for	ACK
Kay Pence	April 15, 2013	Water is more valuable than oil. The Keystone pipeline poses too much risk to the Oglala aquifer.	WRG 01
Kay Philips	April 9, 2013	The review did not adequately address the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil,	CLIM 12
Kay Philips	April 9, 2013	The review did not adequately address … the effect of the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas, and the serious threat that Keystone XL poses not only to communities along the pipeline route but also to those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	CU 08
Kay Philips	April 9, 2013	The review did not adequately address… the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route,	RISK 10
Kay Rhodes	April 4, 2013	Did you see the tar sands spill in Arkansas? Officials can't say when it will be safe for residents of the neighborhood to return home. A similar spill happened in Michigan and after 10 years it still isn't completely cleaned up. You must reject the Keystone tar sands pipeline and all other dangerous, polluting projects.	ACK
Kay Rhodes	April 5, 2013	I know you are aware that many previous spills of all kinds do very serious damage and can never actually be cleaned up. It is also true that ordinary people pay for the damages through higher taxes and higher oil and gas prices.	RISK 07
Kay Rosen	March 22, 2013	risks to the over-heated climate	ACK
Kay Schaser	April 9, 2013	I am writing about the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. Please re-evaluate the impact this project would have on our land, air, water, health, and climate. Yes, I am a layman, but it seems clear that this project would drive even more tar sands development and push us ever closer to the point of no return regarding global warming	ACK
Kay Tolson	April 11, 2013	The risks, already evident where tar sands are toxic spills that can't seem to be cleaned up, are far to great.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kay Warren	April 17, 2013	Another major issue is that we have a tax in place per barrel to send crude oil through our nation, it helps fund necessary clean-up efforts. The problem is that Tar Sands oil is exempt from this tax. So, even though it is MUCH dirtier, and harder to clean up, NO money is being set aside for this guaranteed eventuality. Want to know what tar sands actually does to a river or an estuary? Go look at Kalamzoo, Michigan, they had a nasty spill in 2010. Ask the residents how the still-not-finished clean up went, and the impact on their town and way of life.	SO 15, RISK 03
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	The SEIS ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will accelerate tar sands extraction and increase CO2 emissions, bringing climate change beyond its tipping point.	ACK
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	The lack of comprehensive consultation with Native Nations and lack of meaningful participation with indigenous traditional societies, spiritual leaders and tribal grassroots on the protection of sacred areas, and cultural and historical resources is an environmental justice and treaty rights issue and is unacceptable.	CR 01
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	The report doesn’t address the human rights violations of the Dene, Cree and Métis that live downstream and other First Nations and local communities living in the regional areas of Alberta’s tar sands industrial complex.	CU 05
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	The bulk of the refined oil will be loaded on tankers bound for China, South America, and Europe. Therefore, the people of the United States and Canada are going to suffer the environmental and human health risks of continuing and supporting a dirty and destructive fossil fuel economy.	PN 07
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	TransCanada’s first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010. In just one week, this year, from March 25th to the 31st there were three pipeline failures: 1)121,000 gallons in Alberta, 2) 15,000 in Minnesota, and 3) 550,000 in Arkansas.	RISK 26, RISK 14
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	The construction of the Keystone XL will create approximately 3,900 temporary and 35 full-time positions as cited in a U.S State Department report. In fact, and contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 05, SO 04
Kayla Armstrong	April 21, 2013	the pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, irrigation for farms and ranches with devastating tar sands spills. This new route still traverses the Ogallala Aquifer that supplies water to millions of people and for agriculture.	WRG 01
Kayla Perron	March 18, 2013	The negative impact on the environment far outweighs the benefits in my opinion.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kaylynn Strain	March 6, 2013	Please think carefully about the environmental impact this pipeline is already causing. There are leaks in several srgments which go unreported. The contents that seep out make cleanup extremely difficult at best.	RISK 07
Keepers Of The Sacred Tradition Of Pipemakers	March 15, 2013	I think the proposed pipeline should be stopped!! All that garbage is not refinable as far as I know in this country. If we need 500 million gallons of crude quit shipping ours overseas!!	PN 07
Keith	April 22, 2013	None of this gas will be sold in the US after it is refined.	PN 07
Keith	April 22, 2013	The threat of contamination to the Great Plains aquafir is unacceptable.	RISK 07
Keith Allen	March 17, 2013	Basing a decision as important as the Keystone XL pipeline on a document WRITTEN BY THE GAS AND OIL INDUSTRY is an absolute abomination. It amounts to OFFICIALLY ENDORSING LIES. This is "leadership"???? This is "government"??? This is "Change we can believe in"??? NO! This is the basest form of political CORRUPTION.	PRO 01
Keith Allen	April 9, 2013	By now, it is common knowlege that the environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline released by the State Department last month was an insider-rigged pack of lies. There is utterly no excuse for such massive corruption and dishonesty in government agencies	PRO 01
Keith Krupinski	April 17, 2013	We as a country must pursue truly clean and renewable energy. Buying into the Koch brothers and others plans to damage nature and sell the filth oil to the Chinese is NOT IN OUR INTEREST.	PN 02
Keith Loomis	April 15, 2013	Pipelines are organized under the 1986 Tax Reform Act as Master Limited Partnerships. They do not pay federal taxes in accordance with the reform act. Some investors pay taxes on their dividends. Pipelines are regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission which has in the pass allowed them to tax customers and pocket the money. Who will be the partners in this firm which will operate the pipeline and oversee its maintenance, public safety and inspections? The public has a right to know these and many more things about pipeline's organization, profits, taxing programs, investor dividends from profit and/or new investors, maintenance records, safety of all 200 pipeline enterprises and inspection records..An Executive investigation of these matters should be undertaken before any approval is given.	SO 15, LEG 26

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Keith Loomis	April 17, 2013	Pipelines are organized in accordance with the 1986 Tax Reform Act as Master Limited Partnerships. They do not pay Federal Corporate Taxes since the Act exempts enterprises organized as MLP's. Some of the investors may pay taxes on their dividends. Pipelines are regulated by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which has a history of allowing pipeline firms to collect taxes and pocket them as profit. The Commission and its employees are a revolving door between regulator/regulatee. The public needs to know the following: Who are the partners and what is their role and contribution to the firm? Who is responsible for the pipeline's operation and oversight of maintenance, inspections and public safety? The public also has the right to know how all 200 pipeline firms are organized, their profits, taxing programs, investor dividends whether from profits and/or new investors, and there overall safety record. An Executive and Legislative investigation of all these matters should be undertaken before any approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline is given.	LEG 26
Keith Mcbee	April 1, 2013	The potential environmental disaster from this pipeline and, indeed, the entire process of tar sands extraction far outweighs any possible benefit, economic or otherwise.	PN 05
Keith Miller	April 16, 2013	Tar sand oil is very corrosive so the pipleline will be subject to more wear and tear, thus more leaks. Caution with approving such a pipleline should be the watchword for all concerned.	RISK 11
Keith Pension	March 18, 2013	Have you looked at a map of the area the proposed Keystone XL pipeline is to bisect? What a textbook example of a rare area we should TREASURE, NOT TRASH?	PN 09
Keith Porter	April 17, 2013	Tar sands oil produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than crude oil, which would exacerbate our climate change problem.	CLIM 05
Keith Rutter	April 17, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	ACK
Keith Wood	March 11, 2013	Now we hear that the State Department actually used one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write their report on Keystone XL! Considering the source, how much credibility does it have?	PRO 01
KelleyH	April 18, 2013	This tar sand material that is going to end up in the City of Port Arthur, Texas; Beaumont, Texas; Baytown, Texas; Houston, Texas, we are going to see the end result of what's flowing out of that pipeline. We're urging you to do everything you can to protect the health and the welfare of people that live in these communities, on the fence line of these refineries and chemical plants.	RISK 07, CU 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kelli	April 22, 2013	I'm living in South Dakota, just a few hours south of the oil boom in North Dakota. The social, environmental and psychological impact of the recent boom in ND is disgusting to most members of my community: gun violence, murder and rape, thousands of unconcerned workers living in a village that cannot sustain their energy and food consumption, a state that has given up its safety and welfare for a few extra dollars. … Rather than wrecking the last few decent states left in this country, we should be focusing on other ways to provided sustainable energy that can create a more independent country!	SO 17
Kelli Means	April 22, 2013	contaminated water will be water we are USING on a daily basis.	ACK
Kelli S	March 22, 2013	I am deeply disappointed that your State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest, most carbon-intensiv-e fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 05
Kelli S	March 22, 2013	Please reject the State Department's review and direct Secretary of State Kerry to undertake the kind of comprehensive analysis that you have long promised. That review should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands	CLIM 13
Kelly	March 14, 2013	The trouble, of course, is that the ratio of pipeline failures to total distance of the network and the vague description of “impact on the public” does not adequately convey the environmental risks of large oil pipeline networks. The environmental impact of oil pipeline spills is obscured under this rubric.	RISK 06
Kelly	March 14, 2013	Research published on an EPA website shows that oil pipelines are a greater risk to water quality than other forms of transport. They leak more often and release larger volumes of oil when they do leak. They also are harder to identify than other types of spills (see this link!)http://www.epa.gov/osweroe1/docs/oil/fss/fss06/etkin_2.pdf	RISK 13
Kelly Blank	April 14, 2013	They have no significant financial motivation to make sure such catastrophes never happen. A fraction of their profits is all it takes to make the problem of accountability go away - but the environment cannot be returned to its pre-spill state.	RISK 07, LEG 06
Kelly Curtis	April 8, 2013	But our environment is in crisis here, and we to change how we get our energy sources now! Wind and solar…	PN 02, ALT 01
Kelly Ellenwood	April 22, 2013	lets focus our attention on alternative forms of clean, renewable energy	PN 02
Kelly France	April 22, 2013	If the oil is needed that badly build a refinery at the source, otherwise create a fule science or infrastructure program that would foster career growth and not pose such a devastating potential reality.	ALT 08
Kelly Peral	April 5, 2013	How about a solar highway along a route of similar proportion instead?	ALT 01
Kelly Pope	March 1, 2013	Is TransCanada threatening you? Bribing you?	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kelly Pope	March 1, 2013	it will have such a significant impact on the global climate (not to mention the local ecosystems where pipe is being laid, and tarsands are being mined) that it will make even your own gaffes seem small.	CU 02, CLIM 14
Kelly Sare	April 22, 2013	open us up to a potential oil leak	ACK
Kelly Seacrest	April 22, 2013	Today we are facing huge environmental problems that are on the verge of causing catastrophic impacts.	ACK
Kelly Seacrest	April 22, 2013	goals for a sustainable energy policy, such as wind, solar and other alternative resources.	PN 02
Kelly Tamburello	April 11, 2013	This spill in Arkansas is just one more reason not to make this pipeline. ……	ACK
Kelly Tamburello	April 11, 2013	The only truly green energy solutions are solar, wind and water. Put the best minds in the country on making cheap affordable solar, subsidize green energy to create more PERMANENT new jobs. Keystone XL will only create a tiny number of temporary jobs, and they're not worth another spill.	PN 05, ALT 01
Kelly Witcraft	April 16, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Kelly, Sean	March 26, 2013	Keystone XL has undergone one of the most thorough environmental assessments ever conducted. In this latest environmental review, the State Department again concludes that Keystone XL will not significantly affect the environment. With over 57 additional mitigation measures to be undertaken by TransCanada, Keystone XL is much safer, more efficient, and more reliable than other modes of crude oil transport examined by the State Department.	ACK
Kelly, Sean	March 26, 2013	As our economy struggles to recover, Keystone XL will provide much-needed jobs to construction workers, manufacturers, and other laborers. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education, and medical services.	PN 10
Kellyeo	April 21, 2013	It is my position that if the XL Pipeline is built, then companies exploiting Canadian tar sands will expand operations far beyond current activities to the detriment of air quality, natural environment and efforts to mitigate the effects of global climate change.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kellyeo	April 21, 2013	But, key to my stance in opposition to the pipeline is the fact that the mining tar sands oil is an inefficient, environmentally destructive and dirty business. One need only look at pictures of the Suncor Millennium open-pit mine north of Fort McMurray, Alberta. Tar sands bitumen is thick, tarry oil that requires a great deal of of high-energy “cooking” and chemical processing to be useable. Mining operations create fugitive emissions and uncontrolled effluent that are rich in methane and hazardous materials.	CLIM 14
Kellyeo	April 21, 2013	Those opposed to the XL Pipeline claim that the United States will not be the primary market for Canadian tar sands oil, that few jobs will be produced in the United States as a result of the pipeline and that "oil is oil", meaning as a fungible good, it's impossible to claim the precise source of the oil one buys on the worldwide market. Thus the argument that Canadian tar sands oil will somehow enhance US energy security is hollow.	PN 01
Kels	April 22, 2013	risking the biggest fresh water source in the United States.	WRG 01
Kelsey Miller	April 22, 2013	Neither Keystone nor this study have brought forth a sufficient emergency response plan. Please specify a longterm liability plan that places responsibility not on private landowners or on the federal government in cases of accidents (which will happen), but on Keystone.	RISK 03, PD 01, RISK 05
Ken	April 22, 2013	I am concerned about the damaging affect that this pipeline will have on the environment and its impact on global climate change.	CLIM 14
Ken And Ev Smith	April 21, 2013	I wonder if any thought has been given to building a refinery in North or South Dakota or as far as the pipeline could be built? It seems to me that having a refinery in the North would make a great distribution point for refined products.	ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ken Cantor	April 22, 2013	Continued intense development for exploitation of Alberta's tar sands is not inevitable, and in fact, it is one of the worst of such endeavors, producing approximately 20% more greenhouse gases than conventionally produced petroleum. The International Energy Agency has warned that 2/3 of all proven reserves worldwide must be left in the ground to avoid climate catastrophe. Turning down TransCanada's application for approval of the Keystone XL thus presents a wonderful opportunity to start this process. We must all face the reality that, if we are to survive the worst of climate change, a good portion of proven reserves of fossil fuels must become stranded assets. The pipeline, if approved and constructed as planned, would carry 830,000 barrels of diluted bitumen (dilbit) daily from the Alberta tar sands to the Texas Gulf Coast. Between 2015 and 2050, if approved, the pipeline alone would result in emissions of 6.34 billion metric tons of CO2 equivalent, greater than the total 2011 annual CO2 emissions of the United States. A basic assumption of the State Department's review of the DSEIS is that, even if the pipeline is not constructed, that the 830,000 barrels of dilbit would somehow still be produced and somehow find its way to markets and to combustion. Given the widespread opposition to any and all pipelines in Canada and the U.S. that could be constructed to transport this material, this assumption must be challenged and alternative scenarios, with much lower production figures, be presented by the DSEIS. As noted, if the world is to stay below a 2o C rise in global temperature, then more than half the proven reserves of fossil fuels must remain in the ground.	PN 06
Ken Deshaies	March 28, 2013	First, this does not create the number of jobs promised - not even close. Second, it is some of the dirtiest oil that can be extracted. Third, while it travels through our country, we won't even keep it - it will be exported. And finally - and perhaps most importantly, the possibility for error, for leaks, for contaminated rivers and soil in this country is great.	RISK 17, PN 05
Ken Gates	March 11, 2013	Please push hard for ending this and other dirty energy projects and for investing more in renewables.	PN 03
Ken Hotopp	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline plan should be denied due to its potential environmental and economic impacts, most seriously its contribution to global climate change.	CLIM 14
Ken Hotopp	April 22, 2013	In addition, there would be a huge economic impact due to KXL's contribution to global climate change damage from increasing floods, droughts, wildfires, sea level rise, pests, and diseases.	CLIM 17
Ken Lauter	April 11, 2013	MIchigan and now Arkansas have shown the kind of disaster awaiting us on a much larger scale.	RISK 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ken Lawson	March 11, 2013	Think and act locally in these high unemployment and poverty stricken areas and go for training and construction jobs in alternative energy sources before fossil fuel makes fossils out of all of us!	SO 05, SO 03
Ken Lindsay	March 11, 2013	This conflict of interest between an oil company employee and the US Govt agency tasked with monitoring that same industry is ludicrous.	PRO 01
Ken Marienau	April 1, 2013	I reject the preliminary report conclusions produced on construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.	ACK
Ken Mcwatters	March 11, 2013	This pipeline will encourage the expansion of "tar sands" oil production in Canada, which will enhance the harmful effects of manmade global warming.	CLIM 13
Ken Mcwatters	March 11, 2013	It is also risky environmentally in pipelines, as it is established that "tar sands" oil compared to normal crude oil is more corrosive and contains more abrasives (e.g. sand particles) that lead to more spills than other pipelines. A spill anywhere along the Keystone XL route crossing the United States will endanger precious groundwater and/or aquifers. The monetary risks alone to agriculture due to the impact on irrigation due to a spill should be enough to discourage this pipeline from moving forward.	RISK 14
Ken Morrison	April 23, 2013	It’s not true that tar sands expansion will happen regardless of the decision you make about Keystone XL. If built, the pipeline would enable 30 per cent more tar sands to be produced.	ACK
Ken Revoy	April 22, 2013	I understand TransCanada says their pipeline is the safest in the world but I don’t trust words. I want to see more studies done and I want input on the Emergency Response Plans. Currently when a spill happens we are simply not protected and not prepared.	RISK 05
Ken Revoy	April 22, 2013	I want input on the Emergency Response Plans.	RISK 05
Ken Revoy	April 22, 2013	when a spill happens we are simply not protected and not prepared.	RISK 14
Ken Robinson	April 22, 2013	Also this oil is planned to be sold through Texas ports to the open market. So why are we taking such risks and not getting anything in return except taxpayer burden and toxic spills?	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ken Sletten	April 19, 2013	According to U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) data, in 2011 U.S. net total imports of petroleum (crude oil + petroleum products) amounted to 45 % of total 2011 domestic demand. Of that imported 45 %, about half came from the Middle East & other more-or-less unstable / unfriendly countries in various parts of the world. EIA further projects that the U.S. will continue to need to import between 3.5 to 7.5 million barrels of oil per day (BOPD) until at least 2035, just to meet U.S. domestic demand. Therefore it is clearly in the long-term strategic national interest of the U.S. to as much as reasonably possible reduce if not eliminate net crude and petroleum imports from outside of North America. All by itself, KeystoneXL should reduce current American dependence on oil from the Middle East and heavy crude from Venezuela and other unstable areas of the world by about 40 %.	PN 10
Ken Sletten	April 19, 2013	There are now about 2.5 million miles of pipelines in the U.S. (of all types & sizes). Of this 2.5 million miles, nearly 500,000 miles are interstate pipelines that carry crude oil, other petroleum products, or natural gas. KeystoneXL will add a total of 850 miles of 36-inch pipeline in just 3 states: MT, SD, and NE (the remaining 329 of 1179 total KeystoneXL miles are in Canada); i.e.: Total U.S. interstate pipeline mileage will grow by only about 0.17% with the addition of KeystoneXL; a tiny & insignificant fraction of the existing baseline. IAC: On balance and overall, pipelines are a MUCH better, safer, cheaper, and more environmentally friendly way to transport crude oil than tanker trucks or trains.	PN 10
Ken Sletten	April 19, 2013	That stopping KeystoneXL will somehow reduce world-wide atmospheric CO2 "pollution" (quotes around "pollution" fully appropriate, since no CO2 equals no plant growth). In so doing they totally ignore an obvious objective reality: The Northern Gateway pipeline project (from Alberta to the Pacific port of Kitimat, B.C.) is already far along; operational start-up for that competing project estimated to be as early as mid-2017 (just 2 years after best-case projected online date for KeystoneXL). And China is eagerly knocking on Canada's door; that huge & oil-hungry nation will be happy to sign contracts to buy all the oil Canada is willing to sell them.	PN 12, ALT 09
Ken Sletten	April 19, 2013	A big benefit of KeystoneXL, if taken together with supporting a range of other reasonable pro-energy policies, are the major economic benefits that would accrue long-term to the U.S. as a whole; by growing the economy and maximizing job creation. If fact some estimates (by CERI, for example) predict that at full operation KeystoneXL will, all by itself, add on the order of ~$170 billion to U.S. GDP between now and 2035. By extension that will also substantially increase net government revenues, WITHOUT the necessity of raising tax rates.	SO 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ken Sletten	April 19, 2013	Something that has been only marginally reported (if at all) by major MSM outlets: KeystoneXL is NOT going to carry just Canadian oil: It will also carry a huge volume of oil from the current Bakken Formation oil boom in MT & ND. KeystoneXL is projected to transport a total of ~ 830,000 BOPD. On their website, TransCanada states that 25% of that total capacity will be dedicated to transporting the light, sweet crude produced in MT and ND; i.e.: >= 200,000 BOPD of U.S. production will NOT have to be transported by truck or rail. That is a huge benefit from several perspectives, to local residents in oil-producing areas of eastern MT and western ND; that will last for many years. Just 1 example: KeystoneXL should take at least 500 oil trucks off the roads in the Bakken region EVERY DAY (I've driven thru Williston ND many times in the last 5 years, and truck traffic is already WAY crazy in that very busy area).	SO 19
Ken Woolard	April 15, 2013	THE PIPELINE IS A TERROST TARGET WAITING TO HAPPEN	RISK 04
Kendall Magnussen	April 22, 2013	After the oil spills of recent years…..What are you thinking?	ACK
Kendall Magnussen	April 22, 2013	After the...terrorist attacks that seem always be looking for new damaging targets.....What are you thinking?	RISK 04
Kendra Hershey	April 13, 2013	The reduction in the price of gas would be insignificant (less than a penny per gallon), but the damage could be huge.	PN 05
Kendra Hershey	April 13, 2013	Only 35 permanent jobs?	SO 04
Kenneth Benton	April 22, 2013	TransCanada/Keystone has put two hundred million in the contract for clean up from any tar-sand spill. This amount would be totally short, leaving the tax payers of Nebraska on the hook for anything above this level. Keep in mind that the Kalamazoo tar-sand spill is approaching the one billion level for clean up and not finished yet. We must also not forget that the product being transported (tar-sand) through the TransCanada/Keystone XL pipeline will not be subject to the National Oil Pipeline clean up tax, thanks to an exemption pushed through by former Vice President Dick Chaney. Which brings me back to my original point of Nebraska bearing all the risk and none of the rewards.	RISK 08, RISK 03, SO 10, SO 15
Kenneth Copenhaver	April 4, 2013	any tar sands oil pipeline review must be exceptionally rigorous to assure that the benefits will out-weigh the considerable environmental costs.	ACK
Kenneth Evans	April 15, 2013	I lived in Nebraska for several years. The Keystone pipeline still is scheduled to go through the Sandhills and endanger the enormous aquifer it feeds. I do not believe that it would be possible to clean up a spill in this area. As far as i know no one has shown any plan that could clean up a spill in this area.	RISK 08, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kenneth Gibson	April 14, 2013	We will never have energy independence unless we reconfigure our way of "doing business" to fully utilize the wind resources offshore, in the Plains States and over the Great Lakes. We need to put human and financial capital into that construction project. We can get lots of jobs for a couple of years building a pipeline or start investing now in a renewed energy infrastructure to replace decaying nuclear power, coal-fired power and our gasoline and diesel guzzling transportation systems. Lets stimulate the right jobs and develop the right technology - now!	PN 02
Kenneth Kaseforth	April 8, 2013	And the pollution costs and environmental degradation of the fresh water and soils of America's heartland will be inevitable and costly in all terms. Just ask yourself why the Canadians aren't proposing to build a pipeline to the Great Lakes across Canadian lands -	ACK
Kenneth Kaseforth	April 8, 2013	Permitting the Keystone pipeline doesn't make any economic sense for the USA. Not only will American taxpayers be on the hook for pipeline spills like the one that just occurred in Arkansas, but its purpose is to send Canadian crude oil to the foreign-owned Shell/Aramco refinery near Houston. From there the finished gas and oil products will be shipped and sold all over the world. This extra market competition will raise the price paid by Americans for these Canadian oil and gas products currently refined and sold in the US's upper Mid-West; these higher retail costs will more than offset the relatively meager benefits of short-term construction and long-term maintenance jobs associated with the proposed pipeline.	PN 07, PN 04
Kenneth Kutalek	April 2, 2013	To avoid [global warming]… move toward renewable energy and a rapid decrease and eventual complete discontinuation of use of fossil fuels.	ALT 01
Kenneth Nolde	March 22, 2013	Canada will develop and market their oil reserves regardless of what we do about Keystone XL. It just makes sense to approve this pipeline and bring that fuel to the U.S., to grow our economy, provide jobs for our workers and power our businesses and homes. Americans have waited nearly five years for this pipeline to be approved and for America's government to increase our energy security.	PN 10
Kenneth Price	April 13, 2013	… if there is a spill who is paying and who cleans it up.	RISK 03
Kenneth Sloane	April 17, 2013	No more fossil fuel pipelines. Renewable energy solutions must be sought!!!	PN 02
Kenny Frankel	March 1, 2013	If we are going to build any pipeline or infrastructure, it needs to support biofuel shipping, wind energy transmission, or any clean alternative.	PN 02
Kenny Frankel	March 1, 2013	The true price of building this pipeline is astronomical because it will lead to environmental reclamation and climate change adaptation costs. I as a taxpayer do not want to pay astronomical costs that result from these short-sighted policy decisions since the government will ultimately have to take measures to offset these problems.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kenny Frankel	March 1, 2013	The chemical dose from the added emissions and small spills from this pipeline along with the other chemical doses we are exposed to lead to big day-to-day differences in our lives.	RISK 30
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	A Canadian expert in favor of the pipeline even says this, "And with the International Energy Agency forecasting the U.S. achieving energy self-sufficiency by 2020, Keystone isn't really about reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil. Not in the longer term. It's about a route to Asia for Canadian oil, and diversifying our markets." - L. Ian MacDonald	PN 07
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	They dont want this pipeline to supply the US. They want the refinery and port access to ship this oil abroad. This will not lower our fuel costs.	PN 07
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/05/13/483247/james-hansen-is-correct-about-catastrophic-projections-for-us-drought-if-we-dont-act-now/?mobile=nc	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-17907418	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-09-19/oil-pipeline-spills-go-undetected-by-much-touted-sensors.html	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://www.montrealgazette.com/business/MacDonald+Energy+Canada+issue+2013/7766577/story.html#ixzz2GumHlYGV	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v478/n7370/full/478450a.html	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/10/opinion/game-over-for-the-climate.html?_r=2&ref=opinion	REF
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	[TransCanda] said they would be able to detects leaks quickly. 4 of the leaks they had no idea about until several days later when land owners contacted them.	RISK 15
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	The previous pipeline TransCanada claimed would leak once every seven years. It has leaked over 12 times in one year.	RISK 26
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	They want to put this pipeline over and sometimes through the Ogallala Aquifer, one of the worlds largest fresh water aquifers. The route goes through the Sandhills. A highly permeable land type where the Ogallala Aquifer is very close to the surface, and many times breaks the surface to form small lakes, and springs.	WRG 01
Kent Goertzen	April 22, 2013	We need to protect this resource, and the Ogallala Aquifer is one of the most important sources of fresh, clean water in the United States.	WRG 01
Kent Heese	April 22, 2013	As a landowner and on the route of the proposed pipeline, I oppose the project. Not only for safety concerns to our water BUT to bias easement that TransCanda is offering. Have any of you officials seen the "actual easement" that is being sent to landowners. A one lumpsum payment while millions of gallons is being sent down the pipeline is not justifiable.	LEG 02
Kent Johnson	March 11, 2013	Let's put all out energy into renewable and have the U.S. lead the world again, like we used to.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kent Sonnefeld	April 5, 2013	The rest of the world is going to renewable energy and so should we.	ALT 01
Kent Sonnefeld	April 5, 2013	At a recovery percent of 4 barrels gained to every 1 barrel used to extract it from the ground, this shows that even the oil companies will go to almost any length to make a dime. This is one of the worst projects that I have ever seen that our government is willing to stand behind. Even traditional oil extraction gives a 15 to 1 recovery.	PN 08
Kent Wilson	April 9, 2013	Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	PN 06
Kent Wilson	April 9, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	RISK 07
Kent Wilson	April 17, 2013	Second, extracting bitumen from the tar sands uses enormous amounts of clean water, which becomes a highly toxic waste product that is stored in tailing ponds. These ponds, at the last estimate I have read, cover about 70 square miles. Waterfowl landing on these ponds die.	ACK
Kent Wilson	April 17, 2013	requiring cars and coal plants to meet stricter pollution standards is negated by promoting the product of the tar sands. Approving the KXL pipeline would contribute to global warmin g, something your government has promised to address.	CLIM 14
Kent Wilson	April 17, 2013	This development destroys vast areas of the Canadian boreal forest, which is a nesting and living area for a large number of animal species, and a resting place for migratory birds.	CU 01
Kent Wilson	April 17, 2013	The mix is extremely toxic and corrosive. So the probability of leaks is increased.	RISK 11
Kenwaun	April 4, 2013	Oil independence short term, but oil freedom long term. This doesn't help the initiative of the latter.	PN 03
KerekesJ	April 18, 2013	We believe KXL is in the best interests of America to help ensure our long-term energy security, provide a dependable supply of Canadian oil to US refineries, and create thousands of good-paying American job	PN 10
KerekesJ	April 18, 2013	We believe this project is a tremendous job creator. The department found in its report that construction of KXL will support over 42,000 jobs, putting $2 billion in workers' pockets over the next two years and will also provide market access to significant domestic production from North Dakota.	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Keren Rosner	March 28, 2013	Indeed, how is it possible today, after so many environmental disasters have proven that endeavors such as KeystoneXL are unsustainable and brutally detrimental to the environment that our government is still supporting such paths. It is your responsibility as our government, to protect our people from the greed driven interests of the big corporations who have demonstrated time and time again that they have no respect for any living person or organism except their own personal gain. Where will that lead us in 20 years time?	PN 05
Keriakedes	April 18, 2013	And there's a very popular melody in Nebraska, known to virtually everyone who cares a fig about football that fits very amply with the -- my -- my words: No, we don't want any tar sands. Tar sands are bad for you. They stink and they poison the girls and the boys un, our water yet pure through and through. Keep your sewage in your own land and donate it to Iran, to Russia or China, now what could be finer. TransCanada you should be banned. Ughh. Tar sands, no tar sands, no tar sands. No pipeline. No pipeline, no pipeline.	ACK
Kerreen Brandt	April 9, 2013	The tar sands are not the way to energy independence and safety for our nation	PN 04
Kerry Beheler	March 31, 2013	The oil produced and shipped through Keystone XL is designated for export to China.	PN 07
Kerry Fina	April 22, 2013	We cannot afford to figure out how to wipe up a multi-state oil spil	ACK
Kerry Fina	April 22, 2013	we depend on like the Ogallala Aquifer.	ACK
Kerry Fina	April 22, 2013	Alternative fuels - not poisonous spills!	PN 02
Kerry Fina	April 22, 2013	The resources we would put at risk far outweigh the profits and energy this pipeline would produce.	PN 02
Kerry Kravitz	April 11, 2013	In addition, [Keystone XL] supports more burning of fossil fuels. Let's invest in mass transit, cleaner energy, and avoid further pollution.	ALT 01
Kerry Lemon	April 22, 2013	The fact that the SEIS does not state more definitively the negative impacts of this proposed Keystone XL pipeline puts it in great suspect as to how the information was gathered and who was the force behind this report. I could list a long number of facts and statistics about tar sands and about TransCanada but if I trust that you know all the information about this product and this company.	ACK
Kerry Nelson	March 14, 2013	The petty mitigation measures encouraged by the EIS will do nothing to stop the damage that the life cycle of the Tar Sands oil will create.	CLIM 03
Kerry Nelson	March 14, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement is an inadequate basis on which to base approval of the pipeline because it does not consider the entire life cycle of the oil that will be transported from Alberta to Galveston. It is not the carbon emissions from construction and operation of the pipeline itself that will be the death knell for large regions of our planet, but the extraction, transportation, refining and burning of the huge quantity of filthy tar sands “fuel”. An analysis of this entire process, the life cycle of this material, must be done.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kerry Rochford Hague	March 11, 2013	I am discouraged to learn that the pipeline report was not issued by a neutral third party. Please consider what scientists have been telling us for years and heed their advice, not the dismissive report issued by a stakeholder in putting the pipeline through.	PRO 01
Kevin Avery	April 4, 2013	A recent New York Times op-ed piece by a Canadian revealed just how opposed many Canadians are to their country's knuckling under to the pressure of Keystone to extract oil in the most environmentally destructive fashion. But their protests are muffled by the kind of financial coercion of elected officials exerted by Exxon et al. here. We and our children and grandchildren will get nowhere continuing to bow to that pressure, let alone pressure from beyond our borders. Let the rejection of the Keystone pipeline be our initial line in the sand of fossil fuel reduction.	ACK
Kevin Brown	March 21, 2013	Please see to it that this pipeline does not get built and that we focus on renewable clean energy instead.	ALT 01
Kevin Brown	March 21, 2013	what we must do now is reduce the burning of fossil fuels to prevent this.	PN 02
Kevin Casey	April 13, 2013	Bonding sufficient to cover any loss must be required.	RISK 03
Kevin Clee	April 22, 2013	and this trans canada pipeline fails to move the country forward toward energy independence	PN 04
Kevin Clee	April 22, 2013	We know now since the Arkansas spill, tar sands will not be treated the same, with taxpayers saddled with cleanup costs	SO 15, RISK 03
Kevin Fink	April 13, 2013	Well, allowing Keystone XL will temporarily divert resources (financial, research attention, etc) away from the true long-term solutions to our energy and security needs. Long-term solutions will come from investment in renewable resources, energy storage and distribution technology, and efficient utilization of energy. Keystone XL will slow those projects down as people focus (both constructively and negatively) on it.	PN 03
kevin hauptman	April 22, 2013	A 1700 mile pipeline that transports UNKNOWN chemicals along with the Tar sands, under pressure is sure to leak. The sensors are unable to detect leaks of as much as 700,000 gallons per day.	RISK 15, RISK 12
Kevin Kane	April 17, 2013	We do not need a pipeline to make it feasible for Canada to export more oil to countries that will burn it and increase CO2 emissions and global warming.	CLIM 14
Kevin Killeen, Attorney At Law	April 12, 2013	Keystone trades off public health and safety, ground water resources, air quality, legal rights and global warming for oil company profits.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kevin Kostiuk	March 19, 2013	This pipeline would increase and accelerate the production, amount and scale of tar sands in Alberta. There is enough of this viscous disgusting energy to aid in making climate change go from an adaptable thing to something that will alter human civilization and our planet as we know it. The green house gas emissions that this project will enable to be burned and stored in the atmosphere (instead of underground) will have long term effects on our country's national security, food supply and expenditures.	CLIM 12
Kevin Kostiuk	March 19, 2013	Lastly, this straw (pipe) sucking clay, sand, oil and water from Hardisty, AB to Port Arthur, TX will accelerate the demise of pristine lands and forests in Canada. The mining of tar sands rapes the land and destroys waterways, habitat and bio-diversity of species that live in the Canadian provinces- many of which migrate to lands in the US seasonally.	CU 01
Kevin Kostiuk	March 19, 2013	The threat of a catastrophic failure will be there just as with other pipelines and spills of the past which will (not may) pollute our ground and water ways even those used to grow our food and drink in our homes.	RISK 07
Kevin Leary	April 5, 2013	Tar sands oil production is the wrong path to a sustainable future.	ACK
Kevin Lopota	April 2, 2013	Run the pipeline through more affluent areas so the cost of the desperate need for energy at any price will be realized by those so heavily invested.	EJ 03
Kevin Nelson	April 22, 2013	the reduction in oil imports is only hype.	ACK
Kevin Nelson	April 22, 2013	the spills are numerous and destructive	ACK
Kevin Nelson	April 22, 2013	What is certain is that a valuable and irreplaceable area of fresh water is going to be threatened, and our lives and those of our neighbors across the Great Plains as well.	ACK
Kevin Nelson	April 22, 2013	the jobs numbers are overstated	SO 02
Kevin Nelson	April 22, 2013	do the sensible thing and reroute this pipeline away from the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 04
Kevin Proft	April 2, 2013	while XL will produce jobs, they are not the answer to our high unemployment rate and many of them are very temporary. A few thousand temporary jobs are not worth the environmental price we will pay for this pipeline. I believe the government should find other ways to put people to work that will not mean the destruction of our planet.	PN 05
Kevin Proft	April 2, 2013	it promotes rapid development of tar sands in Alberta, Canada at the total expense of the natural environment. Mining tar sands destroy pristine forests and replace them with black swaths of land stripped of all life. It also results in poisonous water in tailing ponds that are often separated from clean rivers by narrow dikes. It is inevitable that in some places water will be polluted.	PN 06, CU 02
Kevin Proft	April 2, 2013	Companies like TransCanada, Enbridge, and SunCor cannot be trusted to transport this stuff responsibly. They have a proven track record of spills and mistakes. XL will be no different. Breakages and leaks are inevitable and will pollute Americans' water and environment.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kevin Quail	March 28, 2013	We really don't need the oil from the tar sands, just a pipeline to take oil away from the Bakken shale. Of course, as far as climate change goes, the oil from the tar sands will then go to China instead via pipeline to Canada's west coast. Better that the pipeline goes there than through the US and better that China burns more oil and natural gas- anything to get them off of coal.	PN 10
Kevin Robert Douglas	March 7, 2013	[Human civilizatoin needs a cheap reliable source of energy to flourish including access to healthy food, clean water, safe homes, and ability to regulate our home environment (temp.)… alll using fossil fuels]	RISK 07
Kevin Warren	April 13, 2013	If it is approved it is the end of the road for any meaningful efforts to curb big oil's strangle hold and to do something about climate change.	CLIM 14
Kevon Storie	March 31, 2013	America needs long-term sustainable job development, not short-term fossil fuel development that destroys our environment.	PN 05
Kezia Sproat	April 22, 2013	Nebraskas Platte River and the underlying acquifer are national treasures, and should not be put at risk for oil.	WRG 01
Kilmeerry	April 18, 2013	TransCanada wants to trench through the headwaters of creeks that start from the aquifer. They also want to go through wetlands where the pipeline will be within the groundwater.	RISK 07
Kilmeerry	April 18, 2013	They [TransCanada] will also cross ground where the topsoil is thin and when disturbed is highly susceptible to wind erosion. These are the exact conditions that caused the rejection of the original route through the Sandhills.	SOIL 07
Kilmeerry	April 18, 2013	Placing the pipeline on the shallow part of the Ogallala aquifer is a risk.	WRG 01
KilmurryB	April 18, 2013	Tar sands oil does not even pay the 8 cents a barrel Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Tax.	RISK 03, LEG 08, SO 15
KilmurryB	April 18, 2013	Our government officials seem to believe TransCanada's propaganda that this route avoids the Sandhills. As a landowner whose ranch is being threatened, I know the ground that they want to go through is sandy, porous and in place in ground-saturated aquifer water. When manmade pipelines fail, who will clean our water?	RISK 03, LEG 16
KilmurryB	April 18, 2013	In the spring of 2010, we had a flash flood. 8 to 13 inches of rain fell quickly. An estimated 20-foot to 30-foot wall of water filled with sand and debris raced down creeks and streams. In northern Holt County, bridges, culverts, fences and dams fell. No 36-inch pipeline could withstand this.	RISK 22

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
KilmurryB	April 18, 2013	We aren't being told specific chemicals carried by this pipeline. Yet, we know some of them increase risks of cancer and reproductive difficulties. These chemicals alone should raise huge flags.	RISK 30, RISK 12
Kim	April 22, 2013	One leak, and it would be the end of Nebraska as we know it	ACK
Kim	April 22, 2013	We need to save our water supply. We are a ag state not an oil state. What would happen if oil got into our water supply? How would the farmers water their crops? With bottled water?	RISK 09
Kim	April 22, 2013	Its time to put people to work in coming up with alternative fuel.	SO 05
Kim	April 22, 2013	Please find an alternate route so it does not go above our water.	WRG 04
Kim Cavanagh	April 2, 2013	Over the past 30 years, the number of oil spills has remained the same, so how can we or should we expect anything to be different with this pipeline? Why sacrifice our farm fields and water ways for oil that will be refined and exported to other countries? Why should we assume all the risks and irreversible damage to our country?	RISK 07, PN 05
Kim Cavanagh	April 6, 2013	The oil from this pipeline will not bring down the cost of gas in this country but it could potentially ruin farm fields that produce food for all of us.	PN 04, LU 01
Kim Cavanagh	April 6, 2013	Why should farmers and those in the middle of the United States live in fear of the inevitable pipeline spill?	PN 05
Kim Crockett	April 2, 2013	Although we view this as primarily good energy policy, it is also good for our nation's short and long term security.	PN 10
Kim Feil	March 6, 2013	The 11 who died lived in the same trailer court. While we can't say the 11 died b/c of the tar sands oil spill, which flowed right past their doorsteps and yards, the people who died included some whose cancer was in remission or had other chronic illnesses that worsened after the spill.	RISK 30
Kim Feil	April 4, 2013	Texas Administrative Code, Title 30, Part 1, Chapter 101, Subchapter A, Rule 101.4, Environmental Quality, Nuisance No person shall discharge from any source whatsoever one or more air contaminants or combinations thereof, in such concentration and of such duration as are or may tend to be injurious to or to adversely affect human health or welfare, animal life, vegetation, or property, or as to interfere with the normal use and enjoyment of animal life, vegetation, or property.	PD 05
Kim Harris	April 22, 2013	Please deny Transcanadas permit in which they are requesting to place a crude oil pipeline through the ogalalla aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kim Harris	April 22, 2013	Please deny Transcanadas permit in which they are requesting to place a crude oil pipeline through the ogalalla aquifer. Our land which has a very large lake is in the aquifer….. Our lake is spring fed. Please do not allow a foreign company take over our precious water supply that millions depend upon…..The pipeline company has already had 12 confirmed spills within the last 12 months totaling around 23 000 gallons of crude oil detected. No one knows how much goes undetected and also this particular pipeline will be carrying more oil. Please do not allow them to put it in Americas most valuable resource…	WRG 01, RISK 26
Kim Kilchenstein	April 5, 2013	Introducing Keystone XL pipeline to the US is a gravely irresponsible notion, certain to leave our earth, water supply, wildlife, and communities, open to yet more oil spill disasters and toxic pollution.(…..) As is publically available, the science- basic common sense- and recent history- shows, without a doubt, that allowing such a project to occur would have profoundly destructive effects on our environment. Investments should be made by withdrawing all oil, gas, and nuclear subsidies, and funnelling them, instead, towards the application of renewal and sustainable energies- for which we already have the technology.	RISK 07, ALT 01
Kim Mckeage	April 5, 2013	Rather than pander to the interests that feed an insatiable dependence on oil and gas, the U.S. should be leading the world in exploration and development of alternative energy forms such as wind and solar. Tar sands oil is inefficient technologically and economically.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kim Morrow	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will be responsible for emitting billions of tons of additional carbon dioxide into our atmosphere each year, leading us into a no-mans land of climate change. Climate scientists are unanimous in their warnings of a significantly altered climate in the years ahead, and the dramatic effects that will have on agriculture, public health, housing, food supply, transportation, the economy and more. We are at a time when the solutions of the past are no longer viable. We citizens, lawmakers and business owners are being called upon to make wise and forward-thinking choices to protect our future. Climate change is the most pressing moral issue of our time. The National Climate Assessment Report, published every four years by a coalition of 13 government agencies, spells out an alarming future. The U.S. average temperature has already been rising markedly in recent decades. It will continue to rise another 2°F to 4°F in most areas in the coming decades. That is already extreme. But by the year 2100, we will move into territory that none of us has ever seen before. If we as a nation and as a planet can implement substantial limits on greenhouse gas emissions, we will see an additional temperature rise of 3°-5°F. But on the other hand, if we keep going with business as usual... if we keep insisting that we need this tar sands oil to fuel our economy and that we will figure out the rest later, we will see temperature rises of 5°-10°F by the year 2100. That's only 87 years from now. That's a world that none of us will recognize... and which we may not even survive. This pipeline will be responsible for more C02 emissions than our ecosystem can handle.	CLIM 14
Kim Morrow	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will take land away from hard-working Nebraskans	LEG 02
Kim Morrow	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will carry a toxic oil sludge filled with chemicals through the most fragile water resource in our state. There are bound to be spills, and there are bound to be ineffective methods to clean them up.	RISK 07
Kim Ross	April 23, 2013	The draft SEIS makes several erroneous assumptions which need to be corrected. The assumption that it does not have a major impact on climate change presumes that other governments will take action that are not guaranteed. Further, we must look at the actions of the US only, and whether our actions will have an impact on climate change. Given that, there is no way to say that an approval won't have adverse climate consequences.	CLIM 13
Kim Ross	April 23, 2013	This report does not address the rights of the farmers and ranchers who are being bullied and threatened with "eminent domain" by TransCanada - a foreign corporation - who began their intimidation and threats before a permit had been issued.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kim Ross	April 23, 2013	Neither the people of the United States, nor Canada, will be the end users of the tar sands oil. The pipeline has, from its inception been for the sole purpose of moving bitumen from tar sands extraction sites to refineries located on or near the Gulf of Mexico for shipment to foreign markets. The bulk of the refined oil will be loaded on tankers bound for China, South America, and Europe. Therefore, the people of the United States and Canada are going to suffer the environmental and human health risks of continuing and supporting a dirty and destructive fossil fuel economy.	PN 07
Kim Ross	April 23, 2013	just because the Nebraska portion has moved, does not mean that the risk is significantly lessened. The recent spill in Arkansas should provide pause for the State Department and a reconsideration of the draft.	RISK 07
Kim Ross	April 23, 2013	The construction of the Keystone XL will create approximately 3,900 temporary and 35 full-time positions as cited in the U.S State Department report. In fact, it could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 05, SO 04
Kim Saner	April 22, 2013	We need to save our water supply.	WRG 01
Kim Schaefer	March 25, 2013	Please see the New York Times 3/24/2013 op Ed piece on why we really DO NOT have such a huge demand for fossil fuels and how substantial investment in alternative energy sources is really the way to go.	PN 02
Kimberley Fischer	April 21, 2013	More jobs would be created by pursuing solar and wind energy, all without endangering our communities.	PN 02
Kimberly Anns	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline should be built next to her sister pipeline, the Keystone pipeline that runs through the eastern part of Nebraska, NOT following the proposed route. The amended route of the Keystone XL pipeline still runs through the fragile Sandhills and over the Ogallala Aquifer plus it is only 30 to 40 miles away from the first Keystone pipeline's route. While it is true that the original pipeline also runs across the Ogallala Aquifer, an oil leak there would be far less damaging to the aquifer because of the heavy clay soil versus the loamy sands of the Sandhills. TransCanada would benefit from a parallel pipeline route because it would be easier to monitor. Planes would only have to fly one route since both lines would be together. TransCanada workers would need to be in only one area instead of being split, trying to keep tabs on two separate lines. Plus, the functioning pipeline route has already been mapped for 'one or more pipelines,' as stated in the first paragraph of the original easement contracts. There should be minimal work in getting approval of a pipeline following the route of one that has already been approved and is currently in operation. By putting the two pipelines together along the original Keystone's route, all sides would achieve their goals.	ALT 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kimberly Anns	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline should be built next to her sister pipeline, the Keystone pipeline that runs through the eastern part of Nebraska, NOT following the proposed route. The amended route of the Keystone XL pipeline still runs through the fragile Sandhills and over the Ogallala Aquifer plus it is only 30 to 40 miles away from the first Keystone pipeline's route. While it is true that the original pipeline also runs across the Ogallala Aquifer, an oil leak there would be far less damaging to the aquifer because of the heavy clay soil versus the loamy sands of the Sandhills.	WRG 04, ALT 03
Kimberly Anthony	April 22, 2013	In addition to the reality of physics at work in our atmosphere, the processing of tar sands on both the extraction and refining phases requires tremendous amounts of fresh water that we do not have at our disposal.	CU 07
Kimberly Anthony	April 22, 2013	Equally outrageous is the taking of land from American citizens against their will to benefit a foreign corporation. Eminent domain, my ass!	LEG 02
Kimberly Anthony	April 22, 2013	The argument that I have heard is that the tar sands will be burned regardless of whether this pipeline is approved. I am not convinced that this is true, because citizens in the U.S. and Canada are prepared to continue to fight TransCanada and others at every turn. It is already becoming more expensive …..	PN 06
Kimberly Anthony	April 22, 2013	Ask the folks in Kalamazoo, MI. Their river is still polluted from the 2010 spill. You cannot clean up tar sands spills in the water, because the tar sands sink. You cannot skim it off of the surface. What happens when the spill occurs in the Ogallala aquifer, on which millions of people rely for drinking water. You cannot replace that water source.	RISK 29
Kimberly Londer	April 11, 2013	Is it really necessary to do all these false "studies" to tell the people and the government something we all already know, that the country, the land, the people cannot stand for any more of this poison?	ACK
Kimberly Reuter	April 19, 2013	The government has the power and resources to mobilize the country and make immediate changes to the way we get our energy now and in the future. Take the lead! Please start now to put us on the right path for the future. NO to Keystone XL pipeline!	CLIM 18
Kimberly Stuhr	April 22, 2013	The biased report should be enough to predict the future of how TransCanada does business. Add to that their audacity to begin building before even being approved	PRO 01
Kimberly Stuhr	April 22, 2013	The process contaminates water and creates toxic ponds---and kills thousands of migrant birds.	WI 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kimberly Walker	March 10, 2013	The State Department just released its latest report on the pipeline, and it is appalling that the Department actually used one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write it! (Song, Lisa. "Critical Part of Keystone Report Done by Firms with Deep Oil Industry Ties." InsideClimate News. 6 March 2013.) Not only is it obviously biased, the draft is simply malpractice that refuses to acknowledge Keystone XL's huge impact on the climate.	PRO 01
Kimbrough Mauney	March 10, 2013	Some items lacking in the SEIS: 1. safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks posed by tar sands. 2. no mention of how to protect sensitive wildlife habitat and natural resources along the pipeline route, in particular the Ogallala Aquifer and Sandhills region; 3. admitting the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil; 4. discussion of impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife	CU 01, CLIM 14, RISK 07, RISK 11, WRG 01
Kimla Mcdonald	April 2, 2013	According to Mr. Homer-Dixon, a joule, or unit of energy, invested in extracting and processing bitumen returns only four to six joules in the form of crude oil. In contrast, conventional oil production in North America returns about 15 joules.	CLIM 05
Kimla Mcdonald	April 2, 2013	Because almost all of the input energy in tar sands production comes from fossil fuels, the process generates significantly more carbon dioxide than conventional oil production.	CLIM 05
Kimla Mcdonald	April 2, 2013	Tar sands production is one of the world’s most environmentally damaging activities. It destroys the boreal forest through surface mining and subsurface production	CU 01
Kimla Mcdonald	April 2, 2013	(It)…uses huge quantities of water from local rivers, turns it into toxic waste and dumps the contaminated water into tailing ponds that now cover nearly 70 square miles.	CU 07
Kimla Mcdonald	April 2, 2013	Also, bitumen is "junk energy.", according to Thomas Homer-Dixon, the CIGI Chair of Global Systems at the "http://www.balsillieschool.ca/"Balsillie School of International Affairsin Waterloo, Canada.	REF
Kimra Sigler	April 11, 2013	Processing and using tar sands contributes greatly to global warming.	CLIM 12
Kimra Sigler	April 11, 2013	We do not have effective clean-up methods in case of a spill.	RISK 08
Kin Hodges	March 7, 2013	[the project will] accelerate the current pace of climate change	CLIM 14
Kin Hodges	March 7, 2013	The only beneficiary of this project will be TransCanada, who will reap increased profits while the rest of the world suffers the consequences of accelerated climate change.	CLIM 14
Kin Hodges	March 7, 2013	And as the EIS states, the project will not even create an appreciable number of jobs.	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
King, Wendy E	March 19, 2013	My opposition to this pipeline project is that many of the uses of this oil, such as for powering our homes and vehicles, could be eliminated by engineering our cars, homes, and other technology users, to be so efficient that pulling in tar sands oil from Canada is unnecessary. We really need to focus on energy efficiency, before we sign off on this dirty source of oil.	ALT 02
Kingery	April 18, 2013	[Commentor reviewed SDEIS and the National Climate Assessment] - the EIS needs to pay more attention to the Climate Assessment. [the Commentor attached the "Highlights from National Climate Assessment Draft" which discusses what climage change is].	CLIM 12
Kingsbury, Inc.	March 13, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will help delivery secure and reliable energy to meet America's needs for decades.	PN 10
Kingsbury, Inc.	March 13, 2013	The pipeline will generate economic opportunity and jobs along the route, and throughout the United States. My own company has first-hand experience with the kind of economic opportunity Keystone XL will unleash by enabling continued development ofNorth America's energy resources.	SO 08, PN 01
Kira Larose	March 17, 2013	Clean energy is more than possible and is greater than the profits of any company. Please stop destroying the planet via pillage of resources and war and PLEASE help us transition to the use of the sun and the wind's replenish-able energy. The corporations can still make their precious profits with less potential to kill us all and deplete us of our precious water, trees, earth, and air.	PN 03
Kirin Furst	April 14, 2013	research in Alberta has confirmed that carcinogenic effects spread at least 50 miles from the site of tar sand oil contamination, and elsewhere in Canada, deformed fish are linked to tar sand oil contamination.	ACK
Kirk	April 18, 2013	Again and again we hear that this refined fuel will be sold abroad. Is that because it is high Sulfur fuel that America has signed an international agreement not to burn that fuel in this country? How will it look to the world community if we support selling that fuel to smaller countries that haven't signed the agreement to reduce their green house gas footprints? We are still putting that fuel into the world ecosystem. I believe Canada has agreed not to burn high sulfur fuel as well. I am sure the fuel could be refined to be a clean fuel but it would cost more than $4.00 a gallon to produce. Isn't that why it would be exported?	PN 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kirk	April 18, 2013	People have spoke about the volume of benzene that could be spilled at an undetectable rate of 2% of volume pumped. We currently have the Government trying to clean up benzene contamination from manufacturing waste from our past in this area. The amount of contamination in these cases doesn't even begin to compare to the amount of benzene we could experience from a small undetected leak on this pipe line.	RISK 15
Kirk & Ann Jacobs	March 14, 2013	Oil from Canada is already being transported by special railroad car tankers, so a working system is already in place. Keystone XL Pipeline is redundnant.	ALT 04
Kirk Erichsen	April 15, 2013	Oil sands are among the most energy intensive fossil fuels to extract and the process itself is spectacularly damaging of the waterways when the washwater shed finds its way to the rivers and streams that snake through Canada.	CU 02
Kirk Erichsen	April 15, 2013	Making matters worse, the primary buyers of these sour oils are in the far East. It has no direct correlation with "energy independence" here at home. The only source of energy right now that can fullfill those needs are natural gas as a power generation and chemical industry feedstock to renewable sources such as wind, solar, geothermal, wave and hydroelectric to name a few.	PN 02
Kirk Erichsen	April 15, 2013	A break in the pipeline has the potential to create significant risk along its entire length and if oil company response times, remediation plans and compensation payouts are any indication from past experience, this nation can ill afford it.	RISK 07
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	As well, any review should acknowledge that financial analysts and oil executives agree that the Keystone XL decision will make or break tar sands development in Canada.	ACK
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	That review [comprehensive analysis of project] should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development, …	CLIM 13
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	In the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other deadly weather events, our government should not be whitewashing the very real and disastrous effects of climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL.	CLIM 14
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	That review [comprehensive analysis of project] should include...the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States…	CU 08
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	Please reject the State Department's review and direct Secretary of State Kerry to undertake the kind of comprehensive analysis that you have long promised.	LEG 04
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	So I am deeply disappointed that your State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	LEG 04
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	As we move toward a clean energy future, it is unconscionable to encourage production of greenhouse gas spewing oil, so extremely destructive to the planet.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kirk J. Mcdonald	March 30, 2013	That review [comprehensive analysis of project] should include…the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills.	RISK 07
Kirk Jackson	April 22, 2013	Don't hide behind the excuse that if we don't use it, someone else will. That's not responsible.	ACK
Kirk Swiss	April 5, 2013	The same amount of money spent on wind turbines and solar arrays and smart grid expansion would employ at least as many, if not more, people and provide more long terms jobs while at the same time providing clean, renewable energy	SO 05
Kirk Welch	March 14, 2013	... the more important issue is that this pipe line runs the course of the Ogallala Aquifer. If and when it ruptures it will make the Exxon Valdez incident look like a day at Disney World. we cannot drink or irrigate with oil tainted water.	WRG 01
Kirsten Bransford	March 15, 2013	superior alternatives do exist to effectively meet our energy needs.	ALT 01
Kirsten Burger	April 2, 2013	Moreover, tar sands oil produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than crude oil, which would make our climate change problem worse. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that Keystone XL would increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	ACK
Kirsten Burger	April 2, 2013	Please put public health and safety first and revise your Environmental Impact Statement to include the full hazards the pipeline represents.	RISK 07
Kirsten Burger	April 2, 2013	The dangers from tar sands oil were made vividly real last Friday when thousands of barrels of tar sands oil gushed out in Arkansas, forcing residents to flee their homes. A similar accident in North Dakota spilled 21,000 gallons of oil and in one year, Keystone I, which runs from Canada through Illinois, had 14 reported leaks.	RISK 07
Kirsten Burger	April 2, 2013	The construction and operation of the pipeline would bring substantial risks to the lives and livelihoods of those living along its route and near the refineries to which the tar sands oil would be directed.	RISK 20
Kirsten Burger	April 2, 2013	As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas), several major rivers (including the Missouri, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers), and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland.	WRG 01
Kit Blumenstein	April 20, 2013	Please consider the contamination this pipeline will do to our wild life, the natural habitats to our aquifers our farm lands and to the air we breathe.	ACK
Kit Blumenstein	April 20, 2013	The jobs being used as a needed reason are temporary jobs . No more long term than any other pipeline that has been built.	SO 04
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	The United States does not need to support a project that puts so much freshwater at risk (both in Canada and in the US)	ACK
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	Tarsands interests have bullied Canadians into accepting their mining practices and continue to destroy the Boreal Forests of Canada	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	They bully landowners along the proposed route and grease the palms of politicians to smooth their way	LEG 02
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	If we allow this project we divert funds that could be invested in our clean energy future, which is a better way to gain energy security for the US.	PN 03
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	The economic benefits are not for the American public, but rather for the well-invested few from around the world.	PN 05
Kitty Fynbu	April 22, 2013	The purpose of this pipeline is to get Enbridges product to the gulf coast refineries to sell on the global market.	PN 07
Kitty Hardy	March 17, 2013	he biosphere surrounding tar-sand operations is contaminated, from air to soil, to groundwater, throughout the whole eco-system that relies on these areas for survival.	ACK
Kitty Hardy	March 17, 2013	North America cannot rely on such an unsustainable resource for it's economic well-being. … We should instead direct our attention, energy and capital towards developing renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Kitty Hardy	March 17, 2013	At a time when Obama and the nation have worked so hard in partnership to reduce these climate changing emissions over the last four years, why would you now erase those efforts with this extra dirty source of fuel?	CLIM 18
Kkaspar	April 7, 2013	I would encourage our government to focus on sustainable, clean, more environmentally friendly sources of energy.	PN 02, ALT 01
Kkaspar	April 7, 2013	I believe the pipeline is not in the United States best interest because it will harm our forests and waterways, and will increase the possibility of environmental disaster, such as oil spills.	RISK 07
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	Potential Releases, is confusing due to the use of three separate defined releases as distinct terms. Table ES 3 fails to utilize these definitions, thereby Table ES 2's accuracy is in question. By doing the math provided in the two tables and using the definition of Spill as a liquid volume of a leak that escapes any containment and enters the environment. I come up with unacceptable levels of risk to the environment as follows: Using table ES 2 4 % Large spill 42,000 to 848,000 gallons 121.6 incidents 17% Medium spills 2,100 to 42,000 gallons 516.8 incidents 79% Small spills max 2,100 Gallons 2,400. 16 incidents According to Figure ES-11: Spill Volume Distribution by Pipeline Component the majority of the spills involved some element of the pipelines or the tanks. Again I think this is unacceptable, especially in light of the fact that the new pipeline proposal is for a 36 in pipeline, when the size of the pipelines in the above tables of potential release only range from 15 to 16 inches in diameter. The larger the pipeline, the larger the potential spill and potential environmental damage done.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	"Connected actions are projects that would not be constructed or operated in the absence of the proposed Project." The three projects mentioned alone will have many impacts. the demands for electricity for the pipeline itself are too great, as are development of the The Bakken Marketlink Project.	CU 13
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	"The Contractor is required to include in submittals to Keystone a complete discussion of applicable state-specific requirements regarding oil product and hazardous materials handling that are stricter than the federal requirements, if any, to be included in Attachment I. If none, then the Contractor will clearly state that in the discussion." Coordination of State and Federal requirements need better alignment than an statement made by a contractor to KXL. This is problematic. I would hope that we have learned something from the Gulf Oil Spill, and the recent Pegasus, Mayflower, Arkansas pipeline rupture.	LEG 20
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	"The new proposed route is 509 miles shorter than the previously proposed route; however, it would be approximately 21 miles longer in Nebraska to avoid sensitive areas including the NDEQ-identified Sand Hills Region." This is very misleading as the pipeline project must be considered in total, when evaluating environmental concerns. The length of the pipeline is 3,812 miles in total.	PD 03
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keystone_Pipeline#Keystone_Pipeline	REF
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keystone_Pipeline#Keystone_Pipeline	REF
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	I find that appendix I leaves much to be desired in terms of spill response and control. Another issue related to this is trade secrets. In the event of a spill, first responders mucst know what hazards they are dealing with and there must be coordination with state agencies tasked with environmental protection and hazard materials handling.	RISK 12, RISK 05
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	ES.5.1 "Construction of the proposed Project and its connected actions could affect soil resources. Potential impacts could include, to varying degrees: "Minor route realignments, are noted as mitigation. Approximately 4,715 acres of prime farmland soil would be directly impacted by construction of the proposed pipeline. To avoid permanent impacts to these soils, topsoil in non-forested agricultural areas would be removed and stockpiled at the edge of the ROW during excavation activities and returned. " Executive Summary ES-8 March 2013 Keystone XL Project Executive Summary—Draft Supplemental EIS I think it is a matter of opinion if the is a minor thing or not, I do not consider it minor.	SOIL 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	"The primary source of groundwater impacts from the proposed Project Would be potential releases of petroleum during pipeline operation and, to a lesser degree extent spills for equipment...." (The proposed pipeline will still cross much of the Ogalla aquifer.)	WRG 01, RISK 24
Kkimberling	April 18, 2013	"...The proposed Project route would avoid surface water whenever possible; however, the proposed Project route would still cross approximately 1,073 waterbodies, including 56 perennial rivers and streams, as well as approximately 25 miles of mapped floodplains." I note that these water bodies are exempt from federal protection under the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts, this is very problematic.	WRS 01, LEG 07
Klara Zimmerman	April 16, 2013	Tar Sands is the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive way to get fuel and power, and we can do better. We need to wake up to the future of renewable energy. We've already had over 1 year of the warmest months on record and this is not a coincidence. It's time for this to stop. I urge you to reject the Keystone XL Pipeline and move forward on climate.	PN 02
KleebJ	April 18, 2013	We know that these are good jobs for families. There is no doubt about that. But what TransCanada then puts through that pipeline is not good for our families, and that is not fair. They are good jobs for two years, and then we assume the risk for the rest of our lives. And that is not okay.	PN 05
KleebJ	April 18, 2013	The water analysis in the EIS is not sufficient. There has not been a worst case scenario spill analysis on the Ogallala Aquifer, the Platte River, the Niobrara River, the countless family wells. We want to see that proper water analysis done.	RISK 02
Kleinschmidt	April 18, 2013	Our [Nebraska] eminent domain laws state that a project such as this needs to be for the public good. I ask you how this is for the public good, let alone in the national interest of our country, when this pipeline full of toxic tar sands is simply cutting open the heart of the breadbasket of America, being shipped through our country to the Gulf to be refined and shipped off on the open market.	PN 07, LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kleinschmidt	April 18, 2013	The revised route goes through a half mile of farm ground that has been in our family since 1876. My three sisters and I are the fifth generation of my family to own and farm this land. This ground sits right over the top of the Ogallala Aquifer. Our pristine water supply, which allows us to irrigate our crops, provide fresh drinking water for our livestock and for our families who live in the area. If the tar sands pipeline would be embedded in our soils, we have grave concerns of what the consequences would be when a spill occurs.	RISK 07
Klett	April 18, 2013	This is a security issue. I mean, how much -- how many billions of dollars are we spending on war making for national security and we're not securing our air and our water and our land? There are [Union workers] -- they have skills. So how about retraining? How about retraining for jobs to retrofit buildings so we're using less carbon fuels, building renewable energy, coming up with ideas for other ways to create energy, figuring out ways to live our lives where we use less energy, reclaiming our land and our water. We have so many poisoned places that need tender loving care.	SO 05
Klopping	April 18, 2013	One of the things that concerns me about these tar sands is the fact that there's - not xylene. There's benzene in it. And benzene, the threshold limit value for benzene set by the EPA is zero because benzene cannot be effectively removed from water. You can't remove to zero, it's at five parts per billion, which is very, very small. And it can't be removed. So that has a big concern.	RISK 10
Klopping	April 18, 2013	I did a little bit of math. And - - because I had a hard time putting in perspective what 830,000 barrels of oil is. 830,000 barrels of oil at 42 gallons a barrel is 34,860,000 gallons a day, 1,452,000 gallons per hour, 24,208 gallons per minute, every minute. So in round numbers, that's 25,000 gallons a minute. That's hard to put your head around. So I understand the people here in Nebraska understand football. So at 7-1/2 gallons per cubic foot, 25,000 gallons is 333,000 cubic feet every minute. If there was a breach in this pipeline from some idiot with a bomb, a tornado, whatever could possibly breach this pipeline, that's a football field every five minutes, six inches deep, if this was breached.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kneil, Thomas	April 22, 2013	Despite their claims, TransCanada has a poor safety record and a history of numerous spills/leaks. The sand and heat in the flowing bitumen is highly corrosive and the thickness of the pipe is inadequate for it.	RISK 26
Kneil, Thomas	April 22, 2013	The oil will not benefit the United States as the refined bitumen will be shipped overseas. It will provide a number of construction jobs but only a few (estimated 50) permanent jobs. We saw that in Kansas when the Keystone pipeline went through two years ago. The construction crews were not local, moved with the progression of the line and disappeared when the work was completed. There may be two people that maintain the pump stations.	SO 04
Koleszar	April 18, 2013	In essence, what was silent and is explicit justification is what is most glaringly missing to me and all of the government reports concerning this Keystone XL Pipeline. And that missing piece is beauty. So what could beauty add to the report that we don't already know? Beauty shows us the value of things beyond the numbers. What kind of dollar amount can you attribute to the place where you spent your honeymoon or the breathtaking history of that city or the people you met while you were there? Numerical analysis and market values break down when you consider the beauty of something. And we desperately need beauty in this report because so much of what is being put at risk by this pipeline is immensely beautiful, yet relatively worthless in the eyes of shareholder reports, on product move, product refined and product sold. Numerical analysis and market values break down when you consider the beauty of something. And we desperately need beauty in this report because so much of what is being put at risk by this pipeline is immensely beautiful, yet relatively worthless in the eyes of shareholder reports, on product move, product refined and product sold.	LU 02
Konen	April 18, 2013	If we spent as much money on oil companies or coal companies - on renewable energy sources - we wouldn't need to be dependent on oil. Renewables create many on-going jobs.	PN 02
Kontz, Brian J	April 22, 2013	To continue pursuing fossil fuels at the expense of a meaningful effort to move towards a clean energy economy both is a life and death threat to scores of millions of poor people around the world, and also will be a cause of American decline globally as its youth will find themselves further behind their global peers in state-of-the-art technology that is in demand.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kopecky	April 18, 2013	I think we need to put what really matters into perspective. Which ones do we need to survive and exist? Clean water and food come first in my mind before dirty oil. Dirty oil, a killer of wildlife and people by cancer, a destroyer of beautiful land. Drought across this nation last year, and it's still continuing, should have helped open everyone's eyes. Try washing, bathing or even drinking oil. Just ask the wildlife who drown in these oil spills and toxic holding ponds. Not that great.	ACK
Kopecky	April 18, 2013	The Kalamazoo River in Michigan is still being cleaned today. Will it ever be what it was? Why the hell would we want to jeopardize our land, water, animals and family? ... This pipeline and others have spilled and they will spill again.	RISK 13
Kraig And Valerie Schweiss	April 9, 2013	There are known open stress welds through which daylight shines and these pipes are being buried and will leak profusely when the oil goes through them. There will be another ARKANSAS-sized oil leak that will contaminate and poison water, crops, livestock, wildlife, and the entire environment that this SHAM of a pipeline will travel through! STOP THIS INSANITY NOW before it's too late!	RISK 23
Kris Brown	March 18, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement is an inadequate basis on which to base approval of the pipeline because it does not consider the entire life cycle of the oil that will be transported from Alberta to Galveston. It is not the carbon emissions from construction and operation of the pipeline itself that will be the death knell for large regions of our planet, but the extraction, transportation, refining and burning of the huge quantity of filthy tar sands “fuel”. An analysis of this entire process, the life cycle of this material, must be done.	CLIM 05
Kris Brown	March 18, 2013	The State Department is not doing its job of protecting Americans if allows this dirty material to be disseminated through the world, causing us to reach 450 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere, an irreversible tipping point for our climate.	CLIM 05
Kris Brown	March 18, 2013	Though the 3.19 million metric tons per year of CO2 to be emitted in operating the pipeline, annually, is not an insignificant amount, it is only a small part of the total emissions of the extraction, transportation, refining and burning process.	CLIM 12
Kris Brown	March 18, 2013	The petty mitigation measures encouraged by the EIS will do nothing to stop the damage that the life cycle of the Tar Sands oil will create.	RISK 05
Kris Emly	April 13, 2013	America needs to focus on clean and green energy.	PN 02
Kris Epley	April 22, 2013	disaster waiting to happen, particularly regarding the Ogallala Aquifer	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kris Epley	April 22, 2013	The draft environmental review of the pipeline suggests its climate impacts are limited because the project will not substantially "induce growth in the rate of extraction in the oil sands." This narrow analysis misses the mark. Researchers now say that the Alberta tar sands contain 360 to 510 billion tons of carbon — more than double that of all oil burned in human history. While only a fraction is considered economically recoverable right now, we humans are genius at finding new and better ways to dig junk out of the ground. Once the big spigot is open, TransCanada will have every incentive to milk the massive tar sands basin for all it is worth. The idea that the tar sands would get developed at the same rate without the pipeline is undercut by mainstream financial analysis and industry documents that show Keystone XL is the linchpin for tar sands expansion in the next decade. Tar sands may get to market without it, but at a slower rate and a much greater cost. For example, Canadian research and investment advisory firm Peters & Co. says moving tar sands by rail would spike costs twofold, from $7 to $11 a barrel to $15 to $20 a barrel. Some tar sands will inevitably cross the border on trains and in smaller pipelines but not at the scale permitted by Keystone XL. Only with a substantial increase in pipelines to the coasts, and with access to markets overseas, can the tar sands industry meet its eye-popping production targets — a full tripling of output in coming decades — along with the crushing blow that would deliver to our climate.	PN 06, CLIM 13
Kris Epley	April 22, 2013	This pipeline is an egregious assault on landowners rights and an environmental disaster waiting to happen particularly regarding the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Kris Farmer	March 1, 2013	[Keystone XL] also represents a move in the wrong direction in terms of shifting the worlds engery needs from non-renewable fossil fuels to greener alternatives.	PN 03
Kris Harker	March 11, 2013	Report Prepared By Contractor Hired By Owner Of Pipeline Now we are learning that this document was not prepared by any neutral government officials, but rather by a private company in the pay of the pipeline's owner. So it's hardly surprising that the statement came out strongly in favor of the pipeline.	PRO 01
Kris Herbst	April 20, 2013	The economic benefits of the pipeline have been exaggerated, and the environmental devastation of the tar sands mining where the oil originates is a crime against our environment that exacts a heavy price on our children in the form of ..., failure to slow the rate of global warming, …	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kris Herbst	April 20, 2013	The economic benefits of the pipeline have been exaggerated, and the environmental devastation of the tar sands mining where the oil originates is a crime against our environment that exacts a heavy price on our children in the form of… causing cancer deaths in native communities, and fish deformities, through massive contamination of water and air in territory protected by treaty with numerous First Nations.	CU 01
Kris Herbst	April 20, 2013	The economic benefits of the pipeline have been exaggerated, and the environmental devastation of the tar sands mining where the oil originates is a crime against our environment that exacts a heavy price on our children in the form of ruined, poisoned landscapes in Canada,…	CU 02
Kris Houg	April 22, 2013	The keystone XML pipeline our workers and their family could use the work and it would be good for our local economy	PN 10
Kris Rosvold	March 11, 2013	It is also NOT going to help us in any way as the vast majority of the oil will be shipped out of the country, while leaving the toxins and environmental poisons from processing it here!	PN 07
Krishna	April 12, 2013	few private companies is not as important as survival of human race.	ACK
Krissa Lee-Regier	April 22, 2013	Please protect our water supply by stopping the Keystone XL pipeline. The price is too high to our environment.	ACK
Krista Glosson	April 15, 2013	The drought that has developed in this region has placed an even higher value on the Ogalla Aquifer for this region. Imagine the devastating impact an oil spill such as the current one, into that aquifer would have for the south western population. There is no doubt that leaving the southwestern portion of our country without a potable water source will have impacts that our country cannot sustain.	WRG 03
Krista L. Merrihew	April 11, 2013	Government should help to support solutions that have lower environmental impact but are currently costly to the average family. Requiring new stricter “green build” guidelines, making homes, cars, and transportation more energy efficient so that we don’t need the influx of oil and truly become less dependent on foreign oil or oil in general, should be where we are putting government time and resources.	ALT 01
Krista Vogel	April 22, 2013	Water is our most precious resource, and the KXL endangers our water supply.	ACK
Krista Vogel	April 22, 2013	Carbon emissions from KXL would prove detrimental to our planet, as we stand on the edge of the climate change cliff.	CLIM 14
Kristen Bailey	April 22, 2013	if we don't stop things like this from happening, and figure out how to reach 350 ppm, we won't have a world to fix... or the world won't have us.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kristen Humphrey	April 13, 2013	We must pursue as many alternative and renewable sources of energy as possible and we must do it NOW in order to have any hope of slowing catastrophic climate change. How many more Katrinas, Sandys, droughts and floods will it take for us to realize that the human and economic toll of sticking mindlessly to a fossil fuel based economy will be our own undoing	PN 02
Kristen Thibodeau	April 17, 2013	START investing with renewable energy. The rest of the post industrial world has. Educate, create jobs in the field, research, acknowledgement of its capabilities and new technology for the United States that doesn't require this NON-Renewable product.	ALT 01
Kristen Walsh	April 22, 2013	I've seen the destruction of oil before, animals slowly dying because they cannot move or their home is black and sticky. Once this happens, there is little that can be done to help. That's why it's important to stop it before it even happens.	RISK 07
Kristi and Fred Scheele	April 22, 2013	Our ground water is a very precious commodity for sustaining life itself and to water the crops which are grown for food. Any pollution of this precious life sustaining water would be devastating to all Americans.	ACK
Kristi Farrington	April 22, 2013	It is this aquifer that supplies irrigation water to the sandhills . It is this aquifer that allows our state to have such a unique ecosystem not found anywhere else. Please dont destroy it…	ACK
Kristi Harter	April 4, 2013	Please! We have but one world to leave our children. We can no longer ignore our impact on the climate and wildlife.	CLIM 14
Kristi O'donnell	April 2, 2013	this is the PERFECT time to launch a clean energy initiative with enough gusto to get it rolling with in a couple of years. The President spoke of it in his address, the people are for it, the environment, grateful and so, let's go!	ALT 01
Kristi Stanton	April 2, 2013	We need to invest in clean energy sources so that we don't use up the earth and rape its resources. Its the right, long term strategy.	ALT 01
Kristin Erman	April 13, 2013	As this latest spill in Arkansas, and that in the Gulf, demonstrate, oil companies cannot be trusted to maintain their pipelines and to address spills in a transparent and honest manner. Nor do they have the technology and wherewithal to effectively return a damaged area to its prior state. Until they have these capabilities and assume those responsibilities, oil companies cannot be trusted with this enormous project that could possibly have such tragic ramifications.	RISK 13
Kristin Erman	April 16, 2013	The number of spills and mishaps involving oil and other toxic byproducts of our energy consumption IN JUST THE PAST 30 DAYS is more than disappointing.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kristin Forgrave	April 12, 2013	Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline. The pipeline will be incredibly destructive to the environment, and a large portion of the country would be at risk for toxic spills from the pipeline. If the pipeline rupture in Arkansas two weeks ago is any indication of how the Keystone Pipeline will fare, it simply cannot be allowed. There is a tremendous risk in a pipeline as long as the Keystone XL, and the latest Environmental Impact Statement neglects to address the risk or toxic spills.	RISK 07, PN 05
Kristin Forgrave	April 21, 2013	A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the pipeline found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants.	ACK
Kristin Galbraith Huntsinger	April 23, 2013	Supporters of the pipeline are in denial that the planet's climate and ecosystems are changing despite evidence they can see with their own eyes.	CLIM 14
Kristin Galbraith Huntsinger	April 23, 2013	Pollution from oil refining in Texas is already causing abnormally large rates of cancer and other significant health problems in communities surrounding these plants. Many of these communities are populated by the "underprivileged," those without the financial means to make you pay attention.	EJ 02
Kristin Grosskopf	April 22, 2013	When the future of our collective health and longevity requires that we seek alternative energies, constructing a pipeline to carry an even more toxic substance than has been historically used, is BACKWARDS IN ITS APPROACH!	PN 09
Kristin Harris	April 22, 2013	Join this centurys leading nations in energy reform and DONT succumb to Keystone pressure. No pipeline! Solar and win energy will create more jobs and a cleaner world for ourselves, and more importantly, our children.	SO 05
Kristin Hoffman	April 22, 2013	Its not a matter of if the pipeline will leak, but when, where and how much!	ACK
Kristin Hoffman	April 22, 2013	d start working on renewable energy. Wind generated power does not threaten our water	PN 02
Kristin Hoffman	April 22, 2013	Burying a pipeline across and over our Ogallala aquifer threatens the lifeblood of our region and all of our ecosystems.	WRG 01
Kristin Holloway	April 2, 2013	What good is a few jobs if we destroy our environment? And I don't think "clean up crew" jobs are worth it either.	PN 05
Kristin Hurley	March 20, 2013	Contrary to the biased, whitewashed report recently released by the State Department, the Keystone XL pipeline will be bad for the environment, bad for wildlife, bad for farmers and homeowners, and will do nothing to create a significant number of sustainable jobs for our economy	ACK
Kristin Williams	April 22, 2013	Running a pipeline through or near our aquifer is dangerous and damaging	WRG 01
Kristina Jacobs	April 4, 2013	Although I realize the need to focus our attention and resources on domestic production of energy, the current forms we are investing in are unstable and unethical.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kristina Jacobs	April 4, 2013	The catastrophic effects the pipeline will create will outweigh the believed benefits of this possible pipeline.	PN 05
Kristine Stone	April 14, 2013	As a country we need to do the environmentally responsible thing to keep our planet healthy. Our focus should be on renewable, clean energy solutions and not on more access to fossil fuels which only pollute our environment. Please do the right thing and focus on the long term health of both our country & the environment.	PN 02
Kristofer Barins	April 22, 2013	This pipeline is old, dirty technology that serves the short-sighted and monied interests. It's bad for America, its citizens, our planet and the environment. This pipeline will carry the most polluting petroleum to source, refine, and burn. When will we begin to structure our energy, economy, and society based on modern principles and science? Certainly not with this project; better conceived in 1913 than in 2013! Not to mention the risk of pipeline malfunctions and serving-up a prime target for any group wishing to harm our country by damaging the pipeline.	PN 05
Kristofer Johnson	April 18, 2013	The Sandhills, Ogallala aquifer, ranch lands, family farms, and remaining tallgrass prairies are the foundation of Nebraska's cultural, economic, and natural heritage. IT IS WHO WE ARE. Our identity is rooted in these places.	ACK
Kristofer Johnson	April 18, 2013	I still have yet to understand WHY a process where multiple alternatives are investigated and the BEST alignment (or combination thereof) does not apply to pipelines. Nor do I understand why TransCanada does not propose an alignment that follows their own existing pipeline in the far eastern part of the state that could be constructed on land that is already disturbed.	ALT 03
Kristofer Young, Dc	March 8, 2013	Science shows us that the Keystone project is seriously damaging to the process of climate change	CLIM 14
Kristopher Giltz	April 5, 2013	The economic implications are negative as well, piping oil from Canada to be processed in the US benefits us in NO WAY as the refined product would then be shipped to OVERSEAS MARKETS, not benefiting Americans at all.	PN 07
Kristy Schaaf	April 22, 2013	this pipeline will eventually lead to the contamination of the Ogallala Aquifer which will involve people needlessly dying.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
KruseB	April 18, 2013	Regarding pipeline safety and spills, Congress has ordered a two-year study of dilbit. And basically the report indicates that the United States is not at this time ready for more dilbit pipelines from a regulatory or safety perspective. The TransCanada Keystone Pipeline is a dilbit pipeline. The TransCanada system cannot detect less than a 2 percent leak. Pipeline capacity is to be 830,000 barrels per day. Leakage rate at 2 percent would come out to 588,000 gallons per day. Dilbit sinks, making cleanup impossible. Benzene is one of the chemicals mixed with dilbit and is highly carcinogenic in small amounts. Professor John Stansbury, associate professor of environmental water resources engineering at the University of Nebraska and instructor for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Risk Assessment Program reported that a spill in the Sandhills above the Ogallala Aquifer could dump as much as 180,000 barrels of crude oil, tainting the vast water supply in the region. Pipeline safety is a shared responsibility. According to the National Transportation and Safety Board, we have a lot of work to do before the presidential permit for the XL Pipeline can be granted. According to the NTSB, there must be a process in place to ensure facts are reported, repaired and verified. There isn't. Operators of pipelines need a verifiable procedure to notify potentially affected communities of the basic information such as the route of the pipeline, pipe diameter, operating pressure, product transported and potential radius. There isn't. Companies need to have qualification requirements subject to U.S. federal regulations for all control center staff involved in hazard liquid transmission operations. They don't. There needs to be a federal response preparedness standards stating specific pipeline response planning guidance for worst-case discharge. There aren't.	RISK 27

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
KruseB	April 18, 2013	It is still prudent that the Keystone XL Pipeline route is not located in the sandy soils and fragile soils and shallow water tables of Nebraska. The new Keystone XL alternate route still crosses these lands. These lands are not currently identified as Sandhills on some current maps, but they exist and where the alternate route is located. The new Keystone XL route that has been proposed is better than the first route. But the new route still places the Keystone XL Pipeline in the water of the Ogallala Aquifer and still crosses sandy soils and fragile soils and shallow water table areas.	WRG 06, SOIL 07
KruseJ	April 18, 2013	We question the employment and fiscal numbers in the DEQ report. The report states Keystone expects to employ approximately 270 Nebraska workers during construction or 110 average annual jobs. This looks less to be 110 average jobs for only 2-1/2 years. When the dust settles on the construction of this pending pipeline, real numbers say it will create 38 permanent jobs in America, 13 of them in Nebraska, according to this state's own DEQ report. Our observation from the first Keystone Pipeline is that once the pipeline is built, there are very few permanent jobs. Also, we observed from the first pipeline that crews brought trailer homes and well-stocked campers with them. And our communities saw very little economic impact. At best there would only be a temporary increase in economic activity as most of the construction would take place in the rural parts of Nebraska. Let's talk real jobs. U.S. Department of State is not demanding that the pipeline be made of strong U.S. steel. That would create -- indeed create significant number of jobs.	LEG 17

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
KruseJ	April 18, 2013	Let's talk real jobs. U.S. Department of State is not demanding that the pipeline be made of strong U.S. steel. That would create -- indeed create significant number of jobs. TransCanada refuses to disclose publicly where and by whom the pipe of the pipeline is manufactured. The best welders cannot make up for weak pipe made in India that is not inspected by the Pipeline and Safety Hazardous Administration. As far as we know, the pipe for the XL Pipeline has already been manufactured by the India Welspun Company, and that pipe is being stored in front of U.S. steel mills that are currently closed due to lack of business. U.S. steel worker unions have publicly opposed the XL Pipeline and have sent letters to Obama opposing the pipeline because the pipe was not manufactured here. If TransCanada can't afford to build this pipeline right using strong U.S. steel and refusing to replace the route to avoid the Sandhills region and the Ogallala Aquifer that supplies drinking water to 2 million people, then TransCanada has no business building the pipeline at all.	SO 11
KruseJ	April 18, 2013	Regarding soils and sediment, Nebraska DEQ found that potential impacts associated with operation and maintenance of the proposed pipeline include erosion, compaction, temperature effects and contamination of oil to potential leaks. We are especially concerned about the impact of blowouts in these fragile and sandy soils which are common when such soils are disturbed. We did not see this issue addressed in the evaluation.	VEG 15, SOIL 06
Ks Hanna	March 28, 2013	What do we, as Americans, get from this except a few hundred measly jobs and the constant danger of leaks which will pollute our beautiful countryside for hundreds of years??	PN 05
Ks Hanna	March 28, 2013	Why must we allow thousands of square miles of American landscape to be "rented" by the owners of the Keystone Pipeline who will ship dirty tar sands oil from Canada straight out of the ports abroad?!?	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kuehl, Bruce	April 21, 2013	America is taking too many risky chances with the environment (risking environmental and public health) as it seeks to supply more crude energy to its citizens. Instead, the nation and Wisconsin (my home) should be putting its resources into renewable energy.	PN 02
Kuehn	April 18, 2013	…continued development of North American petroleum resources and an increased diversity in the source of those products is more critical than ever. Stability of the fuel supply is critical to the interest of rural Nebraska. Providing alternative stock for refineries in the PADD III region only makes common sense in a world of global markets, supply disruptions, and geopolitical unrest. The need for alternative sources to guarantee refining output critical to agricultural operations and affiliated industries is imperative.	PN 10
Kuehn	April 18, 2013	In addition, the transmission infrastructure required to serve the pumping stations along the pipeline route is being paid for by TransCanada at no cost to Nebraska ratepayers. However, our ratepayers will own the infrastructure and benefit from its construction. Grid reliability, a significant concern in energy policy locally, is a function of the transmission and distribution system in total. The expanded, modern transmission facilities constructed for this project, and paid for by Transcanada, enhances this objective. Specifically, it facilitates a conversion from 34.5 to 69 Kv, which is a significant component of the capital projects of Southern and other Nebraska public power districts over the next decade and beyond. Furthermore, the expanded transmission infrastructure placed along the current route further expands high voltage grid access into some of the most remote areas of the state, where the greatest potential for renewable energy resources are located. If renewable generation is ever to become economically feasible, expanded transmission infrastructure such as that being constructed to serve the Keystone XL pipeline will be essential.	SO 10
Kuehn	April 18, 2013	The tax base generated for local government has been estimated in excess of $1.5 billion in Nebraska. For our communities, the enhanced tax base represents more than just dollars: it is community based programs for the at risk and elderly, educational resources for our children, and a continuation of the rural lifestyle that has preserved and protected our resources for generations.	SO 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kuehn	April 18, 2013	For residential, commercial, and irrigation customers of Nebraska's public power system the Keystone XL pipeline could have a significant impact on electric rates in the local districts impacted. A high load-factor service with low fixed costs effectively distributes the revenue from kWh sales to offset system overhead expenses for customers in the entire district, applying downward pressure on electric rates for all customers in the public power system, the standard in Nebraska. For consumers, irrigators, and our commercial customers, most of whom are agriculture associated industries such as biofuels, this provides a positive economic impact in both the short and long term, especially in light of the progressive upward trend in electric rates.	SO 10, PD 08
Kunstel Ingrid Carper	April 5, 2013	The disaster with the oil spill in Arkansas demonstrates graphically what can happen with a pipeline. This scenario, if Keystone goes through, could be happening all over the United States at various times, destroying our environment and endangering our health	RISK 07
Kurt Gleichman	April 9, 2013	Citizens across the country are becoming more and more frustrated with the literal loss of the peoples voice in our government. As industry gets bigger and bigger, their financial power that has a stranglehold on our lawmakers, regulators, and media, is encroaching on not only the disenfranchised, but now into all communities. Such encroachment is unacceptable at any level, and that is why we are asking our leaders to have the backbone to stand up against an economy based on exploitive practices, and lead the nation and world down a path where the economy is based on preservation. This is the legacy our current leaders must leave for the sake of a livable future for our children.	ACK
Kurt Kessler	April 10, 2013	I also believe that we - the world - will consume the Canadian oil in question. I think the most environmentally responsible way to accomplish this is to transport by pipeline - the safest & least impactful way. I also believe the oil should be refined in the USA - with the domestic refining industry's good safety & environmental record. I believe this combination is the low impact alternative (vs shipping other ways &/or refining in other places). Besides that, consider the value of securing a safe & steady supply of oil from a friendly neighbor, and finally consider the jobs, wages & taxes that the project will contribute to both private & public sector.	PN 10
Kyla Zehr	April 22, 2013	Lets put the $$ towards finding ways to decrease our use of oil.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kylar Engelmann	April 14, 2013	It is unacceptable that we are expanding pipelines instead of investing in alternative energy.	PN 03
Kylar Engelmann	April 14, 2013	We must stop the Keystone XL to prevent yet another large-scale oil spill that will greatly impact our country and the environment.	RISK 07
Kyle Bartowitz	April 22, 2013	My perspective is that a proper monitoring protocol should be in place for these underground/underwater sections, as the effects of such a leak would be that much harder to see.	RISK 19
Kyle Berghold	March 14, 2013	Although, I am not keen on how important wetlands are to Nebraska and its watershed, I do understand how adding pressures to an ecosystem can dramatically change the environment.	ACK
Kyle Berghold	March 14, 2013	…the pipeline's route will run through large amounts of wildlife habitat. Not only does the pipeline directly fragment wildlife populations, approximately 120 acres of wetlands would be destroyed. Fragmentation of environments increases animals tolerant of the change likelihood of survival. As these organisms increase in number, species diversity will lower.	WI 22
Kyle Jones	March 20, 2013	Im sure you know that people with vested interests played a part in writing the report on the environmental impacts of using tar sands oil and pumping it through out country. They will minimize the dangers and moral wrongness of this venture.	ACK
Kyle Jones	March 20, 2013	Please invest in clean energy rather than dirty energy that may be cheaper now but will be detrimental to our posterity and all other life on the planet.	ALT 01
Kyle Kalinich	April 22, 2013	Keystone would create a very small number of permanent jobs while materially increasing CO2 emissions. It would be of very little benefit the U.S. economy, though it would enrich a few. It would do nothing for our national security.	PN 05
Kyle Kelley	April 22, 2013	The government and the company that would be installing/controlling this pipeline would not control the piping flow or safety of the situation up to the standard that should be required.	PD 05
Kyle Mcadam	March 24, 2013	Tar Sands Oil is a caustic substance that most likely eat a hole threw the pipeline and leak onto the ground eventuall contaminating the Ogalla Aquifer.	RISK 14
Kyle Mcadam	April 4, 2013	A proper EIS needs to be conducted addressing the items previously listed. As, I stated earlier, Keystone XL is not safe and should be rejected but at a minimum must be rejected until a proper EIS is conducted.	LEG 04
Kyle Mcgaa	April 3, 2013	You are breaking the laws your forefathers and their congress has agreed to (and no congress since has struck down) with the people of the land in question- the Lakota (Sioux) and other plains tribes. Do not disrespect their American oath and respect for private or Tribal property- there is no more "eminent domain" here -	CR 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kyle Mcgovern	April 7, 2013	….ar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	PN 04, CLIM 14
Kyle Mcgovern	April 7, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation.	RISK 26
Kyle Mcgovern	April 7, 2013	Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water,	WRG 01
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	A KXL rejection preserves American Sovereignty. Canadian Corporations should not be permitted to strong-arm their way through American public issues.	ACK
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	The growing implications: Canadian Corporations are apparently able to unilaterally dictate United States energy policy in an environment where climate policy has heretofore been almost nonexistent.	ACK
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	You owe my daughters a clean world where farmers can dependably conduct agriculture sufficient to feed 7 billion.	ACK
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	A KXL rejection helps keep the cost of oil high, embodying the single most effective type of action for combating climate change. Even if it is only incremental, it is the right thing to do.	CLIM 18
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	A KXL rejection is powerfully symbolic and validates the consistency of the administration's climate policy moving forward.	CLIM 18
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	A KXL rejection sets new precedent: It is OK to take actions that make oil more expensive.	CLIM 18
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	Throughout the planned route for the Keystone XL, from North Dakota all the way to Texas, Transcanada Corporation has exercised the U.S. Constitutional provision of eminent domain to seize/condemn property of United States Citizens. The Canadian Corporation has simply taken with impunity Americans' property that it wanted.	LEG 02
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	Pipelines are not that difficult to build. If this ever legitimately becomes about national security...we can just finish the pipeline later. Clearly right now, however, this pipeline jeopardizes food security and national security by promoting an oil-dependent culture.	PN 05
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	If completing the KXL must by default lower the cost of getting heavy Alberta oil to market, then rejecting the KXL must by default make Alberta oil (and Texas refined oil) more expensive.	PN 06
Kyle Sager	March 1, 2013	This Keystone XL battle is all about reducing cost of Alberta tar sands product, making that tar sand oil more marketable.	PN 06
Kylee Peterson	April 4, 2013	We need to get away from oil immediately. There's still time to mitigate and even reverse our climate disaster, but we must invest and innovate in green energy, not in dangerous, polluting oil pipelines.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Kylee Peterson	April 4, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would increase our carbon emissions, which are already far too high to preserve our climate in its current state.	CLIM 14
Kyoshi Bryant	April 2, 2013	[The SEIS] should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development, the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States, and the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills. As well, any review should acknowledge that financial analysts and oil executives agree that the Keystone XL decision will make or break tar sands development in Canada.	PN 11, CU 04, RISK 07
Kyoshi Bryant	April 2, 2013	If the pipe were to burst -- even if it's up keep is daily, the 'if' is still there. If the possibility is there and is of extreme consequence, why would it even be considered?	RISK 07
Kyra Shair	April 4, 2013	The Impact Statement that you are currently buying into was written by an oil industry insider, hand picked by Transcanada, for goodness sake!!!	PRO 01
L Anderson	March 14, 2013	It is time, rather, to admit that the initial costs of implementing new, clean technology are outweighed by future savings.	PN 02
L Dodd	April 18, 2013	How many more spills need to happen before you understand the very real risks this pipeline poses to the environment -- even without the impetus of a terrorist act?	RISK 07
L Sherburne	March 20, 2013	Jobs will be few and short lived at best.	SO 04
L Sherburne	March 20, 2013	let's look at this pipeline. How can it not cause big changes in our eco system. If not on the way, the negative impact it will have on the refining process will be devastate our environment. We will ruin our sea coast the toxic residue that will be left behind	WI 21
L. David Smith	April 21, 2013	First, oil extraction from tar sands and its processing entails the destruction of large tracts of boreal forest and the use and contamination of unconscionable amounts of water and energy.	ACK
L. David Smith	April 21, 2013	Third, extraction and combustion of tar sands oil contributes significantly more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere than does conventional oil … At a time when we need to dramatically reduce the amount of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, approval of this pipeline would instead exacerbate the problem. … We have already surpassed the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere deemed ‘safe’ and should be doing everything in our power to stem additional contributions. I read scientific paper after paper describing degradation of ecosystems attributed to changing climate - from coral reefs to arctic tundra, from agricultural lands to temperate forests – and I have seen changes firsthand. Many of these alterations will take decades or centuries to reverse, but at some point, we will exceed the capacity of most ecosystems to recover.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
L. David Smith	April 21, 2013	The conclusions of the State Department's Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) - that the Keystone XL pipeline will have negligible impact on climate change and pose little environmental risk - defy logic and common-sense…. The SEIS finding that CO2 contribution from the Keystone XL oil would contribute less than 1% of global amounts from human sources is a deplorable example of statistical flimflammery.	CLIM 13
L. David Smith	April 21, 2013	people's property rights are being violated; their health is put at risk; … Arguments that the government is putting the environment ahead of the economy; that we risk alienating our neighbor Canada by rejecting the pipeline; and that we are sacrificing an opportunity for energy independence are specious. The number of permanent jobs projected from building this pipeline is relatively few; the current Canadian government and its oil industry may be angered, but many Canadians, including First Nations peoples oppose tar sands development; and the oil will be exported and thus do little to meet U.S. energy demand.	PN 05
L. David Smith	April 21, 2013	transportation of this particularly abrasive form of oil through pipelines is inherently unsafe. The integrity of the pipelines cannot be assured, as has been demonstrated by recent oil spills in the Kalamazoo River and in Arkansas. As such, farmland, neighborhoods, groundwater supplies, rivers, lakes and aquifers are all at risk of contamination.	RISK 13
L. F. & Carole Warneke	April 20, 2013	We don't need it, we don't want it and it is bad for humanity.	ACK
LA	April 22, 2013	As of today the Yellowstone River is full of oil from a leak. This was one of the most pristine rivers. Arkansas is a mess.	WRS 09, RISK 13
Lacey Wozny	April 22, 2013	I implore you to consider redirecting funds that used to go to big oil/gas/coal from these destructive cycles to constructive, non-fossil fuel alternatives such as wind and solar. The massive overhaul of the energy industries through internal education and retraining as well as the creation of new innovative researchers and workers to design and implement solar/wind infrastructure, storage, etc. could be a win-win-win for those already in the energy industry, for the qualified unemployed and for the environment.	PN 02
Lagaly, Brittany	April 22, 2013	There is no effective cleanup process for bitumen; and conventional oil cleanup does not work as evidenced by the ongoing process in Kalamazoo Michigan more than 2 1/2 years later and the ongoing process in Mayflower Arkansas	RISK 05
Lagaly, Brittany	April 22, 2013	The corrosive solvents exposed by the bitumen rupture in Mayflower Arkansas rendered the air toxic to the residents requiring evacuations. The effects of the poisons on the land, wildlife and water will be ongoing for an unknown period of time.	RISK 12, RISK 10, RISK 30

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laird Norgeot	April 21, 2013	A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the pipeline found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants.	ACK
Laird Norgeot	April 21, 2013	I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact.	CLIM 12
Lamar Inners	March 12, 2013	put our energy and resources immediately into the development and implementation of renewable sources of energy	PN 02
Lamont J. Richards	April 22, 2013	We cant risk polluting the Ogallala Aquifer by allowing any piplines to cross Nebrask	WRG 01
Lan Richart	April 22, 2013	Now is the time to focus on energy conservation and efficiency and redirect our investments toward the growing renewable energy industry.	PN 03, ALT 02
Lana Touchstone	April 19, 2013	The pipeline would put the water supply of millions of americans at risk. The spill in Arkansas an example of a risk that we would be allowing.	RISK 13
Lana Young	April 22, 2013	The company has yet (Keystone) has given no plans for fixing any pipe that may rupture and contaminate our water source	RISK 08
Lana Young	April 22, 2013	Please stop Keystone from building "their" pipeline under the Ogallala Aquifer under our main source of fresh drinking water	WRG 01
Lana Young	April 22, 2013	Please stop Keystone from building "their" pipeline under the Ogallala Aquifer under our main source of fresh drinking water. The company has yet (Keystone) has given no plans for fixing any pipe that may rupture and contaminate our water source. They have politically ignored the question or have given untruths about what they could do if it would happen. In our history with pipelines it is not "if" they will rupture it is "WHEN" they will rupture that concerns me most.	WRG 01
Landra White	March 11, 2013	The oil is not even intended for domestic use - but to be shipped overseas! We should not endanger our climate for anyone - and the 'selling point' that it will reduce our dependency on.foreign oil is not even true!	PN 04
Landry Wildwind	April 11, 2013	The fact is, the XL Pipeline is being pushed so hard because it's the single most profitable way to export dirty fuel to China. Not building it will result in far less tar sands oil being recovered, refined and used. At every stage, the tar sands oil brings extreme environmental cost and risk. Please resist all pressure to approve it!	PN 07
Lane	April 18, 2013	I have worked in Mayflower over the last two weeks very closely to the spill...The fact is that this type of oil is so toxic that one drop of it in an Olympic size swimming pool is above the health standard. There have been numerous misleading statements both by the Department of Health and Exxon and EPA Region 6 that have led residents to believe they are not at risk when in fact they are being chronically exposed to toxins that are known carcinogens and cancer-causing agents, and they are being put at risk for both short and long-term effects from exposure.	RISK 30, RISK 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lang Elizabeth Lloveras	April 4, 2013	the Keystone pipeline will not contribute even one drop of usable oil to lessen our dependence on foreign fuel sources, that all of this horribly polluted oil is destined for Asia,	PN 07
Langan	April 18, 2013	We've heard many stories today about this special place, this heartland of America. There is one more very special thing about this place that I want to share with you, and that's that the heartland of America has another river, only this one is a river of birds and it's called the central flyway. This incredible highway in the sky is traveled by billions of birds each year as they fly north and south on that migratory flyway. And Nebraska's role in that is actually very special because if you looked at the map of North America, you see that in the winter these birds spread out across the south, across Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico and Mexico, and then they fly north. Only it's an hourglass and the skinniest part of that hourglass is in Nebraska. They spread back out. So it's just an incredible thing. And in those birds that travel here is a very special one called the Whooping Crane. This stunningly beautiful bird is a very fragile symbol of our country's dedication to saving our wildlife for future generations. From a low of 15 birds, over 60 years of investments and efforts have that number up to 250 in the migratory pathway. The photo that we're showing right here is a photo of three Whooping Cranes that was taken less than two weeks ago on the Niobrara River between Nebraska and South Dakota, less than a mile from where the current route of the -- the proposed -- current proposed route of the Keystone XL will cross. It makes no sense to be working, as we absolutely should be, for decades through our Endangered Species Act to help these majestic birds recover and then put them at risk like this for the short-term profit of very, very few. And I don't want a picture of a dead oil-soaked Whooping Crane to become the symbol of how we care about the wildlife in the central part of the country.	ACK
Langan, Marian	April 22, 2013	We do not know how to clean up diluted bitumen spills. We do not know how to get the associated chemicals out of the contaminated water. TransCanada has not created effective clean-up plans. Many areas will be so remote that it will be difficult to even get people and equipment to the sites.	RISK 08, RISK 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Langan, Marian	April 22, 2013	[Regarding whooping cranes, the SDEIS] only assesses risk related to the construction period…and the importance of the central flyway migration corridors – it does not assess what will happen when a break happens during critical migration times.	TES 07
Langan, Marian	April 22, 2013	Approximately 200 miles of the proposed pipeline route crosses through the area that 95% of these cranes are using any given year.	TES 15
Lani Ball	April 5, 2013	A pipeline through our country to export dirty oil to other nations for profit.	ACK
Lani Herner	April 13, 2013	We need to develop the keystone pipeline, in one simple sentence: " we will become energy independent" Nothing will happen if we proceed with this project. It will not affect the land, trees and wildlife.	PN 10
Lanie Craig	April 22, 2013	Tar Sands is so heavy that it sinks in water, making it almost impossible to clean up if it gets into our waterways or aquifers. Unique species, precious water supplies, and local livelihoods will be at high risk if Keystone finally goes ahead.	RISK 07
Lara Pucci	April 22, 2013	If the XL pipeline breaks across the Ogallala Aquifer, the largest underground fresh water reserve in the Midwest, then thousands/millions of people will be without clean water	WRG 01, RISK 07
Laraina Jarvis	April 22, 2013	I mean how stupid does Trans Canada thing we as US citizens are that we will ALLOW them to contaminate our wonderful Aquifer?!?!?!	ACK
Laraina Jarvis	April 22, 2013	I love our aquifer and those pipes will eventually leak due to natural erosion and then what are they going to do???	RISK 07
Laraina Jarvis	April 22, 2013	I love our aquifer and those pipes will eventually leak due to natural erosion.	RISK 14
Larissa Dehaas	April 11, 2013	As a young college student about to graduate, I am very concerned about my future. More importantly I am concerned that when I want to raise children down the road, I am going to find it hopeless for them due to the exasperated effects of climate change. Also, the increasing amount of oil spill pollution that comes extremely close to polluting the waters near by where I live.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Larissa Huge	April 22, 2013	In particular, the State Departments draft statement is wrong on these key points: 1) The Keystone XL pipeline would be responsible for massive greenhouse gas pollution, resulting in more global warming. The State Departments analysis of the climate impact of Keystone XL is flawed, as it is based on a business-as-usual scenario that would bring us to climate chaos. The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would, if approved, be responsible for at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. Read more at http://priceofoil.org/cookingthebooks/	CLIM 11
Larissa Huge	April 22, 2013	2) Keystone XL is a pipeline through America, not to it. It would do nothing to enhance so-called “energy security”; most of the oil it transports would be exported abroad. As shown in Oil Change Internationals recent report, KXL refineries already export some 60% of their products.	PN 01
Larissa Huge	April 22, 2013	3) The State Departments impact statement was written in part by contractors who have ties to oil companies and pipeline proponents. This clear conflict of interest brings the entire analysis into question.	PRO 01
Larry Ayres	March 20, 2013	[Bitumen] requires much more refining than oil to produce fuel and this refining pollutes the air and water as well as creates a huge amount of greenhouse gasses EVEN before any fuel is produced and burned, creating even more greenhouse gasses.	CLIM 12
Larry Berry	April 7, 2013	This pipeline adds zero jobs to our local economy….	SO 02
Larry Caldwell	April 22, 2013	Concerned about Sandhills cranes and other birds in the migratory path	WI 01
Larry Cunningham	April 22, 2013	Such as the actions of your administration and its State Dept. including: Not complying with numerous FOIA request, and lack of transparency (i.e. secrecy), and a very short public comment period and very limited number of public meetings in remote locations only, and the release of the very large (defective)report late on a Friday afternoon.	PRO 06
Larry Fink	April 20, 2013	If the risks to humans, human uses, and wildlife associated with the tar sand pipelines are accounted for accurately and comprehensively, the risks substantially outweigh the benefits, even before one factors in the contribution of the burning of tar sand oil to global warming.	RISK 07
Larry Fink	April 20, 2013	The probabilities of oil pipeline failures in general have been systematically underestimated by the industry, as have the significance of the consequences of a tar sand emulsion spill to surface waters, groundwaters, agricultural and aquacultural land uses, domesticated animals, lake, stream, and coastal fish and shellfish commercial and recreational uses, and wildlife and their habitats, including endangered species and their critical habitats.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Larry Fink	April 20, 2013	If the pipeline is double-lined in the vicinity of or through sensitive areas, the cost would be prohibitive. If the pipeline must be fully licensed, bonded, and insured and reinsured by insurance companies and not self-insured to obtain the required air, water, and waste permits, the start-up costs will exceed the value of the profits from the tar sand oil emulsion transported through the pipeline. Only in a world where the oil industry is allowed to socialize risks to public health and the environment can tar sand oil compete with alternative energy supplies that occupy an area equal to the physical footprint of the pipeline corridor.	RISK 14
Larry Fink	April 20, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. So arguing that only old pipelines are leaking and spilling is a misrepresentation.	RISK 26
Larry Fink	April 20, 2013	Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	WRG 01, LU 01
Larry Harlow	April 18, 2013	I believe the Keystone XL pipeline serves a great interest for my company and nationally,	PN 10
Larry Koltz	April 15, 2013	I'm a professional engineer with (44) years experience in mechanical engineering some of which included the difficult task of transporting sand. This Keystone proposal is a upcoming disaster. What can I say let's see 500,000 GALLONS!!	RISK 14
Larry L	April 11, 2013	Greenhouse gas emissions from tar sands extraction and upgrading is four to five times more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional oil. Replacing conventional crude with tar sands from the Keystone XL pipeline would release an additional 27 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent annually.	CLIM 12
Larry L	April 11, 2013	The Keystone XL would create few new jobs, and do nothing to improve our national security	PN 05
Larry L	April 11, 2013	Where is the technology to cope with and clean up [a] spill? There is no technology available to deal with this heavy, corrosive sludge and this alone should be enough to reject the XL	RISK 08
Larry L	April 11, 2013	Dr. John Stansbury of the University of Nebraska conducted the first independent analysis of the Keystone XL pipeline and found a likelihood of 1.8 spills per a year.	RISK 13
Larry L	April 11, 2013	The U.S. portion of TransCanada's Keystone One pipeline had one major and eleven minor spills in its first year of operation which opened in June 2010. Its section in Missouri was built with low quality steel from India and current stocks of XL pipeline have inferior welds which show daylight.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Larry L	April 11, 2013	If a spill happened where the pipeline crosses the Platte River…benzene--a human carcinogen--would travel unabated down the Missouri River for several hundred miles and affect the drinking water for hundreds of thousands of people in St. Joseph and Kansas City.	WRS 12
Larry Lambeth	March 21, 2013	Your prior recognition of the scientific necessity to keep global concentrations of carbon dioxide below 450 ppm should preclude the possibility of building a pipeline designed to pump 7 gigatons of carbon dioxide worth of tar sands crude over decades. Please see that the Keystone XL is NOT constructed across America.	CLIM 14
Larry Lambeth	March 21, 2013	This is incorrect and a position of those who would derive short-term profits at the expense of degrading vast ecosystems and releasing huge amounts of pollution and greenhouse gases. This Trans Canada contractor presents a worldview of a global economy inevitably dependent on dirty fossil fuels that is entirely at odds with your expressed views. The State Department cannot accept or use this report in arriving at its decision.	PN 05
Larry Lambeth	March 21, 2013	I am appalled that the recent review released by the State Department was produced by Environmental Resources Management which is associated with Trans Canada and is biased. The State Department must nullify this report which was produced by a contractor of Trans Canada and is deeply flawed. Environmental Resources Management (ERM) was paid an undisclosed amount under contract to TransCanada to write the statement, and is now an official government document. The statement estimates, and then dismisses, the pipeline□s massive carbon footprint and other environmental impacts, because, it asserts, the mining and burning of the tar sands is unstoppable.	PRO 01
Larry Lambeth	April 11, 2013	It's the most carbon-intensive source of oil on the planet. The production process alone generates three times as much global warming pollution as conventional crude oil.	CLIM 12
Larry Lambeth	April 11, 2013	We should be investing in healthy, safe renewable energy that won't harm human health, won't overheat the climate, cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 02
Larry Lambeth	April 11, 2013	Tar sands oil is thicker, more acidic and more corrosive than conventional crude. Transported under high pressure, it poses a far greater risk of leaks along the pipeline route.	RISK 11
Larry Lambeth	April 11, 2013	In addition to surface waters, the Keystone XL pipeline threatens vast underground water supplies that, once contaminated, cannot be cleaned. There's no "away" where toxic oil can go once it enters an aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Larry Machado	April 5, 2013	Keystone is not safe. Look at whats happening in Arkansas or even what happened 2 yrs ago in the kalamazoo river. The Oil industry does not have a clue in how to deal with this type of spill let alone how to clean it up	RISK 29
Larry Moller	April 22, 2013	The reroute still goes thru the aquifer	ACK
Larry Moller	April 22, 2013	I do not believe our eminent domain laws were ever meant to allow a foreign company the right to take over American owned property	LEG 02
Larry Sheets	April 11, 2013	Since this is such a costly and dangerous enterprise in the first place, why don't we just build a refinery in Canada, or near the Canadian border to refine this crud, then ship it to China or whoever wants it? Why run it through our entire country to be refined, then exported? Lunacy.	ALT 08
Larry Shepard	April 2, 2013	It is not going to help us with our energy needs as it contains too many other materials that need to be refined out before it can be turned into engine fuels. Our EPA would not allow for its refining in the US, so they are shipping it elsewhere, to places that do not have such laws to protect their people.	PN 07
Larry W	April 15, 2013	The deleterious environmental effects are obvious; increased co2 release and environmental damage in Canada; increased environmental risk for rivers and aquifers in the US; greater consumption of energy and release of co2 in pursuit of increasing marginal hydrocarbon resources. Burning more carbon to extract more carbon, and therefore releasing lots more carbon into the atmosphere and planetary environment.	CLIM 14
Larry Weixelman	April 22, 2013	Water must be available in abundant quantity for a variety of reasons, but listing a few would include…. Potable water for drinking, cooking and healthcare Public health requirements for human waste management and hygiene Irrigation for farming and food production Recreational uses that generate tourism, trade and sporting events.	ACK
LaRue Wunderlich	April 22, 2013	It is much more important to protect water, particularly in Nebraska. It is our coal, oil, ocean, mountains, beach and playground. It sustains our state like no other resource. It is more valuable than any other resource to our state and its citizens. It should not be sacrificed to another country or corporation, foreign or domestic. It should be protected above other resources because it cannot be replaced, replicated or reproduced. Human, animal life can not exist without it, even armies can not act without it	ACK
Launa Nashlund-jones	April 18, 2013	You should work toward clean solutions and technology instead of old carbon based outdated ways that are killing our earth!	PN 02
Laura Baring-gould	April 11, 2013	This pipeline effort is simply not sustainable, nor is an effective job creation effort in this country.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laura Behenna	April 22, 2013	We have barely begun to explore the potential of energy conservation, localized energy production, localized business opportunities, and fossil-free energy sources. Our economy and culture will not fall apart if we reject KXL, as we should. Closing the door to KXL will propel us toward opening other doors that hold promise of growing our economy gently, with measured consideration of the consequences both short- and long-term.	PN 03
Laura Belin	April 21, 2013	...the U.S. needs to take action against climate change. Tar sands oil is among the dirtiest fuel sources, and blocking the Keystone XL pipeline is crucial to keeping the tar sands in the ground.	CLIM 18
Laura Belin	April 21, 2013	...independent analysis suggests that Keystone XL proponents greatly exaggerate the number of jobs this project would create.	SO 02
Laura Brown	March 17, 2013	We need to focus on clean energy (wind, solar, etc.) not force dirty oil through our environment to be shipped to other lands.	ALT 01
Laura Brown	March 17, 2013	The oil industry has shown they don't know how to ensure the safety and prevent spills. The oil that will be spilled is some of the dirtiest oil there is. The idea of that oil getting into one of the most important fresh water aquifer is very disturbing	RISK 24, RISK 14, WRG 01
Laura Campbell	April 22, 2013	I do not believe that the XL pipeline is safe, regardless of the re-directed route. The route still passes over critical aquifer lands.	WRG 01
Laura Cromwell	March 10, 2013	We don't need this pipeline. In fact, we can't afford it as a planet. It is time to stop acting in the interests of huge dirty energy companies and against the interests of every living being on earth, It is suicidal to keep up this behavior. We have to recognize climate change as real, and as brought on by this very kind of activity, and stop it! Reject the Keystone XL.	PN 02
Laura Fisher Semerad	April 22, 2013	I worry about the fresh water flowing through the aquifer.	ACK
Laura Fisher Semerad	April 22, 2013	This is an export pipeline. It creates very few jobs……..	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laura Fortney	April 22, 2013	My family owns land in central Nebraska. I grew up on a farm and have developed an intimate relationship with the aquifer. We use it for watering crops and the family garden, washing dishes and doing laundry, and most of all, we use it for drinking. I've been around the country – around the world – and I will tell you, there is no better-tasting water than the Ogallala's. And all you have to do is go to the tap. Many places in this great country do not have access to good quality water. It is inconceivable to me that anyone would want to play Russian roulette with such a massive fresh water supply. Because as we've seen, around the world and most recently in Arkansas, it's not a matter of if – it's a matter of when that enormous pipe leaks. The Ogallala Aquifer is so delicate and precious – it supplies water to countless people, plants, animals, homes, farms, and ranches.	WRG 01
Laura King	April 11, 2013	puts future generations at risk from its effects,	PN 05
Laura Kirton	April 5, 2013	You're bringing Canadian tar sands through the American heartland, to be processed for exportation. Sure, a few jobs will be created, but only Big Oil will truly profit, once again at the expense of the average American.	PN 05
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	Keystone XL will contribute dramatically to climate change… The production process alone generates three times as much global warming pollution as conventional crude oil.	CLIM 12
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas-intensive than conventional fuel.	CLIM 12
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions. We should be investing in healthy, safe renewable energy that won't harm human health, won't overheat the climate, cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 03
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline threatens vast underground water supplies that, once contaminated, cannot be cleaned.	RISK 07
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	RISK 07
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	Tar sands oil is thicker, more acidic and more corrosive than conventional crude. Transported under high pressure, it poses a far greater risk of leaks along the pipeline route.	RISK 14
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	The pipeline poses grave dangers to America's vital water resources.	WRG 01
Laura M. Lee	April 11, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Nebraska Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer -- the reason that President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	WRG 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laura Malloy	April 22, 2013	Further, its inevitable breakdown (as all massive scale, complex systems eventually break down at some point) will lead to the release of materials known to be damaging to the cardiorespiratory system in the short run and carcinogenic, teratogenic, endocrine disruptive in the medium to long run.	RISK 30
Laura Marciniak	April 1, 2013	The route is bad, the steel is imported, the time is now to free ourselves from oil addiction.	ACK
Laura Mariski	March 10, 2013	This process uses huge quantites of water which is more valuable than the end product.We must protect our dwindling clean water supplies.	CU 07
Laura Martin	April 22, 2013	the environmental impact report is not impartial	PRO 05
Laura Meier	April 22, 2013	Keystone's own track record as regards previous spills, i.e., in Michigan's Kalamazoo River (which to date, several years later, still has not been 'cleaned up') belies this notion. Tar sands oil is the filthiest form of oil, and the pipeline's route would take it through hundreds of ecologically sensitive areas; most importantly, it will run through, or perilously close to, the largest aquifer in the country, which provides drinking water to several states. Any claim that Keystone may make to guarantee that the pipeline will be safe would be a lie. Regardless of anything that the final Environmental Impact Statement may say, there is no technology on this earth that can clean up the kind of disaster that a tar sands oils spill would cause.	RISK 29, RISK 26, WRG 01
Laura Meier	April 22, 2013	Advocates of the pipeline say that it will create thousands of American jobs. This is a lie. While it may create a certain number of temporary jobs in the construction stage, fewer than 50 permanent jobs will be created. Advocates of the pipeline say that, once the pipeline is finished and the tar sands oil is refined, it will provide the U.S. with a plentiful supply of oil, lowering oil prices and lessening our dependency on "foreign", i.e., "Middle Eastern" oil. They say that because of this, our "national security'" will be enhanced. This is a lie. The tar sands oil, once refined, will be sold on the world market, not directly to the U.S.	SO 02, PN 01
Laura Michaels	April 15, 2013	This pipeline would be a tangible, visible, and inevitably expensive, ugly and dirty reminder to future generations of America's choice to stay mired in the past, going to any lengths to stay in a petroleum-based economy rather than invest the time, energy and dedication to the health and wealth which are inherent in the exploration of renewables. Canada's decision to extract tarsand petroleum makes Canada appear desperate and willing to sell-out their natural heritage in a craven attempt to feed off a dying industry. America's investment in the Keystone XL would do the same. Saudi Arabia invests in renewables more so than oil! We need a forward-thinking approach not a septic tank hovering over our bread basket.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laura Parker	March 10, 2013	Where is the promise that this "wonderful" tar sands petrol is going to be refined and sold in the U.S. anyway? NOT This petrol, after coming through the U.S. is going straight on to cargo tankers (another environmental disaster) and going to be bound for Europe to be sold there. All of this propaganda about U.S. Energy Independence is TOTAL NONSENSE!	PN 04
Laura Paul	March 29, 2013	Look at the spills that have just happened this week! Is this what you want for your children's lives?!	RISK 14
Laura Solkey	April 22, 2013	The pipeline is NOT worth the risks that come with it!	PN 05
Laura Solkey	April 22, 2013	This pipeline is NOT worth all the risks that come with it.	PN 05
Laura Strong	April 11, 2013	We need to address global warming and change our energy emphasis to clean energy alternatives!	PN 02
Laura Walsh	March 19, 2013	We need to subsidize clean alternatives to coal and oil more than minimally. Coal and oil have gotten big boosts in the past from subsidies and we should now turn our focus on solar, wind, and other forms of cleaner energy. It is time to get serious about climate change and environmental pollution.	PN 02
Laura White	April 11, 2013	An honest look at this situation will show the need for a different course of action. Thank you.	ACK
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would accelerate climate change through increased extraction, refining and consumption of the world's dirtiest fossil fuel.	CLIM 05
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	... "An average tree in the boreal forest will absorb about a tonne of carbon dioxide over its lifetime. Trees in the boreal forest also produce a large amount of oxygen especially during the spring and summer when the trees are vigorously growing. During this time the amount of oxygen in the atmosphere around the world increases and the level of carbon dioxide drops." The Boreal Forest: Helping The Earth Breathe, Newsline, 2/22/2007; posted at http://www.environment.gov.sk.ca/Default.aspx?DN=473fa63a-7805-468e-9bd4-2ea9c5243abb	CLIM 06
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	As reported by Oil Change International in “Cooking the Books: How The State Department Analysis Ignores the True Climate Impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline,” [the Keystone XL Pipeline] would result in emission of at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent each year.	CLIM 11
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	ExxonMobil's declaration that the oil industry "will not" leave 55% of proven reserves in the ground is no basis for making public policy decisions, especially after the International Energy Association acknowledged in its 2012 annual report World Energy Outlook that "[n]o more than one-third of proven reserves of fossil fuels can be consumed prior to 2050 if the world is to achieve the 2 °C goal."	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	The draft [SEIS misrepresents] the extent of consultation with tribes along the proposed route of the pipeline. I urge you to engage in genuine consultation with entire tribal councils, and to reflect their collective feedback in your reporting.	CR 01
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	The plan would also involve destruction or fragmentation of nearly 35 million acres of boreal forest, [which] not only affects watersheds and eliminates critical habitats, it also affects climate change.	CU 01, CLIM 06
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	The State Department should conduct or contract out for an objective assessment of the how the proposed pipeline would affect the national interest, this time based on scientific evidence rather than industry-proclaimed inevitabilities.	PRO 01
Laura Ziegler	April 17, 2013	[There would be] the inevitable spills associated with 2000 miles of [Keystone XL] pipeline carrying 900,000 a day of caustic diluted bitumen.	RISK 14
Laurel Felber	April 9, 2013	Tar sands are difficult if not impossible to clean. The recent spill in Arkansas is an example of this. The spill in Kalamazoo was the most expensive spill in the state's history. Are the risks worth the benifits? I say "No" to this project.	RISK 29
Laurel Lindewall	April 9, 2013	I find it hard to believe that YOU believe this report. Perhaps the State Dept. buraucracy is responsible for this bad work, and if this is true, you must fix it, so a tar sands disaster doesn't happen on your watch!	ACK
Laurel Masengarb	March 11, 2013	This is totally irresponsible and unnecessary. Will only create temporary jobs and will destory the US land for profit of other countries. Foolishness!!!	PN 05
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	We in no way profit from the oil. We are the refiners of choice, further sickening our children at the Gulf of Mexico and other refineries.	ACK
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	Our resources should be used to further develop sources of clean energy for our kids' futures	ALT 01
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	Our planet could die from this exploitation of this dangerous tar sand substance.	CLIM 14
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	It carries heavy and dirty oil and must be mixed with unknown chemicals to traverse the pipeline	PD 04
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	Our participation only encourages Canada to continue to mine this dangerous substance, tar sands. Environmental scientists have called this mining a global catastrophe.	PN 05
Lauren Bouche	March 29, 2013	The pipeline will inevitably leak, which could and probably will cause health hazards to Americans and environmental disasters.	RISK 07
Lauren Campbell	March 6, 2013	Look at the cancer in children near fracking sites, the water that burns and no government agency is doing anything about it	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lauren Dapena	April 22, 2013	I beg you to not allow TransCanada to ruin drinking water for all future generations just so that they can save some money. The companys record alone should be enough to make one realize this company has no regard for anything other than profit and is not to be trusted. None of the people making these decisions have a stake in this endeavor. Environmental impact studies presented were wholly inadequate. It appears that not even a worst-case spill scenario was contemplated.	PD 05
Lauren Davis	April 22, 2013	Even the new route is too close to the beautiful, fragile Sandhills. In our current extreme drought the risk to the aquifer is unacceptably high.	ACK
Lauren Davis	April 22, 2013	Not many jobs will be created and the oil will be exported.	PN 07
Lauren Hess	April 8, 2013	Our ground water is precious and disappearing - it is in fact more valuable than oil. The oil companies have not done a good job of cleaning up previous spills of tar sands oil and we cannot continue to have major spills when there doesn't seem to be a good way to reclaim the polluted water.	RISK 08
Lauren Hess	April 22, 2013	The tar sands oil is dirty, requires lots of fossil fuels to be processed, nasty spills along the route are inevitable and the oil from the tar sands would be shipped abroad, all to benefit a Canadian company. This is a lose/lose project for the great majority of the world's people.	PN 07
Lauren Lafauci	April 5, 2013	I worked on rehabilitating oiled birds after the Cosco Busan oil spill in San Francisco Bay in 2007. I took time off from my job and commuted four hours round-trip to the avian hospital of the International Bird Rescue Research Center (IBRRC) in Fairfield, CA. Sometimes I slept inside the facility and woke up with the birds in the morning. I did this for most of November and December of that year. I was motivated to do this work by an image of an oiled egret on the SF Peninsula. I knew where the marshland was where that bird was. I had hiked there. These were animals in my community. They were dying because of my and my country's addiction to oil. I felt responsible. The only way to begin to repair this damage was to live with these birds, to see what we did, to try to make each bird's life a little better. I've seen first-hand what an oil spill can do. I've watched over and over again, since 2007, as our oil companies polluted our precious land and water: BP in the Gulf, Enbridge in Kalamazoo, Exxon in Mayflower. Enough is enough.	ACK
Lauren Porosoff	April 18, 2013	The spill in Arkansas is only the latest evidence that KXL would be a toxic nightmare for the United States, and it would put more carbon in the atmosphere and would violate treaties with Native American nations.	RISK 14, CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lauren Scharf	April 20, 2013	we do need to consider future generations and the kind of existence we want for them. That means a serious, focussed search for alternative sources of energy, and a unified effort--devoid of personal greed--to protect this planet and allow life to flourish here for millenia to come.	PN 02
Lauren Virshup	April 19, 2013	Keystone XL will not solve our energy problems, but it will create divisions in society as we learn how corporations use and discard us.	ACK
Laurence Risser	March 18, 2013	In promoting the Keystone project Trans Canada has been nothing short of brutal, bullying landowners with threats of eminent domain claims if they failed to promptly accept an offer, denial of access by journalists, tasering of protesters, and aggressive spending on lobbying of local officials.	LEG 02
Laurence Risser	March 18, 2013	The EIS assessments have been plagued with conflict of interest, the first with Card no Entrix and the current one written by industry consultants with an interest in the project.	PRO 01
Laurence Risser	March 18, 2013	Bold Nebraska - New Article Archive, 15 October 2012 TransCanada: Extreme Energy, Extreme Force, Extreme Silencing of Americans Author: Jane Kleeb	REF
Laurence Risser	March 18, 2013	Tar sands pose a much higher risk in its production and transport than any other energy source. (Unlike crude oil or natural gas) tar sands is highly corrosive, acidic, and unstable, yet pipelines with tar sands carry no higher required safety standards than other pipelines.	RISK 14
Laurie	April 5, 2013	why aren't you creating energy from the sun, wind and Tesla research?	ALT 01
Laurie Adams	April 16, 2013	It is time to invest in renewable energy....alternative sustainable energy options.	PN 02
Laurie Buckley	March 28, 2013	we should not be putting our soils and waters in jeopardy for an oil pipeline that is not serving us.	RISK 07
Laurie Churchill	April 21, 2013	Please say NO to the foreign private company that will risk the contamination of our precious, pristine water supply.	ACK
Laurie Johnson	April 22, 2013	Keystone told me that if they have a leak, they will know about it within 3 hours! With 1800 pounds of pressure - my family will be dead by then.	RISK 14
Laurie Obbink	April 10, 2013	As a native Nebraskan, I am keenly aware of the risk the pipeline poses to vital water supplies in the Ogallala Aquifer. Dare we entrust this resource to oil companies?	RISK 07
Laurie O'loughlin	March 16, 2013	[Climate change- KXL is a] deterrent to the cause of protecting our planet and slowing the carbon effects on climate change.	CLIM 14
Laurie Pullen-johnson	April 19, 2013	Risking the pollution of aquifers is short-sighted. We need to make the production of wind and solar energy a higher priority.	PN 02
Laurie Wise	April 22, 2013	Building the Keystone XL will directly impact the expansion of tar sands, and in turn speed up climate change.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Laurie Wise	April 22, 2013	The KXL route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department.	CR 02
Laurie Wise	April 22, 2013	According to many reputable sources and TransCanada themselves, the Keystone XL will NOT provide "energy security." The oil is destined for export and we will not see lower gas prices.	PN 01
Laurie Wodin	April 9, 2013	MOST IMPORTANTLY, UNTIL THERE IS A METHOD FOR CLEANING UP THIS OIL, IT SHOULDN'T BE SHIPPED	RISK 08
Laurie Wodin	April 9, 2013	Even this biased report admits there will be very few temporary jobs created.	SO 04
LaVonne Beck	April 22, 2013	We can not drink the poisons that will go into out land, neither can our cattle.	RISK 07
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013		ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	alteration of agricultural productivity resulting from climate change, including the decline in production of crops	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Altogether, the report concludes that the Keystone XL Project will increase Canadian tar sands production by a whopping 36 percent.	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	an increase in sea level rise and consequential damages to coastline communities both in the US and globally;	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	an increase in the decline of glaciers and snowpacks both in the US and globally, together with consequential impact~ on water supplies, as for example in the Sierra Nevada, drastically impacting the state of California	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	an increase in the number and intensity of heat waves, droughts, floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and other violent weather systems both in the US and globally	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	an increase in the reduction of ice present in the Arctic ocean, in Antarctica, and in Greenland, with catastrophic consequential effects on the environment in the U.S. and globally	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	an increase in wildfires, both in the US and globally	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	damage resulting from accelerated methane or other greenhouse gas (GHG) release into the atmosphere due to the melting of permafrost and other areas where methane or other GHG is trapped under ice or other formations	ACK
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	impacts on listed species from the damage to habitat caused by climate change	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS... Must..include an Alternative that describes the transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources to substitute for fossil fuels and dangerous pipelines. It does not, in violation of law. (See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a))	ALT 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	App. W unsuccessfully tries to argue, unbelievably, that the fuels produced from the Canadian tar sands will somehow result in *fewer* GHG emissions than those which would result from conventional fuels. This conclusion is wholly unfounded and is contradicted by numerous studies as well as the SEIS itself.	CLIM 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	As one illustration, note that App. W concludes, "the conventional crude production carbon intensity can be expected to trend upward, whereas the WCSB oil sands carbon intensity can be expected to be relatively flat .... " This conclusion means very little since it is framed in a manner that ignores the basic issue: whether the entire process of production and consumption of tar sands is more or less carbon-intensive than the process of production and consumption of conventional fuels.	CLIM 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives report states: " ... business as usual for the fossil fuel industry is incompatible with action to address climate change that keeps global temperature increase to 2°C or less. Even at the high end of a 20 Gt carbon budget, this would imply that 78% of Canada's proven reserves, and 89% of proven-plus-probable reserves, would need to remain underground."	CLIM 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the analysis asserts without much quantitative support that conventional fuels are becoming more energy-intensive to produce, and therefore tar sands are not more carbon-intensive to produce. Precise quantitative proof of these assertions is not offered.	CLIM 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS should have provided an analysis of the greater impacts from the exploitation of the tar sands than would occur without the Project	CLIM 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	According to...Lome Stockman (of Oil Change International), "The bitumen that would come down the Keystone XL pipeline would supply enough petcoke to fuel five coal plants. Including the emissions from this petcoke into assessments of the pipeline's climate impact means that the total emissions from the pipeline have been underestimated by the State Department in previous studies by at least 13 percent. "	CLIM 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Another glaring omission is any robust discussion of the GHG emissions that will result from the burning of pet coke	CLIM 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Just because a portion of the petroleum coke will be "stockpiled" does not mean it will never be burned. Of course it will likely be burned eventually, and in any event, to the extent that it will be burned eventually, the environmental effects of that must be identified as required by NEPA.	CLIM 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Most of App. W has little to do with the specific problem resulting from the combustion of the specific petroleum coke and other highly carbon-intensive fuels whose production, transportation and combustion will be enabled by the Project.	CLIM 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"The coke produced from Canadian oil sands crudes would be marketed the same as current coke: most of it would be exported, with China being a large importer of U.S. petroleum coke." The effects of that burning, however, will be felt in the United States, a fact ignored by this SEIS, in violation of law.	CLIM 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	This contention [that pet coke will be stockpiled] appears to be contradicted elsewhere in the document itself. " ... [T]ransporting raw or diluted bitumen to refineries in the Gulf Coast that sell coke to other markets may ... cause a greater share of the coke to be combusted rather than stockpiled (Brandt 2011)."	CLIM 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The SEIS's conclusion.. That "in 10 years it is possible that oil sands will be less energy intensive, well to wheels, than Saudi Arab Light delivered to the same Gulf Coast destination" is of no consequence to the analysis that is required under NEPA…the analysis discounts the consumption (i.e., combustion) side of the required analysis.	CLIM 10
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	…the SEIS, to summarize, fails to analyze the facts that (1) tar sands emissions are higher than conventional emissions, and (2) the Project will increase the production and consumption of tar sand fuels.	CLIM 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The CEQ regulations define "cumulative impact" as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." (40 C.F.R. § 1508.7.) Global warming constitutes an unprecedented challenge facing humanity…. The SEIS utterly fails to even consider, much less identify, mitigation or alternatives tor . countless foreseeable harms that will result from the burning of the bitumen and other filthy fuels whose exploitation is the purpose of the Keystone XL pipeline.	CLIM 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS completely fails to even consider these tipping points or these climate impacts as reasonably foreseeable direct or cumulative impacts of the Project	CLIM 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	TD, a major Canadian financial institution, has also recently warned investors that oil sands production growth cannot occur without additional pipelines out of Western Canada.	CLIM 13
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the entire analysis contained in the SEIS of GHG emissions resulting from the Project is predicated on the unfounded and erroneous premise that the Project will not result in an increase in the production of Canadian tar sands fuels.	CLIM 13
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	One Finding is that "WCSB crudes, as likely transported through the proposed Project, are on average more GHG-intensive than the crudes they would displace in the United States ....Thus, the life-cycle carbon footprint, for transportation fuels produced in U.S. refineries, would increase if the Project were approved."	CLIM 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Appendix E: Record of Consultation Table" merely lists the occurrences of meetings and communications with Native Tribes without discussing any grievances or the Tribes might have or issues presented by the Project.	CR 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Tar sands exploitation requires massive man-made toxic lakes, which have irrevocably damaged the fresh water sources for the First Nations communities living downstream from the projects	CU 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The Indigenous Environmental Network has issued a public statement addressing the inadequacy of the SEIS's treatment of environmental justice issues.	EJ 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The portion of the SEIS (3.1 0) addressing environmental justice issues unduly limits the scope of analysis to the risks from potential oil spills near the pipeline. Accordingly, the analysis merely lists relevant populations occurring within a 4-mile distance to the pipeline. (3.1 0-25 et. seq.)	EJ 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	It also ignores minority and socioeconomically disadvantaged populations who will be adversely impacted by the toxic byproducts of refining Canadian tar sands fuels carried over the Keystone pipeline. These populations will be adversely impacted by foreseeable impacts of the Project.	EJ 02
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS ignores the likelihood of harmful health effects on communities downstream from the toxic aspects of the Project, all the way to the Gulf of Mexico and to any refinery that will process materials that move through the Keystone pipeline.	EJ 02
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the toxic contamination of communities near refineries that will refine the fuels transported through the Keystone pipeline is a foreseeable environmental effect that must be evaluated in the SEIS but was not, in violation ofNEPA as well as EO 12898, among other laws.	EJ 02, CU 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS fails to "include ... a detailed statement ... on ... [numerous] adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented" in violation of 42 USC§ 4332(C)(ii).	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS fails to provide any analysis of "the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity" in violation of 42 USC § 4332(C)(iv)	LEG 04
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL Project and Canadian tar sands exploitation should be abandoned in favor of renewable energy projects	PN 02
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	without the Keystone XL pipeline, as abundant evidence already on the record shows, Canadian tar sands production will significantly decline.	PN 06
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	If [the Purpose and Need statement] were true, then there would be little or no need for the Project. TransCanada could just transport the substantial quantities of crude oil profitably under current market conditions, and it could add capacity relatively rapidly.	PN 07
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Canadian oil producers are seeking to maximize transport capacity through both pipeline and rail expansion, simultaneously: Growing conventional oil, including tight oil, and oil sands production has created an urgent need for additional transportation infrastructure. *New pipelines. Expansions to existing infrastructure and increased transportation by rail are all required to meet this need for capacity.* Pipelines continue to be the dominant mode of transportation for crude oil but it takes time for pipeline infrastructure to be built or expanded. In the short term, crude oil transport by rail will increase sharply due to the ability to use rail capacity relatively quickly and in small increments as needed and utilizing the rail infrastructure already in place.	PN 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The analysis in the SEIS assumes that rail or other transport options would be pursued only in the event the Keystone Project does not go forward. This assumption is not supported and is, instead, contradicted by the obvious intentions of the Canadian oil and gas industry to utilize every available option for transporting the fuels which it has overproduced to date.	PN 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The SEIS presents the false choice of "either pipeline or rail" knowing full well that the oil companies will pursue both, and knowing full well that rail cannot accommodate the same quantities or efficiencies as pipeline.	PN 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The way the Canadian oil producers can accomplish this rise in price is to market and transport its product in quantities as large as possible and as quickly as possible to U.S. refineries. But there is a transport bottleneck preventing this (See below.). The most efficient way to open up this bottleneck is to construct the Keystone XL pipeline. Without the Keystone XL pipeline, the Canadian oil producers will have to rely on other more restrictive modes of transport.	PN 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"ERM's second-in-command on the Keystone report, Andrew Bielakowski, had worked on three previous pipeline projects for TransCanada over seven years as an outside consultant. He also consulted on projects for ExxonMobil, BP, and ConocoPhillips, three of the Big Five oil companies that could benefit from the Keystone XL project and increased extraction of heavy crude oil taken from the Canadian tar sands."	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	According to the article, another ERM individual working on the SEIS, Dave Trudgen, has worked previously tor ExxonMobil, a company that could benefit from the Project approval. These appearances of conflict might have been excusable had they been disclosed in the SEIS process; instead, the State Dept. apparently tried to hide these conflicts or appearances of conflicts by redacting biographical information.	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Based on this limited record of disclosure [a copy of ERMS discosurestatement was included], the public cannot be assured that the contractor/authors of the SEIS have not engaged in self-dealing or would improperly benefit from the Project as described in the SEIS. Moreover, to casually delegate the authorship of the SEIS in this manner compromises the "objectivity and integrity of the [NEPA] process."	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Given that the requirements for disclosure have not been met, the presumption arises that there is a conflict of interest concerning one or more of the contractors listed in the List of Preparers. Under these circumstances, approval of the Project would violate NEPA and the Public Trust and is impermissible.	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	SEIS cites to a report by EnSys purporting to confirm, among other things, that "there would be little, if any, difference in emissions associated with crude oil refining in PADD 3 with or without the proposed Project." (SEIS, p. 4.15-75) As noted above and elsewhere, there is little reason to give any credence to a consultant who could potentially benefit from a particular outcome of the process of evaluation	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL Project was written and prepared not by the State Dept. but "by a private company in the pay of the pipeline's owner."...there must be assurances against conflicts of interest and a disclosure statement must be formalized and completed. As Judge Clarence Thomas stated for the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in Citizens Against Burlington v. Busey (938 F.2d 190 (1991)): "The regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality require that an environmental impact statement 'be prepared directly by or by a contractor selected by the lead agency.'	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The SEIS itself does not describe how it was assembled or who are its actual authors. Section 6.0, "List ofPreparers," is a brieflist (without explanation) of several entities presumably credited with co-authorship. These entities include ERM, EnSys, ICF International, Lloyd Levy Consulting LLC, and TerraQuatic LLC. Only ERM has filed a disclosure statement.	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	The SEIS should disclose the identity of the author of Appendix W so that the public can properly evaluate the credibility of this critical Section of the SEIS.	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	While there has been a disclosure statement filed with the State Department, this disclosure statement appears not to have been completed by the State Dept. and has been completed for only one of several contractors who participated in authoring the SEIS.	PRO 01
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	" Irrational Exemption: Tar sands pipeline subsidies and why they must end," by Oil Change International, et. a/., May 2012, found at http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/0S/Irrational-exemption_FINAL_14May12.pdf	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"A Dilbit Primer: How It's Different from Conventional Oil," by Lisa Song, lnsideCiimate News, June 26, 2012, found at http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20120626/diIbit-primer-diIuted-bitumen-convention-oiI-tar-sands-AIbertaKalamazoo-Keystone-XL-Enbridge	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Arctic Warming Favors Extreme, Prolonged Weather Events Such As Drought, Flooding, Cold Spells And Heat Waves," by Climate Guest Blogger, Think Progress, April4, 2012, found at http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/04/04/457823/arctic-warming-extreme-weather-events-drought-floodingcold-spells-and-heat-waves/	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Canada's Carbon liabilities: The Implications of Stranded Fossil Fuel Assets for Financial Markets and Pension Funds," by Marc lee and Brock Ellis, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, March, 2013, p. 6, found at http://www.policyaIternatives.ca/publications/reports/canadas-carbon-liabilities	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Critical Part of Keystone Report Done by Firms with Deep Oil Industry Ties," by Lisa Song, lnsideCiimate News, Mar 6, 2013, found at http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20130306/keystone-xl•eis-statedepartmenttranscanada-oiI-tar·sands-industry-ensys-energy-koch-brothers-exxonmobil-bp-obama	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Forty Questions," 46 Fed.Reg. at 18,031; see also Sierra Club v. Sigler, 695 F.2d 957, 963 n. 3 {5th Cir.l983)	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Global Warming's Terrifying New Math," by Bill McKibben, Rolling Stone, August 2, 2012, found at http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-20120719	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"lEN Responds to Draft Keystone XL Supplemental EIS," March 6, 2013, found at http://www.ienearth.org/ien-responds-to-draft-keystone-xl-supplemental-eis/ "Keystone XL Risks Harm To Houston Community: 'This Is Obviously Environmental Racism'", by lynne Peeples,Hufftngton Post, March 27, 2013, found at http:/ /www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/03/27 /keystone-xl-pipeline-houston-air-pollution_n_2964853.html "Climate Change and Health," Fact Sheet, National Environmental Education Foundation, found at http://www.neefusa.org/pdf/Ciimate_Change_and_Health_Fact_Sheet.pdf	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Petition Seeking Rulemaking to Address the Transportation of Diluted Bitumen Through Interstate Pipelines," by National Wildlife Federation, et. al., March 26, 2013, found at http://fwww.documentcloud.org/documents/628610-nwf-diIbit -petition-march-2013.htmI	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"Photos of KXL's Life-Threatening Weld Confirm Pipeline Opponents' Fears," Tar Sands Blockade, February 12, 2013, found at http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/shoddy-weld-on-kxl/ "State Dept. Keystone XL Contractor ERM Also Green-lighted Explosive, Faulty Peruvian Pipeline Project," by Steve Horn, DeSmog Blog, April 3, 2013, found at http:/ fwww.desmogblog.com/2013/04/03/state-dept-keystone-xl-contractor-erm-explosive-faulty-peruvianpipeline-project	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"The climate implications of the proposed Keystone XL oilsands pipeline," by Nathan Lemphers, PembinaInstitute, January 2013, found at http://www.pembina.org/pub/2407	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	40 C.F.R. § 1506.5(c). If the agency decides to contract out the work on the EIS, the agency must choose the contractor 'to avoid a conflict of interest,' and the contractor must 'execute a disclosure statement *prepared by the lead agency* … specifying that [it has] no financial or other interest in the outcome of the project.' Id" 938 F.2d 190, 201.	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, March 2013. Canada's Carbon Liabilities - The Implications of the Stranded Fossil Fuel Asets for Financial markets and Pension Funds. Marc Lee and Brock Ellis	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	CITIZEN PETITION BEFORE THE UNITED STATES UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, PIPELINE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION AND UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Federal Agencies Asked to Delay Keystone Over Pipeline Safety Issues," by Lisa Song, lnsideCiimate News, April 1, 2013, found at http:/finsideclimatenews.org/news/20130401/federal-agencies-asked-delay-keystone-over-pipeline-safety-issues	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://ecowatch.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/tarsands.jpg 32 Executive Order (EO) 12898, 59 Fed. Reg. 32 (February 16, 1994), Section 1-101. Found at http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/executive-orders/pdf/12898.pdf	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://greenpeaceblogs.org/2013/04/02/new-photos-exxon-pipeline-oiI-spiII-in-arkansas/ http://www.businessinsider.com/arkansas-exxon-pipeline-spiII-2013-4#exxon-said-in-a-statement-thatemergency-crews-were-on-the-ground-within-30-minutes-of-the-incident-3	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://grist.org/article/state-department-keystone-xl-report-actually-written-by-transcanada-contractor/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20130306/keystone-xl-eis-state-department-transcanada-oil-tarsands-industry-ensys-energy-koch-brothers-exxonmobil-bp-obama	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20130401/federal-agencies-asked-delay-keystone-over-pipelinesafety- issues	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2010/03/23/205696/greenland-ice-sheet-collapse-global-warming-science/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/02/17/207552/nsidc-thawing-permafrost-will-turn-from-carbonsink-to-source-in-mid-2020s-releasing-100-biIIion-tons-of-carbon-by-2100/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/09/28/330109/science-of-global-warming-impacts/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/09/28/330109/science-of-global-warming-impacts/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2011/09/28/330109/science-of-global-warming-impacts/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/04/494641/unprecedented-may-heat-in-greenland-temperature-hitsstunning-766f/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/06/10/496039/must-read-scientists-uncover-evidence-of-impendingtipping-point-for-earth/?mobile=nc	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/03/07/1688231/keystone-assessment-conflicts/?mobile=	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.commondreams.org/headline/2013/03/28-1	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/03%20/keystone-xl-contractor-ties-transcanada-statedepartment	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.ns.umich.edu/new/releases/21185-sunlight-stimulates-release-of-climate-warming-gas-from-meltingarctic-permafrost	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/10/opinion/game-over-for-the-climate.html?_r=1&	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2013/02/05/1214104110.full.pdf+html	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/08/29/idUS257590805720110829	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/shoddy-weld-on-kxl/	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Keysonte XL: A Tar Sands Pipelien to Increase Oil Prices. By Anthony Swift. Natural Resources Defense Council. 2012	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Pembina Institute - Backgrounder January 2013. The climate implications of the proposed Keystone XL oilsands pipeline. By Nathan Lemphers	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Petroleum Coke: The Coal Hiding in the tar Sands, Oil Change International, 2013 (Incorporated herein by reference), Executive Summary	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the "local short term use" of the exploitation of the tar sands of Canada is nowhere related to the "long-term productivity" of the Earth itself	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	without the Keystone XL pipeline, as abundant evidence already on the record shows, Canadian tar sands production will significantly decline. (See, e.g., (1) Oil Change International 2013	REF
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	"In the event of oil spill impacts to water supplies for residential, agricultural (e.g. farming, ranching, and livestock grazing on wild land), commercial, or public uses, Keystone would provide alternate sources of water for essential uses such as drinking water, irrigation and livestock watering, industrial cooling water, and water for firefighting and similar public safety services." (SEIS, p. 4.13-34 to 4.13-35) This provision by itself contains no enforcement assurance. Keystone should be required to provide this service by way of a binding contract, and approval of the Project should be conditioned on Keystone's agreement to this and similar terms.	RISK 03
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	PHMSA might have the legal authority to inspect and enforce anything, but without adequate funding this provision is of little consequence. Hence, Keystone should be required to post a bond or establish an adequate funding mechanism for any and all PHMSA activities included in the SEIS. Oil spills are of such a severe potential magnitude that the SEIS cannot simply rely on a government agency that may or may not be adequately funded to do its job.	RISK 03
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	stated by a document from Oil Change International, Earthtrack, and the Natural Resources Defense Council: " ... [t]his exemption is an unnecessary subsidy, and one that ignores the elevated risks of transporting tar sands crude oil relative to conventional crude. Logically, tar sands oil transport should be subject to a higher rate than conventional oil not exempt."	RISK 03
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Keystone agreed that if the Presidential Permit is granted, it would incorporate those conditions into the proposed Project and in its manual for operations, maintenance, and emergencies required by 49 CFR Part 195.402." (SEIS, p. 4.13-64) This provision is unacceptable for several reasons. First, there is no enforcement mechanism; it merely recites that Keystone has made a promise without any reference to any written enforceable contract.	RISK 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Require PHMSA and EPA to work with communities to put in place spill response plans and training that prepare communities to respond to the unique threats created by the movement of diluted bitumen.	RISK 05
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	it is much harder and costly to clean up than conventional oil. However, having made the unsupported claim that dilbit is no more likely to cause a spill than conventional crude, the SEIS ignores the issue of whether dilbit is harder or more costly to clean up *after* a spill.	RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	the SEIS fundamentally ignores this problem by providing, once again, voluminous information in Section 4.13 (including the unenforceable provisions of the 57 Special Conditions) without the basic information about cleaning up dilbit spills	RISK 08
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Require detailed industry reporting of what materials are being carried through pipelines and when they are being carried so that communities and responders can be instantly made aware of what material they are dealing with in the case of a spill. Information regarding the materials being carried through a pipeline, especially in the event of any spill, should be easily accessible to concerned members of the public without long delay or cumbersome process. It should also require companies to disclose the chemical composition of diluted bitumen, including the composition of any diluents used.	RISK 12
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	….it would be premature at this stage to approve a document such as this SEIS which contains a set of rules governing pipeline safety based in incomplete information and without even explicitly admitting the simple truth that dilbit is more likely to cause a spill than traditional crude oils.	RISK 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Any pipeline transport of Canadian tar sands, whether the Keystone XL or otherwise, must await an objective, independent analysis of the risks inherent in transporting dilbit through a pipeline.	RISK 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Appendix Q admits as follows: "The effects of a specific crude oil cannot be thoroughly understood without taking its composition into account." (App. Q, p. 4-1)	RISK 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	But then it states, "The precise composition of diluted bitumen and synthetic crude oil will determined by shippers and is considered proprietary information."	RISK 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Elsewhere, the SEIS states, "The exact composition of the dilbit is not publicly available because the particular type of bitumen and diluents blend produced is variable and is typically a trade secret." (SEIS, p. 3.13-4) This is unacceptable. Trade secret rules should never be a shield for oil companies to escape responsibility for toxic contamination.	RISK 14
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Issue protective new pipeline safety standards to ensure that the safety hazards involved in pipelines carrying diluted bitumen are accounted for and safety requirements are stronger than those for conventional crude.	RISK 23
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	It is of no consequence that the safety standards inthis SEIS might represent an improvement over previous standards; what is needed is assurance to the public that the highest possible standards are available. NEPA requires that the highest standards at least be identified in the SEIS.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Revise monitoring and spill prevention requirements for diluted bitumen to ensure that spill detection systems do not fail and that pipelines are shut down in the first instance of any indication of a leak or other pipeline failure, even in cases where operators suspect a safety breach may not be the cause of a possible abnormality.	RISK 23
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	Make sure that oil companies spill response plans for diluted bitumen are independently reviewed and subject to public comment.	RISK 28
Law Office of Samuel Johnston	April 22, 2013	tar sands oil producers are currently exempt from payments into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.	SO 15, RISK 03
Lawrence	April 18, 2013	"Cooking the Books: How the State Department Analysis Ignores the True Climate Impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline"	REF
Lawrence Gilmour	March 10, 2013	Many reports indicate if the tar sands of Alberta are mined, it will be the tipping point for a climate in which mankind may possibly not survive.	CLIM 14, CLIM 05
Lawrence Israel	April 2, 2013	Better alternatives like solar wind and geothermal energy are readily available and they will create more jobs and a cleaner more sustainable way to produce energy.	ALT 01
Lawrence Jacksina	April 17, 2013	Pipelines leak. Tar sands oil is dirty and polluting.	ACK
Lawrence Jacksina	April 17, 2013	Oil will flow THROUGH the U.S. for export. Who benefits? Us?	PN 07
Lawrence Jacksina	April 17, 2013	Keystone XL will provide very few permanent jobs	SO 04
Lawrence Kish	March 26, 2013	The project would resulting billions of dollars in property taxes all along the way.	PN 10
Lawrence Landwehr	April 9, 2013	I have not read State's review and thus do not comment on it. If approved, Keystone XL would set the stage for more tar sands development. Keystone XL would result in major additions to global warming. I trust that you have information sources available to you that can explain why this is true.	ACK
Lawrence Olliver	March 10, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline should simply not be built. If you meant anything that you said about your willingness to protect both the environment and address climate change, you will stop not just this pipeline, but any attempt to utilize tar sands. The Canadian people understand how destructive and dangerous this material is.	PN 08
Lawrence Panico	April 11, 2013	I am told that the tar sands oil has highly corrosive properties that are not being adequately considered in terms of the cost of pipeline maintenance and risk of spills. The extraction process is excessively destructive and consumes water at 3:1 per barrel of production. I also understand that there is a loophole that allows tar sands oil pipeline operators to avoid contributing to the oil spill reserve fund. While some of these issues may be outside of the scope of your environmental review they are obviously exacerbating factors.	RISK 11
Lawrence Rosin	March 14, 2013	Keystone Pipeline is a threat to the ground.	ACK
Lawrence Rosin	April 6, 2013	Keystone Pipeline [would] cause ground pollution.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lawrence Rosin	April 6, 2013	Keystone Pipeline [would] cause ground pollution… plants … will die from it [and] animals will have less crops to eat.	ACK
Lawrence Rosin	April 6, 2013	While I read [the Keystone Pipeline] creates some jobs, I also read that it goes through people's lands, and people lose their lands. Why should businesses lose their lands just so the oil industry can make a profit.	PN 05
Lawrence Rosin	April 20, 2013	[The pipeline] causing lots of ground pollution. People are protesting it because of the pollution it's causing. Get rid of it to end the pollution it's causing	ACK
Lawrence Shipley	April 18, 2013	The risks of surface and groundwater contamination outweigh the rewards of short term job creation.	WRG 01, PN 05
Lawrence Solorio	March 31, 2013	WHAT WE NEED is to invest in solar, wind and other climate friendly power. The days of oil are behind us	ALT 01
Leah Qusba	April 12, 2013	Your decision on Keystone XL will determine what kind of future I can make for myself - or have to deal with. So, I am asking you to follow through on your promises for bold climate action. Now is your chance. And the Keystone XL decision is all you.	ACK
LeAnn E. Thomas	April 22, 2013	[The water] will be contaminated with benzene and other chemicals from the Keystone XL tarsands pipeline leaks. (TransCanada wont really tell us all the chemicals they are using, so we cant know for sure what well be getting sick and dying from)	WRG 01, RISK 12
Leatra Harper	April 22, 2013	There is no effective cleanup process for bitumen; and conventional oil cleanup does not work as evidenced by the ongoing process in Kalamazoo Michigan more than 2 1/2 years later and the ongoing process in Mayflower Arkansas. Bitumen is not biodegradeable and is mixed with unknown toxic solvents to make it flow through pipes that are proving incapable of handling the high pressure required to "pump" the highly corrosive bitumen through them.	RISK 08
Lee	April 4, 2013	…. Step in the wrong direction for our nation’s energy needs.	ACK
Lee	April 4, 2013	Is facilitating this kind of energy pursuit really in the best long term interest of our country? I would say emphatically no….. I would love to see an aggressive program of renewable energy pursued by our great country.	ALT 01
Lee	April 4, 2013	Did you have an independent organization, i.e. one not funded by the oil companies, do the environmental impact study on this pipeline? Apparently not.	PRO 01
Lee	April 4, 2013	[KXL project does not create significant number of permanent jobs]	SO 04
Lee & Sandra Hebert	April 2, 2013	WHAT IS WRONG IN WANTING CLEAN WATER, AND THE RIGHT TO LIVE SAFELY ON OUR LAND, PERHAPS RAISING CROPS AND ANIMALS TOO?	PN 05
Lee & Sandra Hebert	April 2, 2013	AS FAR A JOB CREATION IS CONCERNED..... THE ONLY LONG TERM JOBS WILL BE FOR CLEAN UP CREWS WHEN THESE PIPES FAIL!	SO 04
Lee And Annette Anderson	March 10, 2013	http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/watkins/grandbanks.htm	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lee Bailey	April 22, 2013	Alternative energy solutions are workable, need subsidies that the fossil fuel peoples are getting. If Boeing can fix their lithium batteries, it can be done to store solar energy at night. The fossil fuel companies want deep-water drilling and dirty shale oil to build up their reserves and sell abroad for PROFIT, NOT FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.	PN 02
Lee Ellis	April 21, 2013	The Draft Environmental Impact Statement uses the well to wheel method to determine how much more greenhouse gases are produced by oil sands compared to other sources of crude oil. Yet the relevant issue relating to oil sands is how much more GHGs are released by production (well to tank) since the project has no effect on the combustion stage which is a constant. The only result of using well to wheel seems to be to minimize how much more GHGs are released by oil sands as compared to other sources. It also is confusing to readers of the EIS, this can be confirmed from the number of reports on the State Dept.study that confused the reported impact of 17% as the GHG increase in the production of oil sand (the number relevant for the increase due to production of the oil is, "on average, 72%-111% higher for Canadian oil sands crude than for the weighted average of transportation fuels sold or distributed in the United States", according to a report from the Congressional Research Service " "http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/191608.pdf"Canadian Oil Sands: Life-Cycle Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Emissions").	CLIM 05
Lee Ellis	April 21, 2013	In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement I can find no significant mention of the deforestation impact on the climate. Yet deforestation associated with oil sands development has both tree loss and massive soil disturbance.	CLIM 06
Lee Hilliard	April 4, 2013	The only reason to approve the Keystone pipeline is if you have a financial interest in it or if you are trying to get elected to something.	ACK
Lee Jamison	March 11, 2013	Lets invest the same dollars in solar, wind and our Hudson Valley hydro. The industrial revolution here was powered by hydro---and it's still here. We have clean energy!	PN 02
Lee Jordan Art	March 15, 2013	…..the guarantees of safety come from an industry that claims that offshore drilling is safe and yet still has no way to even clean up after an accident in the water with great destruction to our food chain.	ACK
Lee Jordan Art	March 15, 2013	….it seems that the number of jobs that would possibly be created by approving (KXL) is relatively small and mostly temporary.	SO 04
Lee Liebmann	April 11, 2013	It will exacerbate global warming and put the U.S. on the hook for spills and environmental degradation, all in service to one of the planet's dirtiest fuels.	ACK
Lee Stayton	March 28, 2013	It's about the health and safety of our environment now and in the long term future. We must take the long view on the energy issue and not compromise the health of our environment for short term economic gain.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lee Sulkowski	April 5, 2013	We appear to be more of a conduit for this Pipeline rather than the main user, it is just not worth the risks.	PN 07
Lee Torres	April 17, 2013	TransCanada has already taken 100 farming, ranching and landowning American families to court, securing land through bogus eminent domain claims, lawsuits and threats.	LEG 02
Leela Bruner	April 22, 2013	Please do not vote for the pipeline or anything that potentially puts our water supply in jeopardy.	ACK
Leigh Anne Keener	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Leigh Anne Keener	April 4, 2013	Temporary pipeline jobs are not the answer when you consider al the other impacts that the Keystone XL would have and could cause down the line.	PN 05
Leigh Dionne	March 19, 2013	I oppose the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline because I feel that the risks to our water supply, air quality and cropland outweigh any benefits that would be gained in taxes or jobs.	PN 05
Leigh Dionne	March 19, 2013	It appears that Congress's main goal throughout the past several years has been to ram this pipeline through the center of our country even to the point of repeating inaccuracies as to the number of jobs created, whether it will help stabilize fuel prices in this country, and just where this supply will end up being used. I feel that their attempt to forward a bill that would takes the on whether or not to grant access for this pipelines decision out of the hands of the state department also sets a dangerous and unwise precedent that threatens our countries security. I already oppose the fact that Canadian companies own transportation in the form of railways and feel that main transportation corridors, no matter what the purpose, whether pipeline, roads or rail, should be owned and managed by respective states or the federal government not a foreign business or entity. I feel that all member of Congress should be required to make public any connection that they may have with Trans Canada, their suppliers and/or contractors due to conflict of interest problems. I think that this should include any contributions for political campaigns that they or their party has taken from any company or corporation that has business ties or contracts with Trans Canada.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Leigh Dionne	March 19, 2013	I also have a growing distrust of the present Congress in regards to safeguarding the American people and land from environmental accidents that may occur due to any leakage from this pipeline. After reading the current document under consideration I feel that arial and ground level checks for contaminants and leakage isn't a very sound way to check for contamination from a pipeline that is required to be buried underground. This is since the largest concern would be contamination of groundwater not visible by either of these means.	RISK 07
Leila Flumerfelt	April 2, 2013	this pipeline will not lower gasoline prices at the pump, or increase U.S. energy security, but as the Mobile Exxon Spill in Arkansas shows, it will increase the risk of hazardous accidents.	RISK 14
Leila Quinn	March 4, 2013	It [Keystone XL Pipeline] is dangerous and no amount of research - even if paid for my the fossil fuel industry - will prove that it is safe.	ACK
Leila Quinn	March 4, 2013	It is imperative that the Keystone XL pipeline is not built.	ACK
Leila Quinn	March 4, 2013	It will endanger our health, our land, our history, and our position as a leader of the free world.	ACK
Leland Griffin Jr	March 30, 2013	There is really no reason other than money for "Big Oil" for this project that has already allowed Foreign Corporations to steal property under the guise of Eminent Domain from its rightful owners. It is Criminal and is it not, it is at the very least a misuse of the "Law".	LEG 02
Len Brault	March 15, 2013	Please do not accept this assessment of the pipeline project. This project can only proceed if it takes into account its local AND global impact. We are all a part of the world, and climate change will affect us no matter where we are. We are not against any form of clean energy. But there is no reason to believe at this juncture that the pipeline project can possibly fall under that heading.	ACK
Len Brault	March 15, 2013	We feel that this country is in imminent danger of being given totally over to corporate welfare at the expense of public health.	ACK
Lenelle Mcinturff	April 11, 2013	we need to be investing in renewable energy sources and put fossil fuels in our past.	PN 02
Lenelle Mcinturff	April 11, 2013	Oil and gas are dirty, non-renewable energy sources. Spills and leaks in pipelines are inevitable and disastrous, and we know this from past repeated painful experience.	RISK 13
Lenore Hollowell	April 22, 2013	I am very concerned about the Keystone pipeline. I would rather the money be put into energy sources that do not have the potential to reek disaster.	PN 02
Lenore Scott	March 18, 2013	I think it is terrible to even consider using eminent domain to allow a foreign country and business to take land from USA citizens as well.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lenore Scott	March 18, 2013	We have no reason to add to our current pipelines, the jobs is a very weak reason because the long term sustainable jobs are much lower than projected and no one person's job is worth destroying our own health and safety for	PN 05
Lenore Scott	March 18, 2013	I fear for our long term health and safety when this pipeline, like so many before it, eventually leaks	RISK 14
Leo Duran	April 22, 2013	why is the US still not leading the world in sustainable energy technology? I believe that we're missing out on a great potential to do good for the world.	PN 03
Leo Goodman	April 22, 2013	Release all the suppressed technology that would make burning fossil fuels obsolete. Cold fusion, Magnetic Motors, Anti gravitics, Tesla free energy.	PN 02
Leo Immonen	April 4, 2013	It is now time for the United States to take a leadership role in preserving our habitable world by reducing our carbon use. Building the pipeline is the wrong action to take.	CLIM 18
Leo Immonen	April 4, 2013	Why should we take the risks of environmental consequences in the continental United States when the profit is reaped in Canada and the usage occurs overseas.	PN 05
Leo Szumel	March 15, 2013	Climate change is a real threat and one whose economic costs far outweigh the profits to be had now by exploiting resources such as these.	CLIM 17
Leon Caster	April 11, 2013	When is the US Gov't going to get its act together to stop giving money to nations that hate us for energy that we can produce and refine in the US?	PN 01
Leon Cederlind	April 22, 2013	we must work together toward getting the pipeline moved from the porous sandhills over the Ogallala Aquifer to the safer clay soils to the east.	WRG 01
Leon Komar	April 22, 2013	It would be better invest in energy conservation or alternative energy sources than to transport toxic tar sand oil across our continent.	ALT 02
Leon Komar	April 22, 2013	However if the US State Department does approve the pipeline proposal the citizens of the states involved should have a voice in the route it takes and the safegaurds required on the developers or corporate owners.	PRO 06
Leon Komar	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline route as proposed presents a great environmental risk for the Ogallala aquaifer	WRG 01
Leona Wieland	March 13, 2013	Michigan still trying to clean up the spill from 4 years ago, costing $1B	ACK
Leona Wieland	March 13, 2013	3900 temporary jobs for XL is NOT NOTEWORTHY.	SO 02
Leonard And Ellen Zablow	April 2, 2013	Aside from the obvious danger of spills along the route, the local devastation of native American lands in the extraction of the tar sands, and the environmental pollution there and surrounding the refineries, the rest of us are faced with the increased threat of global warming from both the production and use of the oil.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Leonard Bronec	April 22, 2013	Climate Change: Based upon science and research the production and spewing of CO2 into our atmosphere is contributing to warming of the planet and the growing issue of climate change. This is caused primarily by our use of fossil fuels. It would be a huge mistake to contribute to increased use of fossil fuels throughout the world by allowing the increased flow of products such as tar sands crude or bitumen throughout the world. President Obama, you have repeatedly said we need to take action regarding climate change. Here is your chance to make a huge impact. As European Climate Commissioner Connie Hildegard said so well, "Rejection of the Keystone XL would send a strong message internationally that the U.S. is serious about fighting climate change." We join you in wanting to do something positive about climate change.	ACK
Leonard Bronec	April 22, 2013	Flawed Review: Please look carefully at the review study of the Keystone XL Pipeline that was done by consulting companies connected to the oil industry. The testimony at the Public Hearing pointed out many flaws especially the one about using a different map of the large Aquifer in Nebraska. The pipeline is still going over the Aquifer.	WRG 01
Leonard Gilmore	April 8, 2013	and i hope Mr. Obama, you would think and feel like us tribal ppl on this turtle island that you will feel what Mother Earth is feeling with all the destruction happening through greed/envy in the name of profit, as well as all the negative energy being sent out into the universe by desecrating the land, cultural/traditional/environmental sensitive areas.	ACK
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	Its conclusion is dictated by the money interest of the pipeline firm & its investors.	ACK
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	The U.S. State Department's Keystone XL tar sands pipeline environmental review is corrupt.	ACK
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	Among the review's MANY egregious flaws is its disregard of the certainty that the pipeline will cause massive harm of boreal forest & its vital climate-control functions & the habitat it provides wildlife.	LEG 04
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	The environmental review fails to account legitimately for ANY environmental concern for which the law requires accounting.	LEG 04
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	The law & integrity demand that the Obama administration conduct, at last, a thorough & transparent review of the Keystone XL pipeline's likely environmental effects.	LEG 04
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	It findings are not findings, but sponsoring of the money interests of the pipeline firm.	PRO 01
Leonard R. Jaffee	March 18, 2013	Its [SDEIS]text was written NOT by the State Department, but by an entity & people paid by the firm that seeks approval of the pipeline.	PRO 01
Leonard Wheeler	April 13, 2013	Permitting this oil sands pipeline given the recent pipeline accidents would be PER Se a violation of the Migratory Water Foul treaties and Endangered Species Act	WI 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Leroy Haverlah	March 20, 2013	It should not be difficult to look at numbers: jobs actually created in the current year; barrels of oil that would stay in the USA, taxes Texas or the USA would get in this process and ongoing, tons of pollution that WE would get for processing this heavy/dirty chemical.	PN 05
Leroy Rockwell	April 22, 2013	please use common sense in protecting our sandhills and the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Leroy Volmer	April 5, 2013	In addition Keystone is using emminent domain to force their way across private property. Where did our rights of ownership go in this country.	LEG 02
Leroy Volmer	April 5, 2013	The pipeline must cross area of clay pan in as it moves to the South. Clay pan expands and contracts during the seasons and has been know to tear foundations apart. What will happen to the pipelines. In addition the lince crosses headwaters of many of the aquifers that provide water to people living in the area. What happends if these aquifers are contaminated from spills.	RISK 27, RISK 07
Les Heiserman	April 22, 2013	The benefits to the United States are minimal; the pipeline will not create sustainable jobs nor will it add to US energy security.	PN 05
Les Heiserman	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS does not adequately address the safety concerns raised by constructing and maintaining a diluted bitumen pipeline in rural areas, including a lack of emergency response infrastructure to deal with inevitable spills.	RISK 08
Les Heiserman	April 22, 2013	he DSEIS does not take into account the amount of lost good agricultural land and resources, nor the risk to water supplies that sustain South Dakota's agricultural producers.	WRG 01, LU 01
Lesley Adams	April 6, 2013	All those dollars could go toward developing a sustainable, clean energy economy. Let's go solar and wind!	PN 02, ALT 01
Lesley Beatty	March 15, 2013	[Do we want our children, grandchildren, etc. to know we made the right decision (no) when faced with] more urgent the problem of climate change	CLIM 14
Lesley Darling	April 22, 2013	we should focus more on ALTERNATIVE energies	PN 02
Lesley Darling	April 22, 2013	There have been enough oil spills of late and should any occur in Nebraska, they would destroy the largest underground aquifer in the hemisphere	RISK 07
Lesley Jones	March 6, 2013	Please note this was the costliest cleanup of a river in US History. I do not want a dirty Tar Sands project threatening water anywhere	ACK
Lesley Jones	March 6, 2013	We cannot afford the same policy positions that have resulted in the current climate change.	CLIM 18
Lesley Wexler	March 2, 2013	...aside from the ecological concerns, tax venture, and the lack of alternative investment, my biggest concern, is perpetuating this existing greed promoted structure, that has come to remove any last traces of our Free Democracy.	ACK
Leslie Brad	April 8, 2013	do we really want the oil to go to China? Do we really need to be endlessly dependent on Middle East oil which compromises foreign policy decision making to our detriment.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Leslie Browning	April 5, 2013	Invest subsidize solar power invest subsidize natural gas /engines I-80 clean energy fuels and renewalble resources.	ALT 01
Leslie Currens	April 9, 2013	Please re-do the environmental impact review of Keystone XL.	ACK
Leslie Currens	April 9, 2013	Approving Keystone is bad public policy. You are one of our only lines of defense against this foreign oil pipeline, which endangers our environment both with spills and with vastly increased Carbon Dioxide emissions. Climate Change is the most urgent issue of our time.	CLIM 18
Leslie Devine-milbourne	April 5, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 05
Leslie Flanders	April 4, 2013	My husband and I have two children, each of whom have children of their own...our grandchildren. We want them to have a clean and comfortable world in which to live their entire lives. Climate change is real even though our own government remains in denial of it. Keystone will only increase climate change and destroy more wildlife areas.	CLIM 14
Leslie Garrison	April 20, 2013	I support the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline ONLY IF the President requires a commensurate level of oil conservation/efficiency measures to decrease our consumption of oil….. Any increase in oil extraction/production must be offset by conservation programs: Examples: * increase (or better - eliminate) quota for tax credits for hybrid and electric vehicles * tax superfluous uses of oil in everyday products (plastic bags, disposable plastic utensils…cups/forks etc) * require recycling (deposit system) of plastic bottles in all states (use Federal powers of spending and appropriations to pressure states) * enforce CAFÉ standards	SO 16, ALT 02
Leslie Kingsley	April 21, 2013	Secondly, most of our oil comes from friendly nations. We should be focusing on diminishing our dependence on oil, not foreign oil. Subsidize research and create jobs for a creative future, not more of the same. furthermore, any oil is going to be sold on the open market at whatever price it fetches; no one will be partial to America's need above others'.	PN 04, PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Leslie Kingsley	April 21, 2013	The argument for jobs: I have been unemployed for several months, but that does not mean I will sell my soul for income. Jobs today means a loss in the future - for our families, for destruction on the landscape that solves only a short-term problem Destruction for the soul of American.	PN 05
Leslie Roberts	March 11, 2013	Furthermore, gas from fracking is ruining trillions of gallons of precious clean water with toxic and carcinogenic chemicals, heavy metals, radioactive radon and radium.	ACK
Leslie Sinclair	April 17, 2013	I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. It sickens me to think that there is a chance that science will be ignored, and 37.7 million cars' worth of CO2 will be released into the atmosphere. That means 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year..	CLIM 11
Leslie Sperry	April 14, 2013	Rather than invest in more oil-based technologies and continuing to endanger the environment with even more risky and damaging petro fuels, let's continue to invest in solar, wind and other non-poluting energy sources.	ALT 01
Leslie Stanick	April 9, 2013	I am from BC Canada. We are fighting the Tar Sands expansions, and their dirty carbon footprint. A few weeks ago, a pipe broke and spewed toxic water from their processing into the Athabasca River, causing terrible damage to land and waters. First Nations live downstream of this "spill", communities that have extremely high rates of cancer from the toxic waste pouring into their water supply. Please - do not sign the agreement for the XL pipeline It helps no one but the big oil producers. They will continue to pollute our Arctic with dirty oil and toxic sludge, shattering eco-systems, and human settlements.	CU 05
Leslie Taylor	March 10, 2013	"Canada's tar sands, deposits of sand saturated with bitumen, contain twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history. " James Hansen James Hansen May 9, 2012 ... "Over the next several decades, the Western United States and the semi-arid region from North Dakota to Texas will develop semi-permanent drought, with rain, when it does come, occurring in extreme events with heavy flooding.	ACK
Letitia Grimes	April 22, 2013	Canada has chosen to extract a low-grade, dirty oil from tar sands by destroying huge tracts of their land. That was their decision. But the US does not have to support their bungled energy policy with the Keystone XL pipeline.	CU 01
Levi Hyland	April 21, 2013	There have been numerous spills in the TransCanada's pipelines, especially those carrying tar sands, not to mention the fact that much of the oil carried in the pipeline would be for export, which is plainly evident in TransCanada's investor statements.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Levi Martfeld	April 5, 2013	This most foul fossil fuel is destroying the Canadien landscape and will only add to our polluted air and water	ACK
Levi Martfeld	April 5, 2013	Building this pipeline will only add to the coffers of the Saudi Corporation that owns the oil plant in Texas. It is not in our best interest to have this pollution run across our great land	PN 05
Lewis R. Lowden	April 2, 2013	What do we truly gain in the long term by placing our environment, our climate, and American families in a very clear and present danger?	PN 05
LewisC	April 18, 2013	"Additionally, the Houston area hovers perilously close to nonattainmnent of the new annual standard for fine particulate matter. Refining the tar sands in area refineries will certainly add to these significant air pollution issues.	CU 08, CLIM 17
LewisC	April 18, 2013	"Its route in Texas crosses three aquifers which supply water to over 10 million Texans. "The tar sand is bitumen which is more acidic than conventional crude and contains significantly higher quantities of abrasive particles. "Given that corrosive given that corrosion tends to be the second most common cause of pipeline failures, this corrosiveness of the tar sands makes the potential of contaminating these domestic water supplies from spills of major leaks a grave, grave concern.	RISK 07
LewisC	April 18, 2013	"These communities are already inundated with petrochemical plants and refineries and overburdened with environmental pollution and health risks. "They experience higher levels of air pollution, leading to increased incidence of cardiac and respiratory illnesses and increased risks of air toxic-related illnesses. "Given that tar sands refinery emissions have been been linked to prenatal brain damage, asthma and emphysema, overburdened and at-risk communities such as those along the Houston ship canal will only have their health problems made worse.	RISK 07
Libby Bottrell	March 19, 2013	This letter is to send the strongest message possible about the pipeline. My understanding is that it is some of the dirtiest crude oil we are extracting and putting into the environment. Just moving it does not keep it out of the environment...it still affects global warming no matter where it is. Why not provide more jobs through clean energy.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Liddy Wilson	April 4, 2013	Your job is to protect our Earth from the Corporations that would destroy it. The oil covered birds in Arkansas seemed harmed to me. I remember when scientist claimed cigarettes were not harmful. If you cannot stand up to the MoneyMasters I suggest you quit.	ACK
Lieboch	April 18, 2013	The greenhouse gas emissions impact petcoke will have on global climate change are excluded from current reports of tar sands oil production. The information about the negative use of petcoke is more than I can report today, but is clear this is a 'don't ask, don't tell' product and while it is not legally required to include refinery byproducts in total emission reports, the moral and ethical thing would be to do so.	CLIM 08
LiewerD	April 18, 2013	During the spring when the ices break up in the Niobrara River when the ice breaks up in the Niobrara and Keya Paha Rivers, no one will ever be able to stop that spill because it's going so fast. During the months of December, January, February, the rivers are usually solid ice. It would be impossible to clean up an oil spill.	RISK 22
LiewerD	April 18, 2013	In the EIS they stated -- there was the statement in there that they only found two Least Terns in the Niobrara River. I know by canoeing the river that there are a lot more than that. It is time to deny this pipeline.	TES 02
lifson	April 14, 2013	Perhaps most importantly, there is an overwhelming scientific consensus on the reality of anthropogenic climate change. The tar sands oil is one of the dirtiest of dirty fossil fuels	CLIM 05
lifson	April 14, 2013	The pipeline will not create meaningful numbers of good sustainable jobs, and will not contribute to energy independence.	PN 05
lifson	April 14, 2013	As evidenced by the recent Arkansas spill, and the dismal history of oil pipelines in general, and particularly those transporting highly corrosive tar sands oil, it is not a matter of if a spill will happen, just when and how bad.	RISK 14
Lila Aurich	April 4, 2013	the dirty oil it would carry would work against our aims to control climate change.	PN 05
Lila Aurich	April 4, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline poses a serious danger to the huge area it would traverse, and especially the huge aquifer that lies under the proposed path	RISK 07
Lillian E Goodman	March 19, 2013	What the pipeline carries and how much damage Fracking and the oil it produces will damage our Planet...which is the only one we have to sustain us ! Other ways must be found. It cannot be all about money...we must look for better opto	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lillian E Goodman	March 19, 2013	The pipe is above ground, over ranch and farm. When it breaks, the damages will be another new problem.	RISK 07
Lillian Feierabend	April 1, 2013	This will not help gas prices go down in this country. The oil will be exported to the highest bidder and the American people will be left with dirtier air and polluted water.	PN 07
Lillian Ordaz	April 19, 2013	Every time (the oil companies) create an environmental disaster, they get out some paper towels and insist no one can film their incompetent clean-up effort. At some point someone has to consider the future of this planet and the future generations that will be left with the clean up of all this toxic waste.	RISK 08
Lily Baum Pollans	April 15, 2013	I believe there are other, more important infrastructures and services that urgently need our government's attention. Further, we should not be continuing to financially and politically support the development of fossil fuel resources, especially in other countries.	PN 05
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	Tar sands is not just the worlds dirtiest source of oil from the refinery process, it also has blood on its hands from the destruction of extremely important ecosystem.	ACK
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	Transcanada claims that the pipe line is 'eco friendly' since emissions will be higher if the oil is trucked. This is a thinly veiled threat aimed at gaining our cooperation in their environmentally destructive practices that could never be claimed as environmentally friendly	CLIM 14
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	Very rarely is mentioned the boreal forest and first nations indians that make up the surface.	CU 01
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	It will not bring down the gasoline prices in the united states, and will only further pollute the earth.	PN 04
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	It is only headed this way because Canadians would not allow a pipline to the west coast of canada	PN 06
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	Not only does it not bring permanent jobs to America, the oil is not destined for our use- instead it is headed to the refineries in the gulf coast so it can be shipped overseas	PN 07
Lily Heyns	March 28, 2013	it gives very few jobs to Americans, far fewer than promised, a few thousand only. To boot- they are temporary	SO 04
Lily Sanders	March 16, 2013	Please STOP the keystone pipeline. We have had too many oil disasters these past decades.	RISK 13
Lilyana Srnoguy	April 3, 2013	If we build Keystone XL this will happen over and over again untill we poison all of our water and land, wild life and finaly our shildren. And for what! Some temporery jobs? When pipe line is finished it will employ about 100 people. Big dill. To distroy aour future because our politicions are greedy and coruptive. STOP it when is time.	RISK 07
Lin Brummels	April 22, 2013	The water under the Sandhills provides many people with drinking water.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lin Brummels	April 22, 2013	water is an amazing asset. Everyone needs water to live. The water under the Sandhills provides many people with drinking water. I would like to protect that resource.	WRG 01
Lin Jensen	April 22, 2013	Please know that I am opposed to any pipeline transporting tar sands oil across public and private property.	ACK
LIN SHAYE	April 22, 2013	NOW MORE THAN EVER, WHERE ALTERNATE SOURCES OF FUEL AND ENERGY ARE BEING EXPLORED...IT SEEMS TO BE THE WRONG TIME TO CREATE MORE HAVOC.. PLEASE INVEST THE ASTRONOMICAL AMOUNTS OF MONEY AND MAN POWER IT WILL TAKE TO BUILD THIS, INTO SAFER AND MORE ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY ALTERNATIVE ENERGIES	PN 02
Linda Ager	April 21, 2013	The oil is not going to stay in the United States anyway, why not let the Canadians route it through their own land?	PN 05
Linda Ager	April 21, 2013	Please do not let the XL Pipeline go anywhere near the Ogallala Aquifer. We cannot afford to contaminate this valuable resource	WRG 01
Linda Ann Jones	April 13, 2013	It is clear to me that companies in the oil business do not regulate themselves responsibly through inspection and maintiance of their pipelines and equipment. There are thousands of miles of decaying pipeline already runing through this country's landscape that are not being repaired. Investment in future profits is where oil companies are investing, but they do not take responsiblilty for maintaining their current infrastructure for long term protection of the public lands they use to gain those profits. This intentional lack of investing in maintinance and repairs is gross negligence of the public lands owned by this generation of Americans and every generation there after.	RISK 23, PN 05
Linda Armour-finch	March 12, 2013	IT MAKES SENSE TO ME TO BUILD A REFINERY IN THE GREAT LAKES AREA AND SEND CANADIAN OIL TO IT - REDUCE TRANSPORTATION COSTS, GET SOME REFINING DONE AWAY FROM THE RISK OF STORM DAMAGE AND FARTHER FROM UNFRIENDLY ATTACK.	ALT 08
Linda B. Hoke	April 22, 2013	We must protect the Ogallala Aquifer	ACK
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	Air quality issues will abound with all the tractors and oil consuming machines at work	ACK
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	Basic rights such as drinkable water will be thwarted.	ACK
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	communities will have to pony up the funds for dealing with the health effects from working with toxic substances,	ACK
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	Finally, at one end, in Canada, there will be a lot of methane emitted into the atmosphere	CLIM 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	entrepreneurial folks have been active in launching projects such as wind turbines, solar panels, microorganisms for alternative, and free, energy sources. Denmark, Germany, France, Spain are leaders in local economies and alternative energy that reach more people at less cost.	PN 02
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	for the jobs it creates: a few jobs, a lot of money poured into the aftereffects, i.e. social services will be taxed	PN 05
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	The US is just a pathway for this "investment" that lines the pockets of "BIG OIL".	PN 05
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	at the other end in TX/LA the crude substances will be loaded onto cargo ships to be transported elsewhere.	PN 07
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	pending spills and leaks will necessitate clean-up and remediation efforts.	RISK 08
Linda Babcock	March 29, 2013	Habitats will be destroyed; think of our natural heritage -- for species that live in the pathways of this huge elongated project	WI 21
Linda Bannister	March 24, 2013	the abuse of eminent domain is a serious threat to our property rights and therefore our liberties as Americans.	LEG 02
Linda Bannister	March 24, 2013	For the small amount of gain we get from this project it is not worth the long-term losses we will suffer as we spend more money to address the health and environmental issues this project will cause.	PN 05
Linda Barnes	April 18, 2013	Millions of Americans can be hurt by it [Keystone XL Pipeline] while only a handfull make money on it	ACK
Linda Batliner	April 15, 2013	There will be a leak or spill at some point in time.	RISK 21
Linda Batliner	April 15, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer may be needed to supply water to Colorado, Arizona, California, and Nevada, as well as Nebraska.	WRG 01
Linda Batliner	April 22, 2013	If we dont protect our water now, we will NOT get a second chance. This aquifer may be needed to supplement water for, not only, Nebraska, but also potentially, Colorado, Arizona, and California.	ACK
Linda Batliner	April 22, 2013	The TransCanada oil pipeline must be detoured to avoid any possibility of Harming the Ogallala Aquifer. While there are potential issues with the environment wherever it would be placed the Aquifer is potentially the future source of water for not only Nebraska but Colorado and Dry Southwestern states.	WRG 01
Linda Batliner	April 22, 2013	There WILL be a leak in the pipeline at some point in time. Why risk a water source that could someday conceivably be needed by the western half of the United States?	WRG 01, RISK 24
Linda Batliner	April 22, 2013	The TransCanada oil pipeline must be detoured to avoid any possibility of Harming the Ogallala Aquif	WRG 04
Linda Becker-mcwhinney	April 10, 2013	There have been SO MANY SPILLS and there WILL BE MANY MORE. We know that each one damages our environment in ways we can't even imagine-aside from the obvious, visible destruction.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Berger	April 20, 2013	This pipeline WILL NOT lower US gas prices - it will only line the pockets of Big Oil. They plan to ship the gas out of the US.	PN 04
Linda Berger	April 20, 2013	Old pipes ARE NOT maintained properly.	RISK 13
Linda Berkoff	April 13, 2013	Until the current tar sands pipeline and supporting operations are better controlled and less polluting, we do not need a second one to become operational. We deserve to know that the Keystone XL will not destroy the area it is located in and does not contaminate the Oglala Aquifer, life line of our of much of western plains.	WRG 01, RISK 14
Linda Bishop	April 11, 2013	The pipeline poses grave dangers to America's vital water resources.	ACK
Linda Bishop	April 11, 2013	The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	ACK
Linda Blossom	April 5, 2013	We are literally at war for oil while the people at home use the resource as though it was their right. How about initiating a war effort in which conservation of this resource is made a patriotic duty. I would support rationing as we should do our part here at home.	ALT 02
LINDA Bone	April 22, 2013	This is oil will not be used here!	PN 07
Linda Boots	April 15, 2013	That same dollar investment into alternative power would advance us past the need for fossil fuels	PN 02
Linda Burke	April 15, 2013	President Obama, I trust that you will keep your climate promise and move us toward developing and using other energy sources besides oil and gas. How about "a solar panel on every house" and the energy produced can go to the public service company in your area (and would not require that the house occupant change anything in their system to solar)????? This tar sands pipeline is trouble for us and we need to start NOW to make a major shift to other energy sources besides oil and gas (like solar, wind, geothermal, etc.).	PN 02
Linda Childs	April 11, 2013	The best case scenario would be to exercise your considerable diplomatic skills to persuade the Canadian government to route its dirty oil east or west through its own country. It might significantly alter the equation in favor of braking this environmental train wreck.	ALT 05
Linda Cooke	April 4, 2013	Some regulatory agencies have even allowed a private for-profit foreign company to take citizens' lands through eminent domain, even though this private pipeline project clearly does not meet the criteria intended for such takings.	LEG 02
Linda Cooke	April 4, 2013	I implore you to put the health and safety of your constituents, the people who elected you, first and revise your Environmental Impact Statement to include the COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS of the FULL hazards that this tar sands pipeline represents.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Cooke	April 4, 2013	There are no effective means of reclaiming waterways that have been contaminated by toxic tar sands, so the outlook for damaged areas is bleak. A spill into the Kalamazoo River in 2010 has yet to be adequately cleaned, leaving a 32-mile stretch of the river unusable.	RISK 08
Linda Davis	March 21, 2013	At a time when we should be ratcheting down our reliance on fossil fuels	ACK
Linda Davis	March 21, 2013	The consequences of developing this pipeline have long-term impacts to our planet that far outweigh the benefits (if any).	ACK
Linda Davis	March 21, 2013	The approval of the keystone pipeline is a huge mistake for the United States and the world with far-reaching implications for climate change. … Instead, the resources that would go into constructing this pipeline should go toward further development of renewable resources. Deny approval for this pipeline!	PN 03
Linda Dugan	April 22, 2013	Nebraska needs to promote renewable and clean energy.	PN 02
Linda Dugan	April 22, 2013	promote renewable and clean energy	PN 02
Linda Dumey	April 10, 2013	Mining tar sands is an environmental and humanitarian disaster. It involves destruction of the Boreal Forest in Canada, home to First Nations communities, and home to migrating birds, herds of caribou, lynx. To destroy this precious old growth forest, turn it into a moonscape and contaminate huge amount of water with toxic chemicals, destroying bird and animal populations and endangering the lives of native people -- is criminal.	CU 01
Linda Ehrisman	March 10, 2013	I know of someone who went to a town hall meeting with their representative in NY state and asked who would be to responsible when it has a leak. (not if, it will leak sometime) There wasn't anyone who knew the answer. We all know that those responsible will get off with a fine and the people (govt) will pick up the tab. These tar sands are hugely toxic and there has already been a devastating spill along the Kalamazoo. They still cannot swim in their river.	RISK 03
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	The oil sand is the worst polluter of all fossil fuels.	ACK
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	The user of the oil sands will most likely be improvised nations.	ACK
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	The pipeline is owned by a Canadian business and why is it not going through Canada?	ALT 05
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	The International Energy Agency suggested that tar sands production should not exceed 3.3 million barrels a day, in order to restrain the earth's warming to two degrees Celsius or less, yet approved tar sands production would surpass 5 million barrels a day…	CLIM 05
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	Coal is responsible for as much atmospheric carbon dioxide as all fossil fuels combined. A bi product of the tar sands, "petcoke" produces three times more carbon dioxide when burned and 15% to 30% of a barrel of oil can end up as petcoke.	CLIM 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	If America approves the Keystone XL Pipeline, we will seem like we have a total disregard for climate change.	CLIM 12
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	Oil sand that is transported over American soil is sold at the world market.	PN 07
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	If the reasoning behind this unthinkable project is employment, let's move forward towards green energy projects, producing jobs and sustainable inexpensive energy for all of our citizens, not backwards.	SO 05
Linda Gillaspy	March 30, 2013	There will be approximately 35 full time employees and it is not even known if US produced steel will be used.	SO 11
Linda Green	April 5, 2013	Please don't risk the nation's water supply	WRG 01
Linda Greene	April 21, 2013	We need jobs in solar, not oil!	SO 05
Linda Grosserode	April 22, 2013	I believe that water is the most valuable resource that we have. If you dont have water, you dont have life. I can not believe that the United States is actually considering letting a foreign county place a pipeline over our most valuable resource. My drinking water, is close to the proposed pipeline. Agriculture is Nebraskas biggest industry. These are things that we need to protect!	WRG 01
Linda Grove	April 4, 2013	The oil (…) "generates 3 times as much greenhouse gas pollutiion as regular oil".	CLIM 12
Linda Gruer	March 17, 2013	Obama will have missed his chance at slowing global climate change appreciably in just this one decision,	CLIM 18
Linda Gruer	March 17, 2013	A pipeline benefits few average workers for the huge benefit of big energy. With the environmental risk of spills taken by local people.	RISK 07, PN 05
Linda Handley	April 21, 2013	The pipe could spill and damage both the land and the wildlife and people that call it home. The first pipeline that TransCanada built spilled 14 times in one year….Another reason is that it would use many resources, including oil for the trucks to burn. And in my future, I would like to see that those resources had gone to alternative renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, geothermal, and micro-hydroelectric.	PN 02
Linda Harrison	April 15, 2013	Let Canada run this across their own country, the have coastlines and port, it can ship from there.	ALT 05
Linda Hart	April 16, 2013	It profoundly and blatantly does not consider the state of scientific knowledge of climate science and global warming.	CLIM 14, CLIM 12
Linda Hatfield	April 22, 2013	Water is more vital to the livelyhood of people then is oil.	ACK
Linda Hatfield	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow the pipeline to cross the Ogallala Aquifer in the state of Nebraska. Very dirty oil running through the pipeline would contaminte the water supply. Water is more vital to the livelyhood of people then is oil.	RISK 07
Linda Hayes	March 14, 2013	I have also been shocked to learn that this country is allowing TransCanada to use the power of eminent domain to force people to let this foreign corporation take parcels of their lands.	LEG 02
Linda Hayes	March 14, 2013	We should be working to declare our independence from big oil…..	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Hayes	March 14, 2013	I have heard that the document just released by the State Department was written by people who are very much involved with TransCanada and are very far from being objective about what this pipeline would mean for us. I certainly don't want to see this duplicitous document used to approve this project.	PRO 01
Linda Headley	April 11, 2013	PLEASE SEE THAT A PROPER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS DONE BY THE APPROPRIATE PEOPLE THAT ACTUALLY KNOW WHAT A SPILL WOULD ENTAIL FOR AMERICA.	ACK
Linda Hoffman`	April 22, 2013	When (not if) there is a leak in the pipeline as it crosses our acquifer how do we sustain life as we know it? We all know that we can survive without a lot of things but pure water is not one of them.	RISK 24
Linda House	March 15, 2013	Many jobs for Americans, more tax dollars coming in, more businesses helped up and down the entire length of the pipeline, then ultimately more energy independence for America -- anyone who is against it must certainly be against America herself.	PN 10
Linda Howe	March 10, 2013	And now we know that the ersatz State Department memo urging approval was written by a Transocean contracter, so it should be ignored in the final decision and a neutral State Department review undertaken.	PRO 01
Linda Jacobs	April 3, 2013	What really pisses me off is that the fricking thing is already, almost completely built! And no one addresses that fact and the point that land, wildlife, & civil liberties have already been violated and devastated all while our government is supposedly exploring, researching, & analyzing the impact of such a monstrosity!	ACK
Linda Jean Foster	March 11, 2013	The main issue, climate change, will affect us all whether one "believes" in it or not. The scientific community - those who study this issue with instruments and logic - resoundingly support the fact that human-generated emissions, primarily from burning fossil fuels, are driving the rate of climate change. To add the carbon contained in the tar sands to this problem would probably irreversibly send the climate into a condition that may not support agriculture or existing ecosystems. This is not a joke, and this is not the time to ignore science.	CLIM 16
Linda Kacser	April 2, 2013	Tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, It will worsen the climate crisis --	CLIM 05
Linda Kacser	April 2, 2013	and will not lower our as prices or increase our energy security.	PN 02
Linda Kager	April 2, 2013	We absolutely must engage in a Manhattan Project for clean(er) energy. NOW.	ALT 01
Linda Kager	April 9, 2013	Our efforts need to go to a Manhattan Project for clean sustainable energy for the world to use.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda L Ollinger	April 22, 2013	Accidents with pipelines can and do happen, which can cause irreversible damage to water ways which sit above or below ground. Water is the life blood of the planet. We All depend on this precious resource, water, and can not afford to let it disappear due to contamination. We are the stewards of the land AND the water, let us protect our water resources, keeping future generations in mind.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Linda LeBoutillier	April 22, 2013	The KXL route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department. TransCanadas Pipeline Permit Application to the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission states project impacts that include potential physical disturbance, demolition or removal of "prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, districts, buildings, structures, objects, and locations with traditional cultural value to Native Americans and other groups. Indigenous communities are also concerned with health risks posed by the extension of the Keystone pipeline.	CR 02
Linda LeBoutillier	April 22, 2013	Locally caught fish and untreated surface water would be at risk for contamination through tar sands oil production, and are central to the diets of many Native Americans.	FISH03, FISH01
Linda LeBoutillier	April 22, 2013	The job creation claims being made by pipeline supporters and some media outlets are wildly exaggerated…..The most recent State Department EIS estimates that the KXL will only create 35 jobs. These jobs will be mostly filled by workers who are not local to the area where the pipeline runs, so it will do nothing for local economies.	SO 03, PN 02
Linda LeBoutillier	April 22, 2013	In the Nebraska Sand Hills, the water in table the valleys rises to the surface of the earth, creating wetlands that cover 1.3 million acres.	WET 05
Linda LeBoutillier	April 22, 2013	The fact that the Keystone XL Pipeline will cross the Ogallala Aquifer raises much concern about pollution of the aquifer. The Ogallala Aquifer is a wide but shallow underground water table that exists under eight different states in the plains area...This fact makes the groundwater especially susceptible to hazardous liquids, like oil, spilled on the surface. 27% of all the irrigated land in the U.S. is under this aquifer system, and it supplies about 30% of all ground water used for irrigation in the United States. It supplies drinking water for 82% of the population who live on the plains. If this aquifer were polluted, there would be dire consequences for the earth, for the food supply, for animals, and for human beings. If the pipeline should spring a leak in a location that touches the aquifer or even above it, the oil could easily seep into the porous, sandy soil, to pollute the groundwater. The ground above the aquifer is rightly called the nations breadbasket. Pollution of the water used to irrigate this land will have dire consequences to Americas food supply.	WRG 01
Linda Lieb	April 11, 2013	renewable energy sources is what we need [not non-renewable sources].	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Lindsey	March 14, 2013	...supporting the Keystone XL pipeline would be an act of Treason because it would facilitate the export of North American oil resources to countries like China.	PN 07
Linda Lippner	April 9, 2013	Let's get on with going away from fossil fuels and using clean more effience energy. It's out there. Newer solar panal configurations are being tested daily declaring an expense to near nothing to those they may provide energy to.	PN 02
Linda Lustig	April 4, 2013	The big winners economically are the the people of this country, but big oil.	ACK
Linda Marx	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL carries more economic risks than profit and is a bad investment financially and morally.	PN 05
Linda Marx	April 22, 2013	ENDANGERED whooping cranes and also sandhill cranes use the Niobrara River right where this thing would cross. After visiting the cranes on the Platte River during their Spring migration, I am moved to strongly object to the Keystone XL or to anything else that would disrupt what little habitat these birds, including the ENDANGERED whooping crane, have left to use.	TES 15
Linda Mccracken	April 9, 2013	What it does to wildlife is to stress them (as proven by scat dogs that can use DNA and other scientific studies to prove this) as well as to interfere with migration routes and perhaps polluted water and other environmental hazards not necessarily delved into in great enough detail.	WI 24
Linda McDermitt	April 22, 2013	We do not want any pipline across Nebraskas aquifer!	ACK
Linda McDermitt	April 22, 2013	... a leak in the oil pipeline it would drain directly into the water aquifer.	RISK 07
Linda Mcdermott	March 22, 2013	So I am deeply disappointed that your State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 12
Linda Mcdermott	March 22, 2013	As we move toward a clean energy future, it is unconscionable to encourage production of greenhouse gas spewing oil, so extremely destructive to the planet. Please send your State Department back to the drawing board.	CLIM 18
Linda Mcdermott	March 22, 2013	That review should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development, the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States, and the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills.	CU 08, CLIM 20, RISK 06
Linda Murawski	March 11, 2013	There is no need to endanger our environment and drinking water aquifer that can become contaminated by leakage from this filthy bitumen that will run through this pipeline.	RISK 07
Linda Murdock	March 10, 2013	Furthermore, this will NOT create new permanent jobs, only temporary ones. And the oil is for shipment to China NOT use by the US.	SO 04, PN 07
Linda Newman	April 6, 2013	The oil from this pipeline isn't even designated for our country. This is bad planning, a bad idea.	PN 07
Linda Newman	April 6, 2013	Not only that, the company that has constructed many other pipelines has seen a high failure rate! Polluted neighborhoods, polluted water ... danger to our citizens.	RISK 26

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Norelli	March 10, 2013	Please invest in solar and wind and the infrastructure required to move the energy. We MUST start supporting and promoting CLEAN energy.	ALT 01
Linda O'connor	March 11, 2013	Our future must be in renewable energy. We haven't been investing as much as we need to reach our goal for renewable energies.to be our most used energy source.	PN 03
Linda Reik	April 10, 2013	We can power this country, and indeed the world, on wind water and solar.	PN 02, ALT 01
Linda Rosch	April 8, 2013	We Know that the State Department has allowed persons who work for or are attached to TRANSCANADA to review the Keystone Pipeline Decision. The Keystone Pipeline is NOT IN THE INTEREST OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. The State Department's actions are reprehensible and could be considered treasonous. SHAME ON THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE. You, TOO, HAVE BEEN BOUGHT BY OIL CORPORATIONS.	PRO 01
Linda Ruggiero	April 13, 2013	Is the oil company going to take all the risk and all the blame. Are they going to able to clean up everything they damage, are we going to hold them liable? Where will everyone whose lives are impacted by these disasters going to go? You can't stay in your home or your neighborhood, it has been poisoned. What will we do with all the people, animals, land who are displaced/destroyed?	RISK 03
Linda Sanders	April 16, 2013	[Regarding DSEIS about Carbon Impact] It demonstrates how misleading the State Department's initial report was in suggesting that the climate impact of the pipeline would be minimal.	CLIM 13
Linda Seeley	April 3, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, if approved by the State Department, would emit substantial greenhouse gases during its construction and operation. The pipeline will transport high carbon fossil fuels, thereby facilitating their production and burning. The claim that Keystone XL would not have a significant impact on climate because these fossil fuels will be transported through other means and ultimately burned in any case erroneously presupposes environmental and political approval of these alternatives.	CLIM 13
Linda Seeley	April 3, 2013	http://e2ma.net/go/13045496660/214285026/240297913/1412438/b64/aHR0cDovL2NsaW1hdGUubmFzYS5nb3Yv"NASA, National Academy of Sciences, U.S. Department of Defense, etc	REF
Linda Severt	April 12, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the [significant risk for costly toxic spills, catastrophic climate impacts, and the] clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in the future of tar sands development.	ACK
Linda Severt	April 12, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the significant risk	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linda Severt	April 12, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the significant risk for costly toxic spills,	RISK 07
Linda Silversmith	March 21, 2013	the consultants doing the environmental impact study were unqualified because of their conflicts of interest	PRO 01
Linda Simmons	April 2, 2013	I am from South Dakota and many of my cities literally drink from their rivers. Many municipalities in my State process river water and use it as the main water supply. An emergency where the normal water supply is tainted by oil would have enormous consequences.	WRS 02, RISK 07
Linda W. Purdy	April 15, 2013	I am TOTATLLY opposed to the development of the tar sands. A solar panel on everyone's roof would be a better use of the money.	PN 02
Linda Wagner	April 11, 2013	The more responsible direction is conservation and renewables first	ALT 02
Linda Walley	April 22, 2013	The National Climate Assessment warns that staying on our current fossil fuel energy course will result in the worst-case scenario predicted. It says, "… climate change threatens human health and well-being in many ways, including impacts from increased extreme weather events, wildfire, decreased air quality, diseases transmitted by insects, and threats to food and water security. Some of these health impacts are already underway in the U.S." Knowing this, approval of the Keystone XL pipeline would not only disregard our government's own science, it would be wrong.	CLIM 17
Lindsay Addison	April 4, 2013	You cannot cut down a forest, churn up the soil, replant, and pretend that you have not catastrophically affected the environment--and the migratory birds that rely on the boreal forest for breeding.	CU 01
Lindsay Vivian	April 22, 2013	Please ensure the protection of the Ogallala Aquifer by saying "no"	WRG 01
Lindsay Vivian	April 22, 2013	the US already has several subterranean pipelines traversing its soils a new one bisecting the High Plains Aquifer would endanger the principal water supply for two-thirds of US agriculture and would leave current landowners vulnerable to takeover by a private company.	WRG 01
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	We have seen map after map, with the boundaries [pipeline route] ever changing.	PD 03
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	In 2011, at the first State Dept. hearing in Lincoln, NE, I asked, How do you clean an aquifer? I am still waiting for the answer. (I don't believe there is one.)	RISK 08
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	We know, from the Enbridge Kalamazoo disaster that an open water spill of this type of material (tarsands 'oil') is not able to be remediated as first thought. And that spill occurred in open water.	RISK 29
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	…this pipeline, no matter the route--will cross our state entirely over and through the Ogallala Aquifer--the very entity that President Obama said we MUST protect and avoid.	WRG 01
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	The evidence in this instance says that this project is NOT safe for our water, for our aquifer, for our very lives and futures.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	this KXL route (and any others proposed) crosses Nebraska's Ogallala Aquifer virtually the entire route. This is my concern, and that of many.	WRG 01
Linell Connolly	April 1, 2013	What has never changed is that our Ogallala Aquifer underlies nearly our entire state and those adjoining. No matter the route for KXL, it traverses over and through our precious aquifer--that which gives life to so many. It gives life to every living person and creature--for without water, we cannot exist. It gives life to the crops, so vital for our world and every other living thing.	WRG 01
Linell Connolly	April 19, 2013	(health impact assessment) It would seem that with the environment under our scrutiny with regard to a spill, the health of each and every individual involved or within proximity and with the ability to be affected should, and would be of great and grave concern.	RISK 06
Linell Connolly	April 19, 2013	[health impact assessment] should also extend to the wildlife and other animals. In the case of our farm/ranch producers, that would have also have to do with their livelihoods, food production.	RISK 07
Linell Connolly	April 19, 2013	I do not understand how this project could move forward without a health risk assessment having been completed and reviewed.	RISK 07
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	I am also very concerned about the environmental damage to… especially our aquifer.	ACK
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	There are much safer alternatives, and energy sources that will be much kinder to us, the creatures, and our environment.	PN 02
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	No one can assure me that "they" would be able to recognize and take care of a leak or spill immediately	RISK 15
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	I am also very concerned about the environmental damage to wetlands,	WET 05
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	I am also very concerned about the environmental damage to...the migratory birds and other creatures living and utilizing our land,…	WI 01
Linell Connolly	April 22, 2013	the fact remains: this KXL route (and any others proposed) cross Nebraskas Ogallala Aquifer virtually the entire route. This is my concern, and that of many. Some have used the Sandhills designation to justify a route. We have seen map after map, with the boundaries ever changing. What has never changed is that our Ogallala Aquifer underlies nearly our entire state and those adjoining. No matter the route for KXL, it traverses over and through our precious aquifer--that which gives life to so many. It gives life to every living person and creature--for without water, we cannot exist. It gives life to the crops, so vital for our world and every other living thing.	WRG 01
Ling Tsou	April 16, 2013	This pipeline will destroy more jobs than it creates	SO 05
Ling Tsou	April 16, 2013	We do not need tar sands oil. We need and must invest in renewable energy solutions which will create more jobs than those created by building this pipeline	SO 05
Linn Wilson	April 13, 2013	Please do not allow this Keystone XL pipeline--their huge spills in Canada have killed many deer and other wildlife.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lis Perlman	April 22, 2013	I have seen a documentary about how the tar sand oil is processed and what kind of environmental degradation it causes to the areas and rivers around it. The cancer rate of a small town with an American Native population living nearby has gone up incredibly and the doctor who reported this to the authorities had his license revoked.	CU 05, CLIM 14, EJ 01
Lisa Abbott	March 30, 2013	There has already been tar sand's spills in Michigan, 20 miles northwest of Little Rock, Arkansas, and Minnesota. These tar sands spills are destroying the land that citizen's need to survive.	RISK 07
Lisa Bardack	April 17, 2013	Renewable energy is where all our resources should be going.	PN 02
Lisa Bier	April 10, 2013	A foreign corporations (and their shills in the US Congress) has no right to demand that Americans give up their private property…in order to make money	LEG 02
Lisa Carey	April 2, 2013	Please choose all of our health first, not the least the health of the earth, air, water, creatures that we depend on.	PN 05
Lisa Carrabis	March 31, 2013	Maybe you're wealthy enough to keep your families safe and far away, but the ones who have nothing to profit from this will have no choice but to watch as our children are poisoned.	ACK
Lisa Carrabis	March 31, 2013	The ONLY thing you could possibly gain from this is financial, so if you've put your money in this we'd appreciate knowing that so we could stop wasting our breath and withdraw our support.	ACK
Lisa Carrabis	March 31, 2013	This pipeline does NOTHING for the people of this country, what's worse is that if this past year is any indication, this filthy oil will be polluting our land and water.	RISK 14
Lisa Chipkin	April 21, 2013	Extracting Tar Sands oil … destroys the majestic boreal forests that are our allies in removing carbon from the atmosphere and returning us to a stable climate.	ACK
Lisa Chipkin	April 21, 2013	Extracting Tar Sands oil releases much more carbon pollution than conventional oil,	CLIM 05
Lisa Chipkin	April 21, 2013	Transporting Tar Sands oil won't help our energy independence. This oil is bound for refineries and ports on the Gulf coast, where it will be shipped to global markets.	PN 07
Lisa Chipkin	April 21, 2013	Extracting Tar Sands oil threatens our lands and waters with toxic spills of tar sands slurry	RISK 10
Lisa Francioni	April 2, 2013	threat and challenges we face due to climate change, I urge you to reject the pipeline and do not help TransCanadad release the tar and related emissions	CLIM 14
Lisa Francioni	April 2, 2013	We have seen over and over again the inability of oil companies to prevent spills from pipeline	RISK 14
Lisa Good	April 22, 2013	NO pipelines through Nebraskas most precious resource...clean aquifer,	ACK
Lisa Goodrich	April 14, 2013	I would argue that it comes at too high a cost both in the present and the future. In the present, it risks our health and safety because the proposed pipeline can not be adequately engineered to ensure safe transport. There are too many variables which might compromise a pipeline's ability to do it's job. This simply puts too many lives at risk. Once the environment is poisoned, so are humans.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lisa Hall	March 28, 2013	I WAS SHOCKED TO RECENTLY LEARN THE THAT STATE DEPT. ASSESSMENT OF THE PIPELINE WAS ACTUALLY WRITTEN BY A TEAM WHO ALL WORK FOR OIL COMPANIES! PRESIDENT OBAMA, YOU NEED TO DENOUNCE THIS CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND DEMAND A PROPER, IMPARTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT BE DONE BEFORE ANY FURTHER ACTION IS TAKEN.	PRO 01
Lisa Hall	March 29, 2013	It is shocking that the recent State Dept report was largely written by oil company insiders. Surely this conflict of interest needs to be corrected! Either order a new impartial study, or just acknowledge what we all know -- the pipeline is dangerous to the environment, will not solve our energy problems and a really bad idea all around.	PRO 01
LISA J GOOD	April 22, 2013	a foreign companys exaggerated and laughable claims of oil transport safety in the face of frequent and horrific spills all over our nation and the world;	ACK
LISA J GOOD	April 22, 2013	We cannot turn America into a third world country by endangering the property rights of citizens who are terrorized and bullied by a foreign corporations claim of eminent domain rights within our own borders;	LEG 02
lisa jacobi	April 22, 2013	Please protect our water, supplied by good mother earth- that man cannot recreate. Do not put a price tag on Americas aquifer.	ACK
Lisa Kellogg	April 22, 2013	We do not need this pipeline we need to focus on renewable energy solar and wind.	PN 02
Lisa Klosner	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala aquifer needs to be protected	ACK
Lisa Lalumandier	April 22, 2013	New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands underestimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because petroleum coke, the high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal was not accounted for in its calculations.	ACK
Lisa Lalumandier	April 22, 2013	In Texas, TransCanada's southern segment has already proven it is a threat to water as pipeline construction has polluted landowners' natural springs with drilling mud, destroyed wetlands, and contaminated farm ponds with diesel fuel.	RISK 07
Lisa Lalumandier	April 22, 2013	The new Keystone XL pipeline will operate at pressures up to 1440 psi, almost double the pressure of conventional crude pipelines. Due to the quartz-like nature and friction of the material, the pipeline may heat up to as high as 158 degrees. Yet these pipelines are built to conventional crude pipeline specs and standards.	RISK 27
Lisa Laplaca	March 20, 2013	Our government MUST mandate things that reduce greenhouse gases.	CLIM 18
Lisa Lapp	March 14, 2013	It's time to declare our independence from Big Oil, not double down on the dirtiest energy available.	ACK
Lisa Lapp	March 14, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline project would charge forward recklessly simply to squeeze out a bit more dregs of a vanishing and nonrenewable resource, all at unjustifiable expense and with enormous and ongoing damage to our everyday lives.	ACK
Lisa Lapp	March 14, 2013	The pipeline … would do nothing for jobs or our economy.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lisa Lapp	March 14, 2013	The pipeline would be bad for the environment and bad for America	ACK
Lisa Lapp	March 14, 2013	Saying yes would light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	CLIM 14
Lisa Lucero	March 25, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region.	ACK
Lisa Lucero	March 25, 2013	I would like to commend the State Department for executing a thorough and transparent Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL project. In this latest iteration, the State Department again concludes that the Keystone XL project will have minimal environmental impact due to extensive mitigation efforts to be undertaken by TransCanada. I now urge the State Department to finalize the SEIS expeditiously in order to complete a second National Interest Determination. Swift action now will allow this vital infrastructure project to move forward after four years of extensive study.	ACK
Lisa Lucero	March 25, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Lisa Lucero	March 25, 2013	We respectfully request that the State Department expeditiously finalize the Draft SEIS and ultimately grant TransCanada the Presidential Permit necessary to begin building the pipeline.	PN 10
Lisa Marcus	April 13, 2013	And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe.	RISK 14
Lisa McGuire	April 22, 2013	I grew up on a ranch in the Sandhills that has been in my family for three generations. This pipeline directly affects three of our ranches in three counties. This is my childs inheritance and birthright	SO 12, LU 01
Lisa Mcwhorter	March 11, 2013	I also want to reiterate my support for clean, Wind-Powered energy to augment our transition away from such dependance on fossil fuels and the need for oil pipelines, like Keystone XL. Providing tax incentatives for companys, like Virginia Dominion Power, to invest in Wind-Powered infrastructure, is essential and highly supported by the common people, like myself.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lisa Mott	April 15, 2013	Previous tar sand spills continue to defy cleanup efforts years later; the effects are widespread and long-lasting. There are no reliable, proven methods to contain or control spills that will surely increase in a pipeline system that is dated and increasingly burdened with higher flows.	RISK 14, RISK 08
Lisa Nabity	March 22, 2013	This proposed oil pipeline is still too close to the Ogallala Aquifer, will encounter all rivers and waterways in its path, and will remain a threat to all of these irreplaceables: water, land, wildlife, plants, nature, and health.	WRG 01
Lisa Nabity	April 22, 2013	Nebraska has only passed one law concerning oil pipelines, and it only covers reclamation and the siting laws passed do not apply to TransCanada. We have no trust fund set aside to help families if their land, water or health are affected. We have no Emergency Response Plan that has been made public. Nebraskans are, right now with the current pipeline in the ground, at risk and at the mercy of TransCanada if / when a leak, spill, blowout or anything else happens. KXL pipeline would carry the dirtiest form of oil, tar sands, a thick form of oil that requires many chemicals, high heat and high pressure to push it through the pipeline. One chemical added- benzene -can easily travel 100+ miles, once leaked; and only a small amount of benzene leaking out undetected alone can irreversibly contaminate our water. There would be no remedy for a leak of this toxic tar sands sludge. This would be devastating here in Nebraska for our Ogallala Aquifer, Sandhills, rivers, wells and all water sources within extra many miles of a leak. Additionally, numerous reports have cited increased rates of cancer at the source of the tar sands production in Canada.	RISK 03, CU 02, RISK 05, RISK 06, RISK 10, RISK 30
Lisa Novotny	April 11, 2013	Keep in mind when they say the new system is much less prone to spills than the system that just failed, that the new system will age and corrode also -- just like the current one did. Also keep in mind the fantastically inept job the oil companies, Shell, Exxon, etc. have done with transporting oil and protecting the environment already.	RISK 14
Lisa Obrien	April 9, 2013	Without Clean Water, there is NO LIFE.	ACK
Lisa Obrien	April 9, 2013	Lets look for clean energy solutions, wind, solar, water	PN 02, ALT 01
Lisa Oltmans	April 22, 2013	Its not worth the risk to our supply of fresh underground water!	ACK
Lisa Poppleton	April 9, 2013	When a cleaner energy future is on the horizon, it is wasteful and backward to spend this much money on studying and building the Keystone Pipeline.	ALT 01
Lisa Ranghelli	April 2, 2013	I have finally accepted what climate scientists and the dramatic evidence all around us say--our planet is in dire risk of being irreparably affected by global warming, to the point of no longer being able to sustain life.	ACK
Lisa Rufo	April 2, 2013	We need to invest in alternate energy sources that will not ruin our environment.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lisa Stevens	March 6, 2013	[Were] the authors are not perhaps overly reliant on industry data or industry friendships.	PRO 01
Lisa Thomas-Scheele	April 22, 2013	We need new ideas and large investments to be spent of developing new clean renewable energy.	PN 02
Lisa Thomas-Scheele	April 22, 2013	any dollar invested in this crap is money not spent developing renewable, clean energy.	PN 03
Lisa Turnbow	April 13, 2013	It has unforeseen consequences as well as the known consequences of spills.	CU 17
Lisa Vogelsang	March 28, 2013	The location of the pipeline is too dangerous for the critical water table in Nebraska and elsewhere.	WRG 01
Lisa Waltz	April 2, 2013	Native American Families are impacted at the source of the tar sands in Canada where their water isn't safe to drink, their fish are not safe to eat and their land is forever ruined by this greedy company. All along the pipeline route where it crosses native land without regard to their sovereignty they have no way to protect their land and people. Nor are the rights of land owners along the route respected.	CU 05
Lisa West	April 21, 2013	extracting the tar sands oil is environmentally dangerous and energy-inefficient burning tar sands oil produces excessive levels of carbon and contributes to global warming far more than regular oil to transport the oil across the U.S., a foreign company will take the land belonging to American citizens, often against their own wishes transporting the oil presents a danger to our environment, as spills will be inevitable and tar sands spills are proving impossible to clean up the pipeline will be a prime target for terrorists, as vast expanses of it will be unguarded, and an environmental catastrophe will ensue should the pipeline be purposely be breached there is no guarantee the oil will be sold in the United States, so our nation will take on the risk without any "gain"	CU 02, CLIM 14, PN 05, RISK 04, WRS 04
Lisa Whiteman	April 21, 2013	The thing that concerns me the most is that the greenhouse gas emissions from tar sands oil are estimated to be 82 percent greater than those produced by conventional crude oil.	CLIM 12
Lisa Whiteman	April 21, 2013	With the advent of ever-improving 100 mpg cars for sale by American companies right now, the extra dirty oil from Canadian tar sands is not needed.	PN 12
Lisa Winton	April 22, 2013	Tar sands crude is very corrosive and I think that it is inevitable that leaks will occur. This is especially critical since the proposed path is over the Ogallala aquifer.	RISK 24, RISK 11, WRG 01
Lisette Zinner	April 5, 2013	Why don't we invest in energy that will last forever without destroying the earth for future generations?	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lisiunia (lisa) Romanienko	April 2, 2013	I don't believe that allowing this tar sands oil to cross any of our country, whether populated or not, is in our collective interest. This is not exactly oil, it is hydrocarbons, to be sure, but it is closer to the viscosity of tar. They have to dilute it with solvents just to get it to flow in the pipe. And of course, those solvents are a trade secrets. No telling what is in them or what the health and environmental risks are. Especially since there is no currently known method to clean up tar sands oil spills. They are learning as they go at those residents expense.	PN 08, RISK 12
Lissa Firor	March 11, 2013	it ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	ACK
Lissa Firor	March 11, 2013	A fair and inclusive environmental impact statement MUST include the proposed project's impacts on the earth's atmosphere and climate. The decision to evade this monumentally important consideration in the EIS is coward's logic.	CLIM 12
Lissa Firor	March 11, 2013	So instead of continuing to allow oil company contractors to determine what is in our national interest, it's time for this administration to step up and reject this pipeline once and for all.	PN 08
Lita Sandy	April 4, 2013	I LOVE SONGBIRDS AND CAN'T STAND THE THOUGHT OF MORE DESTRUCTION OF OUR NATURAL WILDLIFE HABITATS.	ACK
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	current economic conditions and pipeline capacity constraints have moved our industry to increase rail transportation of our products. Rail and pipelines are compatible as rail can meet market demand and provide capacity until pipelines are built, at which point rail can move to other points of constraint to help keep the whole transporation system in balance. Canadian oil sands producters are also pursuing other pipeline expansions to access markets on the West, South, and East Coasts.	ALT 04
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	The GHG footprint of the oil sands is less than reported in the Draft SEIS. The 2012 HIS CERA study, Oil Sands Greenhouse Gases and US Oil Supply Getting the Numbers Right 2012 Update, found that oil sands, on average is only 9-12 percent [see footnote in this submission from Cenovus on pg 2] higher than the average barrel of all oil refined in the US. This range is materially lower than the 17 percent number in the SEIS which uses 2005 NETL data. For Cenovus, our industy leading steam to oil ratio for our SAGD oil sands operations enables our product to meet California's current Low Carbon Fuel Standard.	CLIM 12
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	The Canadian oil sands inductry has reduced its GHG intensity by 26 percent since 1990 and will continue to reduce this through the development and implementation of new technology. The most recent oil sands projects continue to demonstrate this ongoing trend with GHG intensity within 2-5 percent fo the average barrel refined in the US.	CLIM 15

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	[I]mports from Canada's oil sands from Keystone XL will replace other heavy crudes coming from Mexico and Venezuela, which have comparable GHG emission on a lifecycle basis to oil sands. Oil transported throuigh Keystone XL is intended to meet the needs of US Gulf Coast refineries and is not intended to be exported from the US.	PN 04
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	We [Canada and America] have the opportunity to grow our energy trade between countries with aligned environmental policies through approval of the Keystone XL.	PN 10
Little, Lori	April 22, 2013	Pipelines are the safest and most efficient means of transporting large quantities of crude oil and natural gas over land. Every day, Canadian Energy Pipeline Association (CEPA) companies transport enough crude oil and petroleum products to fill 15,000 tuck loads and 4,200 rail cars. Between 2002 and 2011, CEPA reported a 99.999 percent safety record for pipeline transportation of oil and natural gas. Trans Canada has significant experience building and operating pipelines moving crude oil in North America through a number of different environments.	RISK 14
Liz	April 17, 2013	This destructive pipeline would carry the same amount of CO2 as 37.7 MILLION cars on the road.	CLIM 11
Liz Amsden	March 28, 2013	What is truly appalling is that the recently released State Department "review" of the environmental impact relied almost entirely on "experts" with close ties to the industry poised to impact the environment.	PRO 01
Liz Amsden	March 28, 2013	The construction itself threatens farmlands and virgin habitats. The flow of crude when it comes will threaten vast watersheds and human health along its entire length. Crude from tar sands is highly toxic and corrodes metal pipes increasing the chance of multiple dangerous spills.	RISK 14
Liz Amsden	March 28, 2013	Their 2010-constructed Keystone 1 pipeline, which starts in Hardisty, Alberta and ends in Cushing, Oklahoma, failed (meaning it spilled significant quantities of corrosive heavy crude) 12 times in its first year of operation. Transcanada had predicted an "incident" due to corrosion once every 3,400 years and an "incident" due to flooding once every 87,800 years. Both happened in numbers that put a lie to their predictions in just ONE year	RISK 26
Liz Amsden	March 28, 2013	Turns out that 40 percent of U.S oil-industry jobs consist of minimum-wage work at gas stations. Instead of bankrolling an industry that is laying off workers and threatening our economic future, isn't it time to take the billions in subsidies going to oil companies and invest instead in a sector that both creates jobs and protects the planet?	SO 04
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	I want YOU to make a first priority of the complete shutdown of the Keystone XL project which not only is driving huge environmental damage in Canada but also the RAPE of the American states along its path, …	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	The State Department's review ignores ... the wishes of the PEOPLE through whose land and states the pipeline will pass (although not those of the businesses and governments who stand to make a profit),…	ACK
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	The State Department's review ignores… the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	ACK
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	The State Department's review ignores ... its catastrophic impacts on our climate, …	CLIM 12
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	With the longer Keystone XL pipeline, what do you think the chances are of avoiding MULTIPLE tragic environmental disasters across the United States?	CU 17
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	Furthermore, the same fossil fuel interests pushing the Keystone XL pipeline have been CUTTING, not creating, jobs: Despite generating $546 billion in profits between 2005 and 2010, ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell, and BP reduced their U.S. workforce by 11,200 employees over that same period. In 2010 alone, the top five oil companies slashed their global workforce by 4,400 employees -- the same year executives paid themselves nearly $220 million, i.e. $50K PER laid off employee.	PN 05
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	I want YOU to make a first priority of the complete shutdown of the Keystone XL project which not only is driving ..., the INCREASE of gas prices for ALL Americans …	PN 05
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	What is truly appalling is that the recently released State Department "review" of the environmental impact relied almost entirely on "experts" with close ties to the industry poised to impact the environment.	PRO 01
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	I want YOU to make a first priority of the complete shutdown of the Keystone XL project which not only is driving ... the significant potential of attracting terrorist acts for SHORT-TERM LOW-PAYING construction jobs during and MINIMAL shipping-connected jobs after as the corporate-welfare oil giants ship oil overseas for THEIR gain and American pain.	RISK 04, PN 05
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	The flow of crude when it comes will pollute vast watersheds and undermine human, animal and plant health along its entire length.	RISK 07
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	The State Department's review ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills,…	RISK 07
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	Bituminous crude from tar sands is highly toxic and corrodes metal pipes increasing the chance of multiple dangerous spills.	RISK 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Liz Amsden	April 2, 2013	Their 2010-constructed Keystone 1 pipeline, which starts in Hardisty, Alberta and ends in Cushing, Oklahoma, failed (meaning it spilled significant quantities of corrosive heavy crude) TWELVE TIMES in its first year of operation. TransCanada had "predicted" an "incident" due to corrosion once every 3,400 YEARS and an "incident" due to flooding once every 87,800 YEARS. Both happened in numbers that put a lie to their predictions in just ONE year.	RISK 26
Liz Amsden	April 5, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	CLIM 05
Liz Amsden	April 5, 2013	Furthermore, the construction itself threatens farmlands and virgin habitats. The flow of crude when it comes will pollute vast watersheds and undermine human, animal and plant health along its entire length. Bituminous crude from tar sands is highly toxic and corrodes metal pipes increasing the chance of multiple dangerous spills.	RISK 07
Liz Amsden	April 5, 2013	Their 2010-constructed Keystone 1 pipeline, which starts in Hardisty, Alberta and ends in Cushing, Oklahoma, failed (meaning it spilled significant quantities of corrosive heavy crude) TWELVE TIMES in its first year of operation. TransCanada had "predicted" an "incident" due to corrosion once every 3,400 YEARS and an "incident" due to flooding once every 87,800 YEARS. Both happened in numbers that put a lie to their predictions in just ONE year. With the longer Keystone XL pipeline, what do you think the chances are of avoiding MULTIPLE tragic environmental disasters across the United States?	RISK 26
Liz Amsden	April 5, 2013	Furthermore, the same fossil fuel interests pushing the Keystone XL pipeline have been CUTTING, not creating, jobs: Despite generating $546 billion in profits between 2005 and 2010, ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell, and BP reduced their U.S. workforce by 11,200 employees over that same period. In 2010 alone, the top five oil companies slashed their global workforce by 4,400 employees	SO 02
Liz Amsden	April 5, 2013	Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill would contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize the American food supply by destroying farms and ranches.	WRG 01, LU 01
Liz Amsden	April 19, 2013	Bituminous crude from tar sands is highly toxic and corrodes metal pipes increasing the chance of multiple dangerous spills.	RISK 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Liz Amsden	April 19, 2013	TransCanada's 2010-constructed Keystone 1 pipeline, which starts in Hardisty, Alberta and ends in Cushing, Oklahoma, failed (meaning it spilled significant quantities of corrosive heavy crude) 12 times in its first year of operation. TransCanada had "predicted" an "incident" due to corrosion once every 3,400 years and an "incident" due to flooding once every 87,800 years. Both happened in numbers that put a lie to their predictions in just one year.	RISK 26
Liz Mitchell	March 16, 2013	This form of oil production is extremely destructive. The tar sand oil is very carbon intensive. The claims that it will be developed anyway may or may not be true.	CLIM 05
Liz Palmer	April 9, 2013	There are alternative sources of energy that are not terminally destructive of our threatened environment. I urge you to consider them.	PN 02, ALT 01
Liz Renner	March 24, 2013	The repercussions of its construction will have a negative impact on our environment, public health, and our livelihoods.	RISK 07
Liz Ryan	April 9, 2013	Furthermore it [the DSEIS] dismisses far too casually the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, even claiming that they need not be considered.	CLIM 12
Liz Ryan	April 9, 2013	The ongoing pipeline rupture in Arkansas clearly demonstrates three things. 1. Pipelines rupture with unacceptable predictability. 2. The oil industry has no plan nor technology to cope effectively with oil spills, including those from pipeline ruptures. 3. Tar sands oil is extraordinarily corrosive, messy, and difficult to clean up.	RISK 14
Liz Wolf-spada	March 11, 2013	The oil will be shipped THROUGH our country, not TO our country and the pipeline endangers major water sources.	PN 07
Liza Marks	April 10, 2013	We need to move away from using fossil fuels, not towards using more of them	PN 02
Liza Marks	April 10, 2013	In addition to contributing to climate change, this project would destroy valuable habitats and precious ecosystems that are a crucial part of our heritage as a nation.	PN 08
Lizabet Arellano	April 22, 2013	Not willing to risk our health & water for oil.	PN 09
Lizbeth Stringer	April 4, 2013	Alternative energy sources have got to be the push to sustain our energy needs. This continued push to extract a non-renewable resource is hard headed and short sighted.	ALT 01
Lizette Weiss	April 11, 2013	I will wager that the residents whose property was fouled consider this a major disaster to them, their families, their property and everything living in the vacinity.	ACK
Lizzie Of Earth	April 22, 2013	The only honest and sound approach to assessment of the project would be to assess the entire project and it's total impact, now and in the future. This should be done by qualified scientists without affiliation or ties to TransCanada, which has not been the case.	ACK
Ll Macdermott	April 22, 2013	No pipeline is immune to leaks, even one built with the latest, most expensive technology. Tar sands spills would be especially detrimental to the ecology and agricultural economies of the environments it would pass through.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
LLoyd and Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	We beg of you to keep our air clean by opposing the refining of this "dirty" tar sands oil in the United States. Please continue with the efforts of cleaning up our air and pushing towards "Green" energy rather than allowing an old "fossil" fuel dependency to grow.	ACK
LLoyd and Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	And the risk to our water is unimaginable. One small leak will put our Ranch and Feedlot out ofbusiness as the proposed pipeline runs right over top of our drinking well and dissects the springs of water that flow into the dam that supplies ALL of the water to our feedlots.	RISK 09, RISK 07
LLoyd and Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	Disturbing these native grasslands will take years, if not forever to restore to their original production.	VEG 01
LLoyd and Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	At the present time the proposed Keystone XL pipeline crosses our land and the precious Ogallala Aquifer that is below it.	WRG 01
LLoyd and Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	Consider the miles of Fresh water that would be exposed to the same dangers in the event of a leak.	WRS 02
Lloyd Frank	April 20, 2013	The Keystone pipeline will move oil more cheaply than trains & not wear out railroad lines Also train cars set around waiting for engines to move them	ACK
Lloyd Ramsey	March 11, 2013	Please do not rely on an altered report, that make every thing appear to be w/ out difficulty.	LEG 04
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, irrigation for farms and ranches with devastating tar sands spills. This new route still traverses the Ogallala Aquifer that supplies water to millions of people and for agriculture.	ACK
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	Human Rights: The report doesn’t address the human rights violations of the Dene, Cree and Métis that live downstream and other First Nations and local communities living in the regional areas of Alberta’s tar sands industrial complex.	CU 05
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	Land Rights: This report does not address the rights of the farmers and ranchers who are being bullied and threatened with "eminent domain" by TransCanada - a foreign corporation - who began their intimidation and threats before a permit had been issued.	LEG 02
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	Indigenous Sovereignty: The lack of comprehensive consultation with Native Nations and lack of meaningful participation with indigenous traditional societies, spiritual leaders and tribal grassroots on the protection of sacred areas, and cultural and historical resources is an environmental justice and treaty rights issue and is unacceptable.	LEG 03, CR 01
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	KXL does not provide energy security because the end product will be exported to China, South America, and Europe.	PN 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	Pipeline Failures: TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010. In just one week, this year, from March 25th to the 31st there were three pipeline failures: 1)121,000 gallons in Alberta, 2) 15,000 in Minnesota, and 3) 550,000 in Arkansas.	RISK 26
Logan Davis	April 21, 2013	The construction of the Keystone XL will create approximately 3,900 temporary and 35 full-time positions as cited in a U.S State Department report. In fact, and contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 04, RISK 06, SO 05
Lois Barber	March 19, 2013	Please see that the State Department's Report on the XL Keystone pipeline fully addresses the long-term environmental consequences of burning the oil from the tar-landen sands of Alberta.	CLIM 10
Lois Barber	March 19, 2013	As the New York Times said in its recent editorial, "It is the long-term consequences that Mr. Obama should focus on. Given its carbon content, tar sands oil should be among the first fossil fuels we decide to leave alone."	CLIM 14
Lois Bernstein	March 14, 2013	In sections that have been installed spills have already been reported and poor construction of segments are common	CU 13
Lois Brunelle	April 11, 2013	.The recent rupture of a tar sands pipeline in a residential subdivision in Arkansas provides yet another illustration of how unreliable these pipelines are and how they threaten to contaminate our neighborhoods and our waterways.	RISK 14
Lois Cecsarini	March 12, 2013	GHG emissions are, on average, 14%-20% higher for Canadian oil sands crude than for the weighted average of transportation fuels sold or distributed in the United States. Compared to selected imports, Canadian oil sands crudes range from 9% to 19% more emission-intensive than Middle Eastern Sour, 5% to 13% more emission-intensive than Mexican Maya, and 2%-8% more emission-intensive than various Venezuelan crudes, on a Well-to-Wheel basis. The estimated effect of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline on the U.S. GHG footprint would be an increase of 3 million to 21 million metric tons of GHG emissions annually (equal to the annual GHG emissions from the combustion of fuels in approximately 588,000 to 4,061,000 passenger vehicles.	CLIM 08
Lois Congdon	April 3, 2013	The only politically impartial study of the effects of this proposed pipeline was done by Colgate University, and it found that IT WILL DESTROY MORE JOBS THAN IT WILL CREATE.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lois Dalsin	April 22, 2013	While the State Department's draft SEIS fails to provide adequate documentation for its conclusions, the public sector has provided substantial documentation proving the devastation of the environment, ecosystem, water, air, and health of the indigenous peoples living in the national sacrifice zones of the tar sands, and indeed, of all in the direct areas of development, transportation, refining, and use of the tar sands oil itself. And the public's documentation contains irrefutable evidence that the tar sands will rapidly accelerate global climate change.	CU 02, CLIM 12
Lois Dalsin	April 22, 2013	The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires that supporting documents be made available to the public. During this 45-day public comment period, the State Department has not, to my knowledge, made available such documents as would substantiate the conclusions drawn in the draft SEIS. In the absence of such documentation, I have come to the conclusion that the documentation in support of at least some of the draft SEIS's conclusions probably does not exist.	PRO 05
Lois Dimarco	April 2, 2013	No one stands to gain from this dirty oil except the corporations pushing it. It won't make us 'oil independent'. It won't make us secure. It won't lower gas prices. It will push us ever closer to the place of no return re the climate We should be making a major effort to get off oil, not push for more drilling and exploration in fragile places.	PN 08, CLIM 12
Lois Haupt	April 22, 2013	We dont want to risk having our groundwater polluted by dirty tar sands oil. Why should we allow them to run their dirty oil through our country, only to have it exported to China and other countries? Please consider the health of our communities and dont endanger it in this way!	PN 05
Lois Kain	April 4, 2013	The Environmental Impact Statement is a flawed piece of work produced by agencies with deep ties to the fossil industry. Environmental Resources Management, just one of the oil-soaked consulting firms which Platform London describes "as a key node of the Carbon Web," uses their own "Tabacco Playbook" to twist the science into double speak and debated facts.	PRO 01
Lois Karasek	March 14, 2013	…today I learned about all the private land owners in Texas who are being FORCED OFF THEIR LAND for the construction of this useless pipeline. We still live in America, don't we? The "taking" of private land is only intended for purposes of providing the highest and best use of the land for "all concerned." The only ones to benefit from the taking of our citizens' land in this case are the Canadians, and that simply IS NOT RIGHT.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lois Karasek	March 14, 2013	And today I learned about all the private land owners in Texas who are being FORCED OFF THEIR LAND for the construction of this useless pipeline. We still live in America, don't we? The "taking" of private land is only intended for purposes of providing the highest and best use of the land for "all concerned." The only ones to benefit from the taking of our citizens' land in this case are the Canadians, and that simply IS NOT RIGHT.	LEG 02
Lois Mills	April 9, 2013	We have no idea how to deal with accidents...The recent accident in Arkansas is a reminder of what is to come, and we should learn from it.	RISK 13
Lois Newton	April 1, 2013	It does not benefit Americans, and it detracts from the focus of building up our alternative energy choices.	PN 03
Lois Norrgard	April 22, 2013	[funding should go into] research and development of clean, alternative energy.	PN 02
Lois Schank	April 22, 2013	…tar sands oil through our Ogallala Aquifer endanger- ing our purest and most necessary source of water.	ACK
Lois Schank	April 22, 2013	At a hearing in May 2010 in York NE we were informed that a Canadian oil pipeline had broken and leaked oil earlier until it was discovered by rural firefighters. The danger is always there that without adequate safeguards our entire water supply could be polluted and in peril.	RISK 14
Lois Schreur	April 22, 2013	Tar sands mining destroys vast areas of the earth for little oil and the pollution is mind bogling.	ACK
Lois Schreur	April 22, 2013	3 million gallons of toxic waste a day are flowing into the Athabasca river in Canada with results of high cancer rates and ruined environment/wildlife.	CU 02
lois schreur	April 22, 2013	For more information on studies and reports it is important to read the studies done by Professor on Environmental engineering John Stansberry at http://watercenter.unl.edu and learn what TransCanada does not want you to know.	REF
Lois Schreur	April 22, 2013	... spills would ruin the Ogallala Aquifer on which much of the midwest depends for drinking water, irrigation, wildlife habitat.	RISK 07
Lois Schreur	April 22, 2013	toxic pollution that causes severe increased health risks to humans	RISK 30
Lois Todd-Meyer	April 22, 2013	The possibility for excellent, well-paying jobs is far greater as we explore renewable energy sources.	SO 05
Lola Messall	April 21, 2013	Sweden has a goal of being petroleum free by 2020. They will attain this goal very soon. Let us join them	PN 02
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	It risks of increasing global warming exponentially : top climate scientists have opposed it. It will increase greenhouse gases.	CLIM 14
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	Forests, wilderness and wildlife destroyed.	CU 01
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline is antithetical to the goals of America.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	Environmental impact report on pipeline is flawed and misleading, and undermined by a conflict of interest, since experts who helped draft it had ties to TransCanada and the Keystone pipeline.	PRO 01
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	The major fact is that OIL ALWAYS LEAKS AND TOXIC EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT UPON WHICH WE RELLY FOR EXISTENCE ALWAYS OCCUR.	RISK 07
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	The current pipeline has already leaked 14 times.	RISK 26
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	only a very small number of jobs would be created, very little benefit economically.	SO 02
Lonner Holden	April 1, 2013	Drinking water could be seriously affected: Keystone XL will run through the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides at least 20 percent of America's agricultural irrigation and provides millions with their drinking water--one leak could be a nightmare.	WRG 01
Loren Lund	April 15, 2013	Will you take responsibility if our Ogalla Aquifer here in Nebraska gets polluted from a spill?	WRG 01
Loretta Lane	April 2, 2013	Besides that dirty oil will go down to Texas to be shipped to the East ..like China,we won't benefit from it and who wants to ??	PN 07
Loretta Lane	April 2, 2013	A person can see the horrible devastation that dirty tar sand oil can do ..then just imagine what a pipe line that they want to put right in the middle of the country...that huge pipe line that will harm the water ways...if it cause the damage in Arkansas then what can it do in the middle of the country…	RISK 07
Loretta Valenski	April 9, 2013	the environmental review was done with people who have strong ties to the oil and gas industry.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	Allowing the pipeline to be built will set precedence by granting a private for profit company the full power to take away private land owners rights. As you heard at the recent hearing in Grand Island, many of these ranch families have been here for as long as five generations. Their land is not for sale at any price. And they loose value after a pipeline is put on their land. Many court cases at this time are being fought all a crossed our county to defend landowners from this wrongful taking. Indian tribes have agreed to not allow the land they control to be used. As one speaker said at the hearing: "Come through Indian country, you wont make it." Farmers, Ranchers and the indigenous people have joined forces to fight. In Polk County Nebraska as of April 15th, two day before the State Department hearing TransCanada had only three land use lease agreements filed for the segment that runs a crossed my entire county. Trans Canada will never be able to honestly claim that the compensation they offer does not infringed on our land owners rights or is agreeable to many property owners in my state. It should be clear after knowing they lack most of the easements in my county and in others it will be a long hard fight to tear away land from private US land owners. Our Government should not be helping them to do it. It should be crystal clear there will be a fight to take the land when so many would rather be forced by eminent domain than sell easements to Trans Canada.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	Pipe line companies use a wide array of techniques to detect leaks, remote leak detection technology is the most comprehensive, offering real-time, nonstop monitoring along the lines route. But the facts have shown some operators may get so used to false alarms that they may become dismissive of real ones. For instance, consider the rupturing of an Enbridge (NYSE: ENB) pipeline in July 2010, which discharged more than a million gallons of dilbit crude into Michigans Kalamazoo River in what was the first major bituminous crude spill into a U.S. waterway. At the time the pipeline ruptured, the companys controllers were monitoring data from multiple lines, while also working 12-hour shifts. At the first sign of danger -- the moment pipeline 6B ruptured -- numerous alarms were triggered. Yet control room and other personnel dismissed the warnings as false alarms triggered because of column separation. It took them 17 hours to figure out they had a spill on their hands. If you get a multiple false alarms a month, what happens when you get a big [real] one? How do you tell the difference? You cant. The unfortunate reality is that no solution to detect all oil spills consistently and reliably today. Even companies with top-notch leak detection systems and experienced control-room personnel have to face the very real risk that some leaks will go unnoticed. In the remote areas along the pipeline route it will be difficult to discover them until they are big enough to notice if any one is around to see. The spill response plan in the study is useless. Tar sands Crude is NOT conventional oil, and does NOT behave like it!! The empirical, undeniable evidence from the Enbridge 6-B spill into the Kalamazoo River, the ExxonMobil spill into the Yellowstone River, and the ExxonMobil Pegasus spill in Mayflower, Arkansas ALL showed that Tar sands SINKS in water! I have personally heard from the mouths of Trans Canada representatives during the Nebraska Natural resource committee hearing that it floats. They also say it is not any more corrosive that other products shipped by pipelines. I would like to know if that is also a lie before any more new pipelines are build or more of the old lines are converted to trans port it.	RISK 08, RISK 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	The federal agency responsible for regulating interstate pipelines is the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), a perennially under funded and understaffed division of the U.S. Department of Transportation. For the most part the agency relies on pipeline operators to monitor their pipelines and self-report any problems. In 2008, Enbridge identified 140 corrosion defects on 6B as serious enough to fall into the 180-day category. But the company repaired just 26 of them during that period. In 2009, Enbridge self-reported a separate set of 250 defects to PHMSA. The company fixed only 35 of them within 180 days. Instead of immediately addressing the 329 defects that now remained, Enbridge got a one-year extension from PHMSA by exercising its legal option to reduce pumping pressure on 6B while it decided whether to repair or replace the line. A defect on 6B near John LaForges house, where the pipeline eventually ruptured, didn't even appear on any of the 180-day repair lists. This small part of the history of oil transport companies alone shows how venerable our aquifer will become by putting trust in the management by TransCanada or any new owners of this pipeline.	RISK 23, RISK 05
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	I had a conversation with Evan Vokes a ex TransCanada pipeline engineer, a man responsible for ensuring that pipelines were constructed safely, who came forward with shocking information about TransCanada's unscrupulous safety practices. Evan Vokes gave testimony information about how industry regulations are poorly enforced and lead to potentially dangerous incidents like the Enbridge oil spill. When referring to work done on past pipe lines he said someone is going die and they just don't know it yet. He said I should be very worried about the first Keystone pipeline built just a few miles from my home. He said they did not listen to safety recommendations he made because they had already spent more money than they planned. I find it also hard to trust the state of the art technology TransCanada intends to use as being good enough to protect the most valuable water resource in North America.	RISK 25
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	Every type of crude oil, including diluted bitumen, is made up of hundreds of chemicals, and many of them evaporate into the air after a spill. If Scientists don't fully understand how some of these chemicals affect humans how can Doctors know how to treat people exposed? During a congressional hearing on the Michigan spill, Scott Masten, a scientist at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, would testify that the potential for human health effects exist. However, understanding and quantifying these effects requires further study. There has been relatively little long-term research into the human health effects from oil spills.	RISK 30, RISK 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	This briefing paper raises a number of questions regarding the jobs claims promoted by the industry, questions that are serious enough to generate a high level of skepticism regarding the value of KXL as an important source of American jobs. http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI_KeystoneXL_Reportpdf.pdf	SO 02
Lori & Ron Fischer	April 22, 2013	The compromise to move the route changes nothing as far as protecting the water source for our heartland, it only give a false impression that it does. A different map was used that does not reflect the same shared soil types as on the original true map of our sand hills that Trans Canada used in their first permit application. And even then neither one of the general ecosystem management maps were ever intended to be use for pipeline sitting. They did not move the new route out of the sand hill. The same soil types that help to contribute to the recharge of our aquifer exist on the new route. The same vulnerability still exist. A DEQ staff member John Bender, told Inside Climate that it is up to TransCanada to "come up with something that's as far away from [the Sandhills] as possible while still meeting their needs." Appearing to only Hug the Sandhills on a different map is hardly "far away" from the fragile part of our state we are so concerned about. It does not eliminate the threat a spill could cause to the recharge area for our aquifer.	WRG 06, SOIL 08
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Because of the demand to transport oil to coastal refineries, oil-by-rail projects are increasing dramatically in part because of limited options for transport via pipeline. The Keystone Pipeline is expected to pipe 830,000 barrels per day, which could be absorbed by current and additional rail projects but without the environmental impacts and risks that oil pipelines can have.	ALT 04
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The Air Quality and Noise Resource sections of Affected Environment address federal and state air quality regulations, but does not examine tribal regulations. Because air quality will be impacted and transported across administrative boundaries, the SEIS must review any and all tribal air and noise quality regulations/standards and address how tribal air quality would be impacted later in Environmental Consequences section 4.12.	AQN 06
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	SEIS at 3.11-28. The PA is problematic because it establish an agreement and included and excluded Tribes from fair and reasonable participation in the NHPA process. A tribe's right to fair and appropriate participation in the identification and evaluation of historic properties exists under NHPA regardless of a PA. Our Tribe was never provided an opportunity to participate at any level in the NHP A process of this Project.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Tribal consultation was insufficient. Consultation did not occur with our Tribe. While Appendix E Record of Consultation lists a large number of Indian Tribes who were contacted about this project, but our Tribe was not contacted or consulted whatsoever. Our Tribe has historical and current cultural ties to areas that may be impacted by the Project and therefore should have been consulted in a government-to-government forum as required under NHP A and executive orders. Lack of consultation also prevented our Tribe from having an opportunity to be involved in any way with the tribal monitoring activities and the tribal monitoring plan.	CR 01
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The Cultural Resources under Affected Environment also is insufficient. Our Tribe was precluded from having any opportunity in the cultural resource assessments and final determinations ofNRHP eligibility for historic and prehistoric sites, including lithic deposits, stone circles, and other prehistoric cultural resources important to our Tribe and other tribes. Cultural resource inventories often identify prehistoric artifacts that third party consultants determine as "isolates"; whereas our Tribe upon review of those cultural resource data typically find that those determinations are incorrect and are actually part of a large prehistoric site and eligible under NRHP. Because our Tribe and many other Tribes were precluded from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in culturalresources inventories and final determinations, we are concerned about misclassifications of our prehistoric resources, which greatly reduces the number of NRHP eligible sites. Furthermore, the lists of cultural resources under Table 3.11-2, Table 3.11-3, and Table 3.11-4 seem incredibly few for the length of pipeline and this greatly concerns our Tribe not only of because of misclassified cultural resources, but also that cultural resource rich area seem to have been missed or unreported resources. Cultural resource inventories must include tribal members and their resource specialists in both field surveys and final determinations of NRHP eligibility. Moreover, the evaluation of properties of Religious and Cultural Significance never included our Tribe and our connection to the affected area.	CR 02
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The SEIS fails to consider tribal land uses under Section 3.9 of the SEIS. Our Tribal members use affected lands for cultural purposes. There are culturally significant sites in the affected area and sites that protected under state, federal and tribal laws that are likely to be impacted from the Keystone Pipeline.	CR 02
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The CEA does not accurately depict impacts from refinery expansions as may occur once Keystone Pipeline is in place. With the large number of oil releases from oil pipelines and other oil storage and transport facilities, this CEA must also address how Keystone Pipeline would add an increment of impacts from potential oil releases.	CU 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The CEA fails to assess whether future actions would add an increment to the cumulative. The increments must be illustrated individually and shown how they add to the cumulative effect.	CU 09
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA) uses a CEA matrix to illustrate subjective connected and cumulative impacts on certain subjective resource parameters. The determinations of those resource parameters that are included in the CEA matrices are incomplete and not fully representative of potential effects. CEA does not address past, present, future and connected oil releases on/in soil and water supplies that impact the all resources.	CU 11
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Connected actions are not fully evaluated and disclosed.	CU 13
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	It is clear from the Keystone Pipeline FEIS and SEIS that the risk to public health, public safety, and environmental necessities that sustain Indian nations and the American public would be extraordinary. Because of this, the Secretary of State cannot approve the Keystone Pipeline Presidential Permit even with the associated terms, conditions, and monitoring and mitigation. This Keystone Project places the burden of catastrophe on the public and the environmental resources upon which Indian nations and the American public require for their livelihoods.	EJ 01
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe is also concerned about the insufficient disclosure of environmental justice parameters of Native America people. Many areas along the proposed pipeline will disproportionately impact Native Americans, with much greater risk of adverse health and environmental impacts on adjacent tribal lands and/or culturally significant lands and sites.	EJ 01
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The FEIS and SEIS fail to consider major historic earthquake/seismic activity. The SEIS limits the data on seismic activity to the USGS's National Earthquake Information Center database. No effort was made to include seismic activity before 1973. Geological data exists that would provide a time series of seismic events before 1973 and many centuries if not millennia into the past. Because m~or seismic activity can occur in the region, the SEIS must include the history of seismic activity on geologic time scales in the analysis. Currently, the omission of that data prevents our Tribe and the general public from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to review potential issues and risks of the Keystone Pipeline, and prevents an opportunity to challenge this NEP A document.	GEO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Because domestic oil exports have risen so sharply in the last decade, the concern that the Keystone Pipeline will greatly facilitate further oil exports rather than securing domestic oil for domestic users is a serious concern. If transportation costs of exporting oil from the Gulf Coast were sufficiently high to preclude selling and exporting to foreign buyers, then the SEIS must include an analysis of how much oil is actually exported. Without this type of information, the FEIS and SEIS preclude our Tribe and the public from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to review and challenge this NEP A document.	PN 13
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	The market analysis also errs in extrapolating and predicting future markets based on market fluctuations just within the last two years since the FEIS was released in 201 1. No doubt there will also be market fluctuations. Predicting future markets based on a two-year interval snapshot not only is ripe with technical flaws, but it provides a misleading market baseline.	PN 13
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	While the market analysis builds a case to suggest that alternative transportation of crude oil from WCSB and Bakken are not economically feasible, the alternatives assessment actually shows that transportation by rail is economically feasible and is booming. For example, oil exports by rail from the Bakken reserves in North Dakota have quadrupled within a single year (2011-2012) and is expected to exceed 800,000 bpd of exported oil by rail just from Bakken reserves by the end of 2013. SEIS at 2.2-3.	PN 13, ALT 04
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	An agreement between TransCanada and the Federal government that would delineate TransCanada's total responsibility in any oil releases from the Project must be included as part ofthis NEPA document and permit terms and conditions.	RISK 03
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	A major flaw in the FEIS and SEIS is the failure and insufficiency of addressing potential environmental impacts from oil pipeline spills, leaks, breaches or other releases. SEIS at 4.13-1. While the SEIS provides about 30 pages of background on data sources, regulations, responses, and methodology background, it fails to provide scenarios from which assessments of environmental impacts would be based. With the large dataset that is available on oil pipeline spills in the United States, construction of oil release scenarios and conducting corresponding impact analyses must be conducted to provide our Tribe and the general public an opportunity for a real evaluation and challenge of the FEIS and SEIS. The SEIS must illustrate the high and low risk areas on maps so that the reader can readily understand the risk areas. Without this scenario type analysis, the SEIS fails the hard look test of NEPA and prevents our Tribe and the public from having a fair opportunity to understand the potential impacts and hazards of the Keystone Pipeline.	RISK 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	the SEIS must include an analysis that evaluates multiple scenarios of potential oil release on all resources. This risk analysis has not been sufficiently conducted. Mitigation offered is insufficient.	RISK 10
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	No alternatives address design features of the pipeline that would further decrease or eliminate altogether potential oil spills. No alternatives address design features of the pipeline right of way that would completely contain oil from any leaks and spills. With the large number of oil pipeline spills/leaks each year in the US, it stands to reason that pipeline design and spill catchments need to be addressed. Alternatives that address design improvements that would eliminate or greatly reduce spills must be included.	RISK 14, ALT 10, RISK 19
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe is also concerned about impacts on sensitive, threatened and endangered species (TES). These TES species are culturally significant and there is no description of that importance in the SEIS.	TES 14
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	Section 3.5.4.6 fails to provide a sufficient synopsis of native plants used for traditional purposes.The plants listed under this section are few, not even close to a complete list and description of those traditionally important plants. This limited section fails to take a hard look at this resource parameter, and without a full assessment of those traditionally important plants the SEIS prevents our Tribe from an appropriate opportunity to review and comment on the NEP A document as provided for under NEP A and NHPA.	VEG 08
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	There is no subsection in Wildlife Resources or Fisheries Resources that addresses Native American traditional uses of fish and wildlife such as hunting, fishing and spiritual purposes. The SEIS provided no mention of bison in the areas potentially impacted by the Project. Bison are important animals to many tribes, including our Tribe historically and presently. The SEIS justifies no assessment of impacts on bison by stating that "[flree-ranging bison no longer occur within the area that would be crossed by the proposed Project route". SEIS at 3.6-2.	WI 20
Lori Bear	April 22, 2013	In the Water Resources section, the SEIS fails to evaluate pristine waters, protected waters, or wild and scenic rivers or other protected designations. Instead, the SEIS evaluates "Impaired or Contaminated Waterbodies" and attempts to establish a misleading baseline condition for water resources by selectively including this water parameter while excluding other important water parameters. This skewed baseline assessment and exclusion of information prevents our Tribe from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to effectively review and comment on this NEP A document. Also, that exclusion fails to meet NEPA's requirement to take a hard look at all possible impacts.	WRS 11, WRS 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Brunswig	April 22, 2013	It is critically important for agriculture and for the people who live in Nebraska that this aquifer is protected.	WRG 01
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	Dont put our Aquifer at risk.	ACK
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	We have no Emergency Response Plan that has been made public. Nebraskans are right now with the current pipeline in the ground at risk and at the mercy of TransCanada if/when a leak spill blowout or anything else happens with the pipe. Since Governor Heineman and Attorney General Brunning have both taken campaign contributions from TransCanada my guess is we never will have any protection.	LEG 24, LEG 17
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	We have no Emergency Response Plan that has been made public.	RISK 05
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	PHMSA lacks the resources to adequately monitor the millions of miles of pipelines over which it does have authority. The agency has funding for only 137 inspectors, and often employs even less than that (in 2010 the agency had 110 inspectors on staff). A Congressional Research Service report found a “long-term pattern of understaffing” in the agency’s pipeline safety program. According to the report, between 2001 and 2009 the agency reported a staffing shortfall of an average of 24 employees a year. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/R41536.pdf A New York Times investigation last year found that the agency is chronically short of inspectors because it just doesn’t have enough money to hire more, possibly due to competition from the pipeline companies themselves, who often hire away PHMSA inspectors for their corporate safety programs, according to the CRS. Given the limitations of government money and personnel, it is often the industry that inspects its own pipelines. Although federal and state inspectors review paperwork and conduct audits, most on-site pipeline inspections are done by inspectors on the company’s dime. The industry’s relationship with PHMSA may go further than inspections, critics say. The agency has adopted, at least in part, dozens of safety standards written by the oil and natural gas industry. "This isnt like the fox guarding the hen house," said Weimer. "Its like the fox designing the hen house." Last January, Obama signed a bill that commissioned several new studies to evaluate some of these proposed safety measures, although his decision on extending the Keystone pipeline may come long before those studies are completed. Will the Keystone be exempt if its already approved?	RISK 23
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	pipeline poses to much risk to… our wetlands…	WET 05
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	pipeline poses to much risk to the… whooping cranes and other migratory birds…	WI 01
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	pipeline poses to much risk to the Ogallala Aquifer	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	After viewing some of the recent aerial photos from the Arkansas tar sand spill, all I could think about -is what that might have been like for us- if it would have been from a pipeline ten times its size. Or not above ground but out of sight in our aquifer. Or worse yet in the RECARGE area for our aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 13
Lori Fischer	April 22, 2013	pipeline poses to much risk to… our surface waters	WRS 02
Lori Horan-fortina	April 4, 2013	Why are we even considering this matter? This is a request by a foreign corporation to run a hazardous substance through our country. In return, it offers a couple thousand temporary construction jobs for 2 years and only a couple hundred long term American jobs.	PN 05
Lori Hubbart	April 10, 2013	we have the woefully inadequate draft environmental review your department released last month for the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.	ACK
Lori Lawrence	April 1, 2013	When it leaks it will not be seen by anyone but cows until unbelieveable damage has been done.	ACK
Lori Lawrence	April 20, 2013	I [pipeline] is running through my state [Kansas] which is heavily dependent of well water for drinking, bathing and livestock. We all need clean water and when this pipeline goes through it will, there is no doubt of this, leak and contaminate our ground water.	ACK
Lori Lawrence	April 22, 2013	As a native Kansan I see the need to keep our limited water clean. We are currently in a severe drought and cannot afford to have our water contaminated by an oil spill along this pipeline.	WRG 03
Lori Mcdaniel	March 19, 2013	Quote from Chief Allan Adams, of the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN), Fort Chipewyan, Alberta, Canada, whose people live downstream from the source of the toxic crude oil that will flow through this Keystone XL pipeline said of the draft SEIS: “I must stress my extreme disappointment with this report. The fact that the Keystone XL pipeline is deemed as non-consequential simply paves the way for its approval and is directly connected to the unabated expansion of Tar Sands in my peoples’ traditional lands….and the Keystone is a vital pipeline for expansion. Expansion of the tar sands means a death sentence for our way for life, destruction of eco-systems vital to the continuation of our inherent treaty rights and massive contributions to catastrophic global climate change, a fate we all share.”	CU 05
Lori Mudloff	April 22, 2013	This pipeline still crosses the Ogallala Aquifer. When, not if, the pipeline leaks will be certain disaster.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lori Steckervetz	April 4, 2013	Including an honest appraisal of the current clean up strategies, or lack there of, as it has been widely reported that clean up workers dealing with the Kalamazoo River clean up effort are essentially writing the book as they go, acknowledging the scary truth that we are creating hazardous situations for which we are unprepared and incapable of effectively addressing.	RISK 08
Lori Steckervetz	April 5, 2013	The Kalamazoo spill three years ago demonstrates that we do not have the technology or resources to be able to effectively address any sort of accident with this material, so, it would be criminal to go ahead and move forward when we know we could not effectively clean a spill and restore a community, both natural and human, back to its pre-spill state.	RISK 29
Lori Tatreau	April 18, 2013	Risk of leaks into the fragile and crucial Ogallala Aquifer; (…)No information (even basic MSDS sheets) has been offered on contents flowing through pipes; (…) No thorough leak/clean-up plan has been offered(…) Risks to anyone coming into contact with processing tar sands or in the downstream path of the processing	RISK 07, RISK 05, RISK 12, RISK 30
Lori Tatreau	April 18, 2013	Route still does not avoid the Sandhills or Aquifer	WRG 06
Lori Tatreau	April 22, 2013	Exposing tar sands will release billions of tons of carbon into the atmosphere o increasing greenhouses gases increasing effects of global warming increasing storm damage and irregular weather patterns and sea level rise increasing risks of loss of life, property and livelihood everywhere on earth	CLIM 17
Lori Tatreau	April 22, 2013	Threats to landowner rights with eminent domain and other bullying tactics by a foreign corporation	LEG 02
Lori Tatreau	April 22, 2013	Creation of very few permanent local jobs • Contents of pipeline will be sold overseas for foreign corporation profit	PN 07
Lori Tatreau	April 22, 2013	No information (even basic MSDS sheets) has been offered on contents flowing through pipes • No thorough leak/clean-up plan has been offered	RISK 12
Lori Tatreau	April 22, 2013	Route still does not avoid the Sandhills or Aquifer • Risk of leaks into the fragile and crucial Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Lorinda Cooper	April 22, 2013	And the Ogallala Aquifer is a precious resource that one spill would poison.	RISK 07
Lorinda Cooper	April 22, 2013	make green energy mandatory and you create jobs, new industries and hope for a cleaner tomorrow	SO 05
Lorinda Cooper	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is a precious resource that one spill would poison.	WRG 01
Lorna Falkenstein	April 4, 2013	I put forth my personal evaluation of the Tar Sands, among many other damaging Earth activities, to be unworthy of promoting in any way, shape or form. The evidence is damning to say the least where ANY part of our environment is concerned. In fact, it would behoove our government to recommend an International Convention of Responsibility to halt and ban this horrid profit making venture forever for the sake of all humanity and all other life on Earth.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lorna Falkenstein	April 4, 2013	Nowhere has the phony 'clean-ups' from oil spills been successful and this form of crude exceeds any known effort now or in the future for reversing the damage caused. The frequency of these spills, ruptures and explosions are accelerating. These pipelines alone are unable to sustain the toxicity contained therein.	RISK 08
Lorna Smith	April 11, 2013	Please stop the destruction of the environment both of the planet and specifically the territory of Alberta Canada. The damage to the native people and the flora and fauna is incalculable and will last for generations to come even if the desecration were to stop today.	ACK
Lorne Stockman	April 18, 2013	It is also a great thing because we must reduce our use of oil in order to do our part to prevent the climate from becoming so unstable that we reverse the course of human progress and leave little hope for our children's future.	ACK
Lorne Stockman	April 18, 2013	The pipeline's major purpose is not to provide energy security for America, but to enable access to international markets in order to maximize returns for tar sands producers and refiners. In 2012, a full 60 percent of gasoline produced at Texas Gulf Coast refineries was exported. . This export boom is not something all U.S. refineries share equally in. It is in fact the same refineries that will receive Keystone XL crude that are the leading export refineries. They already export the majority of what they produce. The State Department's own report, published in March, confirmed this, stating that almost half of the products produced by these refineries go to the domestic market. It is also clear that if we carry on with business as usual, exports from these refineries are only likely to increase. Since 2005, a remarkable thing has happened to U.S. oil demand. Instead of growing relentlessly, as it had done for over a century, it is now declining. Americans are doing more and going further on less oil, and that is a great thing. It is a great thing because no matter how much oil America or Canada produces, American families and businesses will always be vulnerable to a volatile global oil market; a market in which prices can soar at the whim of distant dictators, or as a result of unavoidable natural disasters. The less oil America consumes, the less vulnerable it is to these unpredictable events. So while Americans do their part to use less oil, the tar sands producers and their refining partners are doing their best to undermine these efforts by producing the world's dirtiest oil and exporting the products refined from it.	PN 13
Lorraine	March 18, 2013	In addition, the oil will be exported and will not benefit the supply of the U.S.	PN 07
Lorraine	March 18, 2013	The pipeline will pass over important aquifers and put much of the heartland at risk of spill.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lorraine	April 11, 2013	The jobs provided by Keystone will be few and temporary. They will go to Canadians. The oil will be the filthiest on earth. Any spills will do permanent damage. The oil will go to China and India. I cannot believe anyone would give Canadians domain over Americans' property. It makes my blood boil!	SO 09, PN 05
Lorraine J Meyer-peyton	April 4, 2013	The risks are too great; the minimal rewards do not justify the potential for multiple disasters.	ACK
Lorraine Luntsford	April 20, 2013	We will *never* move away from fossil fuels and start healing our planet so long as we continue to take measures -supposedly for in the meantime- that facilitate it's continuation and causes us to be even MORE dependant upon it.	PN 03
Lorrie Eaton	April 8, 2013	Exxon's tar sands pipeline ruptured, on March 29, flooding a suburban community outside of Little Rock, Arkansas with hundreds of thousands of gallons of tar sands crude. This toxic river is not a mix that anyone would want flowing in front of their houses. Most of the residents had no idea there was such a thing running under their homes.	RISK 13
LoscutoffJ	April 18, 2013	How can humans, their animals, wildlife, and plants survive the [potential] toxic spill. It makes no sense to put this pipeline anywhere near our acquifer, not to mention the rivers it will cross.	RISK 07
LoscutoffJ	April 18, 2013	The Ogallala acquifer us very large and is under several states. It is a precious source of clean water. Clean water sources are diminishing and need protection. The first and second route of the proposed pipeline goes over or through the Ogallala acquifer.	WRG 01
LoscutoffM	April 18, 2013	This State Department decision presents an opportunity to start honoring treaties made between the US government and native tribes regarding the ownership, access, and use of land and water resources. Review all applicable treaties. If they do not allow access, then you may not grant the permit.	CR 02
Loseke	April 18, 2013	If the secretary thinks it's important to satisfy our Canadian neighbors and oil company agendas, the SEIS market analysis shows that rail can ship raw bitumen. Pipelines can't do that. American railroads can meet all market demands. And this option will eliminate the chemical component and all of the risks, fears and abuses.	ALT 04
Loseke	April 18, 2013	We have to stop diluting bitumen. Pipelines are inadequate, unsafe, outdated, untested and unwanted. But there should be a price for the privilege of moving this bitumen across our border and across our country. Make it sufficient to fund research and development to develop new energy solutions. That's how you do business for America.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Loseke	April 18, 2013	The oil companies resolved this problem by adapting the bitumen to fit their outdated and untested technology by adding diluents, the composition of which are a trade secret, adding pressures two times greater than required for traditional crude oil and result in higher heat levels than with crude oil. There are no parts of this pipeline technology that has undergone focused peer-reviewed testing. There is no data available on the corrosiveness of the product on the pipe. And there has been no testing on elevated temperatures and pressures on the pipe.	RISK 12, RISK 11, RISK 27
Lou Carol Cihak	April 20, 2013	Time to quit playing politics and start employing U.S. citizens looking for work! There is no valid reason for the day!	SO 02
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Additional details regarding the above concerns are included in the attached document titled, KXL Pipeline and Sage Grouse.	ACK
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	All development in Canada should be outside of the [sage grouse] critical habitat	ACK
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	a decision to green-light the Keystone XL pipeline will threaten current and future international climate negotiations.	CLIM 18
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	should the State Department choose to permit the Keystone XL pipeline to move forward and determine that the project is in the national interest, such an action will cast doubt in the eyes of the world on the Obama Administration's promises to reduce U.S. emissions and the seriousness with which it embraces collective efforts to prevent global temperatures from rising to dangerous levels.	CLIM 18
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Were the State Department to decide to deny certification of the Keystone XL pipeline, such an action would reaffirm the intentions of the United States to transition away from carbon-intensive energy sources towards those that gradually reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions over time.	CLIM 18
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	allowing the Keystone XL pipeline to move forward will deepen the continued reliance of the United States on the dirtiest forms of fossil fuels and contradict the Administration's stated commitment to reduce U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.	PN 03
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Constructing new large-scale fossil fuel projects such as Keystone XL locks in carbon-intensive energy infrastructure and reduces the short-term incentives for development and expansion of clean and renewable sources of energy.	PN 03
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	alternative export channels [to the Project] do not currently exist, and it is highly questionable whether they would actually be constructed, calling into question the premises of the State Department's conclusion in this case.	PN 06
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	[WWF recommends that] Areas that have been identified as sage grouse core areas should be areas of no/minimal disruption. We agree with the state fish and wildlife agencies that a four-mile buffer from active leks is preferable so as to protect as many nests as possible	TES 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	All pump stations and other permanent structures should be placed a minimum of two miles from the nearest [sage grouse] lek, with a preferred distance of at least four miles from active leks	TES 08
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Power lines should be buried whenever possible to decrease impacts [to sage grouse] from predators	TES 08
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Threats Assessment for the Northern Great Plains Ecoregion	VEG 10
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	WWF identified the Northern Great Plains (NGP) eco-region as one of the most biologically significant landscapes in the world. The [WWF's 2004 Northern Great Plains eco-regional] assessment identified 11 high-priority areas for large-scale conservation, including the Nebraska Sandhills…The proposed route from Morgan, MT to the South Dakota-Nebraska border remains the same, placing the pipeline through the Northern Great Plains eco-region, including through Bitter Creek and Slim Buttes priority areas.	VEG 10
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	[WWF] would specifically like to highlight...the impacts to sage grouse from buried pipelines and their associated infrastructure, specifically within the Northern Great Plains eco-region since the proposed pipeline would cut through identified core areas for sage grouse. We are concerned about the permanent pump stations that require five to ten acres in 48-50 mile intervals and the associated road construction within core areas. We are concerned that overhead power lines will increase the number of predators for greater sage grouse by providing perching areas.	WI 04
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	The impact of the pipeline on [sage grouse] migratory corridors has been overlooked. It is imperative that there is no disruption of their migration in core areas one and two	WI 04
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Should the pipeline proceed as proposed, WWF is concerned about the impacts to priority grassland landscapes, areas of biological importance and wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and the wildlife that depends on healthy native grasslands, especially in the event of a spill.	WI 23, RISK 07
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	We are also concerned about potential damage to the quality and availability of freshwater resources as the pipeline would cross over the Ogallala Aquifer, which the State Department already recognizes is the largest aquifer in the U.S. and provides freshwater supply to three million people and the agricultural economy.	WRG 01
Lou Leonard	April 22, 2013	Although the DSEIS states that the route through Nebraska was revised to avoid the Nebraska Sandhills, the ecoregion map used to define the Sandhills was inadequate and inconsistent with other maps, including the USGS map of hydrologic landscape regions of the United States. Therefore, the new route fails to avoid the Sandhills and continues to route the pipeline over the Sandhills, through highly permeable soils, posing a serious risk to the Ogallala Aquifer, the nation’s largest aquifer and important agricultural water supply.	WRG 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lou Peugh	April 11, 2013	Tar sands release more greenhouse gasses than oil produced from conventional methods causing rapid climate change causing droughts, floods, and super storms such as hurricane Sandy, not only in the US, but in countries that cannot cope with the impacts resulting in starvation and civil unrest.	CLIM 17
Lou Rowan	March 6, 2013	We should be focusing on sustainable alternatives.	ALT 01
Lou Rowan	March 6, 2013	We should be aiming at the goal the President announced in his State of the Union Address: bequeathing our children a cleaner planet. Huge projects like Keystone always cause unforeseen damage. Keystone represents policy at its worst: the shale extraction process uses about as much power as is generates.	PN 05
Louis Carliner	April 15, 2013	It is clear that bitumen cannot be safely transmitted by pipeline because the close inspection needed because of its very corrosive nature. The bitumen spills at the Yellowstone and Kalamazoo Rivers have yet to be cleaned up satisfactorily. Already, Canadians have rejected cross Canada pipeline routings because of the corrosive nature of bitumen. This alone should give you the political courage to finally put the Keystone Pipeline project out of its misery!	RISK 13, RISK 11, RISK 20, RISK 21
Louis Hale	April 22, 2013	Its time to get serious about wind and solar sources of energy	PN 02
Louis Hale	April 22, 2013	TransCanadas dismal record of a dozen spills in less than a year from Keystone I is a warning. Its time to get serious about wind and solar sources of energy and reject in no uncertain terms this fools project which is Keystone XL and which has the potential to create long-term damage to the environment of every U.S. state it would cross.	RISK 25, ALT 01
Louis Stoeger	April 5, 2013	I have never heard of a pipeline that doesn't leak, and when this one leaks it will contaminate our nation's farmland	RISK 07
Louise Chegwidden	April 22, 2013	It will not create sustainable employment - only green energy jobs can do that - and we are behind other countries in switching to the only rational response to our warming, climate ravaged existence - solar, wind, thermal - elements that are intrinsic to planet Earth and require harnessing rather than processing.	PN 03
Louise Fabrykiewicz	April 5, 2013	Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, and stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands.	ACK
Louise Fabrykiewicz	April 5, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Louise Fabrykiewicz	April 5, 2013	All you have to do is consider the consequences of (KXL) by just checking the recent spill of 84,000 gallons in in the much smaller Arkansas pipeline this past week.	RISK 14
Louise Frontiero	March 14, 2013	I am very upset to learn that this report was written by someone hired by the oil company .	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Louise Frontiero	April 16, 2013	IT IS NOT going to to lessen our dependence on oil -- WITH ONLY TRANSCANADA RACKING IN THE PROFITS AT AMERICA'S EXSPENCE -- NO JOBS CREATED ETC..." WE THE PEOPLE "DO NOT WANT IT PERIOD .	PN 05
Louise Grosslein	April 21, 2013	With atmospheric carbon dioxide already exceeding the sustainable limit of 350 ppm, we can ill afford to tap tar sands oil, which results in 3x as much greenhouse gas pollution as regular crude oil.	CLIM 05
Louise Kidder	April 15, 2013	New jobs should be created, yes, and they should be jobs in the area of new, clean forms of energy. Let's create wind and solar technologies, wind and solar factories and wind and solar installations for homes and for industry.	PN 02
Louise Marcoux	March 17, 2013	In terms of carbon emissions to our atomosphere, the tar sands are devastating.	CLIM 14
Louise Sherman	April 1, 2013	Even if the pipelines were totally impregnable the end result would be a pitiful number of jobs and oil being shipped to other countries.	PN 05
Louise Silver	April 2, 2013	The oil industry keeps offering assurances that their pipelines are safe, and time and time again, those assurances turn out to be fantasies. When will we stop allowing ourselves to be duped? This isn't some abstract "We need to protect the environment; the environment is important." This is oil gushing through residential neighborhoods and up to the doorsteps of the houses where actual people live. You can't dismiss the Reject KXL movement as just the rantings of tree huggers. These oil spills are real and are affecting the lives of real people--ordinary citizens.	RISK 14
Louise Stonington	April 10, 2013	The comments presented about this issue should be totally open and available to the public. This is the essence of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.	PRO 02
Louise Stonington	April 15, 2013	Government investment in clean energy will create many more jobs, lower the price of alternatives, and make the pipeline an outdated boondoggle.	ALT 01
Louise Stonington	April 15, 2013	For lower energy prices, we need to invest in battery powered vehicles, charge them with solar and wind.	PN 02
Louise Yacovone	April 11, 2013	My heart goes out to the treatment of our US citizens. They are having their land taken by eminent domain because of the oil pipeline. Citizens fight for their land in court to save their precious land only to have their land taken away by the Big Oil Giant.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Louisette Lanteigne	March 13, 2013	It has come to my attention that the Harper government continues to prevent the UN special rapporteur on Indigenous peoples from visiting Canada. Please review the following article regarding this concern. By Jorge Barrera APTN National News OTTAWA–The Harper government continues to prevent the UN special rapporteur on Indigenous peoples from visiting Canada. James Anaya, the special rapporteur on the rights of Indigenous peoples, says the federal government continues to ignore his year-old request to visit Canada to investigate the "human rights situation of Indigenous peoples," according to a Feb. 20 letter he sent to the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (UBCIC). "I have communicated with the government of Canada to request its consent for me to conduct an official visit to the country to examine and report on the human rights situation of Indigenous peoples there," writes Anaya, in the letter. "I initially made the request in February of 2012 and am still awaiting a response from the government." Anaya has written the federal government at least three times requesting permission to visit the country. Anaya says in the letter that Canada has issued "a standing invitation" to special rapporteurs that hold mandates from the UN Human Rights Council, but he can't enter the country on an official visit without the formal consent of Ottawa that would include an agreement on dates and terms of the visit. Anaya says he will find a way to meet with First Nations leaders through unofficial channels if the government continues to ignore his request. "If I do not receive a positive response from the government in the coming months, I can explore ways of meeting with First Nations leaders from Canada outside the context of an official visit," writes Anaya. Anaya's letter came in response to an invitation from Grand Chief Stewart Phillip, president of the UBCIC. Anaya's term ends in May 2014. Aboriginal Affairs Minister Bernard Valcourt's office did not immediately return a request for comment. jbarrera@aptn.ca @JorgeBarrera Clearly there is no plausible deniability on the part of the Harper Government in regards to this matter. It is clearly an act of contempt towards the UN and towards the treaty rights of First Nation's people in Canada. Canada's First Nation's people are a Sovereign Nation and the UN provided a Special Rapporteur to work in their behalf but the Federal Government of Canada is overstepping it's jurisdictional powers to block access and this must be stopped.	ACK
Lowy, Kathleen	March 1, 2013	it will add to the climate crisis around the world.	CLIM 14
Lowy, Kathleen	March 1, 2013	the oil from the pipeline is to be exported to other countries, not the United States so it will not make us energy independent.	PN 04
Luanne & Joseph Kovalick	March 10, 2013	Additionally, this project will only create temporary jobs and very few permanent jobs.	SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Luanne Napton	March 13, 2013	That you would suggest that the Keystone XL pipeline will not contribute to climate change is puzzling since it is well known that the extraction, refining, and burning of tar sands oil will contribute greatly to climate change.	CLIM 05
Luanne Timmerman	April 10, 2013	It's ridiculous to think we can't power America with renewables and if we don't start quickly we will lose our chance completely.	PN 02
Luba Ortoleva	April 14, 2013	There should be better safety measurements, better materials for pipes, better workmanship making those pipelines.	PD 05
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	One alternative is to build a pipeline to the Canadian west coast and ship the blended bitumen to the Far East. Assuming Canada manages to export crude to Asian markets, oil sands development will carry on unimpeded and the U.S. would import the same volume of crude oil and refined products as it would if the Keystone XL pipeline were not built. However, the benefits in U.S. crude oil transportation and processing (refining) efficiencies would be lost.	ALT 05
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	Given the established history on U.S.-Canadian energy trade, TransCanada had no real reason to doubt ultimate approval of the project as all previous cross border pipelines had been approved. TransCanada spent more than $2 billion for steel and related facilities under expectations that the historical relationship in cross-border energy trade would be sustained. The delays in construction have cost TransCanada hundreds of millions of dollars. Towards the second half of 2011, objections to the route were raised by officials in Nebraska over concern that the pipeline crossed “ecologically sensitive terrain” above an important aquifer. Instead of approving the project and letting the legal process play out in Nebraska, the State Department in early November 2011 announced a decision that granting the cross-border permit would be postponed so that further study of a new route could be undertaken. Nevertheless, concerns over the route through Nebraska have now been resolved by state authorities.	PN 05
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	[F]urther delays in permitting the Keystone XL pipeline would mean a lost opportunity for expanded trade between two stable and reliable allies in which long-term supply arrangements are assured…Such trade arrangements provide a strong foundation for deploying long-term cost saving capital projects, such as pipelines and refinery upgrades.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	Although our research shows that rail shipments will continue to provide an important role in moving crude oil across the North American continent, Keystone XL is an essential piece of new petroleum infrastructure. The mid-continent region of the United States no longer processes waterborne imports; i.e., refiners in the Rockies and mid-continent of the U.S. are processing only U.S. and Canadian feedstock and running at full capacity. New Canadian and mid-continent crude production will have to be shipped to coastal refining centers in the U.S. Keystone XL plays a vital role in adding the necessary infrastructure to move Canadian crude to the U.S. Gulf Coast and help displace waterborne imports from Venezuela and Mexico.	PN 10
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	In response to a 2009 request from U.S. Secretary of Energy Steven Chu, the National Petroleum Council (NPC) issued an extensive report on North American potential to expand oil production. The report's authors, an authoritative group of experts from in and outside the petroleum industry, concluded that North America could raise petroleum liquids output from approximately 10 million barrels/day (mmb/d) in 2010 to over 20 mmb/d by 2035. The majority of the new supply would come from four sources: tight oil, shale oil, natural gas liquids, and oil sands. The NPC identified Canadian oil sands as having the potential to increase North American supply by 3 to 4 mmb/d by 2035. Although the US currently imports over nearly 2.5 mmb/d of Canadian crude oil through an extensive pipeline and rail network, planned increases in Canadian output will require more crude transportation capacity. Because both Canadian crude production and U.S. crude production have risen in tandem, the pipeline capacity to import Canadian crude is constrained and is lowering wellhead values on Canadian and U.S. crude oil production. Keystone XL is a necessary infrastructure project that will help move Canadian crude directly from Alberta to the Gulf Coast, bringing needed relief to extensive pipeline capacity constraints on both U.S. and Canadian crude pipelines.	PN 10
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	New crude supplies, combined with the current surge in natural gas production, offer the promise of a renaissance in long-moribund petrochemical processing and petroleum refining industries. The capital now sitting on the sidelines is available and willing to fund profitable projects. However, it will not be deployed if political risk cannot be contained. The construction of the Keystone XL pipeline would send a clear signal to Canadian and U.S. producers that a critical piece of the North American petroleum transportation infrastructure is underway. It would inform investors in Canada, the US, and abroad (including OPEC) that North America is putting into place a key building block for the emerging petroleum renaissance.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	The proposed Keystone XL pipeline is an expansion of TransCanada's current Keystone pipeline network and will include sufficient capacity to carry both Canadian oil sands production and up to 100,000 b/d of crude oil from the surging production now taking place in North Dakota (and Montana to a lesser extent), largely from the Bakken formation….By increasing crude oil transportation efficiency and allowing Bakken producers to access new refinery markets, the Keystone XL project will have the added benefit of improving wellhead values for oil production from the Bakken formation.	PN 10, PN 05
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	Diverting Canadian oil sands output to Asia would likely harm U.S. refining efficiency as the blended bitumen is well matched to the complex refineries on the Gulf coast which have invested billions of dollars in refinery upgrades. These refineries currently purchase around 2 mmb/d of heavy crude oil (similar in quality to Canadian blended bitumen from the oil sands) from Venezuela and Mexico and will continue to do so if projects are postponed or canceled to bring Canadian crude to the U.S. Gulf Coast. Rejecting the Keystone XL permit will not stop the U.S. from importing and using 2 mmb/d of heavy crude oil.	PN 12
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will add over 800,000 barrels/day of new capacity to move Canadian oil sands production to U.S. refineries. Given the high likelihood of continued growth in oil sands production, access to the US market will eventually require a substantial increase in pipeline export capacity. Without Keystone XL or alternative transportation capacity solutions, Canadian producers and government authorities may view full reliance on the U.S. market as too risky and seek alternative destinations.	PN 12
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	The U.S. continues to import large volumes of petroleum and even after accounting for exports of petroleum products, net imports into the national economy remain over 7 mmb/d and forecasts by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) indicate that the U.S. will remain a large net importer of crude oil even under the most optimistic scenario of conservation and use of alternative fuels.	PN 13
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	A movement away from pipeline shipments will also bring about an increase in global tanker traffic and a somewhat higher risk for oil spills (shipping point to point in a pipeline is inherently less risky than tanker shipments).	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	The new pipeline would ensure a stable supply of crude for at least the next 20 years, roughly the length of time to which buyers must commit to ship crude oil via Keystone XL. Given the expected growth in oil sands production, which is likely to rise by as much as 4 mmb/d over current levels, half of U.S. crude oil imports could be sourced from North America in the coming years. Much of the money spent on crude oil purchases from Canada would be reinvested in the United States and contribute to economic growth in both countries.	SO 08, PN 10
Lucian Pugliaresi	April 16, 2013	U.S.-Canadian trade is a major component of economic activity in both countries. Canada's imports of U.S. goods support millions of U.S. jobs. Trade between the two countries reflects highly integrated ownership patterns and joint economic benefits not prevalent from other suppliers of crude oil to the US. In 2010, trade between the U.S. and Canada totaled $525 billion and over twenty thousand jobs in the United States are directly dependent on current oil sands development alone.	SO 09
Lucki Wilder	March 13, 2013	It will also dislocate thousands of workers desperate for even short-term employment, leaving them high and dry when the short term is over and only 35 jobs remain.	SO 04
Lucy	April 22, 2013	Furthermore, tar sands development is proceeding without any regulations in place to reduce greenhouse gas emissions	ACK
Lucy	April 22, 2013	If built, the pipeline would enable 30 per cent more tar sands to be produced. This would create the global warming pollution equivalent to 6 million more cars on the road, as well as increase water and air pollution and further jeopardize the rights of downstream indigenous communities.	ACK
Lucy Kelly	April 11, 2013	The world should use solar power. There is an unlimited supply of this. Why is it not preferred? If oil is so scarce that it needs to be got from tar sands, then surely going solar now is essential? Please go solar now!	PN 02
Lucy Kelly	April 20, 2013	We all know the damage caused to wildlife by toxic oil spills	RISK 07
Lucy Sajdak	April 4, 2013	The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts	LEG 04, CLIM 12
Lucy Sajdak	April 4, 2013	To add insult to injury, how much of the oil will actually be used in the U.S. and how much sold on the world market?. For this we risk our land, water and wildlife?	PN 07
Lucy Wold	April 9, 2013	Don't let your judgment be clouded by the possibility of a few more jobs.	ACK
Lucy Wood	April 4, 2013	It just seems so absurd for us to endanger our heritage of wonderful land by piping this material across our country. It is ot even a good idea for us to be "refining" it and burning it, no matter where it is processed.	ACK
Luebbe	April 18, 2013	for all native and indigenous Indians that have suffered enough from Canada to Texas. … You should care about the natives in Canada. The cancer is rate is just too overwhelming at the mouth of this monster	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Luebbe	April 18, 2013	This proposed 7 billion dollar project has no rewards for our nation. Tar sands will generate a grade four fuel. Because of the lower emission standards of the United States, this fuel cannot be burned here. Why should we carry the liability for this company?	PN 04
Luebbe	April 18, 2013	At our group meeting we had this past February with the Department of State in DC, we were told that HDR was checked out and was not found to have any conflicts. Really? Are you going to say the same thing also about ENSystem Energy and IFC International on this Supplemental EIS? Why don't you let the landowners and tribal members do .their own environmental impact statement? You know, from real people that own the land and live off the water to provide food sources for all Americans.	PRO 01
Luebbe	April 18, 2013	I would also like to mention the fact that there are no studies for anthrax in the soils like there is in the Alberta Clipper FEIS. I would like to see attention paid to anthrax, which would affect all landowners and animals for this proposed route.	RISK 31
Luigi Bai	April 13, 2013	The pipeline represents a poor decision to use government power to create infrastructure which will generate mostly private benefits, with the risk of creating mostly public costs. If the pipeline were economically feasible to create in a safe and environmentally responsible fashion, the companies involved would have already invested their private equity into building it without government intervention.	PN 05
Luigi Bai	April 13, 2013	Building the pipeline would only make sense if, amoung other reasonable concessions: 3. the Federal government were to commit to enforcing surface-use agreements, along the route of the pipeline, which included a commitment to environmentally-neutral practices. Violation of such an agreement can be made a cause of action in Federal courts. In particular, where building the pipeline would cause damage to habitats, watersheds, or native prairies, the surface-use agreement would require remediation to restore the land, as closely as possible, to its original condition and/or function.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Luigi Bai	April 13, 2013	Building the pipeline would only make sense if, amoung other reasonable concessions: 2. the Federal government were to impose a tax, based on the carbon content of incoming fuelstocks, on any combustible imported into this country whose purpose is to be burned for fuel. The proceeds for this tax could be earmarked for a "Carbon Superfund" which could be used for remediation purposes, including treating medical conditions (physical harm) which can be reasonably shown to be caused by the atmospheric carbon and particulate matter which are the result of such combustion. An end-user of such a combustible who (1) uses the item for something other than combustion, or (2) uses the combustible in a fashion which does not generate atmospheric carbon or particulate matter MAY be made eligible for a refund of the amount taxed at the border, if this is considered reasonable from a policy standpoint. This would help mitigate the damage done by continuing to rely on carbon-based fuels for power; and	SO 16
Luigi Bai	April 13, 2013	Building the pipeline would only make sense if, amoung other reasonable concessions: 2. the Federal government were to impose a tax, based on the carbon content of incoming fuelstocks, on any combustible imported into this country whose purpose is to be burned for fuel. The proceeds for this tax could be earmarked for a "Carbon Superfund" which could be used for remediation purposes, including treating medical conditions (physical harm) which can be reasonably shown to be caused by the atmospheric carbon and particulate matter which are the result of such combustion. An end-user of such a combustible who (1) uses the item for something other than combustion, or (2) uses the combustible in a fashion which does not generate atmospheric carbon or particulate matter MAY be made eligible for a refund of the amount taxed at the border, if this is considered reasonable from a policy standpoint. This would help mitigate the damage done by continuing to rely on carbon-based fuels for power; and	SO 16, CLIM 03
Luke Charchuk	April 19, 2013	Born in Alberta, I am sick of what you have done to our province. You have turned a wilderness paradise into the planet Mars. Here are some of the stupid acts of humans that are contributing the the devastating problem of dirty oil.	ACK
Luke Habberstad	April 4, 2013	I reject the State Department's claim that development of the pipeline will have no significant impact on overall development of the Albertan tar sands. The claim makes no sense prima facie, for it is quite plain the Canadian oil industry is pushing hard for this pipeline and sees it as key to increasing its profits.	PN 06
Luke Habberstad	April 4, 2013	The recent spill in Arkansas and the 2010 Kalamazoo River oil spill in Michigan both demonstrated that pipelines are extreme hazards to our water supply. The State Department's draft report gives short shrift to these threats to our nation's water	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Luke Martinkosky	April 2, 2013	Current forecasts already show that vast areas of North America will be experiencing water shortages in the next two decades. We shouldn't encourage the allocation of a necessary and scarce resource to extraction and processing of an unnecessary one.	CU 07
Luke Massman-johnson	March 28, 2013	No the REAL THREAT is that once the XL is approved, the subsidized profits and profligate political power of the petroleum industry GUARANTEE that the tar sands will be dug, the muck will be washed and pressurized and piped, and consumers will consume.	CLIM 13
Lula Kay (katie) Ingham	April 20, 2013	BECAUSE OF A LEGAL LOOPHOLE (SO TYPICAL OF BIG OIL & GAS COMPANIES) THAT DOESN'T CLASSIFY GOOEY TAR SANDS CRUDE AS "OIL", EXXON & OTHER COMPANIES ARE NOT EVEN REQUIRED TO FULLY PAY FOR THEIR INEVITABLE, INEFFECTIVE, CLEAN UP EFFORTS!	RISK 03, LEG 08, SO 15
Luther Strayer	April 9, 2013	Let's put our efforts into solar & wind.	PN 02
Luttich	April 18, 2013	this proposed pipeline is complicit in contributing to causing significant changes in the Global Climate, without being obligated to pay any of the costs for having done so.	CLIM 14
Luttich	April 18, 2013	Where are the guarantees that will enable the U.S. American consumers to acquire their fuel at the pumps at a cost less than being paid on the global market?	PN 04
Luttich	April 18, 2013	neither the current nor any of the earlier editions of the Environmental Impact Statements acknowledge how constructing this pipeline, or any other pipeline, through any ofthe few remaining tracts of unbroken native tallgrass prairie Will: o · permanently destroy the aboriginal ecological integrity of that prairie and prairie sod, and, o how the pipeline cannot be buried and constructed without doing so.	VEG 01
Luttich, S.N.	April 22, 2013	...the construction and use of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline does not involve the issue of if the pipeline will develop ruptures and leak, but, when, where and how much oil will escape into the environment.	RISK 14
Luv Knudson	April 9, 2013	I call on you to revise your department's review and faithfully report the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate. Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	CLIM 13
Lydia Michaels	April 22, 2013	I live in Arkansas...Exxon is doing a terrible job managing the cleanup. They are blocking access to information, blocking wildlife rescues from saving animals, and paying off residents to keep quiet about the destruction.	RISK 05, PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lykken	April 18, 2013	Spend money on putting solar farms and wind farms in these states.	PN 02
Lykken	April 18, 2013	This time we stand to ruin farmland and destroy ground water	SOIL 01
Lyle Vannier	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is Nebraskas most important natural resource. An underground pipeline carrying toxic tar sands crude oil will eventually leak to some extent and potentially to an extent that will seriously pollute a vital source of drinking water for central Nebraska communities and agricultural operations. There are better ways to get Canadian tars sands crude to market. Please deny TransCanadas permit application	RISK 07
Lyle Vannier	April 22, 2013	An underground pipeline carrying toxic tar sands crude oil will eventually leak to some extent, and potentially to an extent that will seriously pollute a vital source of drinking water for central Nebraska communities and agricultural operations	WRG 01, RISK 24
Lyn Adams (sr)	April 4, 2013	The review is woefully inadequate, ignoring the massive impacts from tar sands operations in Canada that are destroying millions of acres of boreal forest so important to many of our songbirds. The report further finds that building the pipeline will have little impact on climate change--even though the pipeline would increase emissions so much it would be like adding 4.6 million cars to the roads.	CU 01
Lyn Adams (sr)	April 4, 2013	Now, alarming reports are coming from Arkansas on a pipeline break that is releasing thousands of barrels of this same kind of thick, dirty oil into waterways that feed nearby Lake Conway and the town of Mayflower, AR. Oiled birds and other wildlife in the area are being treated, with many more expected to succumb to the toxic oil. The Arkansas incident is the second spill of Canadian tar sands oil in a week. On March 27, a mile-long Canadian Pacific train hauling Canadian crude derailed in Minnesota, spilling 30,000 gallons about 150 miles northwest of Minneapolis. These two incidents are a stark reminder that transporting this oil across the U.S. is just asking for trouble	RISK 14
Lyn Brown	March 18, 2013	This pipeline endangers our water, it doesn't provide 'thousands of jobs', and we won't even benefit from the refined oil because it is due to be exported!!	PN 07
Lynda Chesney	April 7, 2013	why continue to lay unsightly, leaking pipe? We have railroads. Let us utilize our rail systems again.	ALT 04
Lyndyn Sophia Stratbucker	April 22, 2013	The co2 emissions of tarsands is off the chart- i have heard (movie- Carbon Nation) that if this goes in- the co2 level will be irreversible by the end of the century- and, Earth will collapse into runaway global warming- like Venus did	CLIM 14
Lyndyn Sophia Stratbucker	April 22, 2013	WHEN this pipeline leaks- they always leak because the tarsands requires a very high pressure and the pipelines are poorly made- into the Ogallala Aquifer- which supplies water to 1/3 of the US- that will be the end of that.	RISK 24

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lyndyn Sophia Stratbucker	April 22, 2013	The money will mainly go to a foreign oil company- Lee Terry himself said 30 jobs for 5 yrs. NE is the 7th windiest state in the US- and is at the bottom of wind power- WAKE UP. 1000s of job will be created- over unending years-	SO 05
Lyndyn Sophia Stratbucker	April 22, 2013	The TRUE way to create jobs, along with needed US energy production is with sustainable energy	SO 05
Lynell Withers	April 5, 2013	the U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts.	CLIM 12
Lynette Espinoza	March 11, 2013	Encourage green energy, support green energy and put it into place. The technology is here, it would provide thousands of jobs, and the rewards are greater than any other accomplishment this president and his elected officials will ever accomplish.	SO 05, PN 02
Lynn	April 22, 2013	This money allotted for this pipeline and jobs creation should be going towards our US states Solar cars project, electric cars and other renewable alternative energy projects. WE must create the NEW RENEWABLE ENERGY JOBS,PRODUCTS AND SERVICES NOW!	PN 03
Lynn Anderson	April 17, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. … The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	WRG 06
Lynn Barber	April 22, 2013	Allowing the XL pipeline to cross the United States from Canada would be an unconscionable threat to our water supplies.	WRG 01
Lynn Bills	April 22, 2013	Transporting corrosive DilBit through a pipeline over a fragile ecosystem like the Nebraska Sandhills is a recipe for disaster. The aquifer is very close to the surface here and provides our fresh water.	WRG 05, RISK 07
Lynn Bowdery	April 2, 2013	ALL FOSSIL FUELS PROMOTE CLIMATE CHANGE, SOME MORE THAN OTHERS. TAR SAND OIL IS ONE OF THE WORST.	CLIM 05
Lynn Bowdery	April 2, 2013	If it is true that because tar sands oil, called "bitumen" is technically not "oil" and therefore companies are not required to pay into the oil spill clean up fund, that is amazingly inept governmental oversight of the dangers of pipelines.	LEG 08
Lynn Bowdery	April 2, 2013	"Bitumen" is every bit as harmful to the environments it is leaked or spilled into as oil. Companies that spill should PAY, no matter what they spill.	RISK 03
Lynn De Mott	April 22, 2013	Please protect the Ogallala Aquifer and the farmlands around it by not building a pipeline through the area.	WRG 01
Lynn Dorsett	April 11, 2013	The time has come for the United States to take a stand on climate change. The inefficiencies of tar sands oil makes it obvious that the Keystone XL pipeline should be rejected.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lynn Dorsett	April 11, 2013	Beyond that, Americans understand that the tar sands will be coming THROUGH our country not TO our country, and that the refined oil will be sold to the highest bidder on the global market.	PN 07
Lynn Fitz-hugh	March 15, 2013	I am shocked and dismayed beyond belief that your environmental impact statement comments that climate change will not negatively impact the building of the Keystone XL pipeline, but does not comment how it will impact Climate Change. I feel like I just feel down Alice's famous rabbit hole into a world of nonsense. Is this some kind of sick joke? So gosh we have about a decade left before we fry the planet so thank God we can still keep pumping oil out unaffected by what we are about to do? You are kidding right?	CLIM 14, CLIM 12
Lynn Fitz-hugh	March 15, 2013	Ok you don't want to talk about climate change only about economic and cultural impacts? Check this out: when there is world wide displacement of refugees from flooding of costal cities, famine and water shortages and resources wars resulting……do you think it will effect our economy??????	CLIM 16
Lynn Graves Gulyash	March 30, 2013	The company installing the pipeline has used high pressure tactics to coerce land owners to accept the pipe line on their land. It has the gall to use the excuse of imminent domain to deny the rights of property owners to use their land as they see fit.	LEG 02
Lynn Hansen	April 15, 2013	We have had enough of dirty oil and coal and are ready to offer you a solution to our oil addiction with natural gas and alternative fuels	PN 02
Lynn Hodenfield	April 8, 2013	Saying no to tar sands pipelines is not only an environmental necessity, it will inherently force us to do more towards developing clean energy which counters rather than precipitates climate change..	ALT 01
Lynn Lander	April 2, 2013	it is incontrovertable that pipelines will have accidents, regardless of promises from operators. There is ample evidence to support that statement.	RISK 14
Lynn Leopold	April 15, 2013	It has already destroyed an enormous area of northern Canadian wilderness, a set of ecosystems so fragile and unique, they will never repair themselves in anyone's lifetimes.	CU 01
Lynn Magnuson	April 4, 2013	There are just TOO many bugs in the safety procedures for the petroleum industry for me to be comfortable with this at all. The Deepwater Horizon oil disaster and more recent event in Arkansas point to this, not to mention numerous smaller leaks and spills I have heard about or witnessed because of living in a an oil producing state.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lynn Mulholland	April 15, 2013	PLEASE NOTICE THE SYSTEM IN THE MOJAVE DESERT NEAR THE NEVADA BORDER: 70,000 70 SQ. FT. MIRRORS REFLECT SUNLIGHT ON FOUR GRIDS FILLED WITH WATER. THE RESULTANT STEAM POWERS 140,000+ HOMES, COMPLETELY. NOT ONE DROP OF OIL, NOT ONE LUMP OF COAL. LET'S CONCENTRATE ON SOLAR POWER AS DESCRIBED AND OTHER SOLAR SYSTEMS.	PN 02
Lynn Olson	March 22, 2013	The risks (pipeline spills) outweigh the benefits to US citizens	PN 05
Lynn Whitmeyer	April 15, 2013	We have oil soaked beaver! We have beaches that are closed to the public! We have contaminated fish! I live in Land Locked UTAH. What should we expect from a 50 year old buried pipe line.	RISK 10
Lynn Winchester	March 16, 2013	I am sick and tired of oil and gas getting government money and taking over land this needs to stop now the animals deserve a place to live and the people a peaceful place to walk among them	ACK
Lynn Yates	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is just a bad idea - I realize it may seem like a good idea in the short term, but the money should be invested in the long term. Clean, renewable energy is the pipeline forward - let's don't waste time and resources on backward thinking.	ALT 01
Lynne Dixon	April 5, 2013	If it is completed, it will enable the oil industry to exploit the Alberta tar sands, which contain enough carbon to radically alter our climate.	CLIM 05
Lynne Dixon	April 5, 2013	And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Keystone is a monumental make-it or break-it symbol, either the courage to truly address the challenge of global warming and to stand-up to Big Oil profiteering, or to give-up and give-in, and fail to meet the most serious threat to our earth and its peopl	PN 05
Lynne Dixon	April 5, 2013	The fact that the State Department's recent draft environmental review of the pipeline was based on work done by Big Oil's contractors only confirms that this pipeline is being built to benefit the oil industry	PRO 01
Lynne Dixon	April 5, 2013	We also need to ensure in advance that every extraction project has a truly comprehensive plan for safety and regard for the environment, as well as realistic emergency disaster plans with available technology, and there must be continuous and tight monitoring of every step in the process, as well as thorough oversight by the government all the way.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Lynne Eggers	April 22, 2013	As a Nebraska landowner, I am totally opposed to running the pipeline through Nebraska - or any other state for that matter. Our water resources are much more valuable than oil transport at this point.	WRG 01
Lynne Gavin	April 20, 2013	What we need is non-fossil fuel, clean, sustainable energy sources, such as solar and wind power, globally, not more environmental disasters	PN 02
Lynne Nittler	April 9, 2013	It is time for us to leave fossil fuels in the ground and instead put our funding into renewable energy which will also create jobs but with far less danger to our immediate health and environment and the global climate.	SO 05, ALT 01
Lynne Oglesby	April 5, 2013	Bring our nation into the 21st century with smarter, cleaner, more efficient energy solutions.	ALT 01
Lynne Rockenbauch	April 13, 2013	I am particularly concerned that the tar sands oil will corrode the pipeline faster than we've seen in the Alaska pipeline. We don't need such a long, high-volume pipeline and its potential for huge environmental disasters either through lack of proper maintenance or through accidental breaches.	RISK 11
Lynne Schrupp	April 2, 2013	Continuing to develop fossil fuels does not serve America's vital long term national security or environmental interests. We need to develop natural renewable resources. We need to invest in technology and energy infrastructure that supports all Americans and protects our environment for future generations.	ALT 01
Lynne Schrupp	April 2, 2013	This pipeline brings no economic benefit to everyday Americans. It is only a profit center for big oil and the billionaires who run those companies.	PN 05
Lynne Treat	April 10, 2013	Given all the scientific information available regarding the extreme toxicity of dilbit diluents, it is extremely concerning to me as a registered nurse with 35 years of health care experience to find that the U.S.State Department report declares dilbit pipeline to be perfectly safe,	RISK 07
M Harney	April 15, 2013	I believe spills are inevitable. Safe drinking water should be our first priority. Oil spills will no doubt contaminate water sources.	RISK 07
M K Wiebe Keogh	March 11, 2013	The recent State Department report is written in part by one of TransCanada's own consultants--a bias of phenomenal proportions.	PRO 01
M Katy Meyers	April 16, 2013	It is up to you to show leadership and consider its dangerous and harmful impact on our climate and environment and rejects the Keystone Pipeline.	PN 05, CLIM 18
M Older	April 2, 2013	This pipeline would be 10 times as large as the one that spilt last week. And the demonstrators who climbed inside the pipes saw, and photographed, holes in the pipe!!!	RISK 23
M Weber	April 15, 2013	We can't afford the increased greenhouse gases that will be generated by this dirty fuel. We are in the middle of climate change. The more CO2 we pump into the air through burning fossil fuels, the more severe and long lasting will be the effects on our climate, on us and on the species of the world.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
M Weber	April 15, 2013	Canada should not be intensively mining this energy resource. But if it chooses to do so, our country must not support its efforts by allowing Transcanada to force US citizens to comply with its entry onto their lands. Property owners shouldn't be forced to comply with a project that doesn't support the greater good but instead lines the pockets of wealthy oil producers and refineries.	LEG 02
M Weber	April 15, 2013	Approving the transport of this oil through our country via a pipeline puts us at a strong risk of dealing with pipeline spills. Pipeline violations poorly enforced/rupture risk is widespread http://thetyee.ca/News/2012/09/28/Pipeline-Violations/ Between 2008 and 2012, U.S. pipelines spilled an average of more than 3.1 million gallons of hazardous liquids per year, according to "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/SigPSI.html?nocache=5779#_liquidon"data from the Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, the nation's pipeline regulator. Those spills -- most commonly caused by corrosion and equipment failure -- caused at least $1.5 billion in property damage altogether. http://www.latimes.com/news/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-arkansas-oil-spill-20130412,0,6174184.story	RISK 14
M. Theolass	April 2, 2013	Provide assurance that jobs will be completed properly and shortcuts will not be taken.	RISK 23
Mac Owner	March 4, 2013	Please deny the keystone pipeline application.	PN 08
Madeline Wahl	April 22, 2013	The oil produced from the project does not move forward the US energy policy, nor does it help reduce dependency on foreign oil. There is minimal benefit in terms of reducing energy costs for corporations or consumers alike.	PN 01
Madelyn Mihm	April 4, 2013	This oil will not add to our domestic supplies, likely, and will probably end up in China. TransCanada has a terrible safety record, as I understand it, and according to the NY Times, 40% of Canadians do not want the pipeline crossing their land. Why then, would we accept it here? … Spend the money on alternative energy, and support the creation of clean jobs instead.	PN 05
Madelyn Mihm	April 4, 2013	I am truly alarmed that the dirtiest oil on the planet will be crossing the middle of our country, and close to the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Madelynn Arana	March 21, 2013	The few permanent jobs that will be created simply do not justify the risk we will be assuming to our nation's environment.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Madge	April 12, 2013	The damage caused to our planet by the resource-intensive extraction process and the energy-intensive refining of Tar Sands is not in the United States best interest. The Canadian Tar Sands cannot be fully developed without the co-operation of the United States. They cannot reach their east nor west coasts without the consent of the aboriginal First Peoples. The First Peoples of Canada have not, nor will they consent.	PN 08, PN 06
Madhu Nair	April 21, 2013	After the tragic tar sands oil spills in Mayflower, Arkansas and Otter Tail County, Minnesota, it's clear that tar sands oil is not safe and not worth the risk.	ACK
Madison M	April 22, 2013	We have all the oil wed ever need in North Dakota. Why isnt the biggest refinery in the nation near Bismark or Minot or anywhere else in ND ??	ALT 08
Madison M	April 22, 2013	And why in the world cant the pipeline be above ground??	ALT 10
Madison M	April 22, 2013	And why in the world cant the pipeline be above ground?? I mean of all things to destroy why would you ruin an aquifer that provides means to 6 states??	ALT 10
Madisyn Rohde	April 18, 2013	It takes three barrels of water to extract only one barrel of tar sand oil- this would add up to 400 million gallons of water being used every day! Ninety percent of the used toxic water waste ends up in man-made pools, referred to as tailing pools. These tailing pools are full of dangerous chemicals such as lead, benzene, mercury, and chromium and they have been known to leak into neighboring bodies of water. Some of the tailing ponds already existing are so massive they can be seen from outer-space!	ACK
Madisyn Rohde	April 18, 2013	Canada's Boreal Forest would never be the same beautiful and bio-diverse land it is today if the pipeline is approved. Referred to as 'the lungs of the Earth,' destroying this forest wouldn't just be affecting Canada. The trees of the Boreal Forest store carbon and keep it from polluting our atmosphere, clear-cutting over 4 million hectares of trees is the plan for this project. Cutting down all of those trees would be damaging our air quality; on top of that tar sand oil production alone emits three times more carbon emissions than conventional oil. The extraction of tar sands would also be taking away the homes of many animal species.	CLIM 06
Madisyn Rohde	April 18, 2013	Indigenous communities in Alberta, Canada are suffering consequences from the extraction of tar sands that's already happening. The communities located downstream from tailing ponds are the ones getting the worst of it. Ever since the extraction of tar sands, cases of rare forms of cancer, hyperthyroidism, lupus, and other serious illnesses have been drastically increasing in the people of these communities. The number of people getting sick would be increasing with the installation of the Keystone XL Pipeline.	CU 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Madisyn Rohde	April 18, 2013	Along with several major rivers, part of the pipeline will be passing over the Ogallala Aquifer, a very important underground water source that stretches from South Dakota to Texas. The Ogallala Aquifer is responsible for irrigating a massive twenty percent of our country's agricultural lands. It also provides drinking water for millions of people. The results of this water source getting contaminated by the pipeline, from a spill or some kind of malfunction would be absolutely devastating. Considering the already existing TransCanada Keystone pipeline has already spilt a dozen times in the short year it has been operating, I would say we have a right to be concerned.	WRG 01
madonna stallmann	April 22, 2013	I stand with the First Nation People in Canada who have had their lives turned upsidedown by the rape of their air, soil, and water from tarsands extraction.	CU 05
madonna stallmann	April 22, 2013	As seen in Kalamazoo, MI and Mayflower, AR the effects of tarsand pipeline ruptures are devastating. Tarsand oil & the solvents mixed with it (bitumen), are very different in nature than the average "crude". Unlike crude oil, bitumen sinks, plumes, volitolizes, etc., making "clean up" impossible. I live 13 miles east of the XL pipeline in Kansas. It is not unreasonable for me to feel personally threatened by the presence of that line when, once there is bitumen flowing through it, any day I could be the one waking up from a severe headache, unable to breathe, overwhelmed by the disgusting smell, and unable to drink the water from our well.	RISK 29
Maec Woersching	April 21, 2013	And most of the oil will not be for American consumption. Rather,it will be refined and exported from the Gulf coast states.	PN 07
Maec Woersching	April 21, 2013	Only a modest number of new jobs, mostly temporary jos involving construction of the pipeline, will be provided.	SO 04
Maegan Puzas	April 5, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate …	CLIM 12
Maegan Puzas	April 5, 2013	If approved, as the USA's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, Keystone XL "will mean game over for the climate."	CLIM 14
Maegan Puzas	April 5, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's …significant risk for toxic spills.	RISK 07
Maeve Callaghan	April 22, 2013	The money and resources would be far better spent on safe, clean technologies instead of on poisoning our land its inhabitants.	PN 02
Magdalena Hoersch	April 22, 2013	All fossil fuels must be rapidly phased out, within a few years, not decades! Nuclear power, biomass and biofuel are all false solutions. Conservation is the biggest tool to cut down on our energy needs. Some small amount of renewable energy will go a long way if demands are slashed by conservation, and efficiency	ALT 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Magdeline Primrose	April 17, 2013	Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama, Here are the searching for alternative forms of fuels and fuel oils to supply our county's needs that we should really be investing in pushing for: burning, alcohol fermentation, pyrolysis, and anaerobic digestion.	PN 02
Maggie Brown	April 20, 2013	It would create jobs. Jobs create more business because people with jobs spend more money because they make more money. Its a ripple effect of supply and demand.	SO 08
maggie pleskac	April 22, 2013	why not spend the money on renewable energy now.	ACK
Maggie Powell	April 22, 2013	Seeing how this Bitumen oil will be transported to refineries in Texas and then sold to overseas nations, this does nothing to put us on the past of energy independence.	PN 07
Maggie Powell	April 22, 2013	It might bring a few hundred temporary jobs, but nothing of the nature that will largly improve out economy.	SO 04
Maggie Schafer	April 6, 2013	THE PEOPLE HAVE MADE IT VERY CLEAR THAT THIS PIPELINE IS UNACCEPTABLE AND WE WILL DEMONSTRATE, RALLY, AND THERE WILL BE ANARCHY IF IT IS PASSED!	ACK
Maggie Schafer	April 15, 2013	You promised sustainable energy and yet, you believe the non-science impact statements from industry instead of reputable studies!	ACK
Maggie Scot	April 21, 2013	Tar sands oil is toxic for our climate, and mining the tar sands destroys pristine forests and threatens First Nation peoples.	CU 02
Maggie Wineburgh-freed	March 27, 2013	the oil is dirtier than any other, and we REALLY need to cut carbon dioxide, not increase it.	ACK
Maggie Wineburgh-freed	March 27, 2013	there is a good chance there will be leaks,	RISK 21
Maggie Wineburgh-freed	March 27, 2013	It will not create jobs	SO 02
Mahlon Dormon	April 5, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates 12% more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis.	CLIM 12
Mahlon Dormon	April 5, 2013	Also, it's inefficient. One unit of energy produces 5-6 units worth of oil from tar sands (expected to improve to 6.5 units by 2015), compared to 15 units out from conventional oil production.	PN 05
Mail.pine-net.com	March 15, 2013	How can a group of "smart" people not see, hear or speak about wanting less dependence on foreign oil, the jobs that could be and the tax revenue from this pipeline. the President said he can't go for it because it crosses international borders. What are these ships doing when the drop off there foreign oil, it sounds like the same to me.	PN 10
Mailroom	April 19, 2013	Tar sands oil in the Ogalalla aquifer will never come out.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Major Daly	April 13, 2013	Gives imminent domain over US citizen's land to a foreign power- a Canadian company. Exempted as a public utility from mandatory contribution to National Spill Fund. One of many pipeline so exempted…	LEG 02
Major Daly	April 13, 2013	It is all for export of Canadian crude to China. No US domestic use. It will not causes gas prices to drop in the US--NO!--The US is now exporting US oil.....Domestic oil is at world market prices So ecologically hazardous that Canadian citizens have blocked every effort for pipeline to Canadian ports.	PN 07
Malcolm Sickels	April 2, 2013	By now, everyone with a brain knows about the State Department Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement having been written by oil industry contractors.	PRO 01
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	The approval of this pipeline will lead to an expansion of tar sands extraction, and in turn speed up climate change.	CLIM 13
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	In addition, the route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department.	CR 02
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	The extraction of tar sands causes unfathomable damage to the environment and people near the extraction sites.	CU 01
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	Please dont pretend that this will lower fuel prices in the US or lessen our reliance on foreign (that would be non-Canadian) oil.	PN 04
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL will NOT provide "energy security." The oil is destined for export and we will not see lower gas prices. In fact, TransCanada statements to shareholders declare that the pipeline will actually raise oil prices in the midwest of the US, thus increasing their profits. We would be taking all the risks AND paying more at the pump.	PN 04, PN 01
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	It seems apparent that your motives are to cross US territory and risks its pollution in order to access shipping channels to export your dirty oil to other countries. Please dont pretend that this will lower fuel prices in the US, or lessen our reliance on foreign (that would be non-Canadian) oil. I am one U.S. citizen who want clean energy AND a clean environment.	PN 07
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	The KXL holds more economic risks than profits. The job creation claims being made by pipeline supporters and some media outlets are wildly exaggerated. While Rush Limbaugh says the KXL will create up to a million jobs, an independent study done by Cornell estimates the number to be closer to 2,000 temporary jobs, and that the KXL could kill more jobs than it actually creates. The most recent State Department EIS estimates that the KXL will only create 35 jobs.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	The KXL will carry diluted bitumen. Diluted bitumen (dilbit) is not considered oil by the IRS, which would allow TransCanada to evade paying taxes into the Oil Spill and Liability Trust, a fund used to clean up oil spills. Indeed dilbit is not oil; it is far more dangerous to the public. A toxic sludge of chemicals and peanut-butter thick tar sands oil, dilbit sinks in water and is proving to be impossible to clean up.	SO 15
Malia Robinson	April 22, 2013	Pipelines leak. Many of those leaks are major and pose immense dangers to the public. According to Dr. Stansbury, UNL Professor of Environmental and Water Resources Engineering conducted a study showing that the KXL would result in 91 major spills over the 50 year life of the pipeline. Given that the KXL still crosses the Ogallala Aquifer, the most valuable resource in our state, and the fragile Sandhills, the certainty of spills is too great a risk for our natural resources.	WRG 01
Malinda Frevert	April 22, 2013	Make no mistake, this pipeline will leak, it will poison land and water and homes…….	ACK
Malinda Frevert	April 22, 2013	A leak in the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would pollute the water in the Ogallala Aquifer, one of the primary sources for irrigation in western Nebraska. Just as the oil spill in the Gulf is destroying the livelihood of thousands of families, contamination of the aquifer would wreak havoc on Nebraska farmers.	WRG 04, RISK 07
Malinda Sommers	April 20, 2013	We have no idea how to clean up tar sand spills. This a disaster from the start. It will rupture. Pipelines all do.	RISK 08
Manolete Garcia	March 17, 2013	The Canadian people rejected the pipeline so why is America willing to endanger our aquafir's & ecology simply to create more profit for the oil industry using the most carbon intensive (dirty) oil on the planet. We need to invest in renewable's. There is no upside in Keystone XL. .	PN 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Manolete Garcia	March 17, 2013	FACTS: The oil is for EXPORT. The Keystone XL Pipeline is an EXPORT pipeline. And it will NOT make our gas any cheaper. "The State Department has released their revised report on the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. Shockingly, the report still downplays the overall effect of the tar sands on our climate. It should be noted that an actual partner in the Keystone XL pipeline for the main Company involved in Keystone provided the report. This is an insane conflict of interest. This is not the only conflict of interest in that many legislators and state department personnel have widely been reported to be investors and therefore interested in the outcome for personal gain. But while the report may be outrageous malpractice, science is on our side. We have several weeks during this comment period, the biggest one yet, to speak out and show the president that there is a national movement demanding he keep his climate promises. With stakes this high, there is no excuse for the White House to approve the pipeline -- and it's up to activists like you to make sure the president gets the message: It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in one of the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet."	PRO 01
Manolete Garcia	April 12, 2013	Unconventional oils including tar sands are exempt form generating revenues to the oil spill trust fund. The trust fund is liable for tar sands oil spill cleanups without collecting any revenue from tar sands transport.	LEG 08
Manolete Garcia	April 12, 2013	Last year, there were 364 spills from pipelines that released about 54,000 bbls of oil and refined products. In 2010 in Marshall Michigan an Embridge pipeline sent 819 gallons of tar sands crude into the town's creek just 80 river miles from Lake Michigan. Now in Mayflower, Arkansas, 22 homes have been evacuated this week as Exxon prepares to attempt to clean 10,000 bbls of this tar sands crude from neighborhoods. The Embrdge pipeline in Michigan and the Exxon pipeline in Arkansas, however, are exempt from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.	RISK 03
Mara Farmer	April 6, 2013	Also accidents caused by a train derailing are much more likely to spill less oil than a ruptured 36-inch pipeline – even if all of the safeguards on the pipeline are functioning properly.	ALT 04
Mara Farmer	April 6, 2013	If the spill from a derailment occurs in the winter months, when the ground is frozen, it would be relatively easy to contain and clean up.	ALT 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mara Farmer	April 6, 2013	It seems that transport by rail might slow down the process [of carbon released into the atmosphere] somewhat and would be the better option for other reasons as well. The dangers of transport by rail seem highly exaggerated.	ALT 04
Mara Farmer	April 6, 2013	Since this bitumen crude is the consistency of peanut butter and has to be diluted by benzene, a known carcinogen, in order for it to flow through a pipeline, isn't it possible to transport it by rail without the addition of benzene and other chemicals? The clean up of a spill would be easier since it would not be able to spread too quickly and would not be able to seep into the soil as rapidly as bitumen that is diluted.	ALT 07
Mara Gillett	March 10, 2013	The costliness of this project goes far beyond dollar increments--not only will this project be very, very expensive for this country to undertake, but it will also be cost to to American health, negative impacts on the environment, and probably have a huge negative impact globally.	PN 08
Marain Cruz	March 10, 2013	We must first think about the safety of those people that live in this area.	RISK 14
Marc Ashmore	April 21, 2013	As well, paper towels as a clean up method? Really?! PAPER TOWELS?!!!	RISK 08
Marc Bruell	April 9, 2013	I call on you to revise your department's review and faithfully report the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate. Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	CLIM 12
Marc Long	April 22, 2013	I am not in favor of another pipeline over or near the largest aquifer in the nation. Water will be a scarce resurce in the world and oil is not worth it.	ACK
Marc Mccord	April 9, 2013	your new evaluation MUST account for the fact that the US will bear the brunt of damages from KXL spills and leaks, but almost none of the economic benefits or availability of the refined products for domestic consumption based upon already stated intentions to sell the refined products in Europe and Asia.	PN 05
Marc Sadoux, USACE	April 19, 2013	c. Section 4.3.3.2 Surface Water, page 4.3-13; Section 4.15.3.3 Water Resources, page 4.15-35; and Appendix G Construction Mitigation and Reclamation Plan (CMRP), page 58: Horizontal bore crossing mentioned as a 6th crossing method (and listed separately from HDD in Appendix G, 7.4.5). This method is not mentioned in Section 2.1.9 where only 5 crossing methods are described. Clarification is needed to describe how HDD differs from horizontal bore and it needs to be listed in Section 2.1.9 with the other crossing methods.	PD07
Marc Sadoux, USACE	April 19, 2013	a. Section 2.1.8 Special Pipeline Construction Procedures, page 2.1-50: "Special construction techniques would be used when crossing … perennial waterbodies; wetlands, etc." "These special techniques are described below." Special techniques for wetland and waterway crossings not described in this section. Mention that these crossings are covered in Section 2.1.9.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marc Sadoux, USACE	April 19, 2013	b. Section 2.1.9.1 Open-Cut Crossing Methods, page 2.1-56 to 2.1-60: Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) Method is listed under this section, but it is not an open-cut crossing method and isn't listed as one on page 2.1-56. HDD should be listed under its own subsection (2.1 .9.2 Bore Crossings) or at least somehow separated out from the open-cut crossing methods.	EDIT
Marc Sadoux, USACE	April 19, 2013	c. Section 4.3.3.2 Surface Water, page 4.3-13; Section 4.15.3.3 Water Resources, page 4.15-35; and Appendix G Construction Mitigation and Reclamation Plan (CMRP), page 58: Horizontal bore crossing mentioned as a 6th crossing method (and listed separately from HDD in Appendix G, 7.4.5). This method is not mentioned in Section 2.1.9 where only 5 crossing methods are described. Clarification is needed to describe how HDD differs from horizontal bore and it needs to be listed in Section 2.1.9 with the other crossing methods.	EDIT
Marc Sadoux, USACE	April 19, 2013	d. Section 4.3.3.2 Surface Water, page 4.3-15: Second to last paragraph: Permits required under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act would include additional site-specific conditions as determined by USACE and appropriate state regulatory authorities. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act should also be included here- Permits required under Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act	EDIT
Marc Smason	April 4, 2013	We need renewable, clean energy now!	ALT 01
Marcella Hamlin	March 11, 2013	Isn't there a better way to make jobs by investing in solar and wind energy in the US, manufacturer by USA workers, and benefitting US directly, and making us energy independent.	SO 05
Marcelline Lawn	April 22, 2013	Our water is far more precious than the oil Canada is trying to run across our lands. Accidents happen. Tar sands are not like crude oil, a spill would be disasterous.	RISK 24, RISK 07, WRG 01
Marci Pritts	April 11, 2013	It is in no way in the national interest to contribute to the ever-growing climate change situation (hello Sandy!) or potential oil spills	PN 08
Marcia	April 11, 2013	The regulations should be in place to require safe transport of these corrosive substances using pipelines that have been subjected to testing and are known to withstand the corrosive nature of the various types of oil that are piped through them.	RISK 14
Marcia Angermann	March 6, 2013	The extraction process itself apparently has a huge impact, not to mention the potential leaks.	RISK 14
Marcia Bailey	April 5, 2013	If we didn't know it before, the problems with the contamination of the Kalamazoo River in Michigan and the problems in Arkansas should prove to us that moving forward with this project is ill-advised.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marcia Clouser	April 4, 2013	How can it be that your EIS doesn't factor in the devastating damage that industrializing the boreal forest will do to habitat for 100s of bird species, bison, wolverines, wolves and ungulates?	CU 01
Marcia Curran	April 2, 2013	The development of the Canadian oil sands will damage the earths atomosphere by significantly increasing global warming gasses, especially the methane releases in harvesting and processing of the oil sands.	CLIM 07
Marcia Godich	March 28, 2013	But my understanding is that most of the oil will be shipped overseas, and that the extra jobs will be temporary, just to build the pipeline, with most of the profits (and few of the risks) going to the big oil companies.	PN 07
Marcia Grande	March 17, 2013	Environmental impact seems like a secondary concern in many issues and decisions, that is, unless, like me, you've spent a year of your life dealing with an environmentally induced cancer! What I can tell you, from first hand experience is that all the decisions being made add up and create a dirtier, more polluted, and toxic environment for all living things. Whatever money you think is being saved by things like the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, are very costly in health care, as well as suffering, which has no pricetag...More and more people are experiencing the horrors of environmentally induced cancer, paying the 'hidden costs' of every environmentally damaging decision. Before any decision is made, I am asking you to think of the hidden costs, such as more than 80 days in the hospital, an entire year of not being able to work, and the devastating emotional and physical costs that I, and others who have to deal with environmentally induced cancer, pay for degradation of the environment.	PN 05, CU 04, RISK 30
Marcia Halligan	March 15, 2013	It's time to declare our independence from big oil, not double down on the the dirtiest energy available. Saying no to Keystone would be a crucial step toward a safe and prosperous future. Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	ACK
Marcia Halligan	March 15, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will damage environment, threaten America's land and waters and do nothing for jobs or our economy. As climate change continues we need to protect our lands and waters as we will need all of them when severe weather with storms and droughts reduce our ability to raise food.	PN 08
Marcia Hnatowich	March 28, 2013	Thie State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate	CLIM 12
Marcia Hnatowich	March 28, 2013	Thie State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline'… significant risk for toxic spills.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marcia Lagerloef	April 21, 2013	I am writing to urge you to reject the environmental assessment for the Keystone pipeline and to deny further construction of this pipeline in the US. (,,form letter text,,) That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. The oil spill in Arkansas already shows that transport of this corrosive fuel is likely to result in other spills in our neighborhoods, over our aquifers, affecting families, health, and environment in the US. What is the gain? This is about profits for the tar sands mining companies, not US fuel independence, and certainly not wise management of our planet in a future already set to be impacted by greenhouse gas- induced climate	PN 05
Marcia Mock	March 17, 2013	If you are a business person,your goal is to make money and it does not matter if you sell salsa or oven mitts or oil or water. A corporation has no responsibility to the public interest. I do not want to pay for water that needed to be distilled.to remove toxic chemicals and petroleum distillates. I do not want to be billed for testing and purification of water that I did not pollute. Who speaks for me? Who makes the rules that require corporations to pay for the externalities? Once the groundwater is spoiled, nothing can undo it.	ACK
Marcia Mock	March 17, 2013	It is simply a matter of the inability of most people to understand non- linear processes. We over age 60 folks who took science courses understand the data and could feel the tipping point of climate change approaching. Businessmen who run corporations do not consider the welfare of future generations. That is the role of government. That is my Congress	ACK
Marcia Roberson	April 22, 2013	lf -- I couldnt understand why they would be talking about sending an oil pipeline right through the middle of one of the largest aquifers in the world. Pipes eventually leak -- we all know that and polluting an underground source of water will harm things probably permanentlly. How would they ever be able to clean up an underground source of drinking water? Common sense says that if you are going to have a pipeline -- it should not go through the aquifer. Please protect our resources and say no to the pipeline unless they can route it around the aquifer	RISK 08, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marcia Roberson	April 22, 2013	lf -- I couldnt understand why they would be talking about sending an oil pipeline right through the middle of one of the largest aquifers in the world. Pipes eventually leak -- we all know that and polluting an underground source of water will harm things probably permanentlly. How would they ever be able to clean up an underground source of drinking water? Common sense says that if you are going to have a pipeline -- it should not go through the aquifer. Please protect our resources and say no to the pipeline unless they can route it around the aquifer.	WRG 04, RISK 07
Marcia Rucker	April 4, 2013	Climate change, should it continue at its present rate and intensity, will dwarf and make a mockery of any and every effort made to improve life on Earth. When thousands on thousands starve as crops dry up, when wars are waged over water, when cities are wrecked in unprecedented storms, what will it matter what fights a president wins or loses? We either agree to work together to push back against climate change or climate change will push most of us into one common grave. What choice could possibly be clearer. Say "yes" to viable life on this planet, say "no" to tar sands oil.	CLIM 14
Marcie Long	April 11, 2013	I come from - Nebraska...and I know that the only way that town survives is becasue of the Ogalala Aquifer. It is a dry and gray area without water, since all the natural prairie grasses and vegetation has been replaced with agribusiness. And agribusiness cannot survive without water.	RISK 07
Marcy Hamilton	April 22, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 03
Marcy Vaj	April 13, 2013	And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe.	RISK 13
Marcy Vincent	March 10, 2013	It's reported that one of the pipeline company's contractors was engaged to help write the Dept. of State's report, which raises the issue of conflict of interest.	PRO 01
Mare Wahosi	March 14, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will increase the warming of our planet and will bring us more climate devastation.	CLIM 14
Mare Wahosi	March 14, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will not provide jobs	SO 02
Mareth Griffith	April 20, 2013	development of tar sands oil would contribute to climate change, at a time when the US should be seeking to develop renewable energy instead.	ALT 01
Mareth Griffith	April 20, 2013	development of tar sands oil would contribute to climate change, at a time when the US should be seeking to develop renewable energy	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mareth Griffith	April 20, 2013	We do not need to be subsidizing Canadian oil by giving their oil companies a way to transport their oil through our country.	PN 07
Mareth Griffith	April 20, 2013	having the pipeline travel through the US would lead to an increased likelihood of oil spills. oil spills, as well as the toxic chemicals used to disperse oil in the aftermath of a spill, can have great impacts on the environment, and human health of those living in the surrounding area	RISK 14
Margaia Forcier-call	April 2, 2013	I strongly suggest that our country invest in solar, wind & alternatives INSTEAD of heavy oil industry subsidies. KXL negatively impacts our country and "Separation of Oil and State" will allow us, as a country united -- not state by state -- to move our country as a whole, in the direction of alternative energies.	ALT 01
Margaia Forcier-call	April 2, 2013	It is a climate disaster waiting to happen.	CLIM 14
Margaia Forcier-call	April 2, 2013	The recent spill in Arkansas alone is reason to recognize the danger to our environment that even the leaking of these pipes can cause.	RISK 07
Margaia Forcier-call	April 2, 2013	The KXL is a dangerous, toxic project. Tar Sands oil is the most lethal kind of "oil".	RISK 12
Margaret Ann Holcomb	April 22, 2013	The potential ruin of lives, property, and public resources should never be regarded a "cost of doing business" nor a reasonable sacrifice for a petroleum based energy supply. Particularly when those affected would not be using the product themselves, since the oil is slated for export. The true beneficiaries of this project are wealthy investors, rather than the general public.	PN 07
Margaret Ann Holcomb	April 22, 2013	According to a 1980 law passed by Congress, the producers may not be assessed taxes for the inevitable spills that will occur, since it is not taxed as oil, and does not contribute to the federal fund allotted for clean-up. The gallons of oil dumped on the Mayflower, Arkansas community this past month is, according to many reports, only one of many spills that happened recently.around the United States. Because of limited coverage and industrial silence, the public has been ill-informed how prevalent these spills are. The pipe line may have been re-routed around the Nebraska aquifer, but there are many water supplies that remain in its intended path. Oil cannot be effectively removed from these water supplies that affect the lives of millions, nor can homes like those in Mayflower be restored adequately to ever be completely safe for human habitation nor regain its original value.	RISK 07
Margaret Arelt	April 2, 2013	Is it true that TransCanada isn't subject to EPA regs because they are a foreign company?	LEG 09
Margaret Banta	April 19, 2013	The oil in this pipeline is destined for export. We are not even getting a portion of the revenue going through this pipeline which is standard practice in the oil industry.	PN 07
Margaret Bartenhagen	April 9, 2013	WE CANNOT, as a nation or as a planet, move forward to a clean energy future, if we at the same time blindly pursue the most destructive oil on the planet.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Margaret Behling	March 10, 2013	I believe that more study and information regarding the TOTAL IMPACT of this project is needed by the public. The public relations material put out by the energy industry tries to overlook the environmental impact of the extraction process, risks caused by spills, and the refining process of this dirty source of oil. Destruction of forests in Canada, water and air pollution etc. are conveniently brushed aside by those who make tremendous profits from the oil industry. Short term gains can cause long term serious environmental damage that we may later regret. This has happened many times in the past with such new ideas which were not well evaluated by unbiased independent experts.	LEG 04
Margaret Berry	April 21, 2013	need to protect Nebraska's precious water resource is the most important argument for denying the pipeline permit. We can survive without oil but not clean water.	ACK
Margaret Chang	April 11, 2013	The short-term financial gain from the tar sands is definitely not worth the negative cost of climate change related mega storms, health risks and other issues dependent on overheating the atmosphere.	PN 05
Margaret Flyntz	April 1, 2013	If the Keystone pipeline is approved, it could spell climate disaster not just for our country, but for the whole planet	CLIM 14
Margaret Fogg	March 22, 2013	We need to use the sun and the wind and other forms of creative energy.	ALT 01
Margaret Fogg	April 6, 2013	Why are we pursuing this idea, when we haven't given any time for the sun, the wind and the water developments - clean ideas which… are able to provide energy while protecting our environment?	ALT 01
Margaret Goodman	April 3, 2013	Why are we poisoning our air, water, and land just so that foreign companies can make money??	ACK
Margaret Goodman	April 3, 2013	As the spill in Arkansas demonstrates, cleaning up after a crude oil spill is next to impossible	RISK 08
Margaret Greenberg	April 17, 2013	the tar sands oil will not help the US because all the oil will flow to Houston and out to China and wherever else it can be sent	PN 07
Margaret Holton	April 20, 2013	British Columbia residents are smart enough to know they don't want a pipeline carrying tar sands output across the virgin territory of their province -- especially if they can get the US to take the risk of oil spills -- which will happen. Perhaps we should value our land and water just as much.	PN 05
Margaret Jespersen	April 16, 2013	Please don't encourage Canada's Prime Minister and his Administration in the destruction of the boreal forest and the consequent harm and possible extinction of already traumatized songbirds of North America.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Margaret Jessie Benoit	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL (Tar Sands) is an example of dirty fossil fuels. It provides toxis waste that are put in pools that is leaking into nieghboring lakes and ponds which are being used by local natives for their drinking water. The fish that is a daily diet for the natives are shown to be deformed while the natives in Alberta are developing rare cancers,ect....	CU 05
Margaret Jessie Benoit	April 22, 2013	We need to focus away from dirty fossil fuels such as Keystone XL and focus on a sustainable green future for our future generations	PN 02
Margaret Johnson	April 2, 2013	I don't think I will ever have any faith that any oil company can be trusted to sufficiently maintain their equipment. Breaks are inevitable but if thorough clean-up doesn't follow such immense expense that so often devolves onto homeowners instead of the oil company who weasels out of full reparation. Don't let Keystone be added to the bad faith list.	RISK 23
Margaret Linderman	April 16, 2013	There is no way this pipeline should be built...Energy alternatives are the future. We desperately need to make the tough decisions to ensure a cleaner, greener future for all, especially our kids!	PN 02
Margaret Lorenz	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL Pipeline…. takes us in the wrong direction with our energy habits. Please continue creating jobs in more prudent 'clean' energy sources.	PN 02
margaret lutton	April 22, 2013	The Ogalalla Aquifer is a valuable natural resource. It is important to protect it. Water is infinitely more valuable than oil. We cannot live without viable water.	WRG 01
margaret lutton	April 22, 2013	The Ogalalla Aquifer is a valuable natural resource. It is important to protect it. Water is infinitely more valuable than oil. We cannot live without viable water.	WRG 01
Margaret Mainelli	April 22, 2013	I have researched the extraction of oil from the tar sands in Canada. It is so utterly damaging. Examples are: the destruction of the Boreal Forests; the use of roughly 400 gallons of water per day; the creation of toxic pools of waste water; pollution downstream that has led to more cases of cancer for Indigenous peoples…	CU 01
Margaret Mainelli	April 22, 2013	The chance of it spilling into Nebraska’s ground water and other waterways..	RISK 07
Margaret Mandy	April 22, 2013	How about we invest in clean, renewable energy sources that will clean up and preserve our environment and ecosystems and provide long term jobs and reliable guilt-free income for Nebraskans instead?	PN 02
Margaret Mccreary	April 13, 2013	Further many of the jobs created will just go to men and we only have to look at North Dakota to see what a devastating effect the oil industry has had on local communities and women.	SO 17
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	(KXL) will ruin America's economy	ACK
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	(KXL) will ruin….people's health	ACK
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	There is only so much fresh water to go around, we will be killing ourselves if that pipeline bursts	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	I want to see the generations after me not having to deal with the horrible effects of climate change and I don't think you, as individuals want to see that happen to your own families either.	CLIM 14
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	Why can't america move past oil and move towards a more green energy use?	PN 02
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	The pipeline will cost around 5.3 billion dollars….We have other options, we can put that 5.3 billion dollars into to green energy and still create jobs!	PN 05
Margaret Miller	March 14, 2013	(KXL) will ruin America's grasslands (and) nature.	VEG 02
Margaret Moreland	April 5, 2013	My understanding is the oil will be refined in Texas for export to Asia and after construction, few new jobs will result. As with all the other pipelines, it is just a matter of time until it leaks and fouls our land.	PN 07
Margaret Nagel	March 28, 2013	Surely you are aware that another Keystone pipeline has leaked repeatedly within the space of a year, and that a pipeline operated by a different company spilled millions of gallons of tar sands goo into the Kalamazoo river in Michigan. Despite clealn-up efforts, the river bed is still coated with bitume	RISK 26
Margaret Othrow	March 11, 2013	It is reported that a contractor from Keystone was asked to 'help' write this review, which was supposed to be unbiased and factual. This is an assault on the integrity of the American public.	PRO 01
Margaret Pearce	April 22, 2013	But the double impact of allowing the Keystone XL Pipeline to carry tar sands oil after destroying the boreal forest is not a bargain: it is a disaster. .	CU 01
Margaret Phillips	April 13, 2013	It would take the risk of horrible spills through the center of America. I don't want my grandchildren to have to live in a poisoned state.	RISK 10
Margaret Pierson	April 18, 2013	It has been demonstrated that nobody knows how to clean up a tar sands oil spill.	RISK 08
Margaret Schermerhorn	March 11, 2013	Saying that it will provide jobs is an exceedingly weak reason, since as many and more jobs can be created by the use of clean energy.	SO 05
Margaret Stern	April 22, 2013	If there is no clean water to drink and the air we breathe is toxic, what use were your bills to create more jobs?	ACK
Margaret Tattersall	April 11, 2013	Please don't let oil companies continue to be permitted to poison our environment.	ACK
Margaret Thomas	April 4, 2013	As well as pollution it is attracting sex-trafficking in the worst way. Very young girls (9-16) are being smuggled from South America indigenous communities to the ManCamps on the pipeline.	SO 17
Margaret Torres	April 13, 2013	We won't even bid for the Tar Sands oil because we have enough developed resources here in the U.S.	ACK
Margaret Torres	April 13, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline does not provide energy security to the U.S.	PN 01
Margaret Torres	April 13, 2013	The pipeline investment would lock us into a carbon energy future that would mean the destruction of the planet.	PN 05
Margaret Torres	April 13, 2013	It's [Keystone XL Pipeline] a conduit to allow Canada to export Tar Sands petroleum to China.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Margaret Torres	April 14, 2013	The poisonous tailings lakes, a result of Tar Sands extraction, are replacing the freshwater lakes migratory birds depend on their annual migrations. We need to husband our resources, especially those of the aquifers.	ACK
Margaret Torres	April 19, 2013	The Tar Sands, when they are extracted, leave a horrible mess that is so large that it can already be seen from space. When Tar Sands pipelines spill, they fill the air and water and land with poisons. This kills wildlife and people, leaving dead oil soaked wildlife rotting by the tailings ponds. There is no 'safe' pipeline. The oil companies have no compunction sending Tar Sands through a 70 year old 'converted' Pegasus pipeline that spilled all over the lovely town in Arkansas. They cleaned up the broken Pegasus pipeline by power washing Tar Sands dilbit into the neighborhood storm drains and, thus, into the wildlife refuge wetlands. The oil companies do and say anything to make a dollar.	RISK 07
Margaret Torres	April 21, 2013	I see no reason to allow the Keystone XL pipeline to cross our border other than to allow Canada to take advantage of the TAX FREE zone in Texas and get their product to their major contributor and client, CHINA. In a free Trade Zone, any thing that originates in a foreign country (CANADA), and is processed or manufactured in a free trade zone, then exported outside the country is free from taxation. Thus, Canada gets to have their dirty oil refined, then shipped to China and other countries, and no taxes are collected by the US Government, State, or city.	PN 05
Margaret Vernon	April 19, 2013	the pipeline would transport "tar sands" which will increase greenhouse emissions, and will commit the use of those tar sands for many years -- and the increased greenhouse emissions for many years.	CLIM 14
Margaret Vernon	April 19, 2013	Thirdly is the issue of the rights of landowners who are directly affected and the treaties our country is supposed to honor	LEG 06, LEG 01
Margaret Vernon	April 19, 2013	Next is the problem of the Oglala Reservoir, and in a time when supplies of fresh water are dwindling as compared to the need, we can't afford to risk the reservoir.	WRG 01
Margaret Williams	April 22, 2013	Another reason I am against the pipeline is because I dont believe a foreign country has the right to come in and take over U.S. property. No foreign country should come in and threaten our citizens right to use their property as they see fit. Just because they have money and lawyers, doesnt make it right. What happened to our freedom to live peaceably on our land? This is outrageous.	LEG 02
Margaret Williams	April 22, 2013	Instead of taking chances with our non-replenishable water, lets starting using alternatives to oil. Lets use alternate fuels!	PN 02
Margaret Williams	April 22, 2013	I do not believe this pipeline will provide more and cheaper oil for the U.S	PN 04
Margaret Zaleski	April 5, 2013	[KXL] puts more fossil fuel exhaust - carbon dioxide - into the air.	ACK
Margaret Zaleski	April 5, 2013	[KXL] creates the probability that ruptures will cause major oil spills ... that will be impossible to clean up	RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Margaret Zaleski	April 15, 2013	We need to move fossil fuel companies to clean energy -wind/water/solar. Residents of Istanbul have solar panels on their roofs because it's a cheap way to heat water. Yet we don't see that here. VW sells a car in England that gets 72mpg, but you can't buy it here. Germany gets 40% of electricity in summer from solar power. We need to lead on this issue if we are going to save this planet.	PN 02
Margareta Tommos	April 1, 2013	The Keystone oil is simply going to be sold in other parts of the world while the US has to take the brunt onf any damage from busted pipes.	PN 05
Margarita Mclarty	April 13, 2013	TransCanada, the company that proposes to build the pipelines to the Gulf Coast Refineries, has stated that our Midwest refineries have a glut of Canadian oil, causing depressed profits for oil companies. They anticipate that prices in the U.S. will rise significantly when oil is diverted to Gulf refineries and shipped overseas. In September, 2009, TransCanada representatives testified that diverting oil from the U.S. Midwest will increase annual revenue to Canada from the United States from two to 3.9 billion dollars as prices in the U.S. rise as a result of building the Keystone XL. The same hearings revealed that the purpose is to ship Tar Sands Crude Oil to refineries located in a Foreign Trade Zone on the Gulf Coast, where there will be no taxes on the importation of the oil nor on the export of refined products, which are destined for the world market, not consumption in the United States.	PN 07, PN 04
Marge Acosta	March 12, 2013	But, unlike the Unites States, the Chinese do not currently have a cost effective means of getting Canadian oil to China. Building the Keystone KXL pipeline would change that. It would also mean that we would be helping our county's biggest global competitor -- China -- meet its energy import needs at the expense of our own.The standard the State Department must consider is whether constructing the pipeline is in the United State's "national interest." To do that, the State Department needs to look beyond the potential for short-term construction jobs and the pipeline's environmental impact (which is a whole other issue) and instead consider whether giving the rest of the world access to Canadian tar sands oil is in the U.S.'s long-term strategic and economic best interests.	PN 01
Marge Acosta	April 22, 2013	Giving the rest of the world access to Canadian tar sands oil is not in the U.S.'s long-term strategic and economic best interests. More customers for Canadian oil means that Canadian producers can charge more for their oil, which then means that American businesses and consumers will pay more for oil.	PN 01
Marge Koehler	April 16, 2013	but none of that will matter when there is a rupture and much of the country has contaminated water.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marge Palleon	April 20, 2013	In - we have felt the threat to our water and environment with the local leaking oil pipes. People were without and are still without use of their wells due to the spillage from underground oil contaminating their water supply.	WRG 01
Marge Van Cleef	April 22, 2013	The Keystone pipeline is dangerous to the enrivonment, to the land and acquifer wherever it passes through and the burning of this oil contributes to climate change and global warming through the emissions.	WRG 01, CLIM 14
Margery Coffey	April 4, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is at 20% capacity and unable to replenish itself. We Nebraskans are facing the second year of extreme drought. The amount of water the pipeline will use will kill the Aquifer	WRG 03
Margit Meissner-jackson	April 22, 2013	Open-pit tar sands mines have brought carcinogens to Native American people in Canada and killed many animals and migrating birds.	ACK
Margo Nielsen	April 22, 2013	We must stop this before it is too late, The audacity of exercising eminent domain for economic gain is the most undemocratic practice in the U.S. today. A corporation disenfranchising people from their property should not be permitted.	LEG 02
Margo Vanderhill	March 28, 2013	Let's not trash substantial parts of Canada's land and water resources, including significant wildlife habitat for high-input oil.	ACK
Margo Vanderhill	March 28, 2013	Further, let's not risk acres of U.S. farmland, and significant bodies of water with pipeline leaks just so that we can pipe this oil to ports that will send the oil to global markets. T	PN 05
Margot	April 11, 2013	perhaps we could build a national oil conservation plan, where we educate people into changing lifestyles that were based on oil abundance. National transportation plans need to be started now if we will be ready for the inevitable shortages that face all countries in the future.	ALT 02
Margot	April 11, 2013	and now we are considering oil pipelines that will certainly leak oil in varying quantities the entire leghth of the Keystone project.	RISK 14
Margot	April 11, 2013	The destruction of the soil that we need to raise our food is not something to do without deep thought.	SOIL 01
Margretta Voinot-baron	April 10, 2013	Transporting tar sand oils across the US, at the risk of neighborhoods, farmlands and sensitive areas so the oil companies can ship it overseas for a profit is immoral! This absolutely is not the direction our country should be moving in, jeopardizing the health of our people, our country and our world.	PN 05
Mari Putnam Osborne	April 22, 2013	I will be directly affected when this pipeline leaks. My family will be directly affected, my community, my livelihood, and the wildlife and vegetation that make - County what it is. A pipeline leak will KILL - County, and any area that the Ogallala Aquifer serves.	ACK
Mari Putnam Osborne	April 22, 2013	I have lived in Nebraska my entire life. I feel that the decision about the pipeline should be made by those who it will directly affect--not by politicians who live hundreds of miles from here.	PRO 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	Processing the heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	ACK
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	Building the Keystone XL pipeline will speed climate change; it will lock us into higher carbon emissions when we should be investing in renewable energy that will provide a secure energy future.	PN 02
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	The entire KXL review process is broken. Conflicts of interest have riddled every review, and each report has ignored very important environmental concerns.	PRO 01
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	TransCanada does not have a good safety record or a good safety culture. Though they claim to promote safety by having "agreed to 57 extra conditions," most of those are required by law. And because diluted bitumen is not considered oil by the IRS, TransCanada could evade paying taxes into the Oil Spill and Liability Trust, a fund used to clean up oil spills.	RISK 25, RISK 19, SO 15
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation; Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010; and now Arkansas has suffered awful damage from a pipeline spill. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening irrigation and drinking water to millions of Americans.	RISK 26
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	The job creation claims of pipeline supporters and some media outlets are wildly exaggerated. Only 10% of the created jobs would be filled by local people living in communities along the route; and an independent study by Cornell estimates that only around 2,000 temporary jobs will be created and that the KXL could kill more jobs than it actually creates.	SO 03, SO 02, SO 04, SO 05
Maria Cadwallader	April 19, 2013	Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns, and President Obama rejected the route the first time around because it crossed the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer the State Department and President Obama should reject the "new" route, because it still does. The original route crossed 90 miles of the Sandhills; the "re-route" still crosses 70 miles of this fragile soil, family water wells, and major rivers that provide water to families, farms and ranches. Our artesian well is fed by sources that connect to the Ogallala aquifer.	WRG 06
Maria Celia Hernandez	April 11, 2013	Mr. Secretary, with all do respect please do what is right for everyone ,because doing this , you will not only will save lives in the future but will also save the future descendants from disease ,Medical Financial debt to the country and more.	PN 05
Maria Dilullo	March 29, 2013	The American people do not want this pipeline entering our country from Canada transporting the dirties oil in the world only to ship it out from our Gulf coast	PN 07
Maria Dilullo	March 29, 2013	I am appalled by the so-called study/review of the impact of this pipeline given that it was perfomed by a partial agency representing the big oil interests.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Maria Irizarry	April 5, 2013	We must continue our efforts for developing renewable and environmentally sustainable sources of energy	ALT 01
Maria Irizarry	April 5, 2013	We must protect our citizens from the consequences of spills just like the two most recent ones.	RISK 14
Maria Jimenez	April 2, 2013	Fossil fuels are an outdated source of energy. For the sake of maintaining our civilization and life on this planet as we now know it, we need to invest in clean energy.	ALT 01
Maria Luisa Tasayco	April 8, 2013	Of upmost concern is that the revised State Department's report on the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline lacks scientific rigor. For instance, a quick review of the scientific literature pulls at least one publication entitled "Oil sands development contributes elements toxic at low concentration to the Athabasca River and its tributaries" by Erin N. Kelly et al which reports that "the oil sands industry releases the 13 elements considered priority pollutants via air and water, to the Athabasca river and its watershed". In light of that, I pose the following questions: 1-What are the basis for monitoring only six criteria pollutants to evaluate ambient air quality instead of monitoring the 13 elements considered priority pollutants (PPE) by USEPA's Clean Water Act in the particle matter (PM) as well as heavy metals other than Lead? 2-What are the basis for not monitoring vapors of aromatic hydrocarbons like benzene and its volatile derivatives as well as alkyl halides to evaluate ambient air quality?	LEG 04
Maria Saucedo	March 16, 2013	Don't built the pipeline. We've destroyed enough of the environment already.	ACK
Maria Sause	March 10, 2013	I am outraged to find out that the government is using a study funded by Transcanada to inform itself about the impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline on the land it will carry heavily polluting toxic tar sands oil to its ports of export, from where it will be sent to pollute other points of the planet, sending more carbon into the atmosphere than any other fuel we burn now. It is our government, fulfilling its responsibility to safeguard our land and our people, that must hire the environmental impact studies necessary to determine the risk of pollution that this project carries with it. not the company that will profit from it. Conflict of interest is a very simple concept that everyone in and out of government is familiar with!	PRO 01
Maria Thompson	March 17, 2013	here are too many safety concerns, too many risks to our communities, wildlife etc.	RISK 07
Maria Torres	April 4, 2013	do not let commercial interest for a few to win over the the National interest and the future of the people and our children.	ACK
Maria Walsh	April 8, 2013	We, as Americans need to Quit Demanding more access to oil and care about our climate changes, both current and in the future.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mariah Holder	April 2, 2013	As a resident of ..., I can't understand why the U.S. government has not taken more steps to protect Americans and American land and water from energy companies and the unnecessary risks they take at our expense.	PN 05
Marian Carling	April 22, 2013	The pipeline will leak while TransCanada will avoid paying into the liability fund.	SO 15, RISK 03
Marian Demcisak	April 14, 2013	TAR SANDS OIL IS NOT FOR US DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION BUT FOR EXPORT. LET CANADA TRANSPORT THEIR OIL ACROSS THEIR COUNTRY NOT OURS	PN 07, ALT 05
Marian Hobbs	April 19, 2013	People have been working so hard to protect endangered species such as the beautiful whooping cranes. A spill from this horrendous pipeline could wreck all their hard work and kill these majestic birds.	RISK 07
Marian L Shatto	March 21, 2013	The threat to Native American lands in the U.S. is substantial. First Nations in Canada and Native Americans in the U.S. are working together to stop this assault on what is left of their traditional ways of life.	ACK
Marian L Shatto	March 21, 2013	TransCanada's record on pipeline safety is deplorable.	RISK 26
Marian L Shatto	March 21, 2013	Independent analysis shows that claims of good jobs for construction are highly inflated and will not lead to permanent employment.	SO 02
Marian Laughlin	April 5, 2013	The cost of oil pipeline cleanup is tremendous. In Michigan removing sunken bitumen from the Kalamazoo River continues two years after the spill from the Enbridge pipeline. Mitigating the impact of this spill could cost one billion dollars. Building the Keystone XL pipeline can only lead to more environmental destruction along its route, damaging habitat, water supplies, and fouling our wildlife.	RISK 07
Marian Nelson	April 5, 2013	The construction of this pipeline is another threat to the areas of the United States which are already is experiencing the effects of global warming.	CLIM 17
Marian Rose	March 10, 2013	Extracting the bitumen from the tar sands is arguably among the most environmentally devastating methods among the processes that provide us with energy. There is no good reason to destroy the environment and contribute to global warming to produce an energy source that is not needed and that will end up being exported. A few individuals will see immense profits. The others who are associated with this misbegotten enterprise will suffer the consequences.	PN 05, CU 02
Marian Rose	April 17, 2013	The method for extracting crude oil from tar sand wreaks havoc on the environment and, furthermore, requires huge amounts of water that end up forever contaminated.	ACK
Marian Rose	April 17, 2013	The final destinations of the refined oil have not, as yet, been spelled out, but it appears that much of the oil will be for foreign countries and not even for use in the US. Hence, we shall be merely serving as a convenient transit for the export of Canadian tar sands oil, with none of the so-called benefits.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marian Rose	April 17, 2013	The plan calls for the pipeline to cross Northeastern Montana and South Dakota prior to traversing Nebraska. This particular section of Nebraska lies above the most productive areas of the Ogallala aquifer, those with the highest saturated thicknesses that have the potential to yield the most water. Most are in the 200-400 feet thickness range, or in the 400-600 feet range, and several are even in the 600-800 feet range. Clearly, this is an unusually productive, arguably the most productive area of the Ogallala most of whose saturated thicknesses lie in the 0-50 foot and 50-100 foot ranges (Ogallala aquifer - Wikipedia). It would be an unprecedented disaster if this superb, indeed unique resource, were fouled by crude oil we do not need.	WRG 01
Marian Schwarzenbach	April 2, 2013	[The Project] further potentiates spilled oil draining through tributaries into the Mississippi River, down to the Gulf of Mexico... and causing [cumulative impacts to water and the environment of] countries of the Caribbean and [along] the Gulf Stream to our Atlantic Coast, Canada, Greenland and northern Europe.	CU 17
Marian Schwarzenbach	April 2, 2013	Transporting this, much dirtier, type of oil through our heartland--"the breadbasket of our country" …risks poisoning one of our major food sources for the entire country (and much exported food).	RISK 06, LU 01
Marian Severt	April 11, 2013	Please reconsider your recent report on the Keystone Pipeline. The catastrophic spill of tar sand in Arkansas must be a red flag. The oil companies are not motivated to protect the environment, they are out to make money at any environmental cost. Only government action and government oversight can effectively protect our people and our land from misuse by the actions of big oil. Please insure that government is doing what only government can do. Protect our natural resources.	ACK
Mariann Latchis	April 22, 2013	Let us urgently proceed with developing renewable resources to meet our domestic energy needs.	PN 02
Marianna Decroes	March 15, 2013	This pipeline is ….dangerous to the many people through whose lands it will pass.	RISK 07
Marianne Comfort	March 14, 2013	the most poor and vulnerable people of the world are the ones who will suffer the most and soonest from climate chang	EJ 05
Marianne Fitzgibbon	April 22, 2013	The KXL route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department.	CR 02
Marianne Fitzgibbon	April 22, 2013	While Rush Limbaugh says the KXL will create up to a million jobs, an independent study done by Cornell estimates the number to be closer to 2,000 temporary jobs, and that the KXL could kill more jobs than it actually creates. The most recent State Department EIS estimates that the KXL will only create 35 jobs.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marianne Flanagan	April 4, 2013	Heavier oil, more stress on pipes, more ruptures and spills.	RISK 14
Marianne Flanagan	April 4, 2013	After a spill the air itself becomes toxic from the fumes.	RISK 30
Marianne Flanagan	April 11, 2013	The studies submitted were flawed because they were written by people with ties to special interest groups. A new, unbiased study should be undertaken	PRO 01
Marianne Flanagan	April 11, 2013	What has happened in Arkansas is a harbinger of things to come if this pipeline is constructed-slow destruction of our resources while we help Canada destroy their own resources.	RISK 06
Marianne Shields	April 2, 2013	one of my biggest concerns about the proposed pipeline is the security of it. How do we protect this huge thing from enemy attack	RISK 04
Marianne Tinkler	April 2, 2013	I have farm land in Kansas and want to protect it from the likely oil spills which will come from a pipeline. The land has been in my family for generations.	ACK
Marie	April 22, 2013	If built, the pipeline would enable 30 per cent more tar sands to be produced. This would create the global warming pollution equivalent to 6 million more cars on the road, as well as increase water and air pollution and further jeopardize the rights of downstream indigenous communities.	ACK
Marie	April 22, 2013	Furthermore, tar sands development is proceeding without any regulations in place to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and Canada has failed to take meaningful action on climate change.	CLIM 20, CLIM 19
Marie Beckner	April 13, 2013	My husband and I lived for 2 years in northwestern Louisiana. That region has a large number of oil pipelines, fracking, etc. As a physician I was amazed at the number of people who developed unusual blood disorders whose lab specimens I saw. These disorders commonly lead to death after months to a few years of poor quality of life. I wondered if there was a connection between soil contamination from oil that could underlie these disorders. I drank bottled water as a precaution. It also tasted much better than the tap water there. Please consider what oil and chemical contamination of the groundwater is doing to the health of common, ordinary and often poor citizens, including children. Our bodies suffer from exposure to chemicals.	RISK 30, RISK 07
Marie Cusic	April 22, 2013	Economic jobs that are vital to our state, in fact the number one economic resource, agriculture, would be in jeopardy.	SO 10
Marie Cusic	April 22, 2013	How can we allow an oil pipeline over one of Nebraskas most sought after (and often fought after) resource our Ogallala Aquifer?! We have seen the impact that oil has on the Gulf Coast, why would we risk our Aquifer to meet that same fate?!	WRG 01
Marie Cusic	April 22, 2013	How can we allow an oil pipeline over one of Nebraskas most sought after (and often fought after) resource our Ogallala Aquifer?! why would we risk our Aquifer?	WRG 01
Marie Freeman	April 6, 2013	Find alternatives to fossil fuel.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marie Johansen	April 16, 2013	As a country, we must push for less dependence on oil and support all efforts that encourage development, innovation and motivators to reduce the use of oil and move to clean energy. It is also time our nation, business and citizens, realize the REAL cost of their gas and oil consumption so let the price of gas go up, it will hopefully hit home for many of us of the need to conserve, and support the options. So if prices go up, as they should, that is the real cost, and that is good-a dose of reality. Govt. should not subsidize these costs in any way, nor should govt. subsidize the destruction of natural resources and treasures and lifestyles and habitats.	PN 02
Marie Jones	April 22, 2013	...if any of that [oil from the proposed pipeline] got into any source of groundwater it would spread great distances and effect people living far from the pipeline. In addition, the soil contamination would render the land useless from an agricultural standpoint	RISK 10, RISK 07, SOIL 01
Marie Leven	April 20, 2013	Who is going to pay for the clean up of all the spills? Usually the tax payer and the residents that live close by are stuck with the bills.	SO 10, RISK 03
Marie Meyers	April 22, 2013	[The] groundwater in the Ogallala Aquifer should not be put in danger by a pipeline being built.	RISK 07
Marie Mollis	April 21, 2013	It will create only 35 permanent jobs	SO 04
Marie Monaghan	April 15, 2013	PUT THE MONEY INTO WIND AND SOLAR , SOURCES OF ENERGY THAT WILL NEVER GO AWAY.	ALT 01
Marie Monaghan	April 15, 2013	AND THERE'S THE MATTER OF WATER; MILLIONS UPON MILLIONS OF GALLONS OF WATER WILL BE USED IN THE PROCESSING OF TAR SANDS.	CU 07
Marie Rossachacj	March 17, 2013	It will be impossible to restore any areas impacted by the tar sands traveling across our nation. The areas that the tar sands are extracted from will never be restored and the wastes from the process are a level of toxicity that is intolerable. It is time to stop seeking additional hydrocarbon fuels and concentrate on solar as other countries have successfully done. Germany is a leader in this and some of the Benalux countries are making strides well ahead of the United States of America.	PN 02
Marika Bourdeaux	March 11, 2013	It is the time for new technologies, but if we don't invest in them and the government doesn't do its part to help show people the way we will continue dumping money down the drain of fossil fuel energy production. We already have viable alternatives. Why not spend the money on them?	PN 02
Marilee Hilgendorf	April 15, 2013	WE HAVE TO CHANGE TO NATURAL GAS and quit making the Oil Barons rich. OK, so someone is going to get rich on gas, AT LEAST OUR WORLD WILL BE CLEANER, and we don't have to worry about oil spills.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marilouise Morgan	April 17, 2013	Our focus should be weaning our nation from oil - exploring and utilizing alternate forms of energy. Our efforts should be made in that direction.	PN 02
Marilyn Barnes	April 22, 2013	There is no excuse for running a pipeline across the Ogallala when the route can be moved eastward a few miles to protect this vast underground water supply.	ALT 06
Marilyn Barnes	April 22, 2013	our own oil resources are becoming greater as a result of new discoveries and new technologies.	PN 12
Marilyn Barnes	April 22, 2013	There is no excuse for running a pipeline across the Ogallala when the route can be moved eastward a few miles to protect this vast underground water supply. If it leaks, the results will predictably disastrous. The Aquifer supplies 30% of American agriculture.	WRG 04, ALT 06
Marilyn Brennan	April 22, 2013	Do not let TransCanada run their pipeline through the Sandhills & Ogallala Aquifer. A leak there could cause a very major disaster much more than the Gulf tragedy or the Yellowstone & Michigan spills.	RISK 07
Marilyn Brennan	April 22, 2013	Please REJECT the Keystone XL Pipeline,because a leak in the Ogalla Aquifer would poisen the water for millions with the toxic ingredients they put in it to make it run through the pipeline	WRG 01, RISK 12
Marilyn Brennan	April 22, 2013	Do not let TransCanada run their pipeline through the Sandhills & Ogallala Aquifer. A leak there could cause a very major disaster, much more than the Gulf tragedy or the Yellowstone & Michigan spills.	WRG 04, RISK 07
Marilyn Broughton	March 11, 2013	Since the agency evaluating the environmental impact of the XL tar sands pipeline were working for the oil companies, it seems unlikely that the results can be trusted to serve the best interests of the U.S. and the environment.	PRO 01
Marilyn D. Mcnabb	April 16, 2013	The State Department's analysis which was dismissive of the pipeline's effect on climate change needs to be done again, perhaps by the appropriate group within the National Academy of Sciences.	CLIM 13
Marilyn DeMoranville	April 22, 2013	I am a Nebraska native and am appalled at the thought that the great resource of the aquifier is being put in jeopardy by this plan. Please preserve this important asset.	WRG 01
Marilyn E Brennan	April 22, 2013	I object to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline in addition to the toxic tar sands, they stated they would NOT remove the pipeline when it is no longer used,, but will remain in the ground forever to leak toxic fluids through the centuries.	PD 02
Marilyn Hughes	March 29, 2013	The pipeline will leak, as other pipelines have leaked, and tar sands oil leaks will have devastating consequences.	RISK 24
Marilyn Kiani	March 13, 2013	Please listen to the public on this. We want clean energy that is renewable.Our little blue planet cannot adapt to more degradation.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marilyn Klein	April 15, 2013	We must look to other means of fuels with which to rely on. Cleaner ways exist and developing them will mean jobs and a boost to the economy. Show that your Presidency made a positive step in this direction and started us on a more responsible way to save the environment and protect the planet while putting more American's back to work.	PN 02
Marilyn Liebsch	April 22, 2013	The differences between tar sand bitumen vs. conventional oil has already been established: the emissions are 3 to 4 times higher and produce 14 – 37 % more greenhouse gases. But, what is omitted from these numbers is the 'heavy' byproduct produced. The refining of tar sand bitumen leaves behind a carbon intense byproduct called petroleum coke, referred to as petcoke that can be used like coal. Between 15 – 30 % of a barrel of tar sand bitumen can end up as this byproduct. Petcoke is over 90 % carbon containing high sulfur and metal toxins and a per-unit of energy emits 5-10 % more CO2 than coal. This means a ton of petcoke yields on average 54 % more CO2 than a ton of coal which we already know to be one of the dirtier forms of energy fuel. After a first high energy input refining of a barrel of tar sand bitumen, this high carbon byproduct is left behind in an unusable form. Canadian refineries are not set up to do the second and third high energy input refining necessary to turn the byproduct petcoke into a useable form and were simply stock piling it in mass amounts...our refineries in Port Arthur and Houston include the biggest petcoke producing refineries in the world. These refineries and several others have already been converted to do the extra refining steps to deal with the massive amounts of high carbon byproduct contained in tar sand bitumen...Because petcoke is a refinery byproduct the energy required to process and the emissions from usage are not required to be included in assessments reports on climate impact of tar sands production or consumption. This means the climate impact of tar sands bitumen oil production is being underestimated. The US refineries are currently producing enough petcoke from pre-existing tar sands pipelines to fuel an average of 50 US coal plants per year. In addition, over 60 % of petcoke produced is being exported. It is not possible for refineries to store the massive amounts of this free byproduct so it is priced to sell cheaper than coal allowing already existing coal-fired refineries run cheaper and considerably dirtier. Coal fired electricity generation is already the largest source of greenhouse gases and petcoke will increase these emissions significantly. Currently petcoke is unregulated and is considered a coal replacement that operates under those standards even though it has higher carbon content. Petcoke is omitted in discussions on the greenhouse gas intensity of tar sands. Not including petcoke emissions means the climate impact of bitumen oil production is being undercounted by an estimated 13 %.	CU 08, CLIM 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marilyn Martucci	April 16, 2013	You must also consider the treaty rights of indigenous Americans and wildlife, for whom the pipeline is a disaster.	CR 02
Marilyn Miller	March 19, 2013	The oil companies in America are still receiving subsidies from American Tax Payers even though they are raking in the highest profits of any Company doing business here.	ACK
Marilyn Miller	March 19, 2013	The people of the United States can't afford this pipe line because : 1. It is the dirtiest fossil fuel on the planet and will contribute enormously to the problem of Climate Change. Environmentalist have already warned the world against this. 2. If there is one spill into our underground water system several states will be involved if they can no longer use this water. 3. If a leak or spill happens it can render farmland useless for years. 4. This tar sand oil when it gets to Texas it will be put on the open market and the citizens of the United States will receive nothing in return for the risk they will be forced to take and if something happened they would just have to suck it up as oil companies always manage to get out of the responsibilities they cause with nothing more than a fine which doesn't even match the profits they get for one days drilling around the world. The Exxon-Valdez spill in Alaska is a good example of what can happen to the land and the people it affected who lost everything with the twenty year stalling's in court while the people died or ran out of funds to fight and then with Bush /Cheney in office the court cut their liability to next to nothing. Big Oil won and the people paid the price. Please we don't want or need this product to cause even more damage to our environment. We need more alternative actions to the deadly grip of Big Oil NOW.	ACK
Marilyn Miller	March 19, 2013	This pipe line will only mean destruction to our ground water and to our farmlands if it is allowed to be built.	LU 01
Marilyn Miller	March 19, 2013	This Canadian Oil Company has a dismal record for leaks to their side of the line with over ten leaks last year. We already know how devastating this type of tar sand oil can do. Just go to Michigan to the Kalamazoo River and see what it has done and is still doing at this time after several years of so called cleanup. BP couldn't clean up the Gulf of Mexico because they haven't put any money into development of new equipment or new research.	RISK 19, RISK 13, RISK 26
Marilyn Noad	April 13, 2013	The idea of continuing with any fossil fuel given climate change is insane.	CLIM 14
Marilyn Seven	April 2, 2013	I grew up in Texas with the Ogallala acquifer and risks to it of a different nature	ACK
Marilyn Seven	April 2, 2013	It creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production	CLIM 05
Marilyn Seven	April 2, 2013	it puts the water supply of millions of Americans at risk	WRG 01
Marilyn Slagle	April 9, 2013	Oil company profits should not come before the health concerns of…, animals	ACK
Marilyn Slagle	April 9, 2013	Oil company profits should not come before the health concerns of people,	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marilyn Slagle	April 9, 2013	Pipelines leak. Sooner or later, they all leak.	RISK 21
Marilyn Weik	March 11, 2013	These jobs are temporary and the oil is being shipped overseas.	PN 08
Marilyn Winfield	April 16, 2013	We need to develop more energy from clean sources.	PN 02
Marilynn Burke	March 11, 2013	There will be leaks, as there have been with the existing pipeline ; it is inevitable. Don't put our water supply and health at risk.	RISK 07
Marina Chicurel	March 19, 2013	As stated in a recent New York Times editorial, I firmly believe that you should reject the Keystone XL pipeline, "for one overriding reason: A president who has repeatedly identified climate change as one of humanity's most pressing dangers cannot in good conscience approve a project that -- even by the State Department's most cautious calculations -- can only add to the problem. "	ACK
Marina Skumanich	April 4, 2013	In addition, the practice of tar sands development causes massive damage to the fragile boreal forest - N America's bird "nursery" - this obviously needs to be included in our assessment of the impacts of the pipeline... since the pipeline will directly encourage further tar sands development.	CU 01
Marion Morgan	March 28, 2013	Reject this project and instead focus on developing infrastructure that will begin to replace our dangerous dependence on petroleum	ALT 01
Marion Weeks	April 5, 2013	Once species are lost and habitat destroyed, we cannot put it back together. Do we really think we are such supreem beings that we can do this to our precious earth that is already under the assault of climate change.	ACK
Marisa Reilly	April 9, 2013	Why can't they just build a refinery in one of the Northern States and NOT pipe the oil all the way across the United States?	ALT 08
Marissa Madia	March 14, 2013	STOP THE INSTALLATION OF THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE AND HELP SAVE OUR ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY BY PROVIDING JOBS/FUNDING FOR ALTERNATIVES TO ENERGY SOURCES, SUCH AS WIND, SOLAR, AND THERMAL ENERGY!!!!!!!	ALT 01
Marissa Madia	March 14, 2013	It will greatly increase the amount of greenhouse gas emissions, which will take a negative turn on our environment and economy. Today, we are greatly concerned with the increasing of temperature worldwide, and the installation of the the pipeline will contribute to it. The gases get trapped in the atmosphere and create global warming. With our concern for the glaciers melting and flooding of countries and different areas in the United States, such as New Orleans, this will negatively impact many areas.	CLIM 17
Marissa Madia	March 14, 2013	The spills from the pipeline will also create mass pollution and kill numerous people, causing property damage and causing people to move. Ultimately, this project will be a lot more expensive than intended and the costs will greatly outweigh the benefits.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marissa Madia	March 14, 2013	Why should something be built to contribute to global warming, when we are trying to figure out ways to prevent it? The pipeline is also 7 billion dollars, and right now we can not afford to spend that much money on something that we do not even know if it will work, and it destroying the environment have much greater costs than the benefits of creating more jobs. Money should be put into creating new jobs to help the environment, not destroy it! If we are so concerned with running out of fossil fuels, jobs should be created to come up with environmental friendly ways to replenish the fossil fuels or ways to decrease the use of them, such as providing mass transportation, installing more subway systems, etc.	PN 05
Marissa Madia	March 14, 2013	[The Pipeline] will contribute to water pollution and affect the Ogollala aquifer, a critical aquifer in Nebraska. Water pollution has serious consequences and can harm many people. For example, the water pollution in the Love Canal in New York caused 80% of the births to have birth defects. Do you want to see this tragedy happen to citizens in Nebraska?	WRG 01
Marita Gowin	April 4, 2013	There needs to be a clear understanding of how the risks a project like this might impact … wildlife if a leak would occur.	RISK 07
Marita Gowin	April 4, 2013	There needs to be a clear understanding of how the risks a project like this might impact farmers if a leak would occur.	SO 12, RISK 07
Maritza Mallek	April 22, 2013	I feel that the DEIS fails to adequately consider and explain the cumulative economic and environmental impacts on the communities through which the pipeline would extend in the context of future public works projects and how they would be paid for and might increase costs and difficulties and other issues relating to the private ownership of this pipeline by a company that could theoretically spin off its liability into a separate company such that in the event of a problematic event, the primary company profiting from this pipeline would be shielded from financial repercussions.	CU 15
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	According to Bill McKibben, an author and authority on climate change, allowing the Keystone to go forward would release so much carbon as to make it nearly impossible to make any headway against climate change.	CLIM 14
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	And we simply can't deal with all the carbon released by the [tar sands extraction] process.	CLIM 14
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	It will cause irreparable damage to the environment at its source, a pristine boreal forest in Canada	CU 01
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	After going all across the U.S., the resultant oil will be sent to Asia.	PN 07
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	Even though it is said there is little likelihood of the tar sands oil leaking from the pipes and into the water system, where there is a pipe, there will be a leak	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marjayrog	March 9, 2013	Jobs: Although many have been promised, it will undoubtedly be fewer than that, and many more jobs could be created if we began a renewable energy plan to invest in air and wind, as they have in Europe. Besides, the unemployment rate is coming down, and while there is still need for jobs, the need is not as urgent as to allow us to ruin the environment.	SO 05
Marjorie Boldt	April 13, 2013	The destruction of the Boreal Forest is an incredible loss - for no good reason.	CU 01
Marjorie Keller	April 9, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	RISK 07
Marjorie Visher	March 10, 2013	… propose more clean energy projects instead.	PN 02
Marjorie Winters	April 22, 2013	We need to protect this aquafer by avoiding a pipeline and using alternate forms of fuel. The money spent on this pipeline could be better spent on lowering the cost of American made electric cars.	PN 03
Marjorie Winters	April 22, 2013	We need to protect this aquafer by avoiding a pipeline and using alternate forms of fuel.It is not possible to ensure nothing happens. Leaks are ievitable.This great gift of underground water needs protecting not exploitation.	RISK 07
Mark & Barbara Nelson	April 15, 2013	The solution is to provide consistent and focused government support for the development of new technologies; financial incentives to adopt those technologies; and disincentives for use of technologies/sources of energy that are causing harm to our citizens. If we get serious and become a leader in the field of alternative energy, we will create sustainable employment opportunities for our citizens.	SO 05, ALT 01
Mark Abushady	March 21, 2013	HOW DOES CRIS-CROSSING OUR COUNTRY WITH PIPELINE TO FACILITATE EXPORT HELP AMERICA OR OUR ECONOMY?	PN 07
Mark Abushady	April 9, 2013	This pipeline, which would transport a river of the most destructive oil on the planet straight through America's heartland to the Gulf Coast, for export, comes a way too high a cost on so many levels.	PN 05
Mark Adcock	April 4, 2013	Why Should The General Population Of This Country And Especially Region Have To Deal With The Ecological Disaster That Would Result Should A Spill Such As This Happen … But All I See Is The Risk Of A MAJOR Ecological DISASTER Affecting MILLIONS Should A Spill Happen Near The Ogalla Aquafer Which Provides Drinking Water To This Area.	RISK 07
Mark Alan Zimmermann	April 22, 2013	the mining of tar sands will cut down large swaths of arboreal forest which soaks up carbon dioxide. It will allow the release of huge amounts carbon dioxide speeding up the process of global warming and wreak havoc on the delicate atmospheric balance under which we all live.	CLIM 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Alan Zimmermann	April 22, 2013	[TransCanada has] proven themselves to be "bad actors" in their pursuit of such a permit. They have bullied and lied to landowners in their unlawful assertion of eminent domain authority. They have unlawfully begun work on the pipeline before any permit has been issued by the U.S. State Dept. They have lied to the U.S. State Dept. in inflating the economic benefits of the pipeline. They have failed even to consult with native and indigenous peoples over routing the pipeline through their lands. And they have used environmental impact reviewers who have an obvious conflict of interest in that they have had recent business dealings within the past three years with TransCanada, contrary to the criteria for independent environmental review. They have proven willful disregard for the environmental concerns of Nebraskans by failing to avoid the Ogallala Aquifer and the sensitive Sandhills regions in both the first and the second proposed routes.	LEG 02
Mark Alan Zimmermann	April 22, 2013	[TransCanada has] proven willful disregard for the environmental concerns of Nebraskans by failing to avoid the Ogallala Aquifer and the sensitive Sandhills regions in both the first and the second proposed routes. They have both overstated their capacities and understated the costs involved in responding to and cleaning up any mess that would occur when there is a rupture in the pipeline. They have resisted detailing the composition of their diluents, making cleanup of leaks harder to plan for and more hazardous to the public as well as cleanup crews. … They are not required to contribute to public funds for the cleanup of diluted bitumen when it spills, as dilbit is not classified as oil, for which such cleanup funds are designated.	RISK 25
Mark Asche	April 22, 2013	You think you can tear up the Sandhills and just replant it to grass, you cant.	VEG 11
Mark Baker	April 22, 2013	Too big a price for little return, and we wont get the majority of the oil.	PN 07
Mark Barkan	April 9, 2013	Oil spills always make a mess. Oil seems to spill frequently and in varied areas around our nation. Oil companies will clean most of it away but the damage has likely already been done to those unfortunate enough to live in the area of that spill.	RISK 06
Mark Bartleman	April 5, 2013	Additionally, the State Department's report doesn't appear to adequately address the Keystone XL pipeline's environmental impact.	LEG 04
Mark Bartleman	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline appears to be bad for the environment ... and bad for America, as it appears to do little towards improving jobs or our economy.	PN 05
Mark Brown	April 9, 2013	Stop oil subsidies and funnel that money into solar and wind power.	PN 03
Mark Cave	April 20, 2013	Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	ACK
Mark Chavez	April 22, 2013	I am mourning for the Beaver Lake Cree Nation where industry has stolen land in order to extract the tar sands, and where people are getting more and more sick. I am mourning for the community of Manchester, the Valero refinery in Houston, where childhood cancer rates are ten times higher than the state average.	CU 05, CU 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Curtiss	April 13, 2013	Have a look on google maps at the area North of Fort McMurray, Alberta. The tailings ponds are so polluted that migrating birds cannot land in the water with perishing as a result of the toxic waste left behind by the oil companies.	CU 01
Mark Daharsh	April 17, 2013	We all know where this oil is going. The Chinese investors include the state-owned (that would be Communist) Sinopec, China National Petroleum, and most likely, SinoChem. With a history of frequent human rights abuses and complete disregard for the environment, does this represent Nebraska values?	PN 05
Mark Daharsh	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is plays a critical role in the lives of all Nebraskan's. This vast underground reservoir supplies the water that keeps all of us alive. It is practically speaking, THE single most important issue facing Nebraskan's today, and should be THE most important National Security issue in the U.S. at this time. Without the fresh water resources of the aquifer, this country could experience an environmental and economic disaster of untold proportions. Not only would the livelihood of Nebraska farmers and ranchers be effected, but the water supplies to millions of people in many major towns and cities throughout the Midwest would be effected. The lives of every individual in this State would be put at risk. Please know, it is NOT the development of new gas and oil I am opposed to. It is the ROUTE that TransCanada has planned through the fragile ecosystem of the Sandhills...This pipeline must be rerouted to a safe clay-confining bed farther East, and NOT in through the fragile Sandhills.	WRG 01, ALT 06, WRG 04
Mark Daharsh	April 22, 2013	Without the fresh water resources of the [Ogallala] aquifer this country could experience an environmental and economic disaster of untold proportions...Please know it is NOT the development of new gas and oil I am opposed to. It is the ROUTE that TransCanada has planned through the fragile ecosystem of the Sandhills...This pipeline must be rerouted to a safe clay-confining bed farther East and NOT in through the fragile Sandhills. Legislation must be implemented immediately.	WRG 04, ALT 06
Mark Dubois	March 6, 2013	The statement completely undercuts Obama's recent pronouncements about leading on climate change.	CLIM 18
Mark Furst	April 15, 2013	And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe. A recently installed pipeline through my area (Wisconsin) has been seen being repaired in THREE locations within a few miles of where I live.	RISK 14
Mark Graski	March 15, 2013	What happens to the pipeline when it's no longer cost effective to use oil ?. Is there a plan to remove the pipeline then ?.	PD 02
Mark Greene	April 22, 2013	save the midwests water supply	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Holoubek	April 9, 2013	We (the people of the United States and world) do not NEED the oil coming from the tar sands. We need a cleaner form of energy at a lower overall cost to our present, future and futures of our children's children.	PN 02
Mark Kaswan	March 11, 2013	There's no question that we need to make smart investments in energy production. Tar sands is not one of these. It is incredibly destructive of the environment, and it represents movement in the wrong direction in terms of what this nation, and this world, need in energy development.	PN 02
Mark Kaswan	March 11, 2013	Reject this report, written in part by a contractor for TransCanada, and reject Keystone XL.	PRO 01
Mark Kausler	March 29, 2013	The Koch Brothers do not need any more money, and this pipeline is bringing tar sands oil from Canada direct to their refineries in Texas, primarily for EXPORT. The refined oil derived from the XL pipeline will not help OUR domestic energy supplies, but be SOLD to other countries.	PN 07
Mark Linahon	April 3, 2013	I believe that the Keystone pipeline will only slow down our progression towards renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Mark Lloyd Baker	April 22, 2013	Finally, aside from a small number of jobs, which could be found in green energy, Keystone XL will be of no benefit to the United States. The oil will be shipped offshore and the profits will go to Canada. The idea that Canadian oil companies should dictate US energy policy is appalling.	PN 07
Mark Lundholm	April 4, 2013	I have worked on the Enbridge Pipeline spill in Michigan. The cleanup is still going on even though the spill happened in 2010! This pipeline system carries Tar Sand Oil. We are already importing this oil. It is very dirty and full of impurities. We don't need more of this oil coming through our country. Keystone XL will not help U.S. energy security and will not provide employment except for temporary jobs. Keystone XL is not needed.	PN 05
Mark Mckennon	April 15, 2013	Furthermore, if -- or WHEN -- there is an accident (and combine complex technology, shoddy materials or construction somewhere along the line, weather stresses, and human error, there WILL be spills and damage)	ACK
Mark Olinger	April 15, 2013	Not only would a spill Keystone XL or any other pipeline threaten the water supply, but key wildlife habitat, numerous species, and potentially accelerate climate change.	RISK 07
Mark Olinger	April 15, 2013	It was just over two weeks ago, when an ExxonMobil pipeline carrying corrosive tar sands oil ruptured, spewing more than 150,000 gallons of toxic crude into an Arkansas suburb, forcing homeowners to evacuate. This is just one example of what we can expect if the Keystone XL pipeline gets built and is not maintained.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Olinger	April 15, 2013	My review of existing documents indicates that that the greatest environmental risk is to the water supply of millions of Americans. The proposed pipeline bisects no fewer than six rivers and numerous aquifers, including the North Great Plains Aquifer System.	WRG 01
Mark Olinger	April 15, 2013	A total of 56 surface water bodies are crossed, all are crucial drinking and irrigation water for many Americans.	WRS 01
Mark Phemister	April 22, 2013	It is not okay to send a pipeline which WILL leak somewhere at some point through American Indian Reservations. Their poverty is not an excuse for us to hand out 21st century small pox blankets.	EJ 03
Mark Phemister	April 22, 2013	Eminent Domain was never intended to be used by corporations or other countries, and was only ever supposed to be used for the greater good, never for the increased wealth of an elite few.	LEG 02
Mark Phemister	April 22, 2013	The contractors that told you there werent problems had financial ties to TransCanada. I know you were stuck using them because of the GSA schedules system, but dont be fooled- these guys think they can get rich, live large, and then die before the consequences really hit the fan.	PRO 01
Mark Phemister	April 22, 2013	The kinds of jobs this pipeline would bring are temporary	SO 04
Mark Phemister	April 22, 2013	The kinds of jobs this pipeline would bring are temporary (except for maybe the clean up ones) and no where near as empowering for the country as solar, wind, and geothermal jobs would be. We have a lot of cows out here. A better energy source would be methane digester capturing all that manure.	SO 05
Mark Piepho	March 6, 2013	The approval and go ahead for the Keystone Pipeline project is a must for the safety concerns have been met and the need for new and reliable energy sources for the US is necessary for our economic growth.	PN 10, PN 05
Mark Pothen	April 9, 2013	Please approve the Keystone Pipeline as this will provide thousands of men and women with good paying jobs.	SO 02
Mark Rainha	April 2, 2013	This is the biggest risk we could take for our country and its prosperity, with very little rewards.	PN 05
Mark Reuter	March 10, 2013	Furthermore, the oil derived from these tar sands will do nothing to reduce the price of gasoline in our country. The oil will be refined, then sold on the world market. All this pipeline will accomplish is making more money for the oil companies while being subsidized by the US taxpayer. It is an abuse of eminent domain power and the public trust	PN 07
Mark Reuter	March 28, 2013	The price of gas will not magically go down, since the refined oil will be sold in the world market.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Ritchety	April 16, 2013	The pipeline will do little to assure U. S. independence from oil from outside North America. Most the the refined oil from the tar sands will be exported to benefit the oil refiners and not the American people.	PN 04
Mark Ritchety	April 16, 2013	I am most concerned about what will happen to our ground water when the pipeline ruptures and the spill fouls the aquifers that supply our cities and our agriculture.	WRG 01, RISK 24
Mark S Cipolla	April 22, 2013	There are clear risks from a large pipeline, with potential leaks, especially since it will be over a portion of the Sand Hills and over the Ogallala aquifer. The risk of such a rupture is very real…	RISK 07
Mark Skelpsa	April 6, 2013	Keystone is the project of entrenched money interests making private profits without paying the full costs. Those costs, especially environmental costs will continue to be borne by the public (BP Gulf spill, Exxon Valdez, groundwater contamination from fracking).	ACK
Mark Smith	April 22, 2013	Today marks the fourth week of the cleanup in Mayflower, Arkansas, after the Exxon Mobil Pegasus pipeline ruptured spilled hundreds of thousands of gallons of oil into a neighborhood and wetland. This Exxon pipeline rupture was 22 feet long, likely indicating immense pressure, possible criminal negligence…… What is known is that the spilled material is Wabasca Heavy; it contains bitumen blended with a hydrocarbon diluent, usually natural gas liquids; benzene, a known human carcinogen; and hydrogen sulfide, a corrosive and poisonous chemical compound. This is a chemical brew akin to what we can expect with the Keystone XL.	RISK 13
Mark Taylor	April 13, 2013	[I] champion and new way; and new sustainable and clean(er) energy system.	ACK
Mark Van Roojen	April 17, 2013	The new route takes the pipeline through the watershed of Eastern Nebraska's only coldwater Class A trout fishery at Verdigre Creek. The Upper Elkhorn Natural Resource District which serves the area of the creek has made its opposition to the pipeline known in letters to the Nebraska DEQ for this reason among others. Similarly, Nebraska's chapter of Trout Unlimited, of which I am an active member has opposed running the pipeline through either Verdigre Creek's groundwater basin or its surface water drainage basin. At present the proposed route goes through both. The chapter did not take a stand on the pipeline as a whole. But it did take a stand on routing it through the creek's watershed, and with good reason. Nebraska does not have all that much by way of cold water fisheries. Furthermore, this particular fishery is the closest one for most of the state's citizens who are concentrated on the state's east end. And it is a treasure with spring fed waters maintaining cool temperatures even in the hot summer months.	FISH01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mark Van Roojen	April 17, 2013	Finally, there are the supposed benefits of using this oil now. Building a pipeline will create some jobs in the short term. But most of these will go away after the pipeline is built and there is reason to think that their numbers have been overestimated by pipeline supporters. The oil itself is as likely to wind up overseas as in the United States, so profits aside it is hard to see why this pipeline is a good thing for US citizens. And the oil itself is of such inferior quality that it takes more energy to extract gasoline from it than virtually any other kind of oil. So its energy yield is lower than that yielded by a similar amount of better quality oil. And it puts more carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere than ordinary crude oil. Perhaps in a crisis there might to reason to use it when we run out of sources of better oil. But we are not in such a crisis today.	PN 05
Mark Van Roojen	April 17, 2013	While the pipeline company claims that the pipeline will be the safest ever, they have provided little by way of facts to back that up. Their first pipeline (the Keystone XL I) had several minor, and one major leak in its first year of operation. Neighbors reportedly called it in before the company did, when they saw oil spouting above the nearby trees. To be sure we can't predict that the pipeline will leak in the Verdigre creek watershed. But the company's operation of their other pipeline gives us some reason to predict a serious leak somewhere or other. That sort of event is even more likely when we consider the kind of oil that will go through this passageway. As I understand it, tar sands oils are more viscous and hence have to be pumped at higher pressure to travel. And they are more abrasive than other oils. Both of these qualities create greater, not lesser risks.	RISK 14
Mark Willsie	April 5, 2013	The pipeline provides an opportunity for terrorists	RISK 04
Marla Bottesch	March 14, 2013	Almost all of tar sands oil will be shipped out of the US.	PN 07
Marla Bottesch	March 14, 2013	Hardly any permanent jobs…..	SO 04
Marla Donato	March 28, 2013	It's not a matter of if, but rather when the pipes will leak. We're talking here about groundwater in the middle of the country where people can't count on the Great Lakes for drinking water like you or I since we call - home. Once ground water is contaminated, it's contaminated.	RISK 24, RISK 07, WRG 01
Marla Epstein	April 9, 2013	Consider the consequences of a pipeline break spilling into our water, contaminating peoples life source. Consider the price of clean up , how many lives will be affected both financially and healthwise.	RISK 07, RISK 06
Marla Fogderud	April 17, 2013	The thought of an oil pipeline running through and possibly damaging the most fertile farmland of my home state as well as the most important auquifier of the western US is terrifying. I do not believe that the dangers of this pipeline are in any way offset by the inflated promises of jobs, etc. I fear for the potential devastating effects of water and soil contamination	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marlan Ferguson	April 18, 2013	It is also a great thing because we must reduce our use of oil in order to do our part to prevent the climate from becoming so unstable that we reverse the course of human progress and leave little hope for our children's future.	ACK
Marlan Ferguson	April 18, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is a pipeline through the United States not to the United States. The pipeline's major purpose is not to provide energy security for America, but to enable access to international markets in order to maximize returns for tar sands producers and refiners. In 2012, a full 60 percent of gasoline produced at Texas Gulf Coast refineries was exported. This export boom is not something all U.S. refineries share equally in. It is in fact the same refineries that will receive Keystone XL crude that are the leading export refineries. They already export the majority of what they produce. The State Department's own report, published in March, confirmed this, stating that almost half of the products produced by these refineries go to the domestic market. It is also clear that if we carry on with business as usual, exports from these refineries are only likely to increase. Since 2005, a remarkable thing has happened to U.S. oil demand. Instead of growing relentlessly, as it had done for over a century, it is now declining. Americans are doing more and going further on less oil, and that is a great thing. It is a great thing because no matter how much oil America or Canada produces, American families and businesses will always be vulnerable to a volatile global oil market; a market in which prices can soar at the whim of distant dictators, or as a result of unavoidable natural disasters. The less oil America consumes, the less vulnerable it is to these unpredictable events. The State Department claims that given business as usual, this pollution will happen with or without Keystone XL. We dispute that, but the point I want to make today is that we simply cannot afford business as usual, and stopping this pipeline is a big step toward changing the way we do business for the better. Building a pipeline that will help open one of the world's biggest reserves of fossil fuels is directly counter to that goal.The majority of the bitumen in the tar sands must be left in the ground and that will not happen if Keystone XL is built. The U.S. Government should deny the permit for Keystone XL as it is not in the national interest.	PN 13
Marlen Beach	March 10, 2013	Jobs seem to be one of the things the brainwashed see as an argument for the pipeline. Why not put people to work PERMANENTLY on renewable energy. They also are mistakenly convinced that this will lower their fuel costs. ... while the fuel will really go into the international market.	SO 05
Marlen Beach	April 4, 2013	It is so damned OBVIOUS that there is a horrible environmental impact from tar sands pipelines. My disgust increases daily with officials who continue to stand up for greedy Big Corpo and their profits instead of for the environment!	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marlen Beach	April 16, 2013	We need to be investing in renewable energy, instead of doing terrible damage to the environment for the huge profit of the few at the expense of all of us.	ALT 01
Marlene Peaslee	April 20, 2013	I feel we will suffer for any problems and not receive many benefits. Once oil spills and ruins people's lives, it is very difficult if not impossible to reverse the consequences.	PN 05
Marlene Robinson	March 31, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Marlin Languis	April 20, 2013	Aside from all the environmental issues, tar sands oil will be refined in gulf area states and sold abroad ... It will not help America's dependence on foreign oil.	PN 07
Marquis Murden	April 19, 2013	Though it sounds quite lucrative I don't feel that one of our nations most beautiful, scenic national park should be affect by a mistake made by our own people.	LU 03
Marry Me Maui Wedding Planners	April 18, 2013	Let's move forward with alternative solutions to our fuel needs.	PN 02
Marry Me Maui Wedding Planners	April 18, 2013	We do not need nor can afford the toxic spells that have created devastation to our water, ground water, homes, people, kids, animals and our air.	RISK 07, PN 05
Marscha Irving	April 9, 2013	It fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas. It seems the state-of-the-art cleanup strategy consists of laying down paper towels over the spill (??) in hope to sop it up. If this is the height of their technology, they hav no business putting a pipline through our wheatfields, foresets, & countryside. I have seen pictures of the interior of the pipeline - riddled with cracks & broken seams - ready to burst open. If this is what they lay down acroos the length of our country, we can expect 10 times the trouble Arkansas is having.	RISK 07
Marsha Arey	April 4, 2013	Keystone XL Pipeline. It would wreak destruction of the environment, including endangering many birds that need the boreal forest.	CU 01
Marsha Patterson	March 17, 2013	This could destroy the country with one accident.	RISK 07
Marsha Rubino	April 13, 2013	Allowing this pipeline to be constructed is a hazard to the health of the planet as well as to the people.	RISK 07, CLIM 14
Marshall Carothers	March 6, 2013	Accidents happen, but oil & gas move by pipeline all over our country with most people not even aware of their presence.	RISK 14
Marshall Elliott	March 7, 2013	I believe that the risks involved to groundwater are not worth the potential short-term gain.	PN 05
Marshall Magruder	April 11, 2013	National security and economic issues concerning exportation of our vital, limited natural energy resources to other countries so their prices are lower while raising the price of energy in our country is a separate but preliminary strategic issue that requires urgent resolution before any of these kinds of projects should be considered.(…..)	PN 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Martha Sanchez	April 22, 2013	We need to support development of clean energy	PN 02
Martha E. Martin	April 22, 2013	Technologies using renewable energy sources, not oil, are now available. Developing them will grow more jobs than the Keystone XL Pipeline provides. New renewable energy sources are safer, cheaper, more protective of ground water, and lower the risk of global warming.	SO 05, ALT 01
Martha Heinz	March 16, 2013	We have the potential for creating an unliveable planet. All we have to do is burn all the fossil fuel there is	CLIM 14
Martha Jaegers	April 16, 2013	In addition to surface waters, the Keystone XL pipeline threatens vast underground water supplies that, once contaminated, cannot be cleaned. There's no "away" where toxic oil can go once it enters an aquifer. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	RISK 07
Martha L. Hipp	April 17, 2013	Please consider the total carbon pollution impact of Keystone XL and reject this pipeline.	CLIM 12
Martha Leslie	March 18, 2013	Many environmentalist state, and I believe, that this pipeline means "game over" for the climate.	CLIM 14
Martha Leslie	March 18, 2013	The fact that the US State Department used pro-oil consultants to draft the Environmental Impact Statement on the Keystone XL Pipeline is unconscionable.	PRO 01
Martha Leslie	March 18, 2013	The pipeline will pass over important aquifers and put much of the US heartland at risk of spill.	RISK 07
Martha Leslie	March 18, 2013	The pipeline will not increase jobs!	SO 02
Martha Lewis	March 19, 2013	i do not support the pipeline. use the cash on alternative energy for transit.	ACK
Martha Munger	April 2, 2013	We all know that the oil market is world-wide, that encouraging North American production does nothing to cut prices or improve supplies in the US because the oil will be sold where demand is greatest, at the most profitable price. Truly secure energy is that which is produced locally AND cleanly. Dirty carbon-based energy threatens our future on this earth, and hence our national security, in ways far more profound than the supply or price of oil.	PN 04, PN 01
Martha O'Farrell	March 2, 2013	The mining of the oil sands is devastating.	ACK
Martha O'Farrell	March 2, 2013	Their is little benefit to the U.S. in permanent jobs or energy savings, as most or all of this oil will be shipped out of country.	PN 07
Martha O'Farrell	March 2, 2013	the difficulty of moving this highly abrasive material through a pipeline under high pressure is guaranteed to create some leakage or failure along the line	RISK 11
Martha Rafter	April 4, 2013	We need less of this poison and more clean and natural forms of energy	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Martha Rich	April 22, 2013	Stop the Keystone XL Pipeline! Just last month there were huge oil spills devastating communities. The pipeline has proven to be hazardous and toxic. Fort Bliss in El Paso, Texas is going totally green. Why not the rest of us????	RISK 13, RISK 06
Martha Shaffer	April 5, 2013	the pipeline will only benefit the oil companies that own and sponsor it.	ACK
Martha Shaffer	April 5, 2013	And the end product is destined for the overseas market after processing.	PN 07
Martha Shaffer	April 5, 2013	a huge potential for oil spills and environmental cleanups	RISK 07
Martha Shaffer	April 5, 2013	I understand that the great "jobs benefit" of the pipeline only exists in the construction process - that once the line is in place, it takes very few employees to keep it running.	SO 04
Martha Warner	April 2, 2013	Inorder for the thick petroleum product to be made "flowable" it must first be diluted with benzene, a know carcinogen that can't even be used in high school and college chemistry classes without fume hoods. When a pipe breaks, living things are exposed to benzene and all the other contaminants in the petroleum mix. Please count the number of pipeline breaks-spills and consider all the damage and devastation.	RISK 30
Martha Williamson	April 13, 2013	How are we to have water to drink… if poisonous projects like Keystone are approved.	ACK
Martha Williamson	April 13, 2013	How are we to have... air to breathe… if poisonous projects like Keystone are approved.	ACK
Martha Williamson	April 13, 2013	How are we to have...fertile land to produce healthy food if poisonous projects like Keystone are approved	SOIL 01
Martin & Barbara Haubrich	April 17, 2013	Years ago, a tar sands pipepline burst in the Kalamazoo River that - to this day - is still not cleaned up. The company responsible for maintenance of this line was aware of the weakness before it burst, but chose to do nothing.	RISK 23
Martin Crossland	April 12, 2013	The recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, [is evidence that] this pipeline will never be safe.	RISK 14
Martin Crossland	April 12, 2013	It's better [to] use US jobs in clean energy and investigate how we can utilize our natural gas reserves without harming the environment.	SO 05
Martin Friedman	April 11, 2013	As a serious threat to the environment of the lakes and lands of the states it would cross, it could be a source of untold and irremediable damage.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Martin Kellogg	April 23, 2013	UNFCCC is US "Law of the Land", thus dangerous climate change MUST be prevented The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was both signed by the US President and approved by the US Senate. Article VI of the US Constitution states: "all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land". From the UNFCCC text: ARTICLE 2, OBJECTIVE, The ultimate objective of this Convention ... is to achieve ... stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system. Such a level should be achieved within a time-frame sufficient to allow ecosystems to adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner. ARTICLE 3, PRINCIPLES, In their actions to achieve the objective of the Convention and to implement its provisions, the Parties shall be guided, INTER ALIA, by the following:, 1. The Parties should protect the climate system for the benefit of present and future generations of humankind, on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities. Accordingly, the developed country Parties should take the lead in combating climate change and the adverse effects thereof., 2. The specific needs and special circumstances of developing country Parties, especially those that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, and of those Parties, especially developing country Parties, that would have to bear a disproportionate or abnormal burden under the Convention, should be given full consideration., 3. The Parties should take precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change and mitigate its adverse effects. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing such measures, [and continues].	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Martin Kellogg	April 23, 2013	Last September was published online a key paper on projected impact of global warming on coral reefs worldwide: Frieler, K. et al., 2012, "Limiting global warming to 2?°C is unlikely to save most coral reefs", Nature Climate Change 3(2):165–170, doi:10.1038nclimate1674. It is based on long-established relationships between sea surface heating and coral bleaching, and was co-authored by the best coral scientists on the subject. In order to cover all reasonable possibilities and to be statistically robust, it used 19 GCMs from CMIP3 (out of 25; these were the basis for IPCC AR4) and 7 climate change emissions scenarios. Using a highly "conservative" threshold, it found that to save only 50% of coral reefs worldwide from long-term degradation and ultimate destruction, global warming would need to be limited to to only about 1.2 degrees C over pre-industrial (1.2 is the average for the 19 GCMs; their range is 1.1 to 1.4 degrees C). At 2 degrees C of warming over pre-industrial, an average of 100% of coral reefs worldwide would thus be destroyed (range, 98-100%). Since we have already had 0.8 degrees C of warming over pre-industrial as of several years ago, and a warming of something like 1.6 degrees C is already set to occur on the basis of the CO2 already in the atmosphere (just waiting for the oceans to finish warming up and for our reflective aerosol pollution from fossil fuel burning to fall out), the excessively CO2-creation-facilitating Keystone pipeline would not be OK.	CLIM 05
Martin Mcduffy	March 7, 2013	full exploitation of the Canadian tar sands is NOT inevitable…by preventing the pipeline capacity these oil companies so desperately need, we also prevent the profitability of the tar sands mines, and thus prevent their "inevitable" development.	PN 06
Martin Mcduffy	March 7, 2013	I have to register my utter disgust with the fact that contractors for TransCanada had any hand whatsoever in authoring the State Department's environmental review of the Keystone XL Pipeline.	PRO 01
Martin Melkonian	March 6, 2013	We can’t continue to produce dirty fossil fuels if we want to avert climate disaster.	CLIM 05
Martin Schwartz	March 10, 2013	Secretary John Kerry , It's beyond belief that you would accept the scientific analysis , of an industry , by the very industry being analyzed .	PRO 01
Martine And James Pillon	March 11, 2013	Instead we would like to see a major commitment to investing in jobs in renewable energy.	PN 02
Marty Grundy	March 6, 2013	No reputable climate scientist or environmentalist believes that putting into commercial use the huge amounts of carbon currently locked in the Alberta tar sands would be "unlikely to have a substantial impact" on climate change.	CLIM 05
Marty Keyser	April 22, 2013	This seems to be one more ploy to place public health, and the ecological state of our country after Profit	PN 09
Marty Lucich	April 22, 2013	You know that it is wrong to allow a more powerful "person" to use the government to steal or pollute another person's property; with or without impunity.	LEG 02
Marty Rajandran	March 24, 2013	, how many real jobs are being created for years to come, not just for now.	SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marty Whitney	April 22, 2013	I am concerned about regulations for constructing these pipelines being insufficient for safely transporting tar sands oil which I understand to be a mix of raw bitumen diluted with gas condensates.	LEG 11
Marty Whitney	April 22, 2013	This diluted bitumen is reported to be toxic and viscous, needing to move at higher pressures and temperatures. I am concerned about protecting the Ogallala aquifer.	RISK 11
Marvin J. Sheffield, D.v.m.	March 18, 2013	The destruction of the Boreal Forest to reach the underlying tar sands oil is an ABOMINATION!! I'm amazed that the Canadians are so ineffectual at stopping and immediately curtailing this very destructive process, promoted by Canadian Big Oil and Red China, plus the Koch Bros. Boreal Forests are most important as habitat for the endangered Mountain Caribou, and hundreds of song bird species that breed up there and that live in the USA during late Spring and summers. These birds are predominently insect eaters and do a wonderful job of ferreting out scale insects and many other small destructive insects that hide in the bark crevices of our trees. As for the endangered Mountain (Woodland Caribou) in Alberta, their numbers have sharply decreased since the advent of fracking the tar sands has started. Stupidly, the Canadians have been killing wolves, which co-existed in balance with these Caribou for eons; in order to use wolves as the scapegoat for declining Caribou numbers; caused by clear cutting forests!! Very importantly, Boreal Forests are the best bulwark against the [progression of Global Warming, and should never be cut down. Lastly the ongoing fracking is wreaking havoc in areas where it has been started. In Pennsylvania, hundreds of citizens became ill from drinking chemically polluted water, as a result of the toxic chemicals injected during the fracking process.into the shale and tar sands.	ACK
Marvin Stevens	March 11, 2013	Education and resources must be put into the direction of clean and renewable energy technologies. Major incentives must be put forth for big oil to use their infinite financial resources for research and development and infrastracture of present clean energy and future new energy technologies.	PN 02
Mary	April 20, 2013	Why not build a refining plant in Canada next to the drilling/mining area? Refine the oil right there and then ship it out. An oil refinery couldn't cost much more than the pipeline across a continent.	ALT 08
Mary	April 22, 2013	It is time for our government to invest in clean energy.	PN 02
Mary	April 22, 2013	Such an irresponsible regard for health and safety demonstrates an arrogance on the part of the large, powerful TransCanada.	RISK 25

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary	April 22, 2013	The state of Nebraska also has no wetland permitting system to protect from an explosive leak of this pipeline.	WET 13
Mary A Carroll	April 22, 2013	In addition, tar sands oil -- like natural gas from shale -- cannot be extracted from the ground without wasting oceans of fresh water: the one liquid human beings need even MORE than they need oil! And we will waste that precious water in the vain hope of extending our dependence on fossil fuels for another decade or two...while poisoning the air with carbon dioxide!	CLIM 14
Mary Adamczak	April 9, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Mary and Douglas Uptain	March 8, 2013	We expect you to fulfill your promise to take action on climate change and move away from fossil fuels.	PN 02
Mary And Dr. Paul Hebblewhite And Davidson	April 11, 2013	Also FOSSIL FUEL EMISSIONS ACIDIFY THE AIR AND HENCE THE LAKES AND OCEANS. The pipeliine proposed route will cross the huge Ogalla aquifer, in the (dry, hot) states of TX and OK, where water is no joke. Jobs, equal marriage rights, equal pay for women, Iran, Korea, the economy, the deficit, the debt, the question of taxiing high wealth, 'too big to be allowed to fail" and bailouts --- HUGE ISSUES, BUT SMALL IN COMPARISION TO IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE TO OUR CLIMATE. WATER, fisheries, forests, whole bands of flora and fauna, trees that can't migrate northward as fast as the climate's temperate zone is going to migrate, peopledisplaced by dought (Dharfur), water 'wars' in court and ultimately with weapons, cities on our coasts - including ancient iimportant cities (Venice, Manhatten). We must LEAVE this TAR SAND OIL IN THE GROUND. We cannot control Canada, but we can make it more difficult and more embarrassing on the world stage for the party in power in CA to proceed with ulneashing all that CO2. We must do the RIGHT THING, for once. Please. Think of our kids and their kids. Think of the $$$ resources that will be spent on cleaniing up coastal cities, doing something for drought and flood etc.	CLIM 17

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Ann Armbruster	April 4, 2013	please consider the amount of water that fracking uses. water that cnnot be put back in to our drinkig water supply [assumiing KXL ability to allow other oil and gas sources , ie. Bakken, transport access and market]	ACK
Mary Ann Gillis	March 11, 2013	And, how is it that the federal government is allowing the pipeline companies to commandeer private property in the name of the common good for all? What? How can a canadian company claim emanate domain over personal property in Texas so they can build their pipeline.	LEG 02
Mary Ann Leitch	March 18, 2013	Tar sands are the most carbon-intensive source of oil on the planet -- just the production can create up to three times as much global warming pollution as that of conventional crude oil. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates the pipeline would add 27 million metric tons of heat-trapping CO2 to our atmosphere annually.	CLIM 05
Mary Ann Leitch	March 18, 2013	What's wrong with this proposed pipeline: The Keystone Pipeline would bisect the middle of the country, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. It would benefit Canadian oil companies at the expense of U.S. taxpayers and our environment, using the U.S. as a pass-through to get the tar sands oil to the refineries near Gulf of Mexico for global export.(…..)The refineries on the Gulf Coast at the end of the pipeline are in Foreign Trade Zones where oil can be exported to international buyers without paying U.S. taxes.	PN 07
Mary Ann Leitch	March 18, 2013	Tar sands oil is a type of heavily polluting crude oil that is made of a mixture of sand, clay, water, and bitumen. Bitumen -- a viscous type of oil that must be diluted before it can be pumped through pipelines -- is more damaging than conventional oil, more toxic, and harder to clean up, as proven by the devastating spill of over 1 million gallons into Michigan's Kalamazoo River in 2011.(…..)The pipeline threatens America's water. Tar sands oil is more acidic and corrosive than conventional oil and is transported under higher pressure, posing a far greater risk for blowouts in the pipeline. Tar sands pipelines are not environmentally safe. The Keystone I pipeline was predicted to spill 1.4 times per decade, yet spilled 14 times in just the first year of operation.	RISK 11
Mary Ann Leitch	April 9, 2013	WE WANT REALITY WITH THE TAR SANDS - THE PRODUCT IS EXTREMELY TOXIC AND THE INDUSTRY IS RECKLESS, MUCH LIKE FRACKING. CITIZENS' HEALTH AND LIVES ARE AT STAKE - MOVE AWAY FROM THIS HORRIBLE PRODUCT FOR CORPORATE PROFITS - THEY MAKE THE PROFITS, WE GET THE CANCERS.	ACK
Mary Ann Lynch	April 3, 2013	It's a strange contradiction to vow to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet,	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Ann Mc Lean	April 7, 2013	The Review of the environmental impact of the Keystone XL pipeline appears to be a whitewash of the actual environmental damage that would be inflicted in Canada's boreal forest, contributing to endangerment or even extinction of many species of birds; of the likelyhood of spills in the areas through which it would run, and of the effect on climate change.	CU 03, CU 01
Mary Ann Perry	April 11, 2013	It's filthy to find, filthy to refine, filthy to use ! That should be enough to stop the pipeline. But oil influence is so big we are told that it's a reasonable risk.Future costs for health, cleanup, wildlife, the peacefulness of nature are enormous and are not factored into studies. If Canadians don't want it, why should I, why should we ?????	PN 05
Mary Anne Andrei	April 22, 2013	The risks to our water, soil, and our childrens health far outweigh the benefits of a few jobs to build an experimental export pipeline filled with the dirtiest form of fossil fuel and toxic chemicals. This pipeline is a disaster waiting to happen—larger in diameter and under greater pressure than any existing pipeline, which upon rupturing will result in a tar sands spill of millions of gallons even with a rapid response time	PN 05
Mary Anne Mcnerney	March 11, 2013	I am particularly concerned that since heavy sludge such as that removed from the Alberta tar sands will have to have chemicals added to it for it to be forced through the pipeline to Texas, this will threaten the American environment, particularly its water sources. Cracks that might develop in the pipeline or the intentional destruction of any portion of it could have substantial consequences for surrounding farmlands and urban populations for years well into the future.	WRG 01, RISK 12
Mary Anne Orlich	March 2, 2013	Please stop the destruction being caused by this Keystone project. Nobody needs oil badly enough to make this devastation to the land acceptable.	ACK
Mary Anne Simpson	March 14, 2013	An engineer for TransCanada says their welding protocols and workmanship is sub-standard.	PD 06
Mary Anne Simpson	March 14, 2013	On a purely economic basis, the XL pipeline will not reduce the cost of gas at the pump or availability in USA markets. Some analyst believe the project could increase the cost consumer's pay at the pump.	PN 04
Mary B. White	March 31, 2013	Portable water sources and agriculture will be jeopardized.	WRG 01
Mary Bamesberger	April 22, 2013	We call on our representatives to work for Clean Energy Solutions. Conservation practices can reduce current energy consumption. Investment in efficient, non-pollutiing public transportation can reduce energy consumption.	PN 02
Mary Bicknell	April 5, 2013	Please reexamine the effects of the pipeline on possible oil spills, as the one that happened just recently. These pipelines pose a hazard under normal conditions, but a disaster under violent weather or earthquakes.	RISK 22
Mary C Deese-barry	April 13, 2013	More important, continuing to facilitate crude refinement in this manner only perpetuates more dirty air.	CU 08, CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources. Only 10% of the created jobs would be filled by local people living in communities along the route.	ACK
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill. This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010.	ACK
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands under-estimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because they don't account for a high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal: petroleum coke.	ACK
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	Where is the Environmental Impact Assessment for the expected 400% increase in tar sands production rate with the Keystone XL pipeline? The existing basis for the Environmental Impact Assessment is invalid and should be reevaluated considering the 400% increase in production rate with the Keystone XL.	PN 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	It is a conflict of interest for the Impact Assessment to have been performed by the company Environmental Resources Management (ERM) who has been a contractor affiliated with TransCanada and the Keystone Pipe line companies of interest. The Impact Assessment must be redone by a company that is entirely independent and unassociated with TransCanada and the Keystone Pipeline companies of interest and a company that DOES NOT WORK FOR other energy companies poised to benefit from Keystone's construction! ERM submitted a conflict-of-interest filing that was released by the State Department. The biographies of experts were redacted to hide the fact that Andrew Bielakowski, "ERM's second-in-command on the Keystone report," had previously worked on pipeline projects for ExxonMobil, BP and ConocoPhillips, which, as Kroll pointed out, are "three of the Big Five oil companies that could benefit from the Keystone XL project and increased extraction of heavy crude oil taken from the Canadian tar sands." Others working on the project previously worked for Shell Oil or the Koch Gateway Pipeline Company, which both have a financial interest in seeing the Keystone XL pipeline built, had their biographies concealed as well.	PRO 01
Mary C Mims	April 4, 2013	What are the clean-up criteria for tar sand oil spills and do they include restoring the water table to preexisting water quality standards? What are the health and economic cost impacts for drinking and irrigation water not treated to preexisting standards and who will guarantee pay for the water treatment costs and associated economic and health treatment costs? What are the estimated clean up costs if the Ogallala aquifer is contaminated? What bond will guarantee pay for all of these treatment costs that likely will result in bankruptcy? What is the approved EPA tar sands oil clean up methodology? Has the EPA has been able to determine an acceptable clean up methodology for all tar sand spills? Monthly oil transported samples and water table samples along the pipeline should be collected and analyzed for fingerprinting characterization to ensure water table viability and allow clean up standards to be determined. Will clean up criteria be better than the Kalamazoo River that was destroyed by tar sand oil spill?	RISK 08
Mary Cartee	March 28, 2013	It is clear that we will continue to need energy while we transition to 100% renewables, but we need to move as quickly as possible toward a 100% green energy future.	ALT 01
mary charlene vogel	April 22, 2013	I stand against allowing TransCanada to build the XL Pipeline due to the risk of major spills and damage to our land air and water in particular the Nebraska Sandhills where I have lived for 30 of my adult years. We can live without oil and gas but we cannot live without clean air and unpolluted water.	RISK 07
mary charlene vogel	April 22, 2013	The possibility of polluting this major source of water for eight states and the bread basket of the country is too high in spite of what the company says.	WRG 01, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Clark	April 9, 2013	It is simply not true that construction of the northern portion of the pipeline will have no effect on the pace and extent of tar sands development, as claimed in the State Department's draft environmental review, That conclusion ignores basic principles of how commodity markets work -- if the tar sands are made cheaper to exploit by construction of the pipeline, the tar sands oil will sell more cheaply on the international market, and there will be more demand (and more development).	PN 06
Mary Clark	April 9, 2013	As you are no doubt aware, the authors of the draft environmental review have professional and economic ties to the companies that stand to benefit from the exploitation of the tar sands.	PRO 01
Mary Connie Comfort	March 6, 2013	How is it possible to discount the enormous impact it is sure to have on our air and our water?	ACK
Mary Connie Comfort	March 6, 2013	On what basis could the State Department report that the proposed Keystone Pipeline would not have an effect on the world's climate?	CLIM 13
Mary Cox	April 1, 2013	Please leave the tar sands alone and focus on all the really feasible alternatives our technology helps us have access to, like solar and wind!	ALT 01
Mary Daub	March 28, 2013	Why does your administration IGNORE these innovations, even as you push for this SLUDGE Pipeline to cross over our entire country's width, for the profit and gains of Other countries ? You Promised the USA Clean Energy.	PN 02
Mary Davies	March 28, 2013	The EIS is inadequate, failing to address the effect on … climate	CLIM 12
Mary Davies	March 28, 2013	The EIS is inadequate, failing to address the effect on spills…	RISK 07
Mary Davison	April 4, 2013	over 40% of Canadians have been opposing this pipeline for years; only Alberta wants it. The neighboring province of British Columbia has emphatically refused to let the pipeline cross their land, knowing the high possibility of a leak that would destroy their land and with it their tourism business.	ACK
Mary Davison	April 4, 2013	The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts	CLIM 12
Mary Davison	April 4, 2013	the viscous bitumen will NOT do a thing to bolster the US energy supply; it's simply being shipped to Texas refineries who are selling it to China--which means the possibility of a disaster somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. We don't need to have the coasts of Oregon, Washington and California gunked up the way the Exxon Valdez spill wrecked Alaska and the BP disaster wrecked the Gulf Coast.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Decker	April 18, 2013	Tar sands spills nearly impervious to clean-up (14 spills from Keystone One alone), TransCanada's negligible job creation and its land-grabbing, and reliable scientific studies and statements (plus extraordinary episodes of violent weather), signaling that further tar sands production is a climate killer--all of these developments leave the Obama Administration without a leg to stand on for approving the foreign-owned Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.	PN 05, CLIM 14
Mary Decker	April 18, 2013	the Administration is doing so [approval of the pipeline] without tar sands operators being required to contribute to the national fossil fuel clean-up fund.	SO 15
Mary Detrick	April 5, 2013	The current spill in Arkansas clearly illustrates the serious threat tar sands oil poses to the environment and the oil companies have continued to prove they cannot clean up these disasters in a timely or complete manner.	RISK 08
Mary Driscoll	April 5, 2013	Look what just happened in Arkansas. These home owners subjected to this oil spill, EVACUATED, Exxon stalling not saying what is in this dirty oil. STOP THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE, NOW. PLEASE PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT & the HEALTH OF OUR CITIZENS.	RISK 06
Mary E & Paul Teshima	April 6, 2013	I fear that tar sands may be harmful to people in the area.	ACK
Mary E & Paul Teshima	April 6, 2013	I do not think that the tar sands pipeline should be part of the energy plan for America. It is too unsafe.	PN 05
Mary Ellen Berger	March 28, 2013	Natural gas is not the answer, with the dangers of fracking and its waste (a problem in my state of OH). We have the technology for clean energy and this creates jobs!	ALT 01
Mary Ellen Gadski	April 5, 2013	Millions of acres of forest have to be cut to develop tar sands. The review does not take in to account the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat, and the wildlife that will result through further tar sands development in Canada. Why is this impact being ignored?	CU 01
Mary Ellen Navas	April 21, 2013	[The pipeline will create] Contamination of dwindling clean water sources.	ACK
Mary Ellen Navas	April 21, 2013	[The pipeline will create] Exaggerated release of carbon dioxide, thence increasing Climate Change.	CLIM 14
Mary Ellen Navas	April 21, 2013	[The pipeline will create] Desecration of forests/lands by surface extraction (i.e. mountain top removal). … Release of toxics: components of mined fossil fuels or of the extraction process.	CU 01
Mary Ellen Navas	April 21, 2013	[The pipeline will create] Likelihood of pipeline failures, thence oil spills from Canada to Texas, as now experienced in Arkansas.	RISK 14
Mary Ellen Navas	April 21, 2013	How about taxing carbon for a starter? We could invest in conservation and efficiency programs, and add a percent or two of that in free-fuel energy production. We could invest in infrastructure, re-training of laid off workers and fueling the economic engine to make our country great again.	SO 16

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Ellen Porter	April 5, 2013	Check with someone besiddes the company,please.	ACK
Mary Ellen Porter	April 5, 2013	After The pipeline rips through our countryside, they plan to sell the oil to China, anyway.	PN 07
Mary Ellen Reese	March 15, 2013	We appear to be swimming in our own oil and nat gas, so why do we need this pipeline to bring down Canadian oil--especially when we need to ramp up cleaner energy sources! Please don't allow this pipeline. I don't care how much the oil industry wants it. They need to find a better way to make a profit. I also don't care how much they donate to political campaigns.	PN 05
Mary Ellen Uptain	April 9, 2013	The potential risk to the Ogallala Aquifer and other water sources along the route far outweighs any potential benefits from the Pipeline.	RISK 05
Mary Ellen Uptain	April 9, 2013	The tar sands oil is particularly dangerous because of the additional toxic chemicals and the extreme difficulty it poses in cleanup, as evidenced in Arkansas and Michigan right now.	RISK 08
Mary Ellen Uptain	April 9, 2013	U.S. Government should not accept the obviously inflated job numbers claimed by TransCanada.	SO 02
Mary Fentress	March 19, 2013	STOP THE XL PIPELINE. Instead, COMMIT TO THE EXPANSION OF USE OF SOLAR,WIND, & WATER SOURCED ENERGY. If we could go from 0 to the moon in ten years, we can accomplish this. BUT, it requires total commitment by our nation to exert a concerted effort to develop and install, throughout our nation, clean renewable sources of energy, and a resolve to end our dependency on oil and other fossil fuels. Our environment and the future of all who live in it demands action now!	PN 02
Mary Gaddis	April 9, 2013	Although I receive financial benefit from the Eagle Ford shale oil project, I am opposed to, and appalled by, the pollution it generates. I am equally opposed to the Keystone XL project, most especially the pipeline to the US Gulf Coast.	ACK
Mary Gilfoyle	March 28, 2013	we Really need to say NO to this and move on to invest in free and clean energy sources for our planet.	ALT 01
Mary Glover	March 11, 2013	There are other safe, clean ways we can generate energy, and those avenues must be explored.	PN 02
Mary Greer	April 22, 2013	MUST begin a mass transition to renewables.	PN 02
Mary H. Hood	March 6, 2013	Let's pursue solar, wind, geothermal, biofuel, and all the other alternate forms of energy. Let's conserve energy, put in place tougher standards of efficiency, and wean ourselves off foreign oil, domestic oil, and natural gas	ALT 01
Mary Haddad	March 28, 2013	The product from the Tarsands that the Keystone XL pipeline would transport would add too much greenhouse gas to the atmosphere.	CLIM 14
Mary Haddad	March 29, 2013	The oil industry has proven time and again that it cannot safely transport fuels.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Haddad	March 31, 2013	ExxonMobil cannot guarantee that this pipeline is not a danger to citizens and the environment.	ACK
Mary Haddad	March 31, 2013	On March 29, 2013, an ExxonMobil pipeline carrying "tarsands" crude oil from Canada leaked thousands of gallons of this crude oil causing residents of Mayflower, Arkansas to evacuate. This incident is further proof that ExxonMobil is incompetent and is incapable of safely transporting this product.	RISK 13
Mary Haddad	April 5, 2013	Global warming is real, and it is getting worse. The amount of greenhouse gases produced by the tarsands product is horrendous.	CLIM 12
Mary Havir	April 4, 2013	It is undoubtedly true that the tar sands will be exploited independent of the XL pipeline but it is necessary to recognize that the pipeline will lower the cost of transporting it. This in turn amounts to a competitive advantage for very dirty high carbon oil as opposed to wind and solar energy.	PN 06, PN 03
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	What sort of negotiation with Canada's 'free market (ie., udernregulated capitalist) oriented Government? What deals with Big Oil?	ACK
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	IN PARTICULAR , we note that the 'Co2 emitted in this projhect" will be equivalent of 628,000 vehicles operating for one year," or something like that. This is OBFUSCATION. VERBAL TRICKERY. The CO2 emitted from PUMPING and processing the sludge may be at this level. However, the CO2 that will be emitted when this oil is sold and BURNED will be equivalent to that emitted by the burning of the Saudi oilfields up to this point, according to everything I read, and we read alot. The Alberta sands oil fields are nearly that big, and more energy intensive to mine and process.	CLIM 05
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	The point is, the TOTAL CO2 emission is what counts. While that includes the emissions from the energy intensive processing, it's way way more than that --- it's also the fuel itself.....which should be left right where it is...in the ground.	CLIM 10
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	Scientists use such phrases as 'if the tar sands are developed it is all over for climate."	CLIM 14
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	The proponents of the pipeline spent 35 times what the .orgs protecting the climate from the pipeline could spend. And they trick the public --- eg., on jobs, when the industry itself has estimated only 3,500 jobs to run the thing, once construction is over.	SO 02
Mary Hebblewhite	March 3, 2013	Americans in many oif those states proposed to be traversed by the pipeline could have sustainable jobs in wind energy. Solar in the southern states.	SO 05
Mary Helen Korbelik	April 13, 2013	THE OGGALALA AQUIFER IS NEAR ME AND SUPPLIES WATER TO MILLIONS. IT WOULD BE A TRAGEDY IF THIS WAS POLLUTED WITH OIL FROM A SPILL.	WRG 01
Mary Hendrick	April 15, 2013	Why can't there be a pipeline to northern nebraska and then truck stuff south or west to seattle/portland/belllingham? This will minimize potiential of environ.damage,create jobs in Nebraska and for truckers.	ALT 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Heusman	April 22, 2013	We need to invest more in Clean Energy with the wind farms and with solar power.	PN 02
Mary Hunt	April 13, 2013	Show us the numbers, what makes the Keystone XL necessary?	ACK
Mary Hyslop	April 13, 2013	As a resident of Nebraska, I am deeply concerned about a leak in the Keystone XL pipeline contaminating the Ogallala Aquifer and surrounding porous soil. The pristine water from the aquifer is Nebraskas most valuable resource and provides drinking water to about 85% of the state.	ACK
Mary Hyslop	April 13, 2013	As a resident of Nebraska, I am deeply concerned about a leak in the Keystone XL pipeline contaminating the Ogallala Aquifer and surrounding porous soil. The pristine water from the aquifer is Nebraskas most valuable resource and provides drinking water to about 85% of the state.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Mary Isabella Stone	April 24, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline solution to our relian ce on a single source of energy fuel without funding innovation and research into more long term global solutions that take into consideration how people actually live will also destroy a sacred tie to our planet earth.	PN 03
Mary J Johnson	April 22, 2013	Build the refinery where the oil is and send the refined product by rail or truck.	ALT 08
Mary J Johnson	April 22, 2013	Build the refinery where the oil is and send the refined product by rail or truck.	ALT 08
Mary J Swanson	April 22, 2013	Global warming is a real issue that needs to be dealt with. Environmental degradation is a crime against our planet and all of us who share it. The development of tar sands and the construction of the pipeline have a devastating impact on both of these issues.	CLIM 14
Mary Jane Colleran	April 22, 2013	TransCanada wants their pipeline badly enough, they can take the necessary time, and gain the necessary permits and public approval to run it through western Canada to British Columbia	ALT 05
Mary Jane Colleran	April 22, 2013	It (KXL) cuts through the most beautiful part of Nebraska and will effect tourism.	RISK 09
Mary Jane Pagan	April 5, 2013	The environmental degradation to the atmosphere, global warming, as well as the land on which the pipeline is built on would be so catastrophic in a few years' time that we could not undo the damage. Why is the easy money more important than everyone's long-term future?	PN 05
Mary Jane Powers	April 22, 2013	My mother is from the Oglala Tribe. PLEASE do not let them endanger this sacred area of our heartland	ACK
mary jo christian	April 22, 2013	Furthermore there isnt any means for funding these spills from the oil companies due to poor planning and faulty regulations.	RISK 03
Mary Jo Guinan	April 22, 2013	I encourage all elected officials who have a voice in this matter to divert the path of the Trans Canada pipeline away from the Sandhills Aquifer.	ALT 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Jo Guinan	April 22, 2013	There is absolutely no reason economic or otherwise why Nebraska should allow another oil bearing pipe line to cross our state especially one that would be built over or anywhere near the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Mary Jo Neal	April 22, 2013	Only 10 to 15 permanent jobs will be brought by it, so the jobs argument does not hold water (no pun intended).	SO 02
Mary Jo Neal	April 22, 2013	The major concern is for the safety of our water supply. There is great risk involved by allowing this corrosive product to pass through pipelines that will be destroyed by it. Already we have seen what happens with inevitable leaks. Our WATER is precious and should not be put at such high risk.	WRG 01, RISK 10
Mary Juett	April 22, 2013	You would be threatening those who live along the pipeline route by allowing foreign companies to take their land by eminent domain, land that for many has been in their families for generations.	LEG 02
Mary Juett	April 22, 2013	All of this risk for a handful of jobs and tarsands that will be sent again to foreign lands.	PN 05
Mary Juett	April 22, 2013	By saying yes you are endangering the livelihood of ALL Nebraskans by threatening our water supply, which everyone across the state utilizes. You would be threatening the livelihood of our farmers and ranchers who depend on the clean water from the aquifer to manage their farms and ranches.	WRG 01, SO 12
Mary Kay Flanigan Osf	April 11, 2013	Why go ahead when we already have the consequences of storms/ floods/droughts.??...If the parts per million pollution goes higher we will have even worse storms, ecological damage, lives lost, and high financial repairs needed.	CLIM 17
mary kay jensen	April 22, 2013	Clean energy - the time has come!	PN 02
Mary Kay Jensen	April 22, 2013	We want clean energy and we need it now!	PN 02
Mary Kefayati	April 22, 2013	We need to invest in wind and solar instead of putting our water and land at risk.	PN 02
Mary Kelley Richard	March 17, 2013	I was a Hazardous Chemical & Oil pollution Response Petty officer...in the Coast Guard...going to disaster after disaster. I know how to read the science. I am begging you both on my hands & knees to reject the Keystone Pipeline.	PN 09
Mary Kerasavich	April 9, 2013	It is a danger to our health	ACK
Mary Koehn	April 4, 2013	Recent environmental disasters have proven that these kind of "projects" ARE NOT SAFE. MORE DISASTERS WILL HAPPEN !	ACK
Mary Koehn	April 22, 2013	IT IS TIME TO DEVELOP OTHER ENERGY SOURCES. WIND, SOLAR,. Just because "Big Oil" is so wealthy, does NOT mean that they should be able to "buy" their way to do what they want. The right, honest, and fair considerations speak for themselves.	PN 02
Mary Leitch	March 14, 2013	….it [the Pipeline] will do nothing for "energy independence" because almost all the tar-sands fuel will be sold to other countries….	PN 04
Mary Leitch	March 14, 2013	Only 35 permanent jobs would be created by the pipeline.	SO 04
Mary Love	March 22, 2013	do not risk our environment and aquifers for profit by foreign oil companies.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary M Sealing	April 16, 2013	We urge you to put the welfare of the planet ahead of short-term gains and to be honest about the underlying assumptions of your analysis. There is a monstrous difference between assuming the oil will be developed anyway and moving aggressively to assure that it isn't.	PN 06
Mary M. Sims	April 11, 2013	I am so frustrated by the continuing threat of tar sands oil being moved through our country. I am not persuaded that this is good for anyone, and angry that, so far, this administration will not consider truthfully the far-reaching impacts posed by Keystone XL.	PN 09
Mary Malotte	April 21, 2013	It is not in our national interest to say that we care about climate change, we care about a clean energy economy, we care about creating a more sustainable planet for generations to come--- and then to approve a project that adds carbon to the atmosphere, feeds a dependence on fossil fuel…	PN 08, CLIM 14
Mary Mancuso	April 22, 2013	I dont believe the project has been thought out well and even more importantly, Nebraskas interests have been utterly disregarded during its development. One would assume the responsibility for engaging proper public review of a project of this magnitude with so much of Nebraskas interests at stake, should reasonably fall in the laps of our state legislators. That is why they were elected. But they are unwilling to get involved. In fact our very own legislators who sit on the Natural Resources Committee (of all places !) refuse to develop a "bare bones" process that outlines rights and responsibilities in the event the pipeline fails. Our state legislators are allowing larger economic interests to be in charge, leaving Nebraskans (1) without a voice and (2) without any accompanying benefit whatsoever. The potential loss to Nebraska is not even compensable. And we cant even get to the table to discuss it.	PRO 06, LEG 17
Mary Mcginn	April 21, 2013	As Nebraska farmer Randy Thompson so eloquently said, “There is no reward of energy independence with this pipeline. Only risks to our land and water. The jobs will soon disappear, the energy independence will be on a ship to some unknown destination, but the scar on America’s landscape will be with us forever... Neither Nebraska landowners such as myself, nor American citizens across the country are prepared for these consequences. We rely on fresh water for drinking and for agriculture — and a spill in the Ogallala Aquifer would make both of these impossible. We’re talking about public health, environmental risks, lost agricultural land and enormous economic costs...	RISK 07, PN 05
Mary Mcginn	April 21, 2013	Two major tar sands spills over the past three years have proven that the oil industry cannot adequately protect our land and water from spills.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Mcgrath	April 17, 2013	The tar sands oil that the pipeline would transport is toxic and dangerously corrosive, and is the most carbon-intensive source of oil on the planet. It poses unacceptable threats to our climate and to our water supplies.	PN 05, CLIM 05, RISK 11, WRG 01
Mary Mcguire	April 22, 2013	As a hard-working taxpayer, I definately want my money spent to develop and advance green energies such as solar, wind and geothermal.	PN 02
Mary Mcguire	April 22, 2013	Have we not learned anything from the many oil spills and its effects on the environment and people. Many Americans rely on wells for their source of water.	RISK 13, RISK 07, WRG 01
Mary Mcnally	April 10, 2013	The spills that have already occurred is evidence that there is a level of carelessness on the part if those transporting this toxic material that we cannot tolerate.	RISK 13
Mary Miller	April 20, 2013	[This pipeline is not worth] contaminating our soil which is needed to sustain all aspects of our life.	ACK
Mary Miller	April 20, 2013	That is already being seen in the spills in this country, as well as in Canada.	RISK 13
Mary Moore	April 3, 2013	It is not our oil and will tie up our refineries, therefore raising gas prices in America.	PN 04
Mary Moore	April 3, 2013	Not to mention the possibility of breaks and oil spills like what they are fighting in AR right now!	RISK 14
Mary Nicholas Picard	April 4, 2013	This review must include names of corporations and individuals who would gain financially from all phases of pipeline development and use, and the dollar amount of those gains.	LEG 26
Mary Ownby	March 9, 2013	Please encourage the State Department to conduct a proper and thorough review of the environmental impacts of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. The current review does not adequately assess impacts to habitat, the carbon pollution contribution, and safety. Before any agreements with the Canadian company that will greatly benefit from this pipeline, its impacts in the US needs to be fully determined.	LEG 04
Mary Paolucci	April 5, 2013	As our elected leaders, you are called to responsible care of our earth. Please work for renewable clean energy.	ALT 01
Mary Pat Brennan	March 10, 2013	NASA's leading climate scientist warns that tar sands expansion could mean "game over" for the climate. That is simply not acceptable from any perspective, economically or morally. We need to start reducing emissions significantly, not create new ways to increase them.	CLIM 14
Mary Perlick	April 22, 2013	The potential (risk) to the Ogallala Aquifer which provides water to eight states is a horror not to be thought of.	ACK
Mary Perlick	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL a Canadian company has been pressuring United State citizens to sign over easements to their property. We should not tolerate such actions.	LEG 02
Mary Perlick	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL, a Canadian company, has been pressuring United State citizens to sign over easements to their property.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Reinertsen	April 22, 2013	Pipelines that carry heavy gritty tar sands and unknown chemical additives are a severe danger.	RISK 14
Mary Robbins Jones	April 15, 2013	So why, when you know that we need to get off of fossil fuels for too many really good reasons to count, and during your presidency we have witnessed the BP spill, probably one of most destructive spills in our history, followed immediately by 3 major pipeline breaks with damaging spills, would you even consider approving a pipeline to bring some of the dirtiest, toxic oil in the world, move it via a pipeline across the the entire United States from North to South, through the heartland/breadbasket of our country, and over the top of a major aquifer to be refined?	PN 05
Mary Robinson	March 2, 2013	The pipeline just postpones the more critical need to develop environmentally clean sources of energy and less use of fossil fuels.	PN 03
Mary Rochester	April 4, 2013	safe means of tranporting oil is still not in place.	RISK 21
Mary Roth	March 16, 2013	We nee to focus on renewable and sustainable energies that create long term systems for jobs and promote clean energy	ALT 01
Mary Roth	March 16, 2013	Tar sands oil is so dirty and crude that the extraction methods create more environmental distress than provide energy. Where is the balance?	PN 05
Mary Shipman	April 22, 2013	If all the powers of Washington DC insist on the Keystone XL pipeline, please relocate the Nebraska segment to the east of the Sandhills and Ogallala Aquifer. This seems such a minimal request.	ALT 06
Mary Siegler	April 9, 2013	At the very least, you need to set in place strong provisions to make the companies involved in the Keystone XL pipeline 100% responsible for ALL expenses that occur if there are any oil spills, leaks, pollution, increases in atmospheric carbon, climate change or damage of any kind. The American people should never foot the bill for the damage caused by energy companies.	RISK 03
Mary Simon	March 9, 2013	The claim that the dirty shale oil will contribute to "energy independence" for the US is clearly bogus because they have every intention of shipping it from our shore on the Gulf to sell to the highest bidder (China?). The Keysone Pipeline would provide short term profits for the oil companies while risking inestimable long term damage to the health of our citizens and future generations.	PN 04
Mary Simon	March 9, 2013	Representations about the employment it would create are greatly exaggerated. The jobs would be mainly the temporary ones necessary for the construction of the pipeline.	SO 02
Mary Simon	March 9, 2013	President Obama has expressed his serious doubts about it because it would expose our heartland's fertile soil and pure water to contamination and benefit only the fossil fuel companies who are trying to promote Keystone.	SOIL 01, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mary Sims	April 22, 2013	Im not convinced the TransCanada Pipeline is worth it anyway but routing it through this vital resource of fresh water [Ogallala Aquifer] is purely irresponsible.	WRG 01
Mary Steinhaus	March 10, 2013	Are you going to believe a report that was not independent but paid for by the company that stands to profit from this pipeline? Do you really believe it is unbiased?	PRO 01
Mary Stewart	April 10, 2013	I feel that the pipeline is too dangerous to our water supply	RISK 07
Mary Teas	March 10, 2013	It is very important for us to develop our hydroelectic power and our wind turbine power. Our climate is changing faster than we realized. Unless we want to have our coastlines under water, we need to change.	PN 02
Mary Wellington	April 9, 2013	And this tar sands oil will hasten climate change. Listen to NASA's Hansen.	CLIM 14
Mary Wellington	April 9, 2013	Relatively speaking, the jobs created by the pipeline are miniscule next to destruction which will inevitably occur. Canada gets the benefits. We get the environmental destruction which can never be repaired.	PN 07
Mary Withers	April 22, 2013	By the end of this century, clean pure water, as is found in the Oglala Aquifer, will be MORE valuable than petroleum.	ACK
Mary Wittler	April 22, 2013	the Project should be stopped or at the very least rerouted somewhere else.	ACK
Mary Woo	March 26, 2013	It will create toxic environments for many citizens. It will steal land from landowners in Texas.	ACK
Mary Woo	March 26, 2013	It will ruin many natural, beautiful lands for future generations.	ACK
Mary Woo	March 26, 2013	This could be the one that guarantees our children will not breathe the same air that we do, that they will not see the same wetlands, waters, and natural plants and animals that we do	ACK
Mary Woo	March 26, 2013	It will not lessen our dependence on foreign oil. It will not do the things that the executives of TransCanada are promising it will do.	PN 04
Mary Woo	March 26, 2013	The pipeline will not bring jobs to America. It will not help the lower and middle class.	SO 02
Mary Yrizarry	April 9, 2013	May I suggest that your department review the sources for their assessment for impartiality and accuracy and seek information that may have been omitted or down graded. I believe that by now, we should have learned from the history of bad and misleading information on environmental issues from those who stand in line to earn the most.	PRO 05
Marya Szaur	March 28, 2013	There are so many options when it comes to renewable energy, it's beyond reason to keep installing and supporting the prolific use of oil for power. The sun and its nuclear fission provide energy for our entire solar system, water and wind turbines are simple and generate clean, sufficient energy. We need to look at our options and reject the less clean, less sensible, less humane ways of generating power for the people of the planet.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Marya Zanders	April 11, 2013	•The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Maryann Armbruster	March 10, 2013	The Keystone pipeline in particular, will do nothing to provide significant job growth or reduce the price of oil. The only thing that it will do is increase the profit to the Canadian owners of the tar sands by about $7 per barrel. The oil would then move, via the pipeline, from Canada through the American Heartland, where any leak would threaten our food and water, to the Gulf coast. There it would be loaded on ships and moved to international markets. There would be some jobs for about the year that it would take to construct the pipeline, but long term.	SO 04, PN 07
Maryann Bloedow	April 11, 2013	Our children and grandchildren deserve a better future ane a planet free of tar sands toxic effects. We need to move forward with investments in solar and wind technology.	PN 02
Maryjane Genestra	April 16, 2013	The answer to energy is now upward to the sun and the wind, our natural, sustainable, earthly energy sources.	PN 02
Maryll Jones	April 22, 2013	As clearly demonstrated by the recent pipeline leaks, it is clear that this is a hazard to human and environmental health. The destruction of native lands is also unwarranted. All for tar sands oil that is going to be exported to other countries.	PN 07
Maryska Suda	March 11, 2013	Combating climate change means NOT contributing to further greenhouse gas pollution--wherever it occurs. Approval of the pipeline means encouraging tar sands energy development in North America, and thus it directly contradicts the promise the president made in his inaugural address. Stopping Keystone XL would be a very powerful signal that the United States now has a serious commitment to do something about the threat of climate change.	CLIM 18
Mason Mcmonegal	April 18, 2013	Americans do not need more of their tax money invested into our grandparents fossil fuels. It is time we invested in real green technology like bio diesel and cellulosic based fuels and textiles including hemp, which our founding fathers grew and considered one of the most important crops of our time.	PN 02
Mast, Joyce C	March 19, 2013	Please slow down the extraction of tar sands oil! We know there are problems related to the amount of water required, and pollution of areas from run-off, as well as the associated burning of natural gas that pollutes the air. And that is only what we know. We must slow down this extraction until we can better assess the costs to our environment.	CU 07, CU 02
MatejkaM	April 18, 2013	And I would much rather see our energy come domestically in North America so we do not have to send our young people and our tax dollars overseas.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mathew Lachesnez-Heude	April 16, 2013	the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact.	CLIM 12
Mathew Lachesnez-Heude	April 16, 2013	The United States Government should be focused on expanding renewable energy, eliminating tax incentives for companies investing in non-renewable energy sources	PN 02
Mathias Bartlett	April 17, 2013	The current method of cleaning up oil on US soil is to use paper towels. We're clearly not ready to deal with this going awry, so we should not do this.	PN 05
Matson, Steve	April 22, 2013	The State Department fact sheet of March 1st, which nominally compares the potential impacts of the “newly proposed” KXL pipeline with the version that was proposed in 2008, completely misses the point. The issue is neither how long the “newly proposed” pipeline would be, nor the number of states or water bodies it will cross. Rather, the issue is how an investment in KXL infrastructure, if completed, will enable – indeed, will make practically inevitable – the long-term development and exploitation of one of the largest and most CO2-intensive hydrocarbon reserves presently known to us. The “newly proposed” and the “2008” versions of KXL will result in precisely the same emissions of the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide to the atmosphere; simply rerouting the pipeline does nothing to change that. The issue is what the pipeline will carry – namely, bitumen that will be brought to market for years to come, once the barrier represented by problematic market access has been dropped. The Alberta tar sands development is bad news, which comes at a particularly inopportune time. Our national interests are best served – now and in the future – by either denying permits altogether for KXL or (at minimum) by further delaying pipeline approval. As a student of chemical engineering over four decades ago, I was told by my Cornell University professors that “the solution to pollution is dilution” (really, no kidding!). Today, we all know better. Our atmosphere is finite, and its capacity to absorb CO2 and other greenhouse gases (GHG) without serious consequences to the habitability of our planet is strained. The Alberta tar sands, if brought to market for years to come by an investment in KXL infrastructure, will be a significant source of future GHG emissions.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matson, Steve	April 22, 2013	Were the United States to have in place any reasonable mechanism for pricing carbon – e.g., a carbon tax of about any form – the Alberta tar sands, along with the KXL pipeline that would bring Canadian bitumen to market, would be prohibitively expensive to develop. The economics of tar sands production would simply not work. The U.S. will eventually put a price on carbon – most likely through a partially rebated carbon tax – but despite increasingly bipartisan proponents for this (e.g., George Schultz, Tom Friedman), this has not happened yet. But it will. Delaying KXL approval until it does would enable Alberta tar sands to compete (or, more likely, fail to compete) on a level playing field; most likely, hydrocarbon from this source would be found seriously wanting at that time. Further delay (if not outright denial) of KXL approval should suffice to kill the prospects for tar sands development.	SO 16, PN 11
Matt & Jennifer Plunkett	April 4, 2013	Climate change is real. We, as a country must address climate change, and the destruction it will bring to our entire world.	CLIM 14
Matt Freeman	April 22, 2013	Building a tar sands oil pipeline with the thinnest walls yet through the worlds largest aquifer? Ive literally never heard a single worse idea.	RISK 14
Matt Gaul	March 19, 2013	The president should keep his State of the Union promises and take a stand for the environment! We are past the tipping point in climate change and it time to start thinking about future generations and not short term profit.	CLIM 18
Matt Mccrory	April 19, 2013	Please listen to our top scientists on this issue. If James Hansen is saying that it will be "game over" for the planet if we burn the oil in the Alberta tar sands, it seems pretty obvious that we should hold off on this project and look for some better alternatives.	PN 05
Matt Miksys	March 17, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is very bad for the environment, bad for America and does nothing for jobs or our economy. And yet the State Department's report lies about its environmental impact and there are rumors that this sham document will be used to approve this climate killing pipeline.	ACK
Matt Niedbalski	April 22, 2013	I am strongly against this pipeline as I dont believe all distater recovery methods, funds, nor scenarios have been developed and proven.	RISK 14
Matt Ragan	April 2, 2013	Spills could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	WRG 01, LU 01
Matt Sherman	March 11, 2013	Stop dirty oil now. hemp bio-fuel, hydrogen made from water, electric cars...no reason to pump one more once of that dirty crap out of the ground!	PN 02
Matt Straw	March 14, 2013	We know green energy is cheaper. We're not as stupid as you make us out to be when you don't include environmental, health, and economic losses due to oil spills in places like Kalamazoo, Michigan, to the overall costs of burning fossil fuels. That community has been devastated and from now on we're holding you responsible.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matt Straw	March 14, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline offers almost no permanent jobs. But it threatens thousands of permanent jobs in outfitting, farming, tourism, guiding, boating, etc.	SO 05
Matt Straw	April 9, 2013	How many Americans have to lose their health, their farms, their property values, and their jobs because one industry refuses to address serious engineering problems? How many more properties will be taken away illegally? (since law demands takeaways through eminent domain must result in benefits to the people--to the "common good.") How many local economies have to be destroyed like Kalamazoo was? When will those jobs count? Will the autonomy, the health, and the economic future of the common people of the United States ever count for anything again?	PN 05
Matt Tibbels	April 22, 2013	The pipeline will also do nothing for the price of gas in Nebraska since will we still have to ship in the fuel from the same refineries as today.	PN 04
Matt Weldon	March 11, 2013	We can only move on to a cleaner, more sustainable, more resilient, more cost effective and more energy abundant future if we stop investing in the old industries and dedicate ourselves to realizing the better future.	ALT 01
Matt Weldon	April 17, 2013	Lets invest in a more resilient and sustainable future rather than continue on the wasteful path to a degraded future that the pipeline represents.	PN 02
Matt` Maguire	April 16, 2013	The State Department's initial environmental report on Keystone XL is so deeply flawed in its analysis that it is apparent it is nothing more than a whitewash.	LEG 04
Matthew "elvis" Wagner	April 13, 2013	With the huge amount of new gas and oil that is being extracted in the US, why would we build a pipeline to move tar sands oil, which is so horrible for the environment?	PN 12
Matthew Akins	March 4, 2013	It is bad for the environment and every part of tar sands production seems to be breaking the treaty rights of native people. It is 2013 we the U.S. and Canada need to stop breaking our promises to native peoples	LEG 01
Matthew Andrew Cronin	April 22, 2013	Our delicate Sandhill ecosystem was not considered as it should have been in the Environmental Report with no proper safe guard for the precious Ogallala Aquifer. Inevitable leaks that will compromise the water our lifeblood in the agriculture state are not acceptable.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matthew C. Desmarais - Desmarmc	April 2, 2013	This pipeline in Arkansas was suppose to have all kinds of leak detection technology, which even if it did, they clearly failed. Two years before this incident, there was another major spill on the Kalamazoo river which was 12 times worse. There also has been two other lesser spills in that time, one in Montana and one in Barataria Bay. This is the oil industries track record: Four spills in two years. Imagine how we would react if the nuclear industry had a similar track record? Imagine if a huge wind turbine ripped apart in a suburban area, would we be any kinder to the wind industry? Of course not. As the Op ed piece in the New York Times said today, if the Keystone had broke instead of the Pegasus, there would have been 10 times as much oil covering the land. That just isn't acceptable.	RISK 14
Matthew Davis	April 17, 2013	Any short-term jobs gain will be negated by the longer term negative consequences.	PN 05
Matthew Emmer	March 11, 2013	Most importantly, there's no requirement that the dirty oil in the pipeline even stays in America. More likely, it would be put on the worldwide market and snapped up by China or India. Americans take all the environmental risk and get no rewards. That's simply a bad deal.	PN 13
Matthew Gabrenya	March 14, 2013	By permitting this infrastructure that facilitates tar sands extraction the State Department will ensure a > 2 degrees celcius average global temperature increase, and thus guarantee and increase of 4 to 12 degrees by 2100.	CLIM 05
Matthew Gabrenya	March 14, 2013	The most critical part of the projects EIS was written by a client of TransCanada. This is an overt conflict of interest which invalidates the findings of this EIS. A new statement must be conducted by a new contractor completely disconnected from the tar sands industry.	PRO 01
Matthew Johnson	March 15, 2013	... if we make selling oil from the Tar Sands too easy, we encourage more and worse damage the environment, especially in the form of global warming, a.k.a "climate change".	CLIM 12
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	While the industry may claim that surface-mined areas [in Canada] are reclaimed after mining activities have ceased, in reality, restoration of these sites to anything resembling their pre-impact ecological condition is next to impossible.	CU 01
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The Draft SEIS does not include in its cumulative impacts section any consideration of environmental impacts within Canada...The problem with this approach is that neither the Department of State nor the National Energy Board considered the significant environmental impacts of increased tar sands development that may occur as a result of the proposed Project.	CU 02
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	All four major flyways in North America — the aerial migration routes traveled by billions of birds each year — converge in one spot in Canada’s boreal forest, the Peace-Athabasca Delta in northeastern Alberta. Tar sands development is a significant threat to the conservation of internationally-important bird habitats.	CU 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	Migratory species breeding and using stopover habitat in the tar sands region migrate and/or winter in the United States. Thus, environmental impacts as they relate to birds can not be compartmentalized by arbitrary international boundaries.	CU 03
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	Section 4.15.4 contains no meaningful analysis of impacts on migratory birds and their habitats. Rather it uses misleading data from rangewide Breeding Bird Survey routes and emphasis on the virtues of voluntary industry bird protection efforts (with no data on efficacy of these practices) in a weak effort to explain away any impact on migratory birds. The data cited by Wells et al. (2008) [see reference in separate comment] on bird impacts of tar sands extraction are not included in this token discussion.	CU 03
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	we find the documentation of affected birds and their habitats and the analysis of impacts in the Draft SEIS to be biased toward an assumption of no significant impact, and specifically lacking in consideration of the long-term cumulative effects of indirect impacts brought about by habitat alteration and potential spills in the many sensitive bird habitats crossed by the proposed route.	CU 03
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	the risk of spills in general does not seem to be factored into the analysis of Cumulative Effects in the Draft SEIS. There is no line-item for possible effects of spills included in the CEA Matrix for Wildlife (Table 4.15-10 of the Draft SEIS on page 4.15-47). Section 4.15.3.13 of the Draft SEIS provides no analysis of the impacts of spills in critical habitat areas.	CU 17, CU 11
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	[Per 40 CFR 1508.14] The economic benefit of the pipeline to tar sands industry must be considered, along with the reasonably forseeable expansion of tar sands extraction that will follow.	LEG 04
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The Draft SEIS states that, “Evaluation of impacts from extraction of crude oil from the oil sands is outside of the scope of analysis legally required under NEPA. Further, it is not expected that the proposed Project would have any impact on the rate of development of extraction in Canada” (Draft SEIS 4.15-111). In light of the facts at hand, this statement is quite simply incorrect.	LEG 05
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The key phrase here is the [National Energy Board's] NEB’s assertion that tar sands facilities “will continue to operate” regardless of the pipeline. Of critical importance is the fact that NEB does not mention whether these facilities and their associated environmental impacts may expand in scale and scope as a result of implementation of the proposed Project.	PN 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	there is significant evidence to support the conclusion that the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will result in an increase in the rapidity and extent of Alberta tar sands development and its concomitant environmental impacts. Current constraints in pipeline capacity will reach critical levels as early as 2016, substantially limiting industry expansion plans according to a new report by CIBC World Markets Inc.	PN 11
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The failure of the State Department to post comments in a publicly accessible docket...represents a serious breach of the spirit of the NEPA regulations and effectively constitutes suppression of the opportunity for public discourse among interested parties with regard to the proposed Project.	PRO 02
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	We would also like to note that our organization is very disappointed by the continued failure of the Department of State to make public comments and underlying documents on the Draft SEIS actually public, as is required by NEPA.	PRO 02
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	we are disappointed that the Department failed to grant a requested extension of the 45-day comment period, which would make it much more feasible for an all-volunteer organization like ours to provide detailed comments on the Draft EIS, and would help ensure that all stakeholders have the opportunity to fully review these important documents.	PRO 04
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	Danger In the Nursery: Impact of Tar Sands Oil Development In Canada's Boreal on Birds by Wells et al.	REF
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	Lewis, J. 2012. “New pipelines needed to hit oil sands growth targets: CIBC,” Alberta Oil, September 21, 2012, http://www.albertaoilmagazine.com/2012/09/new-pipelines-needed-to-hit-oilsands-growth-targets-cibc/	REF
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	A bitumen spill within [the Rainwater Basin] IBA could potentially be of population-level significance for a number of bird species, including iconic ducks such as mallard and northern pintail as well as Federally-listed species such as whooping crane.	RISK 07
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	Current scientific uncertainty about the relative corrosiveness of diluted bitumen products to be carried by this pipeline, along with the predicted extreme difficulty of cleanup of dense bitumen when released into wetland systems during spills leads to significant concerns about whether this pipeline should traverse sensitive wetlands, especially those critical to enormous numbers of migratory birds.	RISK 07
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	[TransCanada's] preexisting partnership [with Ducks Unlimited] does not constitute compensatory mitigation for the potential broad and significant impacts of the project on migratory birds that use the tar sands region.	RISK 07, CU 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	[An example] of inadequate analysis [is the] Greater Sage-Grouse. The proposed Project crosses an area of Preliminary Priority Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse...But because this area is on private land, the Draft SEIS includes no further consideration of the Project's impact on this habitat area. This type of minimal and unrigorous analysis is repeated in a number of areas in the wildlife section of the document.	TES 08
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The assumption that fragmented areas can be restored to pre-construction states via reseeding of native vegetative communities is questionable, given the complexity of many of these native communities and the difficulty of restoring complex, functional ecosystems on sites with compacted soils and heavy disturbance that would be required for this type of construction.	VEG 11
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	The US and Canadian sections of the pipeline route, as currently proposed, traverse a number of sensitive bird habitats, including two Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in the US, namely the North Valley Grasslands IBA in Montana and the Rainwater Basin IBA in Nebraska.	WI 06
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	In general, analyses of impacts to species of Conservation Concern in the Draft SEIS appear to reflect bias in favor of the project and are in many cases insufficient to allow an interested and informed third party to assess the extent of the impacted resource along the pipeline impacts corridor and the degree of impact.	WI 16
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	while the Draft SEIS indicates that "the proposed Project could potentially contribute to increased fragmentation...within the important wildlife habitats identified in Table 4.6-1," data that would allow quantitative analysis of the magnitude of that fragmentation is lacking, and there is no species or guild-specific analysis of these fragmentation impacts on birds or other wildlife.	WI 22
Matthew Sarver	April 22, 2013	the conclusions that there is an "anticipated overall absence of permanent impacts to wildlife resources rom the proposed Project" (Draft SEIS p. 4.15-46) stretches the limits of plausibility.	WI 25
Matthew Spaur	April 22, 2013	I prefer to not have an oil pipeline crossing America's prime agricultural land and major aquifers.	ACK
Matthew Spaur	April 22, 2013	If we are looking to import more energy from Canada, I think we could do it in the form of electricity, not tar sand oil.	ACK
Matthew Steinmetz	March 11, 2013	The State Department admits the environmental impacts will be significant. So, just let TransCanada go ahead with it? No! We all have a responsibility to protect our land and environment, not just let people destroy it. It is not worth adding to the destruction of our country so a minimal amount of jobs can be temporarily created so that a few companies can make billions of dollars off it.	RISK 07, PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Matthew Straw	March 28, 2013	We still don't hear you demanding that the real costs of carbon pollution and oil spills will get figured into the equations on the cost of delivering fossil fuels to the Gulf. Polluted water, losses to tournism (based on real oil spills on the Yellowstone River, the Kalamazoo River, and elsewhere), losses to local economies, cleanup costs, maintenance costs, health care--all these factors and many, many more are being ignored.	RISK 09, PN 05, SO 05
Matthew Straw	April 5, 2013	Tell us how we can afford to kill tourism in Mayflower, Arkansas.	ACK
Matthew Straw	April 5, 2013	Tell us how it helps America to destroy the Yellowstone, "one of the finest trout rivers in the world," according to Wikipedia.	FISH01
Matthew Straw	April 5, 2013	Tell us why the health of the people in Kalamazoo, Michigan counts for nothing.	RISK 29
Matthew Sulser	March 3, 2013	I realize the infrastructure makes it cheaper to continue as we have, but that does NOT justify the risks or consequences of acquiring and burning petroleum products for energy.	PN 05
Matthew Sulser	March 3, 2013	There's a "rumor" that one of the planet's largest aquifer lies under the center of our country, directly under where the proposed pipeline would run. Is is worth risking pollution of enough water to supply the entirety of North America?	WRS 09
Matthew Taylor	April 2, 2013	Energy independence through alternative, sustainable energy is an incredible source of job creation. It is not yet an established industry, so our source of job creation will be twofold - in the production of services and goods, AND in the creation of research positions and center. Notice that these jobs are also much higher quality, and have the potential to help develop the middle class.	SO 05
Matthew Tellers	March 31, 2013	Pipelines may be easier to monitor than rail or ship delivery.	ALT 07
Matthew Tolford	April 2, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline is taking land from people who don't want it.	LEG 02
Matthew Tolford	April 2, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline benefits very few people with little financial (relative) payoff to the United States while providing great risk to the environment	PN 05
Matthew Tolford	April 2, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline is designed to sell oil on the open world market.	PN 07
Matthew Tolford	April 2, 2013	Most of the jobs created by the Keystone XL pipeline are temporary	SO 04
Matthew Tolford	April 2, 2013	There are alternative with better economic and environmental outcomes for the United States and the world.	SO 05
Matthew Williams	April 3, 2013	In the short term our lives and economies require petroleum to function - but neither our lives nor economies will be capable of functioning if we do not immediately move to sustainable sources of energy.	ALT 01
Matthew Williams	April 3, 2013	Why not use the industrial and political power that would be used for the pipeline to move us in a sustainable direction. This will provide jobs and encourage innovation, which is in the national interest.	PN 02
Matthew Williams	April 3, 2013	I am concerned that the keystone pipeline project is not in the national interest.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mattison	April 18, 2013	Short term economic benefit should not be allowed to overshadow the ecological and environmental consequences of the Keystone XL.	PN 05
Mattison	April 18, 2013	The risk to the fragile ecosystem due to construction and pollution from leaks is not justified by the profits generated for the operators of the system.	PN 05
Mattison	April 18, 2013	The route still passes through the Nebraska Sandhills and over the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Mattison	April 18, 2013	[The pipeline route] is proposed to be placed in areas where the Ogallala Aquifer is connected to the surface by high water tables, springs, and porous sand hills.	WRG 05
Maud Easter	March 7, 2013	Building the pipeline would seriously accelerate climate change.	CLIM 14
Maud Easter	March 7, 2013	If the pipeline is not built, the carbon industries so eager to pump out this very polluting oil would find that the extra transportation costs would make this climate damaging process uncompetitively expensive.	PN 12
Maura O'gara	April 3, 2013	The SEIS does not address the GHG emissions of the proposed project. In addition to damaging emissions, there are safety issues. Inevitably, product will be spilled.	RISK 14, CLIM 14
Maureen Barilllaro	March 30, 2013	I am sitting here reading about the March 27th massive spill from the de-railed train in Minnesota, spilling 30K gallons of toxic tar sands oil from Canada.	ACK
Maureen Barilllaro	March 30, 2013	You must put a stop to any tarsands oil coming into our United States.	ACK
Maureen Carey	April 15, 2013	I might also add that investing our money in wind and biofuel industries as well as solar would be a far healthier and wealthier choice for our country. We would be increasing jobs that would be longstanding and increasing the health of our country by using cleaner air sources for our future.	SO 05
Maureen Dagon	April 5, 2013	It is time that we stop our dependence on something like oil that is so toxic to our environment and holds us hostage to a big business profit only mentality, while destroying Mother Earth.	PN 05
Maureen Franklin	April 22, 2013	My farm is near the proposed siting of the pipeline. I do not want my land, which has been farmed by my family for over 100 years, to be damaged by a future spill from the Keystone Pipeline. Please keep the tarsands safely in the ground in Canada. Please do not endanger our land here in Nebraska with the transportation of this highly polluted material. It is toxic to our water supply and therefore, to our way of life.	SO 12, LU 01, WRG 01
Maureen J Quinn	April 3, 2013	On so many levels the US will lose with this pipeline… the environmental carbon impact	ACK
Maureen J Quinn	April 3, 2013	On so many levels the US will lose with this pipeline. The direct spills on population	RISK 07
Maureen J Quinn	April 3, 2013	we won't make lots of $$$ and there are not the number of jobs being touted	SO 08, SO 02
Maureen Kelley	March 7, 2013	The pipeline will cross an aquifer that supplies drinking water to 8 states - and you know the pipeline will leak into that water with disastrous results.	RISK 24
Maureen Knutsen	April 11, 2013	The recent Exxon pipeline accident in Arkansas just underlines this fact.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Maureen Knutsen	April 11, 2013	Please do not add to the global warming situation by approving the Keystone XL pipeline, which would just negate any progress we have made in addressing our carbon pollution problem.	CLIM 14
Maureen Lattimore	April 10, 2013	We cannot afford any projects that could harm our precious fresh water.	WRG 01
Maureen Shallit	April 9, 2013	We can discover ways to live without the products from Keystone XL, but we humans are inextricably entwined with the gifts of the environment, habitat and wildlife. Take a strong stand against the Keystone XL pipeline.	ACK
Mauro Montoya	April 15, 2013	There are SO many potential disasters related to this ill-advised pipeline,	RISK 21
Max and Nina Nelson	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala aquifer is of major importance to the state of Nebraska and the Midwest in general. It supplies clean safe fresh water for drinking water agriculture irrigation industry -- in other words it is VITAL to our health and economy. We MUST NOT allow the routing of the XL Keystone Pipeline to be any where near the Ogallala aquifer!	WRG 01
Max Cavicchia	April 9, 2013	Please do your research on this project!	ACK
Maya Friedman	April 21, 2013	The health of the environment MUST be one of our priorities because the lives of the people, not only in our country but all over the world, depend upon it.	ACK
Mc Hagerty	March 15, 2013	Jobs in the construction of the pipe line are important but at what price, the health of individuals, wildlife, and the land beneath the pipes? We need green energy for the jobs that this new industry will generate while conserving the air, water, and ecosystems.	SO 05
Mccone Co	March 27, 2013	Just the short-term workers that will be in our community during the building ofthe pipeline will be a valuable asset to our businesses.	PN 10
McCone Country	April 8, 2013	By importing oil from our ally Canada instead of politically unstable countries in volatile regions of the world,	ACK
McCone Country	April 8, 2013	our county seat, has already undergone some motivated economic activity that includes a new convenience store/truck stop, a new bank, a new restaurant/bar/casino, a new mechanic/beauty shop/gas station, a remodel and update to the grocery store, expansion of the Western Area Power Administration substation, and plans for a new hotel.	SO 10
McCone Country	April 8, 2013	The county taxes that will be attributed to the pipeline will double our tax base.	SO 14
McCown	April 18, 2013	I do want to point out that pipelines are by far the safest manner to transport energy products in this country.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
McMurrayO	April 18, 2013	When I read about the child care center in Marshall, Michigan, which in 2010 was near the tar sands pipeline spill, I felt motivated to come out and speak because the children at the center were vomiting, coughing, had headaches, rashes, eye irritation and sore throats. It has been a horrific nightmare for that community. And that risk should not be allowed in any community.	RISK 07
McNally	April 18, 2013	The oil can be moved by other means--truck, train, etc. Modes that are already in place.	ALT 04
Mcneal Maddox	March 26, 2013	The Keystone pipeline is not a long-term solution and its construction should be denied in favor of energy programs that will continue to create jobs and renewable resources for the long run.	PN 02
Mcneil, Barbara J	April 22, 2013	As a registered nurse concerned with health, I oppose the processing of heavier, dirtier tar sands oil which will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04
Mcneill Peczenik	March 7, 2013	I have been unable to establish who wrote the draft SEIS or any part of it, but I wonder (from the tone, etc.) if some of the contractors for Keystone XL are not involved.	PRO 01
Mcneill Peczenik	March 7, 2013	The format in which the Draft Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is given on the internet, at http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/draftseis/index.htm, is extremely difficult to use.	PRO 03
Mdibble Tds.net	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline will contribute to global warming - maybe just some or maybe a lot - but it will help accelerate global warming. There is no legitimate question about that.	CLIM 14
Mdibble Tds.net	April 22, 2013	The pipeline will also break and leak, poisoning groundwater, rivers, lakes and soil. To pretend that the pipeline won't leak is negligence: there are already too many instances of pipeline leakage. When water and soil is poisoned, people die.	RISK 07
Meagan Lyle	March 4, 2013	Please do not continue to build the Keystone pipeline across the United States.	ACK
Meagan Lyle	March 4, 2013	Tar Sands oil the dirtiest oil we could possibly burn (…) Instead, invest in the future. Invest in green jobs and technology that we will need in the coming decades.	SO 05
Mechthild Schmidt	March 11, 2013	JOBS: I am discounting the jobs (many of them short-lived during construction only) as mere bait. > Generate construction jobs in renewables, in retrofitting buildings instead. OUR ECONOMY WILL GET A BOOST: Our economy will suffer more from the increase in disaster relief spending. 2-3 'Sandies' or 'Katrinas' a year will wipe out any gains.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mechthild Schmidt	March 11, 2013	WE NEED TO GET INDEPENDENT OF OIL IMPORTS. We need to get independent of fossil fuels (+ their current wasteful use). … A 'NO' WILL OFFEND CANADA. Most Canadians are against the pipeline as well. Your NO will help keep the tar sands under ground and protect the old forest above them.	PN 05
Mechthild Schmidt	March 11, 2013	CANADA WILL SELL TO CHINA: A pipeline to the Pacific will face the same opposition. And China has already understood the climate challenge. And export is planned anyway.	PN 07
Mechthild Schmidt	March 11, 2013	WHY would you trust a report that was partially written by TransCanada's own contractors	PRO 01
Meerdink	April 18, 2013	Permitting a new pipeline sets our energy policy on a course that is at odds with all we know about climate change.	PN 02
Meerdink	April 18, 2013	The risks of the pipeline project far outweigh the minimal benefits in employment and fuel cost.	PN 05
Meg Finerty	April 21, 2013	The State Department's recently released environmental impact report does not adequately assess the Keystone XL pipeline's impact on climate change. The numbers your agency provided for greenhouse gas impacts are drastically lower than any other report that has been released, casting serious doubt on your department's assessment.	CLIM 11
Meg Howard	March 1, 2013	Surely any project that encourages fossil fuel extraction to the extent of the Keystone XL pipeline cannot be argued to pose no environmental threat.	CLIM 13
Meg Howard	March 1, 2013	Recent studies from the World Bank and Pricewaterhouse Cooper (two institutions not known for taking radical positions) both suggest that climate change is an existential threat to the world as we know it. "http://climatechange.worldbank.org/sites/default/files/Turn_Down_the_heat_Why_a_4_degree_centrigrade_warmer_world_must_be_avoided.pdf"World Bank report "http://www.pwc.com/gx/en/sustainability/publications/low-carbon-economy-index/index.jhtml"PWC report	CLIM 14
Megan Gotschall	April 22, 2013	We will have pastures ruin with blowouts. No one can forcast the future, but dry weather plus the pipe and traffic on the land will cause blowouts.	SOIL 06
Megan Jones	April 15, 2013	It's production is exceptionally poisonous to the Canadian environment but few in Canada pay attention because its happening up North where no one lives.	ACK
Megan Jones	April 15, 2013	And the pipeline will go from Canada straight to Texas refineries, from which the oil will be shipped overseas, for no net benefit to US gas or oil supplies or prices	PN 07
Megan Labadie	April 20, 2013	We are sick of oil spills, we are sick of excuses, and we want our country and its natural habitat preserved. The government's involvement with wildlife and wilderness groups should suggest you are working FOR our environment, not against	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Megan Mcgovern	April 4, 2013	We need to REALLY move forward and invest in renewable, sustainable and CLEAN energy sources.	PN 02
Megan Mckinstry	April 19, 2013	We know the risks are serious and real and that if we want to compete internationally, we have to start investing in viable oil alternatives and be leaders in energy innovation. We have to stand up to people who are ignorant and/or corrupt.	PN 02
Megan O'brien	March 15, 2013	The pipeline is a horrible threat to what should be a worldwide effort towards lessened fossil fuel dependence, as well as a horrible threat to our environment. A staggering amount of wildlife would be affected by this decision, INCLUDING us. We would be shooting ourselves in the foot, not to mention disadvantaging our children and our children's children, by approving Keystone.	PN 08, PN 03, RISK 07
Megan Schiller	March 11, 2013	Furthermore, I am personally affected by the Keystone XL pipeline path. When it leaks, it will contaminate the water table which is the source for my water. Millions of mid-westerners like me will be affected.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Meierotto, Richard R.	March 6, 2013	Why should the U.S. allow the tar sand companies to use our land for a pipeline that will cause many miles of negative impact to the landscape in order to access the Asian market?	PN 07
Mel Dickerson	April 22, 2013	Not only is the tar sand oil proposed to be carried by this pipeline the most serious threat to climate of the planet is also not needed and is a direct threat to the productivity of our own resources.	PN 05
Mel Ginsberg	April 13, 2013	The oil spill in Arkansas should be a wake-up call.	ACK
Mel Krutz	April 22, 2013	The pipeline is the invasion of a foreign entity on our soil. It Must Not be allowed.	ACK
Mel Krutz	April 22, 2013	Right now its previous line goes across the City of Seward well field. How has this been allowed?!	GEO 01
Mel Krutz	April 22, 2013	No water resource would be safe from it be it the aquifer rivers lakes streams farm ponds or farm drinking water wells.	WRG 01
Mel Krutz	April 22, 2013	No water resource would be safe from it, be it the aquifer, rivers, lakes, streams, farm ponds, or farm drinking water wells.	WRG 01
Melanie Goetsell	March 31, 2013	The pipleline would not help our economy, would not create a lot of jobs, and will not make our country "oil independent."	PN 05
Melanie Knapp	April 16, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	ACK
Melanie Mizell	April 3, 2013	I do not support a project that destroys old growth forests in Canada. We need those forests. Not only do the forests provide habitat for plants and animals, the forests and uncontaminated soils serve as carbon sinks that aid in climate change mitigation.	CLIM 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Melanie Mizell	April 3, 2013	The Environmental Impact Statement was prepared by consultants with ties to the oil and natural gas industry. This is unethical and calls into question the legitimacy of the document.	PRO 01
Melanie Mizell	April 3, 2013	This project would be dangerous for the entire route, as the tar sands oil causes leaks in the pipeline. The current disaster in Arkansas demonstrates how hazardous it is to move tar sands oil through pipes for long distances. We cannot risk our watersheds, soils and communities.	RISK 14
Mele Mason	April 22, 2013	We do not need a pipeline through our aquifer. The jobs that this project would bring would only be temporary, and the devastation from a ruptured pipe would be catastrophic.	PN 05
Melinda Coyle	April 2, 2013	Surely the publicised oil spills in the past few days, must indicated that oil pipelines are less safe than you are being told by the oil companies, AND that oil pipeline spills are more likely to make headlines.	RISK 13
Melinda Stucker	April 5, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Melissa Bees	April 22, 2013	What I did not see in this draft SEIS was an economic assessment of the societal costs of the climate change to which this pipeline would contribute. What are the costs of increasing floods, droughts, wildfires and hurricanes? Proponents of the pipeline will tell you that this project alone will not destroy the climate. Well no ONE source of CO2 emissions will single-handedly bring down our climate. But it IS a CUMULATIVE effect, and this pipeline would be a SIGNIFICANT and UNNECESSARY culprit	CLIM 16
Melissa Buhler	April 4, 2013	More health and environmental degradation is not worth the reported job numbers that the companies and their supporters claim the pipeline construction will bring.	PN 05
Melissa Buhler	April 4, 2013	Compounding the problem with yet another supersized one, the Keystone XL pipeline can only lead to more environmental destruction along its route, damaging habitat … and fouling our wildlife.	WI 21
Melissa Buhler	April 4, 2013	Compounding the problem with yet another supersized one, the Keystone XL pipeline can only lead to more environmental destruction along its route, damaging ...water supplies...	WRG 01
Melissa Donovan	April 3, 2013	We should be investing in clean alternative energy. Our global climate cannot take the burning of this oil. We must do what is right for the health and safety of life on this planet.	ALT 01
Melissa Kaegel	April 16, 2013	I live 20 miles east of ... and the Mississippi River. If there is a Keystone industrial spill anywhere near water or my home, groundwater, food crops, and critical waterways for wildlife will be poisoned. Water is our most important resource and the drilling and piping used in the Keystone system wastes and poisons water.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Melissa Lareau	April 17, 2013	This country is blessed with so many brilliant minds, we CAN easily make a tranisition away from fossil fuels. It may feel brave, but it just makes sense.	PN 02
Melissa Lessard	April 11, 2013	We need to move away from coal and oil dependency, more aggressively than we currently are, and look towards more renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Melissa Martin-Schwarz	April 16, 2013	I also respectfully ask you sir, to remember those individuals that are having their land taken away through eminent domaine.	LEG 02
Melissa Mccarthy	April 17, 2013	Support clean energy sources and help steer the energy industry into the 21st century.	PN 02
Melissa Spangler	April 22, 2013	TransCanada telling the public that it will lower our gas prices is an out and out lie. When the oil will be up for grabs for any country including China, Saudi Arabia ect.	PN 04
Melissa Spangler	April 22, 2013	One only needs to say that oil over sand is never a good idea oil over water is a horrendous idea. TransCanada telling the public that it will lower our gas prices is an out and out lie.	PN 05
Melissa Tomei	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Melissa Tomei	April 4, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes.	CLIM 11
Melody Draper	April 13, 2013	It seems really really stupid to put a pipeline in an area that could have more quakes and possibly damage a pipeline causing more destruction to our land and water.	GEO 01
Melody Safken	April 1, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Mena Sprague	April 22, 2013	Greeley County, Nebraska is on a fault line and has had earthquakes. They were large enough that they shook our house...What happens to a pipeline made with steel from India (not made with the regulations steel made in the U.S. would have) with high pressure going through it and the earth starts shaking	GEO 01
Mercedes Lackey	March 16, 2013	HOW DARE YOU hire a flunky from the very company that is trying to build the Keystone XL to do the environmental review?	PRO 01
Mercedes Lackey	April 5, 2013	The existing Keystone Pipeline has spilled once a month for every month it has been in operation	RISK 26
Mercedes Lackey	April 19, 2013	Pipe already in the ground in Texas and Oklahoma is documented to have faulty welds and holes big enough for the sun to shine through. We cannot afford this threat to a major source of drinking and agricultural water for half the country.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mercedes Lackey	April 19, 2013	they (TransCanada) have lied about their past record. The existing Keystone Pipeline has spilled at least once a month for every month of operation. Some spills were catastrophic. The Keystone XL will be 10 times bigger at 10 times the pressure and every spill will be 100 times bigger. EVERY spill will be catastrophic. And there will be AT LEAST one spill a month. One catastrophic spill a month, two a year that will be epic.	RISK 26
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	The EIS conclusion that since other methods of transport are available therefore Keystone XL has only a marginal impact on greenhouse gas emissions is tragically flawed logic.	CLIM 02
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	Complete extraction of Alberta tar sands oil will produce 198 billion metric tons of carbon above and beyond the original estimates — 46% of the total carbon left before the 2 degree tipping point is reached. Just with today's technology, 22 billion metric tons of carbon will be added to the total produced — around 5% of the remaining total	CLIM 05
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	What impact will the 17% increase in greenhouse gasses have on the stability of the earth's climate? A 2 degree C increase in global temperature is the consensus limit before life in parts of the United States becomes intolerable due climate events. (3)(4) Extreme climate events today will be tomorrow's normal if that limit is exceeded. (5)(6) The atmosphere can tolerate an additional 430 billion metric tons of carbon before breaching the 2 degree barrier. Based on estimates that did not include Alberta tar sands oil, that limit will be reached in the summer of 2041. (7)	CLIM 05
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	The EIS concludes that since nearly the same volume of Alberta tar sands crude oil will be transported to refineries without the Keystone XL pipeline, denying project approval would have only a marginal impact on tar sands oil production and, by implication, greenhouse gas emissions. (2) Based on the explicit admission of 17% greater greenhouse gasses per barrel from Keystone XL, the Secretary of State must deny approval of the pipeline even if every single assertion in the Environmental Impact Statement stands up to challenges by opponents. Why? Any project that increases greenhouse gasses above expectations at this moment in history, particularly a substantial increase, must be determined an imminent danger to the national interest if the people living in the nation are an interest in this determination.	CLIM 13
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	The rate of climate change is accelerating. (8) The 2 degree C target seems unrealistic providing an even stronger rationale to stop the toxic flow of Keystone XL.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Meredith Cullen	April 17, 2013	While the EIS assessed “Climate Change Effects on the Project,” the impact of increased greenhouse gasses on citizens of United States was not addressed. This impact is the essence of any national interest determination that examines Keystone XL and similar projects.	CLIM 16
Meredith Rose	April 18, 2013	The dirty profits of the tar sands will not benefit any American, not through energy production, reduced energy costs, or jobs. It's very clear. And these terrible numbers do not even take into account the devastating loss of forest land the size of Florida, the increase this blindly wasteful mining will have on out-of-control CO2 levels in the atmosphere, and the massive loss of wildlife habitat and wild spaces.	PN 08, CU 02
Meredith Sampson	April 13, 2013	The draft is very questionable considering who did the study - certainly not objective, scientifically-sound nor credible. To approve the Keystone XL pipeline based on such a study would be downright reckless and irresponsible, and would constitute a huge step backwards in the quest for environmentally-sound and responsible energy independence.	PRO 05
Merideth Genin	April 11, 2013	NOTHING on earth is more precious than fresh water. It's rare enough in the Plains, and there's no reason but profit for a few to permit this pipeline.	ACK
Meridith Baier	March 21, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is also a disaster for endangered species, including whooping cranes, American burying beetles, pallid sturgeon and others.	ACK
Meridith Baier	March 21, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will cross over a thousand water bodies, including the Yellowstone and Platte rivers. A spill into any of these waters would be a disaster.	RISK 07
Merloyd Lawrence	March 28, 2013	he high level of emissions and pollution in the tar sands region where the oil willl come from,	ACK
Merloyd Lawrence	March 28, 2013	The risk of leaks on lands through which the pipeline is built	ACK
Merloyd Lawrence	March 28, 2013	nd most importantly the increase of greenhouse gases development of this fossil fuel source will bring to future generations	CLIM 14
Merloyd Lawrence	March 28, 2013	the taking of private lands with no benefit except to the corporations involved	LEG 02
Merloyd Lawrence	March 28, 2013	the vaunted transparency of this administration would requre that all public comments on this project be available to the public.	PRO 02
Meryle A. Korn	April 5, 2013	Letting industry flacks write the U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is little short of criminal. That "report" fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts.	PRO 01
Meta Felt	April 22, 2013	I want no part of strip mining Canadas boreal forest for bitumen that will be processed with toxic chemicals. The waste produced is destructive to water and wildlife and leaves land that was once beautiful and productive a wasteland. Local native populations and land owners in the path of this pipeline will be directly influenced by this process and dangerous pipeline.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Metaka Maxwell	April 19, 2013	Don't fail us on this. This isn't just fringe or hippie stuff. This is Deepwater Horizon in our front yards and playgrounds. This is Superstorm Sandy every few months. This is vitally important.	ACK
Metapattern	April 22, 2013	I am utterly disgusted with the the effect the tar sands extraction is having on the native peoples of Canada. I am disgusted with the way native civil and legal rights and the health of the Canadian environment have been ignored throughout this pipeline process in the USA. I am disgusted, as well, by the arrogance of Transcanada in it's dealings with landowners who own land the pipeline will cross. How dare a foreign corporation have the right to hold eminent domain over US land?	ACK
Meyer	April 18, 2013	There are better alternatives! If you want to build a structure across our nation that will provide energy, why not make it a 2,000-mile long array of photovoltaic cell	ALT 01
Meyer	April 18, 2013	Moreover, none of the pipeline steel is made in America, and only half of it was rolled and coated in the US.	PD 06
Meyer	April 18, 2013	The use of tar sands continues a reliance on fossil fuels, which are limited, expensive and bad for the environment	PN 03
Meyer	April 18, 2013	TransCanada has a very poor safety record,	RISK 25
Meyer	April 18, 2013	The pipeline will cause the already endangered whooping crane to experience long-term habitat loss. These are the tallest birds in North America and there are fewer than 450 left in the wild.	TES 15
Meyer	April 18, 2013	the pipeline would cross many miles of important wildlife habitats and cause direct and permanent damage to hundreds of acres of wetlands. The impacts to waterways include open-cut stream crossings, increased suspended sediments, temperature changes, physical disturbance of the streambed, and changes in oxygen content.	WET 03, FISH01
Meyer	April 18, 2013	KXL adds to the demand on Nebraska's already stressed water resources, and puts our precious water supply at risk. There are 2124 Nebraska wells within one mile of the proposed pipeline route, and 38 are public water supplies. The route also crosses 74 floodplains and 281 bodies of water in Nebraska. The pipeline would sink wells in 5 of the 6 major river basins it crosses, including the Platte, which is already in jeopardy. KXL will not only add to the water demand on these sources, it will put all of them at risk of contamination from leaks. Nebraska is unique among all US states in that extreme drought conditions currently persist in more than 96% of the state, and all areas are experiencing at least a severe drought. The pipeline will only make that worse.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mia Bergman	April 22, 2013	Lastly, I do not understand how you, the head of our government, that is set up to help protect its citizens, our land, and rights, could allow a foreign company the right to eminent domain. The land that my family and I live on, was paid for by us with a lot of hard work. We are very proud of our accomplishments as a young family, and it is heartbreaking to think this could all be destroyed for a foreign company and oil. I firmly believe that the pipeline running under our soil would decrease the land value greatly. If we ever decided to sell our land, what other landowner would want to deal with having a pipeline on their property? Especially, when you have to contact a second party (TransCanada) to perform every year farming tasks such as deep ripping or deep tilling to aerate the soil on your own land.	LEG 02
Mia Bergman	April 22, 2013	People keep mentioning the number of jobs and economic growth in the towns that this pipeline will pass through. This is all temporary. The number of permanent jobs is very minimal. And now, there are reports from organizations that this pipeline will actually INCREASE oil/gas prices! As farmers, this would be detrimental to our livelihood.	SO 04, PN 04
Mia Bergman	April 22, 2013	My first concern is regarding the High Plains Aquifer and our environment. How can we, as a state that relies so heavily on this imperative source of water, even consider allowing something that could damage it? I realize that there are many different theories on the amount of damage that the land and aquifer may face when this pipeline leaks, but these are all theories and nobody truly knows what devastation we could be facing or if we could ever restore what most of us now take for granted.	WRG 01
Micah Johnson	March 12, 2013	The administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if we also develop the tar sands.	PN 03
Micah Levy	April 4, 2013	WE DON'T NEED THIS PIPELINE RUINING OUR ENVIRONMENT AND ALLOWING EVERYONE INVOLVED TO CONTINUE TO POLLUTE. WE NEED ANOTHER DIRECTION AND I KNOW YOU ALL KNOW IT: ALTERNATIVE ENERGY. CLEAN, NON-CARBON, NON-POLLUTING, NON-DESTRUCTIVE ALTERNATIVE ENERGY.	ALT 01
Michael Arnott	March 28, 2013	The Keystone XL oil is the most damaging "climate change" oil there is and it's extraction is also the most damaging there is to the environment. The there's the danger of leaks from the pipeline destroying American farmland	CLIM 14
Michael Burr	April 15, 2013	THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE AND POWDER RIVER BASIN COAL EXPORTS OFFER VIRTUALLY NO BENEFITS TO THE AMERICAN CITIZENS - ONLY DOWNSIDES IN CURRENT AND FUTURE COSTS IN THE FORM OF POLLUTION, SOCIAL DISRUPTION, AND FUTURE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS.	PN 08
Michael Campinell	April 11, 2013	Rejecting the Keystone XL pipeline also provides an excellent opportunity for our country to move forward with sustainable forms of energy.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Campinell	April 11, 2013	There have been numerous oil spills in our recent history.These spills are clear evidence of the danger and risk that Keystone XL would be presenting to our communities.	RISK 14
Michael Collins	April 19, 2013	The March 13, 2013 Keystone Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) specifies the influence of Alberta, Canada's tar sands heavy crude oil on climate change. Tar sands oil produces 17% more greenhouse gasses than the average barrel of oil. (1) While the EIS assessed "Climate Change Effects on the Project," the impact of increased greenhouse gasses on citizens of United States was not addressed. This impact is the essence of any national interest determination that examines Keystone XL and similar projects.	CLIM 12
Michael Coppola	April 8, 2013	How can the approval of a pipeline that will enable a project that will destroy a boreal forest, which serves to reduce green house gases and keep the surface of the planet cool, and replaces it with a surface that no longer removes greenhouse gases and adds to atmospheric temperatures by absorbing and not reflecting sun light, be in the national interest?	CLIM 06
Michael Coppola	April 8, 2013	How can the approval of a pipeline that will enable the mining and refining of the lowest grade petroleum ore, that creates more green house gases and uses more energy in this process than any other petroleum ore, be in the national interest?	CLIM 14
Michael Coppola	April 8, 2013	Are the estimated 3900 construction jobs for the two year construction period and the 29 permanent jobs that the State Department reported in its 2012 Draft EIS really worth the cost ….	SO 02
Michael Coppola	April 8, 2013	How can the approval of a pipeline that will carry an oil which is much more difficult to clean up than any other petroleum fuel and whose transporters are exempted from paying into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and for compensating for subsurface leaks to the ground water aquifers be in the national interest?	SO 15, RISK 03, WRG 01
Michael Craner	April 13, 2013	We have to invest in the future, not in the past. The pipeline is a small but costly blip on the short term oil supply problem radar, a huge investment for a couple of years of dirty oil energy, while its funding could instead go to build a permanent energy pipeline from the Southwest to the rest of the country from solar and wind. Enough energy falls on our Southwest each day to power the country for a year.	PN 02
Michael Davidson	April 10, 2013	there will be no strengthening of the economy, only a further delay in stabilizing it	ACK
Michael Diehl	April 22, 2013	I still call Nebraska home. I have traveled through our own great country and to different countries around the world and no place have I had occasion to drink water as sweet as that from a Nebraska well. Ive seen the devistation caused by destroyed oil wells in Kuwait and Iraq even after all these years and it gives me nighmares to think of what an oil spill even a fraction of that would do the sand hills.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Earls	April 9, 2013	I call on you to revise your department's review and faithfully report the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate. Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline. The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	LEG 04
Michael Evans	April 16, 2013	My understanding that the pipeline will create jobs in constructing it, but when that is over there will be a neglible amount of employment. It is not worth it.	SO 04
Michael F. Ripberger	April 21, 2013	How can the State Department possibly use a report co-written by one of TransCanada's own contractors? I am quite sure you have heard the term "conflict of interest." Where is your true interest here, your true concerns?	PRO 01
Michael Foley	March 20, 2013	Tar Sands extraction is a blight upon the land visible from space, and only profitable while oil is so expensive.	ACK
Michael Foley	March 20, 2013	"http://thornchronicles.com/2011/03/20/yeah-plan-takes-place/""Yeah well, what you plan and what takes place ain't ever exactly been similar." – Jayne Cobb to Captain Malcolm Reynolds, Serenity	REF
Michael Foley	March 20, 2013	The fossil fuel industry has failed at every turn to prove it can safely and responsibly extract and transport it's toxic material, be it oil, coal or natural gas.	RISK 14
Michael Frazier	March 10, 2013	There are very few long term jobs with this and I do not believe it is a good trade off for the possible environmentat damage it will cause.	PN 05
Michael Frazier	April 15, 2013	Correct me if I am wrong, but my understanding is, the oil sludge carried by the keystone pipeline will eventually shipped overseas. I don't see how that reduces either our carbon footprint or increases our energy independence. This simply makes no sense to me.	PN 05
Michael Freeman	March 15, 2013	Bituminous sand oil is much dirtier than conventional oil, and the refining process releases higher emissions of sulfer dioxide and nitrous oxide. These chemicals are known to contribute to smog, acid rain, and increase complications from asthema. The communities surrounding the refineries are poor and cannot afford to get up and move for their own safety.	ACK
Michael Freeman	March 15, 2013	The amount of energy required to extract and refine tar sands is significantly higher than conventional oil due to the nature of deposits.	CLIM 07
Michael Freeman	March 15, 2013	harmful toxins have been shown to be affecting local indigenous populations.	CU 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Freeman	March 15, 2013	Nearly 400,000,000 gallons of water are pumped into the ground per day to extract (and) separate oil from inorganic mineral deposits. The majority of this wastewater is then dumped in huge open-air tailing ponds. Used wastewater is highly toxic, containing ammonia and cyanide among other substances. These chemicals have found their way into the local water supply.	CU 07
Michael Freeman	March 15, 2013	TransCanada is attempting to cut corners and save money by using thinner than normal steel for the pipeline while pumping oil through it at higher than normal pressures. Not only does this seem dangerous on paper, accidents from similar conditions have already happened in other areas.	RISK 23
Michael Gary	April 15, 2013	Millions of people will be forced to relocate to higher ground along shorelines around the world. Governments will have to spend billions, and likely trillions of dollars on seawalls and other flood control projects.	CLIM 17
Michael Gary	April 15, 2013	Further consideration of, and approval for, the Keystone XL pipeline will continue to propel our economy on dirty fossil fuel that damages the environment, and causes millions of people to suffer further respiratory damage over time.	PN 02
Michael Hall	April 19, 2013	There is no absolutely no need or requirement for the dirtiest fossil fuels in the planet.	ACK
Michael Hall	April 19, 2013	Numerous oil spills in the past show that mankind is totally unprepared for this sort of energy. When we try to control something like this, a spill WILL happen sooner or later. It doesn't matter when. An oil spill WILL happen.	RISK 13
Michael Hall	April 19, 2013	I can't bear to see this country turn to this sort of energy. I know many people who support it say that it will create thousands of jobs. What will create even more jobs, however, is CLEAN energy. CLEAN energy will create thousands and thousands of jobs and is a much, much better choice for this country.	SO 05
Michael Hill	April 22, 2013	When the oil contaminates the aquifer thousands of farms and ranches will be without water to support their production.	ACK
Michael Hill	April 22, 2013	Thousands of farmers ranchers and workers in the agricultural and food industries could be out of work when the oil spills.	SO 12
Michael Houlihan	April 16, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Irving	April 22, 2013	The State Department Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL Project does not adequately address the major issue involved in the approval of the project, namely, what effect will the project have on greenhouse gas emissions and Global Climate Change? Sections 3.12 and 4.12 only address air quality and noise that result from the operation of the pipeline, such as how much effect running a diesel pumping station will have on the local environment. Those sections do not address what the effect on global air quality will be when the product is refined and burned. Neither does the SEIS address the huge expenditure of greenhouse gases required to prepare the bitumen for entry into the pipeline or in refining it into a suite of useable products in various Texas refineries. Section 4.14 addresses Climate Change but only the effect climate change will have on the operation of the pipeline, not the effect that burning the refined product will have on Global Climate Change.	CLIM 05
Michael J McCauley	April 22, 2013	It is a proposal to build a pipeline that would be filled with low quality fuel that doesnt guarantee benefits to the U.S. Economy and only evades the energy problem a few more years.	PN 02
Michael J McCauley	April 22, 2013	the Keystone pipeline being built through the Sandhills poses a risk to natural resources that is worth no amount of profit. The Sandhills are a beautiful part of Nebraska and the aquifer is essential to life in the Midwest. … The Keystone pipeline is not an alternative. It is a proposal to build a pipeline that would be filled with low quality fuel that doesnt guarantee benefits to the U.S. Economy and only evades the energy problem a few more years.	PN 05
Michael Kemper	March 15, 2013	At this time in the history of humanity on the planet earth we are presented with a clear choice. Will we continue our addiction to oil and it's deleterious, indeed eventually fatal, effect on the environment or will we opt to use those resources destined to build the Keystone XL pipeline to create jobs in the sector of alternatives to a petroleum based energy strategy	SO 05
Michael Labonte	April 15, 2013	Another lesson from the Pegasus spill is that diluted bitumen is different. We do not yet have a good handle on what it takes to clean "dilbit" spills. Why would another such pipeline be approved during the cleanup of a massive spill, one that in the coming years might prove to be our warning that any tar sands oil spill will have devastating effects?	RISK 29
Michael Lee Bugg	April 12, 2013	why doesn't that Canadian company just build a refinery there at the bitumen mine and sell a "value added" product and make even more money? Or, why don't they just pipe it to our refineries near Chicago and avoid the expense of piping it all the way to the Gulf of Mexico?	ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Lee Bugg	April 12, 2013	converting all of this stored carbon into automobile exhaust fumes just adds that much more to greenhouse gases, smog, and other air pollution problems. All of these problems will have a cost for us and our descendants that we probably won't be able to pay.	CLIM 14
Michael Levy	April 5, 2013	Canadian citizens are fighting with considerable success to reject the Enbridge pipeline that would carry this nasty stuff to the West Coast and the world market.	ALT 05
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	The report does not evaluate the risk involved with the pipeline traversing the seismic zone	GEO 01
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	Construction and use of the pipeline will be environmentally dangerous by nature of the tar sands product, the means of delivery in a 3 foot diameter pipe, and route of the pipeline (even though the route has been revised)	PD 04
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	Granting of the Presidential Permit for the pipeline will slow progress in focusing upon alternative energy sources that are rapidly becoming more affordable to the people of the United States than oil.	PN 03
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	The processing of tar sands oil run through the pipeline will not necessarily reduce the price of oil, and potentially could have the effect of keeping the price of oil at an elevated level.	PN 04
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	Overall, the pipeline will not benefit the people of our country, and thus is not in the national interest of the United States of America.	PN 08
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	[Regarding Cleanup] …and no method of construction or monitoring is provided that will unequivocally assure improvements upon the current record.	RISK 14
Michael Lewis	April 11, 2013	the extensive length of the pipeline, although rerouted, still crosses 56 waterways and also enters a seismic zone (not evaluated through NEPA) from eastern Nebraska to its termination at Steele City.	WRS 01, GEO 01
Michael Lewis	April 13, 2013	Overall, the pipeline will not benefit the people of our country, and thus is not in the national interest of the United States of America.	PN 08
Michael Linvill	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will devastate efforts to fight global warming	CLIM 14
Michael Linvill	April 22, 2013	The short term benefits are not worth the long term costs.	PN 05
Michael Londo	March 19, 2013	Fossil fuel dependence should always have been viewed as a transitional technology. If we insist, in all other lines of business, that reinventing is crucial to survival it follows we must do the same with the fossil fuel industry.	PN 03
Michael Lotto	April 2, 2013	The Keystone XL shouldn't happen just because it is cheaper and political pressure from those who get payed off by the oil companies.	PN 09
Michael Lotto	April 2, 2013	The Arkansas Oil pipeline rupture is just a small example of what can happen. Oil running down neighborhood streets and into streams, hurting the environment, animals and citizens that live around the rupture, with unknown long term consequences with includes livelihood and health of those citizens of the U.S.	RISK 06, PN 05, RISK 30

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Lotto	April 2, 2013	As said and trained for in emergency management, safety and well-being should always be number 1 priority, Constitutionally, especially above money and a company's finances.	RISK 23
Michael Macdonald	March 18, 2013	We must commit to follow the guide lines summited but the worlds top scientists to prevent climate change.	CLIM 14
Michael Macpherson	April 13, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 02
Michael Macpherson	April 13, 2013	Rather than providing the U.S. with more Canadian oil, the Keystone XL pipeline will increase the amount of gasoline exported, raising prices for American consumers.	PN 04
Michael Macpherson	April 13, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010	RISK 26
Michael Mclaughlin	March 24, 2013	You now know that the entire huge climate-changing export tube will only create about 35 permanent jobs., so job creation is a lie perpetrated by promoters.	SO 02
Michael Mclaughlin	April 15, 2013	THIS is where fosil fuel development must cease, to be replaced by lower consumption and by solar and wind sources of energy.	ALT 01
Michael Mclaughlin	April 15, 2013	The aquifers of the Great Plains will be poisoned by Keystone XL pipeline spills.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Michael Mitrani	April 22, 2013	This will increase the likelihood of spills, threats to the Ogallala Aquifer, destruction of farmland and release of greenhouse gases.	ACK
Michael Mitrani	April 22, 2013	However, the best argument against the pipeline is the moral argument: tar sands is causing cancer death in native communities and fish deformities through massive contamination of water and air in territory protected by treaty with numerous First Nations of Canada.	CU 05
Michael Morin	March 19, 2013	This Administration talks about making 'Bold' decisions...well this is your chance. Given the acceleration of global warming it would not be 'Bold' to build the pipeline	CLIM 18
Michael Morin	March 19, 2013	To whom it may concern. Your Draft Environmental report is based on conjecture and not science. Its bogus and apparently being hobbled together to create jobs? The pipe has already been produced in India...few jobs are permanent and your agency does not have the mandate to review environmental issues such as this.	PN 05
Michael Mosesman	March 15, 2013	I want to register my opposition to this effort for several reasons: 1)the mining process will devastate the production areas in Canada; 2)the pipeline will inevitably leak and spoil water supplies;3)it will contribute more to golobal warming than traditional oil extraction techniques;4)the refined products will exported.	PN 05, CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Murphy	April 22, 2013	There may or may not ever be a leak in Nebraska, but Nebraskans will die, they already are, so people can make large sums of money.	PN 05
Michael Murphy	April 22, 2013	If the pipeline is approved, in our name, Nebraska will have to deal with the responsibility that people will become ill, and some will die, our precious water will be at risk, and there will be fathers and mothers, sons and daughters, and friends left behind wondering how our great state let this happen. How much is a life worth?	RISK 07
Michael Neilsen	April 4, 2013	Please let me add that our great country is acting very irresponsibly by continuing to pursue fossil fuels almost recklessly instead of going forward with energy conservation measures and renewable energy sources.	PN 02
Michael Noel	March 31, 2013	Take the millions that would be spent on the pipeline and build more solar capacity right now with available technology. (This will also add jobs). If we add a little capacity each year we will be that much closer to a cleaner planet.	ALT 01
Michael O'brien	March 30, 2013	As a doctor, I refer you only to the studies pointing to the cancer caused by the Tar Sands extraction to local communities in Alberta (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/13/world/americas/oil-sand-industry-in-canada-tied-to-higher-carcinogen-level.html?_r=0).	ACK
Michael O'brien	March 30, 2013	All reasonable scientists have come to the same consensus... that if we continue to burn fossil fuels at the rate that we are, by the time my son is in high school, we will live in an unlivable world, where Superstorm Sandys are very common events and the droughts that devastated America's farmlands last summer are just normal summers.	CLIM 14
Michael O'brien	March 30, 2013	The Keystone XL will increase the extraction of tarsands from Alberta by industry.	PN 06
Michael O'brien	March 30, 2013	Do you really want this stuff pumped smack through the middle of our country's heartland, especially when Transcanada's last tar sands pipeline leaked 12 times in a year?	RISK 26
Michael Ogre	March 19, 2013	If we are committed to action on climate change as the President said in his second inaugural....this pipeline cannot be approved because of it's negative impact on the environment and the inevitable contribution to global warming.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Ogre	March 19, 2013	I strongly urge an independent environmental impact statement to be done because of clear conflicts of interests by the authors of the report released by the State Department. Not only is the report compiled by a number of individuals with ties to the oil industry, but some of them worked for "ERM, Environmental Resources Management (45 preparers) " Who has a contract with Trans-Canada. Oh wait. That is the company seeking permission for the pipeline The company applying for permission shouldn't have anything to do with any reports on environmental impact should it? This all seems very shady and perhaps even criminal I want a full investigation into how this even happened.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Ogre	March 19, 2013	Not only do we need to move away from our reliance on energy sources that pollute and add to global warming, but this report was put together by consultants to the oil industry. This is unacceptable. This is a clear and overly obvious conflict of interest, which should not have happened This is not how you serve the interests of the American people or the global community. And it further turns out that the State Department, without giving credit to specific contributors for specific sections, does include - at the end of volume 2 of the 4-volume, 2,000-page report - a "list of preparers," 58 of them, almost all from three private oil industry consulting firms. "Is the State Department Being Downright Fraudulent in Assessing the Risks of the Keystone XL Pipeline?" by William Boardman I strongly urge an independent environmental impact review conducted by independent scientists that includes NO representatives of the oil industry.	PRO 01
Michael Owecke	March 28, 2013	The time is now to fully support and develop alternative energy.. solar, wind, geo-thermal.... the only sustainable and rational sources of energy.	ALT 01
Michael Phillips	April 13, 2013	What long term jobs will this create?	SO 04
Michael Rafa	April 22, 2013	CLEAN AND GREEN ONLY	PN 02
Michael Reddell	March 14, 2013	We should put this money and energy into advancing environmentally friendly, sustainable sources such as wind and solar.	ALT 01
Michael Rice	April 20, 2013	Finally, the added access to petroleum via Tar Sands would serve only to delay a benign and permanent solution to our energy needs -- renewable wind and solar -- which would make real inroad into unemployment and spread the benefits to more than a handful of over-wealthy corporations.	PN 03
Michael Ripberger	April 4, 2013	Keystone XL is a mega-catastrophe of historic proportions waiting to happen. It is not a question of "if" but a question of "when". That is a risk our country, especially the states it would pass through, cannot afford to take.	RISK 10
Michael Ryan	April 22, 2013	[Reference to] TransCanada Keystone XL Pipeline: Required Crossing Criteria for Reclamation Facilities	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Schrank	April 22, 2013	http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/03/03/1663291/states-keystone-report-is-the-tar-sands-pits	REF
Michael Schulte	April 2, 2013	Not only will this pipeline destroy wildlife, farmland, rivers, and soil, it will also pollute our atmosphere and release carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	CLIM 11
Michael Shaffer	March 10, 2013	Investing in clean, safe energy is key to protecting the environment, Crude oil should be phased out and replaced by clean energy.	ALT 01
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Why was the original proposed route through Canada to ports in British Columbia cancelled when Petrochina pulled their support? Why did Petrochina pull their support?	ALT 05
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	I am writing you to express my deep concerns over the routing of the Transcanada pipeline through the Sandhills of Nebraska. Transcanada has already petitioned to use a thinner steel for their pipeline to reduce their costs; their costs over our environment. Does the State of Nebraska have any say in this matter, or will the State Department make the decision to approve this petition since it crosses an international border?	LEG 13
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Transcanada has already petitioned to use a thinner steel for their pipeline to reduce their costs; their costs over our environment. Does the State of Nebraska have any say in this matter or will the State Department make the decision to approve this petition since it crosses an international border?	PD 06
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Do local fire departments get reimbursed by Transcanada? [for fires started by the project]	RISK 03
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	If this pipeline is run through the Sandhills who will ensure the cleanup of any release is not only complete but all blowouts repaired if (when) there is a release?	RISK 03
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Who pays for damages to rancher income due to grass fires?	RISK 03
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Who pays to put those fires [sparked by project welding] out?	RISK 03
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Will fire crews be on hand to handle grass fires sparked by welding activities?	RISK 06
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	Installing a 36" diameter pipeline 4 feet below ground will likely cause severe damage to areas that are excavated and driven over by bulldozers cranes and trucks	SOIL 04
Michael Sonderman	April 22, 2013	What will be required for restoration of vegetation [after pipeline construction] ? Will we require a one-time reseeding or multiple efforts? Who will oversee installation activities and restoration activities; the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality a federal agency or a contractor?	VEG 13
Michael Spina	April 2, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Stites	April 21, 2013	As you are probably aware, oil sands like those in Canada are technically bitumen--not oil. Bitumen is oil that has been altered by bacteria at some point in its diagenic history. Bitumen is not a liquid at room temperature and must either be heated or thinned by other hydrocarbons in order to allow transportation via a pipeline. Furthermore, bitumens require more energy to convert to usable hydrocarbons than the crude oil that everyone is probably imagining in their minds when talking about the XL Pipeline and the tar sands.	PD 04
Michael Stites	April 21, 2013	I fear that this pipeline and the bitumens that it carries will quickly fall to operational costs, and many landowners will be stuck with a pipeline right-of-way crossing their lands that has the potential to leak what is essentially tar into the landscape. IF the pipeline is built, I trust that regulatory agencies will demand of the entities involved demonstrable capabilities of mitigating spills and restoring the local ecology afterwards.	RISK 03, LEG 06, RISK 08
Michael Stubblefield	March 10, 2013	the REAL issue is whether the USA should be enabling Canada to use us as a cheap and easy way to get its dirty tar sands to American refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast, where their refinement will not only worsen the already poor air quality created by the refineries, but then - because oil is an internationally traded commodity - will be shipped to the highest bidders all over the planet, not used domestically. So we will get the risk of a serious accident AND the dirty air, with absolutely no guarantee that we will even be able to use the refined product. This is totally unacceptable. We should be trying to persuade our neighbors to the north to focus on solar and wind power (or even thorium reactors), NOT more fossil fuels. And the issue isn't simply whether Project XL will create jobs; it will, but only until it's built. But so will wind farms and solar farms...what's worst about it is that it will prolong, perhaps by decades, our ability to do our share to reduce fossil fuel consumption anytime soon.	PN 02, CU 08, PN 03, PN 07
Michael Sutherland	April 10, 2013	Let Canada have the dirty oil and produce it up there in there refineries.	ALT 08
Michael Sutherland	April 10, 2013	SOME ONE WILL MAKE A MISTAKE! HUMANS MAKE ERRORS! Either durring construction or not long their after, AND IF you/they get Lucky and make it through that stage the USA has a problem with not replacing stuff(Budgets?) Tell it's to late. So after a while the pipe will get old and rott and burst. IT IS A MATTER OF TIME!! IT WILL HAPPEN!! AND THEY DO NOT KNOW HOW TO CLEAN IT UPand OR WILL NOT SPEND THE $$$$$$$$$$$$!!!!!!	RISK 14
Michael Taylor	April 10, 2013	Stand strong and demand analysis and environment reports conducted by knowledgeable people who are NOT a part of the big oil and gas industry!! And make all of our comments a matter of public record. They should never be kept silent.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Toth	April 13, 2013	Any determination of national interest should consider the full harmful scope of tar sands oil imports into the United States and the associated negative impacts from extraction, pipelines, refineries, and end use. By this standard, the Keystone XL pipeline falls far short, and the Department of State's analysis of these issues was seriously lacking in its April 2010 draft environmental impact statement.	PN 05
Michael Traugott	April 13, 2013	In the business sector, a contracting partner with a poor record of performance would be required to post a significant amount of revenue as surety to guarantee their performance. We never seem to get this assurance and it's time for the status-quo process to STOP.	ACK
Michael Treece	March 15, 2013	The issue is simple: the pipeline will leak. It's far too long, and covers far too much area not to have some failure; additionally, other pipelines run by TransCanada have had large spills and leaks.	RISK 26
Michael Treece	March 15, 2013	what makes Keystone XL a virtually guaranteed catastrophe is that the groundwater in question is the entire Oglalla Aquifer. Pollute that, and you've lost the water supply for a very large part of the United States.	WRG 01
Michael Vinciquerra	April 22, 2013	Advance a clean and safe energy future for the US and don't bow to fossil fuel executives who try to portray this product as safe and in the best interests of America and our energy security.	PN 02
Michael W. Shurgot	April 4, 2013	Don't now go into reverse on energy and environmental protection; demand a green energy future!	ALT 01
Michael White	April 6, 2013	This would be a climate and ecological disaster that would compound the already disastrous decision of Canada to wreck an area the size of Texas for a pittance of recovered oil.	PN 05
Michael Wilderman	April 22, 2013	We need to invest in energy technologies that reduce carbon emissions, not perpetuate actions that increase carbon.	ALT 01
Michael Wilderman	April 22, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Wright	April 22, 2013	In addition to climate change due to burning of WCSB crude (the greatest cumulative impact), there are other long-term parasitic or induced effects such as: - Incentivizing export of fossil fuels that accelerates high-carbon development in other countries like China; - Loss of U.S. technological leadership due to continued reliance on fossil fuels and a de-emphasis on developing renewable energy technologies; - Diversion of resources (e.g., funding, labor) from other worthy enterprises such as renewable energy projects; - Distraction of environmental organizations, both governmental and non-profit, away from addressing other important environmental issues, with decrease budget available for these other issues. Environmental Impacts on Canada: Canadian environmental assessment must include impacts due to long-term effects of climate change induced by the Project, including (but not limited to): - Changes in weather (storms, drought, flooding, etc.) - Changes in snowmelt availability - Loss of snow and ice, and consequences on surface albedo (and thus loss of solar energy reflectivity) - Effects on agriculture and terrestrial vegetation - Changes in animal migratory patterns	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Wright	April 22, 2013	To be comprehensive, a market analysis must account for the costs (proportionally prorated for tar-sands oil emissions) associated with impacts due to induced climate change: deaths (due to storms, flooding, drought), overall economic losses, loss of developed and available land, animal species impacts, disaster recovery, etc...No Action Alternative: Although this Draft SEIS assumes that WCSB and Bakken crude will be extracted and (via some means) transported, such assumptions ignore the NAA benefits, most notably making tar-sands oil less cost-effective and thus incentivizing sustainable, renewable energy production. The NAA also offers political benefits, as it would send a positive signal, both domestically and internationally, that the U.S. is serious about addressing climate change and not accepting the fossil-fuel status quo. Further: - Potential NAA scenarios considered do not include not developing, processing, and distributing tar-sands oil at all, at least through the U.S. This scenario opens up greater possibilities for investing resources (government, industry, and NGO) in clean renewable energies. - The NAA must address the fact that not building the pipeline will necessitate alternative means to transport the oil across N. America, and thus make tar-sands oils less desirable. This will incentivize sustainable, renewable energy development, and consequently help mitigate air pollution and climate change in the long run. - Simply concluding that the oil will be delivered one way or another is not a sufficient justification for pipeline construction, or for concluding that the NAA would result in no change. - Concluding that delivering oil via pipeline requires less cost/energy to transport (with thus reduced emissions) than by rail or other mode is not a sufficiently comprehensive analysis: It ignores the positive forcing (incentivization) toward renewable energy that is less-costly (in real $/kWhr) and results in less impact the environment (in construction, O&M, and end-use consumption).	ALT 09, ALT 07, CLIM 18, PN 11, PN 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Wright	April 22, 2013	First, the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL is deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. A new report by Oil Change International that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the pipeline found that it would carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. Far from being a non-impact, the pipeline would induce increased carbon emissions by increasing efficiency of oil delivery, with concomitant exacerbation of climate change. In fact, based on the overwhelming scientific evidence that tar sands crude will sufficiently accelerate climate change as to make it irreversible, tar sands crude itself should be internationally banned, as CFC's and nuclear tests were decades ago. In the space business, NASA assesses risk based on likelihoods and consequences: The higher the likelihood of some risk and the more severe the consequence translates into high criticality. Construction of Keystone is one of those high criticality risks, since it has a high probability of inducing irreversible climate change, with extremely severe consequences for the entire planet. Moreover, if one accepts as the "basline" the earth's original life-giving systems (including climate), then development of a more efficient means of delivering high-carbon WCSB crude seems consistent with the concept of "normalizing deviance" - a phrase coined by Diane Vaughan in reference to the space shuttle Challenger launch decision. … Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Calculation of net greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions must account for: - Planning phase: engineering products, personnel transport, etc. - Construction phase: Loss of carbon sinks in the form of terrestrial vegetation and release of carbon from soil disturbance. - Operations Phase: Extraction, processing, distribution, and end-burning of tar-sands oil all need to be considered in order to provide a comprehensive life-cycle analysis (LCA), compared to no-action alternative (NAA) or to renewable energy. - The on-going (permanent) loss of carbon-sink capacity due to loss of vegetation during construction phase must also be considered. Regarding the analyses of GHG emissions and climate change, the SEIS does not address induced GHG emissions due to the increased exploitation and consumption of high-carbon tar-sands oil that the pipeline would facilitate. Due to our society's lack of action to reduce overall GHG emissions, we must start reducing production and consumption of fossil fuels, not facilitating their increase.	CLIM 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Wright	April 22, 2013	The more significant and basic issue to consider is not how WCSB crude oil will be transported if the pipeline were not to be constructed, but whether it makes ecological and economic sense to support the import, transport, and export of WCSB crude at all. That is, based on the overwhelming science evidence that WCSB crude will sufficiently exacerbate climate change as to make it irreversible, WCSB crude itself should be internationally banned (similar to CFC's). Even if WCSB crude is approved for transport by other means, if its actual climate impacts are recognized by the U.S. government, then tariffs (based, for example, on long-term costs to the environment) can rationally help reduce the "attractiveness" of WCSB crude. A truly accurate comparison of life-cycle cost of the pipeline compared to renewable energy must account for all impacts of both types of energy production, including (but not limited to): - Physical: construction, operation, maintenance, land use impacts; - Utilization: drilling, processing, distribution of energy; - Economic: number of jobs, net community impacts; - Environmental (air, water, climate), due to construction of the pipeline itself and to induced emissions from oil delivered, including its extraction, processing, delivery, and end-use burning; - Societal: long-term technology advancement, international leadership, ethical standing - Sustainability: 50- to 100-year projection of value; impact on not "7 generations," as the Iroquois considered, but on only 1 or 2 generations, as evidenced by the rapid acceleration of climate change. - Risk mitigation: to potential hazards to life and the environment	CLIM 14, CLIM 05, LEG 05, PN 03, SO 16
Michael Wright	April 22, 2013	Environmental Justice: The environmental justice analysis must address the net long-term impacts of pipeline construction to the greater delivery of high-carbon tar-sands oil that will increase emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG's), and thereby increasing the rate of climate change. This end result will, in fact, disproportionately impact vulnerable populations (ref: Geographic disparities and moral hazards in the predicted impacts of climate change on human populations, Global Ecology and Biogeography, 2011, J. Samson, D. Berteaux, B. J. McGill and M. M. Humphries)	EJ 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michael Yellin	April 9, 2013	the most important reason to oppose the Keystone XL pipeline is the impact of extracting and burning tar sands oil will have on global warming and climate change. Denying the pipeline permit will send an important message to the world that the United States recognizes the serious threat climate change poses to living creatures on earth, including humans, and is willing to make the tough decisions required to prevent potential catastrophic climate change in the coming decades. Moving forward with the pipeline is more than folly, it will potentially be an extremely regrettable and catastrophic decision.	CLIM 18
Michael Yellin	April 9, 2013	There are many reasons to oppose the pipeline, including local environmental concerns such as pipeline leaks and spills and the massive destruction of forests and wetlands that will be amplified if the pipeline is approved.	VEG 02, RISK 07, WET 05
Michael Zargaj	April 20, 2013	As Christians, we believe it is important to invest responsibly in our country's economic health and take care of creation. Our leaders must carefully weigh the potential negative impacts of projects like the Keystone Pipeline. Together, we are praying that our nation's business leaders and policymakers put the livelihoods of American farmers, ranchers, and their families above special interests.	ACK
Michaela Ross	April 9, 2013	Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	CLIM 13
Michaele Adams	April 4, 2013	There will be no real benefit to the USA for all of this risk. This pipeline will not help our country. It will just make more money for oil companies, half of whom are not even in our country.	PN 07
Michaele Adams	April 4, 2013	we do not have the technology to prevent another series of such disasters [oil spills from pipelines].	RISK 14
Michalene Horton	March 25, 2013	The pipeline is a waste of what limited natural resources we have left.	PN 05
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	A foreign corp should not be allowed to pollute America's ground water supply.	ACK
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	Burning Tar Sands will excellerate rising temps and climate change.	CLIM 05
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	Fossil fuels will never give energy security, only renewables will.	PN 02
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	Tar Sands oil is destined to be shipped to China, it will not help America at all.	PN 07
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	All pipelines leak; there is no safe pipeline.	RISK 21
Micheal Burtt	March 1, 2013	The Midwest water aquifer is vulnerable to this pipeline. Once polluted it can not be repaired.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Michel Gadoury	April 22, 2013	For the National Interest and the future of our country and our planet, I urge you to reject this pipeline.	PN 08
Michel Phillips	April 20, 2013	1. Increasing global temperatures are not in the USA's national interest. 2. Taking a global leadership role against climate change is in the USA's national interest.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michele Artascos	April 22, 2013	Please veto the pipeline. It is too close to the aquifer and would spell disaster for years to come if there is a spill.	WRG 01, RISK 10
Michele Budica	March 28, 2013	America should be committed to keeping its land pristine and not adding to the negative climate changes. We are a world leader that is watched and copied by other nations, The planet cannot sustain mega-projects like Keystone XL that tamper with the environment in such a monumental way. Let's show the world our decisions are all not dictated by profits.	PN 05
Michele Garrett	April 5, 2013	Saying no to Keystone would be a crucial step toward a safe and prosperous future. Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	CLIM 14
Michele Garrett	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline avoids the tough decisions that would start us on a road away from dependence on fossil fuels	PN 02
Michele Gielis	March 31, 2013	It is the worst kind of folly to invest anything in a fuel that comes from a graveyard, releases up to 3 times the carbon emissions of other fossil fuels …	CLIM 05
Michele Gielis	March 31, 2013	How could we be so ridiculous to risk our environmental resources, right in the heartland, for no benefit at all?	PN 07
Michele Gielis	March 31, 2013	No jobs, no oil for us, only risk and likely damage.	PN 07
Michele Gielis	March 31, 2013	It is the worst kind of folly to invest anything in a fuel that … once spilled, cannot be cleaned up.	RISK 08
Michele Hanlon	April 22, 2013	Per the scientific evidence including the amount of carbon this would produce into our atmosphere, this would be an environmental disaster.	CLIM 14
Michele Hanlon	April 22, 2013	There is no question spills will occur	RISK 21
Michele Sauer	March 24, 2013	the farmlands that will be ravaged when there are spills, and as history teaches, there will be.	RISK 07
Michele Slowey-ogert	March 11, 2013	Now is the time to move forward on renewables and to mitigate the damage done to our climate, the costs are high unless action is taken, in treasure, for the planet's ecosystem and our children and grandchildren who will have to adjust to a changed and more difficult planet.	PN 02
Michele Sprengnether	April 20, 2013	After the tragic tar sands oil spills in Mayflower, Arkansas and Otter Tail County, Minnesota, it's clear that tar sands oil is not safe and not worth the risk.	RISK 13
Michele Trempler	April 5, 2013	President Obama please do not allow this pipeline I live in Utah and we have problems now with oil lines breaking and polluting our water and then having to wait while they take their time to clean up the mess this pipeline is a bigger disaster that we will be left to clean up.	ACK
Michelle Geil	March 27, 2013	it is unconscionable to encourage production of greenhouse gas spewing oil, so extremely destructive to the planet.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michelle Geil	March 27, 2013	environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 07
Michelle Geil	March 27, 2013	undertake the kind of comprehensive analysis that you have long promised. That review should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development	CLIM 13
Michelle Geil	March 27, 2013	the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States	CU 08
Michelle Geil	March 27, 2013	grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills	RISK 07
Michelle Glenn	April 12, 2013	If the oil will be processed anyway, let it be processed and/or shipped other ways. I do not think it will happen without the pipeline.	ALT 09
Michelle Grissom	April 22, 2013	All we get are the spills and clean-up costs--and tar sands oil has already spilled. Tar sands is worse than most oil spills because it's TAR mixed with solvents, and it sinks. Look around. Has BP been able to even begin to pay for its damage to the Gulf? No.	RISK 14
Michelle Grissom	April 22, 2013	There are no jobs (those TransCanada lists are temporary, and most have been hired, completed, and fired already). This is a Canadian company, so no US taxes. The tar sands oil will be sold in a free trade zone, so no US taxes.	SO 14
Michelle Hampton	April 2, 2013	I personally believe that it is time to take back our energy independence. Independence from fossil fuels. If technology has moved so quickly in the entertainment business, then why haven't we moved forward in energy.	ALT 01
Michelle Jacobsen	March 16, 2013	The State Department has willfully not addressed its impact on the planet. The environmental effects of the burning of the oil potentially to be carried through the Keystone XL will be enormous	CLIM 10
Michelle Lesmond	March 7, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is also a disaster for endangered species, including whooping cranes, American burying beetles, pallid sturgeon and others.	ACK
Michelle Lesmond	March 7, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will cross over a thousand water bodies, including the Yellowstone and Platte rivers. A spill into any of these waters would be a disaster.	RISK 10
Michelle Lesmond	March 7, 2013	An existing pipeline called Keystone 1 has already leaked 14 times since it began operations in June 2010 -- including one spill that dumped 21,000 gallons of tar-sands crude. Other pipelines have also had massive spills in recent years, including one in 2010 that leaked 800,000 gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River. This spill has yet to be cleaned up -- because of the propensity of the heavier tar-sands oil to sink, it is not clear that the oil from this spill can be cleaned up	RISK 29
Michelle Mcalpin	April 5, 2013	s a nation, we need to get past justifying the destruction of the planet in the name of keeping the economy "strong.". The real legacy we need to be concerned about is leaving our children and grandchildren breathable air, drinkable water, and land that can still grow food.	PN 05
Michelle Mcelhaney	April 15, 2013	Water, our most precious and most quickly vanishing resource, will be greatly endangered by the Keystone XL Pipeline as it travels such great distances and part of that by the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michelle Mckinney	April 20, 2013	35 full time jobs is not a fair trade for the climate change this will cause the whole world. It doesn't even promise energy security to the US since Canada could decide to sell the oil to China after it's been refined. All we get is 35 jobs and all of the oil spills this company is notorious for producing.	PN 05
Michelle Mullin	April 6, 2013	Excavation of tar sands oil results in release of significantly more greenhouse gas than traditional oil excavation.	CLIM 05
Michelle Mullin	April 6, 2013	The oil is not going to lower our own gas prices- it is being shipped to China.	PN 04
Michelle Mullin	April 6, 2013	Tar sands oil is much more difficult to clean up than regular oil. It is denser, and as previously mentioned, full of solvents.	RISK 08
Michelle Mullin	April 6, 2013	Tar sands pipelines already exist in America, and rupture on a regular basis. They are more likely to rupture than regular oil pipelines because: 1) The tar sands oil is diluted with corrosive solvents. It has to be in order to allow it to move through the pipelines due to its high viscosity. 2) they operate at higher temperatures than regular pipelines. Higher temperature pipelines are 23 times more likely to rupture.	RISK 14
Michelle Owings-Christian	April 22, 2013	The route of the pipeline extends through many sacred tribal grounds, which is a sacrilege.	CR 02
Michelle Owings-Christian	April 22, 2013	The oil gathered through this pipeline is marked for export. Our prices will not go down as a result of this pipeline. The latest estimate suggests that the pipeline will only create 35 jobs.	PN 04
Michelle Tigchelaar	April 22, 2013	n order to slow down climate change, we need to significantly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, we need to keep most of our known and unknown fossil fuel reserves right where they are: in the ground. This is particularly true for fuel sources such as the Canadian tar sands. Not only do they store vast amounts of greenhouse gases, they are extremely polluting and dangerous.	CLIM 14
Michelle Tiger	April 5, 2013	We need alternative, clean energy sources and to stop caving in to the lobbyists for oil and coal.	ALT 01
Michelle Toogood	April 22, 2013	I also believe it creates a soft target for terrorists. There will be so many miles of unguarded pipeline it would be too easy for a terrorist to set off a bomb on the pipeline and destroy the Ogallala aquifer by dumping the tar sands into it. Letting them build the pipeline is just painting a target on our state for those who want to destroy our food supply and way of life.	RISK 04
Michelle Toogood	April 22, 2013	I believe letting a pipeline like this cross our large fresh water source is just creating a soft target for those who want to harm our country. There will be miles and miles of unguarded pipeline where a bomb could be placed to blow up the pipeline and destroy our source of water for homes, livestock and irrigation. Please stop the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you.	RISK 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Michelle Wenderlich	April 2, 2013	When all costs are seen, keystone oil makes neither economic or climate sense.	PN 05
Mickey Lee Johnson Jr.	April 4, 2013	The only answer is to realize Henry Ford's dream of using hemp oil to fuel all of our vehicles.	ACK
micki fowler	April 22, 2013	Water is our most important resource. You cant live with out clean water.	ACK
Middleway (tm Akashi)	March 17, 2013	Building the Keystone XL pipeline will insure that Global Warming gets out-of-control and we fry ourselves and the Earth. NO KEYSTONE XL	ACK
Midori Furutate	April 9, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar and development.	ACK
Mieko Aoki	March 11, 2013	In addition, the tar sands sit in Canada's boreal forest, where a large percentage of migratory songbirds spend the summer months. The pest management service they provide by eating tons of insects a year is immeasurable both ecologically and economically. According to the Breeding Bird Survey, many species of songbirds have been in decline since the 1960s, and further degrading their breeding grounds could contribute towards further declines.	CU 03
Miguel Picanco	April 22, 2013	However, as advancing dangerous means require complicated risks to the involved parties (especially the health of entire states and regions unsuspecting populations) we must always strive to demand that the strictest, explicit, and expansive protocols for any possible (or impossible) contingencies are in place, guaranteed in advance, and in writing. And since the weight of these risks are on the shoulders of these populations, it is only fair that in addition to providing security, a relative portion of these resources proceeds should be set aside to help subsidize any future water, farming, and health risks. Such subsidies could also be very helpful today in dealing as well with related issues currently afflicting the future of these same resources.	LEG 08
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	Any energy project built now will endure for 50 or more years.	ACK
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	However, any energy infrastructure of this scale built today, however expensive (and in the near future it will be more expensive in relative terms), will continue to be used due to the enormous initial capital investment.	ACK
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	This low [energy] efficiency [from tar sands] comes with substantial added environmental cost.	ACK
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	It [the Project] will not benefit US energy independence (in fact, the manpower and likely tax subsidies would be better used to fund wind or solar).	ALT 01
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	Renewable wind is now as cheap as fossil fuels, with solar PV following close behind.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	This [renewable energy] is why, according to a Bloomberg NEF study, almost 49% of new US electricity capacity in 2012 has been renewable energy.	ALT 01
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	To strip mine for tar sands, boreal forest needs to be cut down, thereby removing a carbon dioxide sink.	CLIM 06
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	This is not the direction we should be taking as a nation leading the difficult task of combating climate change.	CLIM 18
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	After the landscape has been stripped barren and the sands have been processed, the water and chemical wastes are collected in immense (miles on a side) pools of toxic effluents.	CU 02
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	Tar sand oils are currently the most polluting, least efficient form of energy, with an energy return on energy investment of only 5:1, as compared to 20:1 for wind energy, 20:1 for conventional oil, 8-10:1 for solar PV.	PN 02
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	This project will only benefit Canadian oil producers and pipeline builders.	PN 05
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	After processing in tax-advantaged refineries on the Gulf Coast, the oil will be sold on the global market.	PN 07
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	Experts state that the possibility of a leak is almost a certainty given the length of the pipeline.	RISK 14
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	The construction jobs so forcefully touted will be only temporary.	SO 04
Mihaela Dinu	March 5, 2013	The cost of cleanup [of pipeline leak(s)] will ultimately be borne by the US taxpayer (although in theory it should not be so).	SO 10
Mike	March 1, 2013	What concerns me is that these Tar Sands pipes are so much worse than crude pipes. The gasses that are used as dilutants are explosive, and when they leak into the air the consequences are deadly. Please do not allow tar sands to be shipped under East Texas land. It will not be worth the lives of myself and my community.	CU 14
Mike And Dorothy Wolf	April 7, 2013	[DOS] help us move in the right direction by rejecting the Keystone XL pipeline and encouraging renewables for a safer, more resilient and more secure future.	ALT 01
Mike And Dorothy Wolf	April 7, 2013	I am very much concerned about climate change. The financial implications, the potential loss of life, and the environmental impacts are staggering.	CLIM 14
Mike And Sharon Tomecek	April 3, 2013	Then I discovered that CONTRACTORS FOR THE PRIVATE CANADIAN OIL COMPANY wrote the report	PRO 01
Mike Bloomfield	March 11, 2013	XL is a bad idea which will not lead to energy independence - only an expansion of the global energy supply. Unless, of course, this energy is not sold outside the confines of the US	PN 13, PN 03
Mike Boyle	April 9, 2013	I live in Nebraska. The Nebraska Sand Hills are 200 miles northwest of my home. Water is so close to the surface in the Sand Hills that it comes to the surface when a spade digs down six inches! the Ogallala Aquafer is so important to the water supply of our Nation. We CANNOT endanger it!	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mike Bullock	March 17, 2013	Our atmospheric CO2 is well beyond the danger zone. All our efforts and money must go to REDUCING our emissions. Therefore, the pipeline makes no sense.	CLIM 14
Mike Carolus	April 22, 2013	A change to a more prudent pipeline route away from the aquifer is the only intelligent course of action.	ALT 06
Mike Coday	March 24, 2013	I learned from an article in Mother Jones http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/03/keystone-xl-contractor-ties-transcanada-state-department and other sources that consultants hired to prepare the Keystone XL DEIS appear to have significant and substantial financial interests at stake in the project, and that the Department of State appears to have redacted information that would have informed the public of these connections. I believe on this basis that the DEIS must be considered invalid, and a new process must be initiated, with the work in the hands of demonstrably unbiased consultants.	PRO 01
Mike Dash	April 22, 2013	The pipeline would carry more bitumen than can be carried by rail. It will increase the total amount of bitumen that can be mined. Extraction, processing and burning of the bitumen will release a large quantity of CO2,which will impact climate worldwide and cause warming. At the Doha talks in November, 2012, the U.N. Environment Programme reported that permafrost in Siberia is beginning to thaw. This could release up to 135 billion tons of CO2 by 2100. That CO2 will then cause more warming and make the permafrost melt even faster. Kevin Schaefer, at the U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center, said “Thawing permafrost could trigger what is called the permafrost-carbon feedback. Once the feedback starts, it’s irreversible. Once you take that organic matter out it’s impossible to put it back, and it will also persist for centuries.” Additional CO2 in the atmosphere will cause higher sea levels and more storms like superstorm Sandy. This is in line with the recent report from NOAA, the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration. On December 6 it released a new report on sea-level rise and forecast an increase the frequency, magnitude, and duration of flooding associated with a given storm.	CLIM 17
Mike Fletcher	April 10, 2013	As a Canadian citizen, you must understand that my (Canadian) federal government is lying about many aspects of tar sand development. An example is the repeated statements by Canadian Natural Resources Minister Joe Oliver that the green house gas emissions profile of the tar sands industry is improving. THIS STATEMENT IS A COMPLETE LIE AND FOR WHICH I HOLD MY GOVERNMENT IN UTTER CONTEMPT.	CLIM 14
Mike Galos	April 22, 2013	Limits on liability for damages	LEG 06
Mike Galos	April 22, 2013	No clean up techniques in place and tested	RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mike Gude	April 20, 2013	The recent oil spill in Arkansas spotlights another concen about the pipeline: that its spills will be more toxic than regular oil, and that potential spills will still occur over sensitive water resources through the Great Plans, especially in Nebraska	RISK 20, RISK 13, WRG 01
Mike Hurst	March 10, 2013	As a government official in a town east of Seattle in the 1990's I quickly learned that the Canadian powers that be had NO concern for the environment. From overfishing to allowing chemicals from mineral extractions to pollute their waters and ours as well the industry in Canada rules over all common sense. Please do not allow the greed of a few destroy the environment of us all.	ACK
Mike Kehl	March 18, 2013	State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest fuel on the planet. In the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other deadly weather events, the United States should be taking a stand and leading the world toward a sustainable future, not whitewashing the very real and disastrous effects of climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL.	ACK
Mike Kehl	March 18, 2013	grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills	RISK 07
Mike Kelly	March 28, 2013	100% of the finished product: gasoline and diesel, will be shipped to China and sold to China.	PN 07
Mike LaMair	April 14, 2013	Lets focus on developing viable and cost effective renewable energy sources instead .	ALT 01
Mike Larson	March 31, 2013	The rail and trucks keep a spill better contained and less of a spill.	ALT 07
Mike Linvill	March 17, 2013	because tar sands produce far more greenhouse gas- causing carbon pollution.	CLIM 05
Mike Lorimer	April 4, 2013	The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) supports comprehensive, mandatory, and aggressive emission reductions that aim to limit the increase in Earth's temperature to 2 degrees Celsius or less from pre-industrial levels. Legislation should focus on the short-term goal of reducing U.S. greenhouse gas emissions 20 percent from 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent from 1990 levels by 2050." If our government is going to keep those promises, it must start by rejecting tar sands pipelines, especially Keystone XL.	CLIM 18
Mike Lorimer	April 4, 2013	I cannot understand how refining Canadian oil and risking more pipeline spills like Arkansas will help the United States	PN 05
Mike Lorimer	April 4, 2013	We missed the boat not focusing on jobs through Efficiency First to reduce our dependence on oil.	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mike MacCracken	April 14, 2013	Elsewhere in the [SEIS] Appendix comparisons are made specifically to other fuels derived from oil sands, so are not even comparable to GHG emissions from conventional fuels. It seems clear that the Appendix calculation is based on flawed methodology and therefore misleadingly underestimates how much more the GHG emissions from use of fuels derived from Canadian oil sands would exceed the GHG emissions from conventionally derived crude oil, as specified in Section 526. [Therefore] I would urge the Department of State to find the Supplementary EIS inadequate and to decline to approve the EIS and therefore the pipeline.	CLIM 04
Mike MacCracken	April 14, 2013	A proper environmental assessment under NEPA, which is required of all government departments and agencies on major project decisions, is required to consider the potential impacts that would result not just from the construction of a project, but also that would result from the completion and operation of the project through its lifetime. In particular, for a pipeline, this would include specifically considering the effects on the climate and then on the national and global environment from the combustion of the bitumen and crude oil that is projected to be carried by the pipeline during its entire lifetime. This does not appear to have been done, and yet the carbon dioxide emissions that are projected to result would be very likely to have serious and virtually irreversible impacts on the climate, on sea level, on ocean acidification, on biodiversity, and on the environment generally.It seems clear that the Supplementary EIS does not fulfill the requirements of NEPA and that it therefore must be redone, again.	LEG 04
Mike MacCracken	April 14, 2013	Based on Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 101-140), enacted by Congress and signed into law by President Bush on December 19, 2007, federal agencies would seem to be prohibited from purchasing or using any transportation fuels that would be derived from the products being carried by the pipeline. The provision specifically: [3]Prohibits a federal agency from entering into a contract for procurement of an alternative or synthetic fuel, including a fuel produced from nonconventional petroleum sources, for any mobility-related use (other than for research or testing), unless the contract specifies that the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions associated with the production and combustion of the fuel supplied under the contract must, on an ongoing basis, be less than or equal to such emissions from the equivalent conventional fuel produced from conventional petroleum sources. Approval and construction of the Keystone Pipeline would seem very likely to lead directly to US government departments and their agencies being in violation of Public-Law 101-140 once fuel derived from the pipeline enters the marketplace.	LEG 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mike Mullally	April 22, 2013	I have great concern for the the Ogalalla aquifier that lies under the majority of our fine state Nebraska.….Jobs will not stay in Nebraska at least not permanently; the potential harm and risk to farmland and natural habitat is not worth the risk for low grade tar oil that will only be available for a short time. Another big concern is if TransCanada goes bankrupt then WHO will do the cleanup as they promise? We already know there are leaks they or other companies are having problems fixing/controlling. This pipeline is still dependency on foreign oil.	PN 05, PD 01, PN 07, SO 03, WRG 01
Mike Nikolas	April 22, 2013	T he laws regarding Eminent Domain were enacted in good faith but have been revised by special interest groups to the point of leaving the individual property owner devoid of protection or recourse. A first step in reversing this "raping" would be to require the TAKING party to pay for all litigation costs regardless of who wins the TAKING action.	LEG 02
Mike Nikolas	April 22, 2013	T he laws regarding Eminent Domain were enacted in good faith but have been revised by special interest groups to the point of leaving the individual property owner devoid of protection or recourse. A first step in reversing this "raping" would be to require the TAKING party to pay for all litigation costs regardless of who wins the TAKING actio	LEG 02
Mike Ormsby	April 3, 2013	rather see a shift in energy sources…..to a more sustainable energy….that will bring long-term economic benefits instead of a short-term gain.	PN 02
Mike Ormsby	April 3, 2013	http://money.ca.msn.com/investing/news/breaking-news/keystone-xl-still-ahead-of-rivals	REF
Mike Ormsby	April 3, 2013	http://money.ca.msn.com/investing/news/business-news/whats-ahead-for-keystone-xl-29	REF
Mike Ormsby	April 3, 2013	http://news.sympatico.cbc.ca/business/margot_kidder_arrested_at_white_house_oil_protest/e3e3612e"CBC News: Margot Kidder Arrested At White House Oil Protest	REF
Mike Ormsby	April 3, 2013	http://www.ctv.ca/CTVNews/TopStories/20110821/white-house-alberta-oil-pipeline-protests-110821/"CTV News: More Arrests On Second Day Of Oil Pipeline Protests	REF
Mike Ramsey	April 5, 2013	(The oil companies) are not responsible for their actions, and until they are (meaning for them paying more money to build more secure lines or safer procedures instead of paying for fines AFTER their faulty equipment fails) we should deny them opportunities to do more harm.	ACK
Mike Ramsey	April 5, 2013	Until oil companies can be positive that what they are doing is not going to harm their surrounding areas, we cannot let them proceed with these plans	RISK 14
Mike Russo	March 28, 2013	This pipeline really only creates a small number of pipeline manufacturing and installation jobs. The intended recipient of this environmentally destructive fuel is not even the United States.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mike Sandler	April 2, 2013	The approval of the pipeline would increase tar sands extractions, resulting in impacts that cannot be mitigated, especially regarding irreversible global climate change as a cumulative impact.	CLIM 13
Mike Sandler	April 2, 2013	The climate change impacts are a result of Keystone XL providing a critical link to the exploitation of the Alberta tar sands, North America's single largest deposit of carbon, and would allow for the drastic increase in the rate of production of tar sands crude. Full exploitation of the tar sands would lead to what NASA's James Hansen calls "essentially game over" for the climate.	CLIM 14
Mike Sandler	April 2, 2013	If the SEIS process does not result in such a basic recognition that if a pipeline is built, more tar sands will be produced and CO2 emissions will increase, then not only should Congress pass a climate law that calls for reducing GHGs, but NEPA should also be amended so that obvious facts are included in Environmental Impact Statements in the future.	CLIM 18
Mike Sandler	April 2, 2013	Regarding job creation, we must distinguish between clean energy jobs and dirty future-destroying jobs. We need more of the clean and less of the dirty. Jobs can be created in many ways, and we do not need to destroy our children’s future for short term corporate oil industry profits	SO 05
Mike Sferruzza	April 1, 2013	If we fail to build the Keystone XL pipeline, more tanker trucks will haul crude oil from Montana and North Dakota to market, clogging the nation’s roads and hindering the development of America’s fastest growing oilfield, the Bakken Formation.	ALT 09
Mike Sferruzza	April 1, 2013	The alternatives to Keystone XL analyzed in the environmental review demonstrate that the Canadian oil sands and Bakken light crude will find a way to refineries, independent of the construction of the pipeline. Given that reality, the alternatives to Keystone XL do not offer the same environmental and economic benefits as the proposal.The alternatives to the project make the United States less secure, worse off economically, and more exposed to environmental and public safety risks.	PN 01
Mike Wilkinson	March 21, 2013	Please approve the Keystone XL pipeline as quickly as possible. Every day we delay this project, our economic growth and National security are weakened.	PN 10
Mike Williams	April 22, 2013	Re route the pipe line to avoid the issues.	ALT 06
Milana Tomec	April 17, 2013	As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states, several major rivers, and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland. This is a real and present risk to people's lives and their drinking water.	ACK
Milana Tomec	April 17, 2013	TAR SANDS OIL PRODUCES THREE TIMES MORE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS THAN CRUDE, MAKING OUR CLIMATE PROBLEM FAR WORSE! The EPA has estimated that Keystone XL would increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	CLIM 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mildred Martin	April 2, 2013	Before this all started I was saying this is dangerous....My ex is a civil engineer who went up to collect the first stats for presenting this awful plan of tar sand mining to Congress....I remember his words.."They told me to make it look good.." animals and birds dying in the Boreal Forest, indigenous people getting ill and the threat of tar sand mining spills along the way. The nightmare has started to become a reality and the people and animals of the US of A are sick and disgusted by it.	RISK 07
Mills-Bria	April 18, 2013	Construction workers will be harrassed and hurried to move TransCanada toward making money and not with the intent to produce a quality product [i.e., a safe pipeline].	RISK 23
Mills-Bria	April 18, 2013	The oil companies get a tax break for cleanup, a reduced incentive to ensure a safe structure for 100 years.	SO 15
Milt Griffith	March 21, 2013	WE CANNOT RUN THE COUNTRY ON WINDMILLS & SOLAR PANNELS.	ACK
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	[The Project] serves no value to humankind except to make a profit for a Canadian Corporation, a few temporary US pipelayers and the Gulf Coast refineries.	ACK
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	The transition from burning ancient hydrocarbons to renewable energy sources (such as solar, wind, geothermal, water/wave) is inevitable within 100-150 years one way or another…the Keystone XL pipeline does nothing to help us make this transition – in fact it exacerbates the problem.	ALT 01
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	Based on the Kalamazoo tar sands crude leak in MI that has already cost $1B to clean up and the work is still ongoing, I would strongly suggest that TransCanada be required to place $2 Billion dollars into a “Spill Cleanup Escrow Account” before the first drop of dilbit is ever allowed to flow through the pipe should it be built.	PD 01, LEG 08, RISK 03
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	catastrophic pollution of the aquifer will occur [following decommissioning] unless the pipeline is thoroughly cleaned of all these toxic materials while it is still in good operating condition and can be properly flushed.I doubt that the cost of decommissioning is included in the $7 Billion estimate.	PD 02
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	One glaring “externality” that was not addressed adequately during the public hearing was “Decommissioning the pipeline.” …When the pipeline is ultimately shut down because it is no longer safe to operate, it will probably just be abandoned, the steel walls will continue to corrode from the inside and from the outside.	PD 02
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	We will stop resorting to armed force to assure our energy needs only when we transition away from these limited ancient hydrocarbons still available in the middle east and begin to utilize the free renewable energy sources that are available domestically – the sun and wind and water and geothermal.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	[American citizens] will pay for all the externalities [of the project] – for all the costs that TransCanada ignores [such as] the cost to repair the damage to our environment, the cost of repairing the damage from extreme weather events exacerbated by continued burning of hydrocarbons, for the health care required by those exposed to the toxic chemicals used by TransCanada and spilled and vented into our common atmosphere, etc.	PN 05
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	This is America where oil and gas and now tar sands corporations still control our political and economic systems and hence control our individual freedom to choose the way we want to live.	PN 05
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	Leaks are most often the result of inadvertent overpressurization…or corrosion and erosion of the pipe wall from continued use…the dilbit moving through the pipe includes sediment carried with the fluid that mechanically erodes the pipe wall.	RISK 14
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	This pipeline will fail and it will leak at some point just like every other underground pipeline has in the past.	RISK 14
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	The notion that because U.S. welders can produce high quality welds and properly x-ray and inspect each weld (which is an agreed upon fact) assures that there will be no pipelines leaks is obviously another false statement with no basis in fact.	RISK 23
Milt Hetrick	April 21, 2013	In reality, the actual welds on this pipeline will probably be made by existing Canadian welders already employed by TransCanada.	SO 09
Milton And Shirley Nelson	April 12, 2013	If we are serious about dependence on oil (not just "foreign oil") -- and we should be -- we will require auto manufacturers to continue to improve fuel efficiency	ALT 03
Milton Dill	April 3, 2013	NOT BUILDING THE PIPELINE WILL NOT PREVENT CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS. FIND OTHER METHODS TO ADDRESS CARBON EMISSIONS.	CLIM 15
Milton Dill	April 3, 2013	IF WE ARE CONCERNED ABOUT PIPELINE FAILURE, ADD ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING SAFEGUARDS!	PD 05
Miltonmarkoiwtz	March 6, 2013	In addition with more oil supply, less need for Middle East oil and reudced gas prices at the pump.	PN 10
Miltonmarkoiwtz	March 6, 2013	It will create 15,000 to 20,000 new high paying jobs, which means more Federal and State revnues,less unemployment and more consumer spending.	SO 08
Mimeyers	March 7, 2013	the use of tar sands oil is not consistent with a move toward a green economy and the promises Mr. Obama made to make changes in the way we use energy resources.	PN 02
Mimi (mrs. Eric) Carlson	March 28, 2013	More jobs will be created in the clean energy sphere than the short-term fossil fuel sector. Rejecting the Keystone XL Pipeline will be good for the economy AND the environment.	SO 05
Mimi Brody	April 17, 2013	I do not buy the notion that if the Keystone XL pipeline is not built, Canada will simply find another way to transport and sell this tar sands oil.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
		he world's largest and most devastating environmental and industrial project is situated in the heart of the largest and most intact forest in the world. Canada's Boreal Forest. It stretches right across Northern Canada and Labrador and is home to the largest Caribou herd in the world. The George River Caribou herd. Numbering approximately 400,000 animals.	
Mimi Newton	April 15, 2013	All across the Boreal is an incredible abundance of wet lands. Wet lands globally are one of the most endangered ecosystems. They're absolutely critical ecosystem they clean air, they clean water, they sequester a large among of Green house gasses. And they're home to a huge diversity of Species. In the Boreal, they are also the home to almost 50% of the 800 bird species found in North America Many of these birds migrate north to breed and raise their young in the Boreal.	CU 01
Mimi Newton	April 16, 2013	This report is the most comprehensive study of Keystone's climate impacts yet -- and it shows that the pipeline would carry 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, equal to 51 coal plants worth of carbon. Another way to put it: that's as much CO2 as 37.7 million cars on the road -- more cars than are currently driving in California, Oregon, Washington, Michigan, New York and Florida combined. That number includes the CO2 released when the earth is blasted with chemical cocktails heated by fracked natural gas, the multiple rounds of refining tar sands require, the ugly byproduct called petcoke used in coal plants, and the burning of the final product as fuel.	CLIM 05
Mimi Newton	April 16, 2013	So, how is it that the Supplemental EIS for the pipeline concludes that the pipeline would have negligible climate impacts? How can one ignore the larger consequences of the Pipeline when looking at the environmental impacts of the pipeline? It really isn't intellectually honest to do so and I expect those in decision making positions within the Department of State to exercise intellectual honesty. Don't ignore the broader implications of the environmental impacts of the Pipeline by focusing piecemeal on the physical aspects of the pipe itself while ignoring what it means to extract these incredible volumes of oil out of the ground in Canada. The construction of the pipeline in the US cannot be viewed abstractly - it needs to be examined whollistically instead. That means the impacts of that much oil being burned needs to be examined.	CLIM 13
Mimi Turchinetz	April 8, 2013	There is more than enough scientific evidence to demonstrate the reason to reject this pipeline. When the science and climate activites reflect a damaging reality and the earth continues to heat up and dry, what are we doing?	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mimi Turchinetz	April 8, 2013	Environmental degradation and the destruction of the Canadian Indian's sacred land is not a reasonable trade off.	CU 05
Mimi Turchinetz	April 8, 2013	There is no reason to sacrifice our future for the limited jobs that will be produced by this pipeline.	PN 05
Minos	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous, dirty, and destructive.	PN 09
Miranda Shaw	April 22, 2013	The extraction and transport of "tar sand" involves threats to public safety and health at every step along the way.	RISK 07
Miranda Shaw	April 22, 2013	We already know that oil companies cannot contain or clean up after spills. Ask the people who lived and live in Prince William Sound, which has not yet recovered from the Exxon Valdez wreck in 1989. Twenty-five years. When spills happen - when pipes burst or tankers wreck or rigs explode - there is as no way to restore the environment or lives destroyed and lost. That alone should stop this pipeline. The costs goes beyond loss of property and livelihood (which often are not fully recompensed) and extends to health problems for years to come, death of domestic animals and wildlife, and destruction of habitats that are essential to the environmental integrity of vast regions. There are emotional and psychological problems as individuals, families, and communities see all that they love and all they have built destroyed by a toxic substance that humans have no idea how to contain, control, or remove from the environment.	RISK 13
Miriam Ascher	April 20, 2013	It is a lie that this reckless project will do anything to lower fuel costs for Americans. My family has been in the oil and gas business for 3 generations. I know better and so do you.	PN 04
Miriam Koren	April 2, 2013	It would create even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, thus contributing even further to climate change	CLIM 05
Miriam Koren	April 2, 2013	The terrible tar sands oil spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, resulting from a ruptured pipeline, shows why the Keystone tar sands pipeline should never be built	RISK 14
Miriam Koren	April 2, 2013	Keystone pipeline would jeopardize the water supply for millions of Americans, polluting drinking water and water used in agriculture.	WRG 01
Miriam Schnoebelen	April 2, 2013	Provide Jobs? They are kidding, right? If we don't do something to protect our future generations from all the contamination in our soil and waterways, there won't be any one to be looking for jobs. And our health care systems will be even more massive than it is now!	PN 05
Miriam Solon	March 20, 2013	Canadians don't want Trans-Canada's project in Canada, so why should we host something Canadians don't want from one of their own companies, which provides no benefit to the U.S.	PN 07
Misty Speck	April 5, 2013	We know pipelines aren't indestructible, we know they aren't clean when something goes wrong (as it does with sickening frequency)	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Misty Speck	April 5, 2013	we know the jobs they[pipelines] provide are fleeting and temporary at best	SO 04
misty stinson	April 22, 2013	We want Hemp fuel.	PN 02
Mitchell	April 11, 2013	We are landowners in the path of the proposed keystone pipeline. [there is] no guarantee of jobs, no contract for a portion of the oil staying in the United States, however we would be responsible if a spill would occur, and no amount of Trans Canada money would be able to compensate for lost of our water, beautiful land, other loss of income, or other economic factors.	SO 02, RISK 03
Mitchell Moe	March 14, 2013	Additionally, already endangered species such as the whooping crane will face the negative implications of such a pipeline, as well as the caribou.	ACK
Mitchell Moe	March 14, 2013	Tar sands oil is the dirtiest energy source available, and the use of it will accelerate the already rampant effects of climate change	CLIM 05
Mitchell Moe	March 14, 2013	KXL will not create a justifiable amount of jobs to negate the environmental damage that is assured, and the general public is largely uninformed of the statistics surrounding job creation. As people cry, "Not in my back yard!" property is being seized under eminent domain,	PN 05, LEG 02
Mitchell Moe	March 14, 2013	An added crisis looming in our nation's horizon is a global water shortage. KXL's projected path crosses over the Ogalala Aquifer, the source of our nation's breadbasket and the water supply for millions. We cannot approve this pipeline and further jeopardize our already water insecure public.	WRG 01
MJ Albrecht	April 22, 2013	It creates just a few US jobs, and moves the Canadian oil south to the gulf area where the oil will be transported to markets outside the US. How is this good for the US?	PN 07
MJ Albrecht	April 22, 2013	Please reconsider the pipeline route. Putting the pipeline over the Ogallala Aquifer is a disaster ready to happen. Existing pipelines show us the question is not IF there will be a leak, but when, where, and how bad.	WRG 04
Mj Berry	April 22, 2013	Innovative green sources of sustainable energy are here now and are key to the future.	PN 02
Mjantz	April 21, 2013	One of our most precious natural resources is WATER. Over 90% of Nebraskans use the aquifer for their water supply-with droughts already across the state in Nebraska (thus creating a water shortage), what would the people do if their underground water supply was contaminated? This should not be about making more money for the oil companies (the companies that have a proven record of creating disasters with oil spills), this is about protecting our environment.	WRG 01, RISK 10
Mk V	April 15, 2013	And wildlife will be the INNOCENT hurt by the ignorance.	ACK
Mk V	April 15, 2013	There WILL be more spills	RISK 21
MMC Contractors	March 27, 2013	[The pipeilne] will be built by the UA, an organization with a stellar safety record achieved by highly-trained and skilled workers.	PD 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
MMC Contractors	March 27, 2013	…once the pipeline is complete, it will be monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week by a highly advanced system to prevent any potential enviornmental safety issues.	RISK 19
MMC Contractors	March 27, 2013	Only the safest, most advanced materails will be used in [the pipelines] construction.	RISK 19
Moina Mcmath-walton	April 4, 2013	The only new oil pipelines that need to be built are those that will replace the current aging system. And these must be fully paid for by the vast profits of the oil companies.	ACK
Molly Holman	March 11, 2013	Push investment in clean energy. If there are financial incentives, oil companies will surely change their focus.	ALT 01
Molly Kingston	April 4, 2013	Before moving forward on a decision that will Severely impact the climate and wildlife - let an unbiased scientific review of the risks determine whether increasing production and consumption of fossil fuels is worth it.	LEG 04
Molly Knox	April 1, 2013	We r sitting on top of so much of our own oil---we need to use our own resources and not subject ourselves to a very dangerous pipeline from a foreign country. Lets become independent of all foreign oil.	PN 05
Molly Maloney	March 10, 2013	The report that is informing your current decision has in part been drafted by parties who stand to profit if you green light it.	PRO 01
Molly Rothenberg	April 22, 2013	The pipeline creates only temporary jobs, whereas green energy investment creates permanent jobs. The pipeline is environmentally unsafe. The pipeline will not affect US energy independence: all of this oil is being sent to Texas for EXPORT.	SO 05
mona Lawrence	April 22, 2013	This is how facisism starts. Taking property by privately owned companies is just WRONG!!! HOW AM I TO PROTECT MY OWN HOME FROM THIS KIND TERRORISM!!!!!	LEG 02
Mona Mehdy	March 10, 2013	I am knowledgeable about and gravely concerned about numerous serious problems with this proposed activity: participation in and escalation of the ongoing destruction of the environment in Canada, current and future damage due to climate change especially by this carbon intensive fuel, risking leak and spill damage to domestic water supplies from the tar sands bitumen---chemical solvents mix which is toxic, and increased refinery activity to process the bitumen in the Houston area further exacerbating mortality and illness associated with the existing air pollution problems in the area.. It is vitally important to not allow further expansion of fossil fuel burning but rather it needs to be sharply curtailed. The economic and environmental impacts need to be fully assessed for now and for years in the future ; if you honestly do this, I believe you will conclude that this pipeline should not be built and I urge this path.	CU 02, CLIM 14, CU 04, PN 02, PN 08, RISK 12, WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mona Mitchell	April 10, 2013	The lack of actual news coverage on these oil spills should be ringing alarm bells. Not only is Exxon blocking reporters, but the spill by Houston isn't being covered at all. I found one small story on a Houston news station site, and it listed the location of the spill incorrectly. There are credible reports of Exxon clean up crews power washing oil into storm drains and covering up wildlife damage, and there is no information on the Shell spill. You want to let these people do more damage!?	ACK
Mona Turner	April 13, 2013	It is foolish to build such a long pipeline. Getting energy from local sources is much better - solar, geothermal, wind, etc. Money needs to be spent to further develop these kinds of clean and renewable energy sources.	PN 02
Monica Anderson	March 10, 2013	Readicker-Henderson, who has a been writing about Alaska for more than 30 years, notes that in the last ice age, it was the glaciers that were melting, but this time, it's the very ice beneath the earth, the permafrost. "Witnessing the disruption of migration patterns, seals that can't find fish, dying salmon, and a landscape changed, are like watching a horror film on fast-forward." (Jan/Feb 2013 Sierra Polarized)	ACK
Monica Anderson	March 10, 2013	The Army Corps of Engineers has identified 26 Alaskan communities that have erosion severe enough to require immediate government intervention as the rising seas chew away at their island. The estimated cost of moving them i$200 million.	ACK
Monica Anderson	March 10, 2013	The research and work of the World Bank, The Army Corps of Engineers, Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, University of Alaska paleobiologist Dale Guthrie, and writers such as Edward Readicker-Henderson make it impossible to be "willfully ignorant" in the discussion of climate change.	ACK
Monica Anderson	March 10, 2013	A report for the World Bank, Turn Down the Heat - Why a 4 degree C Warmer World Must be Avoided is available at climatechange.worldbank.org. is a good place to learn what we can do to save our planet.	REF
Monica Black	March 14, 2013	When we first moved to Tennessee in 1979 we had winter flocks of Evening Grosbeak numbering between 100 and 200. They were a winter delight that we looked forward to eagerly. Over the years the numbers steadily declined. We have not seen any Evening Grosbeak at all since the late 1990's. Populations of Evening Grosbeak have declined 80% or more in the last 40 years, primarily due to habitat destruction. They nest in the boreal forests of Canada...the same forests that are being erraticated by tar sands development. This is only one bird; there are many, many other stories similar to this. Not only do we no longer see Grosbeaks, we are seeing fewer and fewer birds at our feeder stations.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Monica Black	March 14, 2013	Instead of moving to more destructive oil sources we must move towards being a less wasteful energy society and move more rapidly to renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Monica Maloney	April 7, 2013	As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas), several major rivers (including the Missouri, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers), and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland.	ACK
Monica Maloney	April 7, 2013	I am concerned that the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on the Keystone XL pipeline underestimates the pipeline's health and environmental risks.	ACK
Monica Maloney	April 7, 2013	Moreover, tar sands oil produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than crude oil, which would make our climate change problem worse. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that Keystone XL would increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	ACK
Monica Wood	March 17, 2013	“climate change will have no significant impact upon either the construction, or the operation, of the Pipeline.” Well, that’s very nice, but the question I’m concerned with is what impact the Pipeline (with the attendant extraction of the tar sands) will have on climate change.	CLIM 12
Monique Reed	March 11, 2013	And we can't let the foxes run the henhouse. We can't use TransCanada's data and contractors provide the basis for approving this boondoggle.	PRO 01
Montie Annear	March 17, 2013	I've researched this topic. The damage to the enviornment, and to the health of the First Nations People and other Canadian citizens who live in the area has been proven to be deadly. This oil project is immoral. Blood will be on our hands.	CU 05
Moore	April 18, 2013	The United States government has spent $8 billion dollars over the last four years… This assessmentwams that staying on our current fossil fuel energy course will result in the worst-case scenario predicted. It says, " … climate change threatens human health and well-being in many ways, including impacts from increased extreme weather events, wildfire, decreased air quality, diseases transmitted by insects, and threats to food and water security. Some of these health impacts are already underway in the U.S."	CLIM 14
Moore	April 18, 2013	The SEIS does not consider the fact that tar sands oil is three times as carbon intensive, and the pipeline would hasten its extraction.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Morey Wolfson	April 17, 2013	If you don't have time to read 1 million people who are seriously concerned about this pipeline's ... consequences ... then perhaps you should listen to your own: "… By transforming to a low-carbon economy, we can stimulate global economic growth and put ourselves on a path of sustainable development for the 21st century." – Special Envoy for Climate Change Todd Stern, March 29, 2009	ACK
Morey Wolfson	April 17, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline... will ... greatly expand … the Alberta Tar Sands.	PN 06
Morgan Di Stefano	March 30, 2013	tar sands expend more energy to extract fuel for use than is collected from the extraction; thus, this is clearly a waste of time.	CLIM 05
Morna Childers	April 21, 2013	It puts over 50 bodies of water at risk--not counting groundwater reservoirs--thereby putting many human and animal communities at risk. What happens if there is an earthquake? pipe leak? terrorist attack?	WRS 01
Mr Joe Orawczyk	March 1, 2013	Tar sands consume too much water.	ACK
Ms. Alexandra Susan Keriakedes	April 22, 2013	Public Utilities Commission v. Pollack, Supreme Court justice William O. Douglas wrote: "The critical question of "standing" would be simplified and also put neatly in focus if we fashioned a federal rule that allowed environmental issues to be litigated before federal agencies or federal courts in the name of the inanimate object about to be despoiled, defaced, or invaded by roads and bulldozers and where injury is the subject of public outrage. Contemporary public concern for protecting nature's ecological equilibrium should lead to the conferral of "standing" upon environmental objects to sue for their own preservation.	REF
Ms. Christine O'Connor	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL is not about how much oil U.S. chooses to use, but rather it is about where the U.S. chooses to gets its oil.	ACK
Ms. Christine O'Connor	April 18, 2013	Canadian oil through Keystone XL will also replace the declining foreign oil that currently feed Gulf Coast refineries. This will help ensure ready access to secure, reliable crude oilfrom a friendly and policy-aligned partner in Canada.	PN 10
Ms. Christine O'Connor	April 18, 2013	Canadian oil sands development contributes to jobs and economic prosperity for our business, and there are many other U.S. businesses that benefit from the Canada-U.S. energy relationship.	SO 09
Muhammad	April 18, 2013	The pipeline also exposes itself as an environmental justice issue as well. The pipeline will not be built through pretty, gated, suburban developments. This pipeline would not be next to private schools or prestigious universities. It will be built next to neighborhoods and homes of people whose no is not as strong. We can let -- can we let the poor or minority population pay the price of a pipeline that will cost them their health?	EJ 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Mullaly Sean	April 17, 2013	and the latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete. It ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	ACK
Mullaly Sean	April 17, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands under-estimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because they don't account for a high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal: petroleum coke.	ACK
Mullaly Sean	April 17, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer,	WRG 06
Multer	April 22, 2013	There is a high incidence of cancer among Native Americans living downwind and down stream.	CU 05
Multer	April 22, 2013	Even with the rerouting, the pipeline will go across environmentally sensitive areas of our country including the Ogalalla aquifer. It will disrupt forest as well as farmland, with negative impact on families, communities and wildlife. There is no guarantee against leaks, and as the one in Arkansas is showing us, companies responsible can keep the press away so the severity of the problem is never known to the public.	WRG 01
Murphy Oil Company	April 9, 2013	Canadian oil sands industry has reduced its GHG intensity by 26% since 1990 and will continue to reduce this throught the development and implementation of new technology.	ACK
Murphy Oil Company	April 9, 2013	[Canadian oil sands producers are advancing enviromentally responsible oil sands development, especially as it realates to GHGs.	CLIM 14
Murphy Oil Company	April 9, 2013	[imports from canada's oil sands from Deystone XL will replace other heavy crudes coming from Mexico and Venezuela…]	PN 01
Murray Goldman	April 11, 2013	I recognize that many temporarary jobs would be created to lay the pipe lines, but the damage to the environment caused by tar sands leaking, supercedes that	PN 05
MurrayS	April 18, 2013	Tar sands require more energy to extract than crude oil. Burning tar sands causes more carbon emissions than crude oil.	CLIM 05
MurrayS	April 18, 2013	Wildlife habitat around the tar sands would be reduce in both quantity and quality.	CU 01
MurrayS	April 18, 2013	The increase in risk for environmental and health imacts, should leaks and spills occur, is too high. If leakage less than 2% is not even detectable, the amount of pipeline contents leaking into water tables is unacceptable.	RISK 15
Muse Stancil	April 17, 2013	The pipeline will generate ecomonic opportunity and jobs along the route, and throughout the US.	SO 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Muse Stancil	April 19, 2013	My company's business is a clear example that importing oil from Canada creates jobs and economic growth in the U.S. Canadian oil through Keystone XL will also replace the declining foreign oil that currently feed Gulf Coast refineries. This will help ensure ready access to secure, reliable crude oil from a friendly and policy-aligned partner in Canada.	PN 10
My Soul Earth Kearnes	April 22, 2013	We need renewable eneregy.	PN 02
Myers William George	April 13, 2013	Ought we not to be listening to the indigenous people of Canada and other Canadian residents who don't want tar sands pipelines across their country either?	ACK
Myers William George	April 13, 2013	It is difficult for me to comprehend how our State Department can claim that the proposed Keystone pipeline will "not likely result in significant adverse environmental effects" when reputable scientists are saying that if the tar sands crude product is burned it could raise carbon dioxide levels to 600 parts per million.	CLIM 13
Myers William George	April 13, 2013	It is time for this country to stop supporting economic means that depend on "business as usual" for the wealthy industrial people to become wealthier and to seriously look at the development of cleaner ways of producing energy and the jobs that go with that development.	PN 03
MyersC	April 18, 2013	KXL is a crime against humanity, from the indigenous people lying near the tar sands to those living in poverty and pollution near the Texas refineries. And now routing KXL through the Heartland, you can add rural Americans as a minority to whom you turn a deaf ear.	EJ 01
MyersC	April 18, 2013	Our state senators and TransCanada struck a bargain to placate the citizens by moving the route very minimally, while our greatest concern, the aquifer, was not even taken into consideration.	WRG 01
MyersC	April 18, 2013	Here are the exact words from the study, quote, "Some segments of the proposed project route would cross areas that are considered high-consequence areas due to potential risks to sensitive drinking water sources." And it goes on to say, "High-consequence areas of drinking water data are pending and will be included in the final." President Obama's primary concern in delaying the KXL permit was to assure the safety of our drinking water. Yet, this is not in our -- the current study the way it is written for our review.	WRG 01, RISK 16
Mymuna	April 2, 2013	The detriments of this choice [pipeline] from the literature I read on this topic seem to be greater than the benefits due to the basic component of time itself and the limitation if it in respect to our environmental conditions.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Myra Boime	April 7, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands.	PN 05
Myra Delay	April 16, 2013	The draft environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline issued by the State Dept. was little more than a whitewash. I demand a comprehensive, in-depth review of the true environmental costs of this pipeline on our climate, lands, water, and communities.	LEG 04
Myrna Fox	April 2, 2013	The mining of this tar sands destroys carbon absorbing forests and exposes gunky tar sands to the elements.	ACK
Myrna Fox	April 2, 2013	Please reject the latest faulty report on the purported "safety" of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.	LEG 04
Myrna Fox	April 2, 2013	the proponents of the pipeline do not tell truths. Promised jobs---there will be a few jobs in construction, which will go away when the pipeline is done. Energy security for the US---There will be no energy security for the US, when the plan for the crude is to be refined in Texas and sent overseas for sale.	PN 04, PN 01, SO 04
Myrna Fox	April 2, 2013	The abrasiveness of the substance erodes pipelines from the inside out. Spills will happen. They already have.	RISK 11
Myrna Goldman	April 5, 2013	Please do not allow this potential environmental disaster to go forward. We must focus on more environmentally friendly methods to obtain energy and not rely on fossil fuels (…..)	ALT 01
Myrna Tuttle	March 15, 2013	Please do NOT add to the carbon pollution by allowing the Keystone XL project to go forward! We need to invest in CLEAN energy and listen to the top scientists who say that Keystone XL is the DIRTIEST way to extract oil from the planet! We need to create CLEAN ENERGY JOBS, not more global warming jobs!	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Myron Wernette	April 17, 2013	Finally; Please follow our own "Government Accounting Office" recent report that indicated there is ABSOLUTELY no reason for the Keystone XL Pipeline because our North American Railway System not only has the ability to handle all this Heavy Crude Oil NOW, but has the infrastructure in place and equipment available to handle future needs. The railroads can move the crude safely where ever it needs to be refined without any public/government funding so that money can be used to hire more people for long-lasting good paying jobs instead of "short-term" jobs to build a dangerous pipeline with more government spending and the foreign corporations in Saudi Arabia & the Netherlands (Dutch Royal Shell) laughing all the way to their foreign bank$$$$! Railroads have proven their "Environmental Friendliness."	ALT 04
N Edwards	April 17, 2013	PLEASE FOCUS ON CLEAN ENERGY SOURCES.	PN 02
N Wilhelm	March 16, 2013	… high risk of environmental damage in building and operating the pipeline	ACK
N Wilhelm	March 16, 2013	2. Our country needs to work on cleaner, renewable energy and not on processing the dirtiest oil that there is. 3. Renewable energy and new reserves of gas in Ohio and Pennsylvania will create a lot more jobs than KXL	ALT 01
Nadine Fahrlander	April 22, 2013	I am deeply concerned about the impact of the Keystone pipeline on Nebraska soil and water, especially the Ogallala aquifer.	ACK
Nadine Fahrlander	April 22, 2013	Instead, look for ways to promote renewable energy, like geothermal, solar, wind, that do not destroy the environment.	PN 02
Naima Shea	April 2, 2013	Invest all those oil company subsidies in solar, wind and other innovative NON TOXIC alternatives.	ALT 01
Name not available	April 13, 2013	I am opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline project for a number of reasons, including the fact that I believe it will undermine our national energy security.	PN 01
Name not available	April 15, 2013	The pipeline may provide short-term benefit for advantaged sectors of society but will not support long-term, sustainable management of our communities, resources or environment. I urge you to prioritize sustainable energy solutions, uphold international commitments, and focus policy efforts on bringing balance between our human interactions and our world.	PN 02, CLIM 18
Name not available	April 15, 2013	I am afraid that this development will result in the continued exploitation of oil resources, pollution of water and pristine wetland habitats and industrial deforestation in Canada.	PN 06
Name not available	April 23, 2013	Although the United States is still fighting to recover jobless numbers, the Keystone XL Pipeline would only help perpetuate jobs of the 19th and 20th centuries. A transition to renewable energy (e.g. solar, wind, geothermal) is the direction of the 21st century, and should be the direction of our country.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Name not available	April 23, 2013	No Alternative: Without construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, there are few economically viable ways to bring tar sands oil to refineries and markets. The assertion that this fuel will be produced regardless of the pipeline is misguided and ignores the consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree that construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline will make the difference in tar sands development.	PN 06
Name not available	April 23, 2013	This pipeline would facilitate the easy extraction, transit, and combustion of a fuel that would result in devastating environmental consequences.	PN 06
Name not available	April 23, 2013	Our finding that TransCanada's application is not in the national interest of the United States stems from three primary claims: the economy, climate change, and tar sands exploration. 1) The Economy The State Department has stated that TransCanada's claim of 20,000 U.S. jobs created during construction is overstated. The State Department's estimate is closer to 6,000 jobs, almost all of which would be temporary*. The consequences of burning tar sands oil is not worth the potential for job creation. * http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123_162-57361212/keystone-pipeline-how-many-jobs-really-at-stake/	SO 02
Name not provided	March 15, 2013	Gains in Monana Business Activity Stemming from Keystone Pipeline Investments: A County-Level Analyais of Economic and Tax Benefits. The Perryman Group. June 2010. See attached.	REF
Name not provided	March 15, 2013	Haul Route Agreement - Attached	REF
Name not provided	March 15, 2013	Our local electric co-op will be providing power to the pump station. With the added power load the cost of electricity to the local co- op membership should remain stable for an extended period. The base electric rate could be reduced by one half for the co-op's seventeen hundred plus members.	SO 10
Name not provided	March 15, 2013	The first pumping station in the US on the pipeline will be in the northern portion of Phillips County. Keystone Pipeline construction will create temporary jobs for approximately a year to a year and a half. Many of these workers will stay in our small towns supporting the local community by renting lots, buying food, gas and other items as necessary. The purchase or rental of equipment needed during construction of the pipeline and transmission line to service the pumping station will create additional jobs. Gravel for the project in Phillips County will be purchased from a local rancher. The crushing and hauling of the gravel creates more jobs. These are just a few examples of the positive impacts our county will incur by the increased local business.	SO 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Name not provided	March 15, 2013	The project when completed will provide long term tax base to the six counties where the pipeline will be constructed. Fifty percent of the taxes collected will go to the state of Montana to fund schools all across the state. The taxes are estimated at sixty million dollars. Thirty million dollars will go to the state and thirty million dollars will go to the si x counties and thei r school districts.	SO 14
Name not provided	April 22, 2013	One glaring externality that was not addressed adequately during the public hearing was decommisioning the pipeline.	PD 02
Name not provided	April 22, 2013	[Several references cited in scanned document]	REF
Name unavailable	March 1, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will not reduce America's dependence on foreign oil, or do anything to get us off oil completely, which is key to America's national security future.	PN 01
Name unavailable	March 1, 2013	An increase in fuel economy of just 2.5 mpg would completely eliminate the need for all of the oil carried by the Keystone XL pipeline.	PN 02
Nan Burritt	March 15, 2013	Considering that climate change is upon us and that we NEED to make better choices for our generation and those to come, saying NO to the pipeline is a good start.	CLIM 14
Nan Burritt	March 15, 2013	Please do not allow the Keystone XL pipeline to go through. This pipeline is detrimental to American citizens' health and our environment.	RISK 07
Nancy Abrams	March 18, 2013	This pipeline is only postponing the inevitable, but to a time when it will be harder to solve our energy problems since fewer options will be left	PN 09
Nancy Aden	April 22, 2013	The claims of new jobs are far overrated; and we should be focusing on clean energy.	SO 02
Nancy Aden	April 22, 2013	I believe it is a major risk to the water system in NE; the risk to the environment of a spill of tar sands is too great.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Nancy Aktas	April 4, 2013	I am extremely upset to learn from the recent tar sands bitumen type oil spill in Arkansas, that the private oil companies do not pay a cent into the clean-up fund for this. With all the talk of budget responsibility, where is the logic in this ?...Plus, we already know that the bogus SEIS was written by an affiliated firm connected with the Alberta projects.	RISK 03, PRO 01, SO 15
Nancy Allpress	April 22, 2013	This pipeline is not in the national interests of the United States. It will not create permanent jobs, it will not reduce our energy dependence.	PN 04
Nancy Allpress	April 22, 2013	The required study on the corrosiveness of DilBit has not been completed. Additionally, study on oil leak detection has not been completed.	RISK 28
Nancy Allpress	April 22, 2013	I would respectfully request that the route be moved far away from the Ogallala Aquifer and our sandhills. Contrary to the DEQ report and TransCanadas assertions, the current proposed route still crosses the aquifer and sandhills.	WRG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Anderson	March 19, 2013	How is it in our national interest to intensify climate change for a minimal temporary and even fewer longterm jobs? Scientists, members of Congress, members of the UN Security Council, and retired U.S. military officers have drawn attention to the consequences for our national security of climate change, including the destabilizing effects of storms, droughts, and floods. Domestically, the effects of climate change could overwhelm our capacity to respond. http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2013/03/climate-change-more-katrinas/ Internationally, climate change is causing humanitarian disasters, contributing to political violence, and undermining weak governments. We are in an all hands on deck situation regarding climate change. Changing course before we consign our great grandchildren and their descendants to an uninhabitable planet is a moral imperative.	PN 05
Nancy Anderson	March 19, 2013	This claim stems largely from the report's assumption that tar sands oil will be extracted and burned anyway – by somebody -- regardless of US action. First, this argument is specious because as Jane Kleeb, director of Bold Nebraska, has said: "Why would TransCanada spend billions on building the pipeline and millions on lobbying unless this piece of infrastructure is the — not a — but the linchpin for the expansion of tar sands?" Other potential routes to China and beyond are being challenged and will continue to be blocked by concerned people across Canada and the United States working to keep tar sands in the ground, opposing pipeline construction through British Columbia and pipeline reversals in Maine. Secondly, even if somehow the bulk of Canadian tar sands finds its way to export eventually, it is not in our national interest to facilitate it.	PN 08, PN 06
Nancy Bennett	March 28, 2013	It is absurd to give lip-service to fighting climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet	PN 05, CLIM 12
Nancy Black	March 16, 2013	Regarding cultural impacts, First Nations and indigenous cultures around the world are protesting the pipeline, with their popular #IdleNoMore call	ACK
Nancy Black	March 16, 2013	The energy and profit provided are not to our own national benefit, but rather to a foreign company and market. Our nation takes all the risk and sees little benefit.	PN 07
Nancy Black	March 16, 2013	It has our country be more at risk for spills and environmental catastrophe, with new, wide-open targets for terrorism.	RISK 04
Nancy Black	March 16, 2013	There are no real economic benefits to the US to allowing this pipeline by a foreign country to cross our entire continent. Most jobs provided will be temporary and outsourced. No new industries will be developed, and few permanent jobs created.	SO 04
Nancy Bostick-ebbert	March 14, 2013	As a former pipeline worker, I can safely say the money is best spent creating renewable energy and jobs that will last.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Carnal	March 11, 2013	You must consider accurate values of CO2 emission associated with obtaining, processing and burning oil from tar sands. In my professional lifetime as a plant biologist (40 years), I have seen CO2 levels rise from 330 ppm to current 395ppm. Look at the exponential curve of CO2 increase vs year for the past 50 -60 years, i.e. over the time it has been monitored; it is frightening. We are already at a monstrous imbalance of CO2 emissions and release relative to plant and other processes that utilize and sequester CO2. The tar sands boondoggle will add billions more tons of carbon pollution to the atmosphere. The climate consequences of increased CO2 concentration are of immense concern. We must develop other energy technologies.	CLIM 05
Nancy Carnal	March 11, 2013	I understand most of the oil will be sold to markets other than the US, so the whiners about how we need the oil are lying to all of us that developing these tar sands and pumping derived oil across the US is somehow going to reduce our dependence on middle east foreign oil and drive down gasoline prices. It is not worth the potential climate consequences to fuel this falsity.	PN 01
Nancy Champion	March 28, 2013	America will bear all the environmental impact for oil destined mainly for foreign markets.	PN 07
Nancy Champion	April 9, 2013	This review should be conducted by truly independent researchers dedicated to a scientific, objective fact finding mission….not hand picked industry insiders with multiple conflicts of interest whitewashing an advance of industry agenda.	PRO 01
Nancy Clark	March 5, 2013	This pipeline may create jobs, but the probability of it creating much bigger environmental problems is much worse than any job.	PN 02
Nancy Daly	March 14, 2013	We do not and never will accept a report on the pipeline paid for by proponents of the pipeline!	PRO 01
Nancy Deren	April 21, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is all about getting tar sands to international markets in order to get international pricing, which means higher prices for Americans, who will NOT be the recipients of this dangerous, dirty, and destructive fossil fuel.	PN 07
Nancy Devries	April 3, 2013	The impact of a old pipe pumping 3 times the tar sand oil it did when it was new needs to be investigated. I am concerned on the number of gas and oil leaks that happen throughout the country.	RISK 14
Nancy Feinstein	March 28, 2013	It is not just a mistake because scientists have united around saying that investing in this new kind of oil, is the end-game - and everyone knows that we have to stop just adding, but need to start doing something about consumption.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Forst Williamson	April 22, 2013	Invest in solar, wind energy, and alternate fuel vehicles instead. There is a sensible answer here.	PN 02
Nancy Golubski	April 13, 2013	Look what has just recently happened to three different pipelines - doesn't that give pause to what WILL happen with the Keystone XL pipeline? Do we need more "clean up" where the company responsible isn't the company liable and it once again falls on the tax payers of this country to clean up their mess?	RISK 03
Nancy Hamilton	April 3, 2013	There is no longer any reason to believe that oil companies can manage oil safely without devastating spills, no matter how often the oil company executives say that it won't happen again.	RISK 14
Nancy Hanson-bergstrom	April 11, 2013	We as a country should focus more directly on sustainable energy sources and not prolong our focus on fossil fuels.	PN 02
Nancy Hiestand	April 11, 2013	As a teacher, parent, and grandparent, I strongly oppose the proposed Keystone XL pipeline because I believe that the health of people all over and the environment are much more important to our future than corporate profits. There are alternatives that can serve us well if we would only give them the attention they require.	PN 02
Nancy Hilding	April 3, 2013	Prairie Hills Audubon Society has commented on the XL Pipeline before and received CD copies of earlier XL Pipeline NEPA Documents. We do not remember getting a post card notice for this SEIS, a letter notice for the SEIS or CD copy of this SEIS and have only heard about it from third parties. Your web site has 1. No contact information with a phone number to call 2. No link to the Federal Register notice so one can easily figure out the comment deadline 3. An absolutely ridiculous SEIS downloading index page, requiring 98 actions to download the SEIS	PRO 03
Nancy Hilding	April 3, 2013	We have commented before, both in person at hearing and via writing and we request a CD. We request you reformat your web page to offer an efficient downloading option.	PRO 03
Nancy Hilding	April 3, 2013	We read many NEPA documents and deeply resent the waste of our time you require from us via this cumbersome downloading and filing system that will be required to be done before anyone can to read this SEIS. We believe this bizarre downloading scheme will prevent people from reading the document.	PRO 03
Nancy Hilding	April 3, 2013	We read NEPA documents all the time and have never seen such a clumsy and time consumptive downloading system, offered as the only option.	PRO 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	The KXL route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department.	CR 02
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	Diluted bitumen (dilbit) is not considered oil by the IRS, which would allow TransCanada to evade paying taxes into the Oil Spill and Liability Trust, a fund used to clean up oil spills. Indeed dilbit is not oil; it is far more dangerous to the public. A toxic sludge of chemicals and peanut-butter thick tar sands oil, dilbit sinks in water and is proving to be impossible to clean up.	LEG 08
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	The potential for huge oil spill catastrophe and myriad environmental problems with this project is large. We believe that the regulation of large capacity and long pipelines, that carry high volume of toxic, corrosive and abrasive materials, needs to be permitted under a different federal agency than it currently is. The State Department should not be the only federal agency approving this, but should merely be a collaborating agency working with a primary environmental and engineering agency that is truly in charge of all such pipelines and required to approve them under laws and regulation, which allow for an option of denying a permit. … We are dissatisfied with the provisions for protection of the environment as the pipeline becomes obsolete, worn out and nearing closure. We are dissatisfied with the provisions for handling and removal the defunct and not operational pipeline.	LEG 22, LEG 11, RISK 23
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	Additional alternative are needed: another alternative should be provided which requires purchase of pipeline that mined and made in America and also to requires that the pipeline walls are thicker and of improved engineering grade and performance.	PD 06
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	The entire KXL review process is broken. Conflicts of interest have riddled every review and each report has ignored very important environmental concerns.	PRO 01
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	Pipelines leak. Many of those leaks are major and pose immense dangers to the public. According to Dr. Stansbury, UNL Professor of Environmental and Water Resources Engineering conducted a study showing that the KXL would result in 91 major spills over the 50 year life of the pipeline.	RISK 13
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	The KXL holds more economic risks than profits. The job creation claims being made by pipeline supporters and some media outlets are wildly exaggerated. … an independent study done by Cornell estimates the number to be closer to 2,000 temporary jobs, and that the KXL could kill more jobs than it actually creates. The most recent State Department EIS estimates that the KXL will only create 35 jobs.	SO 05, SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Hilding	April 23, 2013	We are especially concerned for the impacts to the rivers and streams it crosses, and in addition to the pollution and stream integrity impacts, recreational impacts need to be considered.	WRS 01, LU 05
Nancy Hoecker	March 11, 2013	My solution would be a carbon tax that would be rebated to citizens to use for weatherizing, reducing fuel use, solarizing, and small scale energy projects.	SO 16
Nancy J. Peek	April 22, 2013	America and Canada need to invest in a progressive energy future not the failed and cracking pipelines of the past.	PN 02
Nancy Jordan	April 12, 2013	A caustic substance as are the tar sands under pressure in this pipeline poses even more danger of a leak than a regular oil pipeline. Also this substance is difficult if not almost impossible to clean up There is a special problem in water as it sinks rather than floating	RISK 14
Nancy Jordan	April 12, 2013	As for jobs not many & mostly temporary. The Canadians want to use us as their supply route because their own people don`t want it crossing their land. We would be taking a lot of risk for no good reason!	SO 04
Nancy Knechtel	April 20, 2013	it won't make your life any better but it will destroy the quality of life of Americans and Canadians for generations to come.	PN 05
Nancy Knight	March 10, 2013	I have learned that the State Dept.used one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write the report on the Keystone Pipeline. I am begging you to look at the climate, not this flawed report, and to act to prevent the pipelines destructive effects!	PRO 01
Nancy Kops	April 5, 2013	Canadians do not want the pipeline to travel through their land.	ACK
Nancy Kops	April 5, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Nancy Kops	April 5, 2013	Tar sands are a highly toxic form of energy. Recent spills of tar sands clearly demonstrate that there is no effective way to clean up the inevitable spills that occur.	RISK 12
Nancy Kops	April 5, 2013	The populations where the tar sands will be processed will also be subjected to high levels of polluted air. Do we really want jobs that carry huge costs to our society? How great can jobs be which cost people their health and lives?	RISK 17, CU 08
Nancy Mauter	March 16, 2013	It is not what this country needs to move forward towards clean energies. Every aspect of this project is bad for the environment. As a nation we need to move towards energy sources that help reduce our CO2 emissions	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Mccoy	March 14, 2013	I live in Wyoming where in August of 2006 a gas well blow out occured which contaminated an aquafir that residents depended on for drinking water...We are still dealing with the consequence of that day...Please don't let the Keystone XL go through. The oil and gas companies claim how safe it is and also how profitable it would be to the communities. It turned out to be a disaster for us and we saw no financial gain. The company and people at fault are scrambling and finding their loopholes to move on and leave us and Wyoming to clean up their mess.	ACK
Nancy Mcpherson	March 28, 2013	The tar sands extraction and XL pipeline harm native peoples of Canada and the U.S. in contravention to the Convention on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	LEG 01
Nancy Mcrae-case	April 22, 2013	We need to start investing in clean, green energy NOW!	PN 02
Nancy Moline	April 9, 2013	I also believe the fact that the pipeline is to handle tar sands to be *exported* is glossed over in the media, and reducing our dependence on foreign oil is not going to be impacted by exporting.	PN 04
Nancy Mueller	March 24, 2013	We will not survive if we continue to increase our use of carbon fuels, especially this ultra dirty fuel whose pipelines threaten our environment including water.	PN 02
Nancy Mueller	April 22, 2013	Mining it and transporting it and refining it will emit more dangerous pollutants into the air than the energy is worth.	ACK
Nancy Mueller	April 22, 2013	It will leak, destroying precious land and water resources.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Nancy Nickerson	March 11, 2013	We must invest in clean energy for the sake of our children and our environment.	PN 02
Nancy Nickerson	March 11, 2013	The latest Keystone study is flawed and was produced by interested parties - NOT an unbiased and uninvolved source.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Packard	April 22, 2013	At the Department of State website, under the heading "Climate Change" I read of the Department's recognition of and commitment to combat Climate Change. Following are introductory sentences to the two paragraphs: "The United States is taking a leading role in addressing climate change by advancing an ever-expanding suite of measures." and "The international community recognizes the importance of moving forward collaboratively in addressing climate change. " In the next section, "U.S. Fast Start Climate Finance in Fiscal Years 2010-2012", I learn that "The United States has provided $7.5 billion during the three-year fast start finance period." This section discusses funds that our country has contributed to, including Clean Technology Fund, Special Climate Change Fund, and FCPC Carbon Fund. Nearly every science scholar agrees that Climate Change is upon us. National Geographic and other publications and sources are documenting it. As excerpted above, the Department of State acknowledges Climate Change and is putting effort and a great deal of funding to combat it. How then can we consider participating in the destructive and climate-changing business of mining and transporting and refining and burning Canadian tarsands?	CLIM 14
Nancy Phipps	April 20, 2013	And that oil isn't even going to do this country any good. Someone else gets it.	PN 07
Nancy Roebuck	April 2, 2013	Just look at the Kalamazoo River spill. It has taken 2 years and the clean-up is still not complete. The tar sands oil sinks so can't be skimmed. The Arkansas spill has only begun to be evaluated for the damage. Mostly, it's just not worth the environmental jeopardy to bring this terrible product through the US.	PN 05
Nancy Schietzelt	April 4, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Nancy Scott	April 13, 2013	Athough I'm not sure if this statement is accurate, I heard that the oil will be sold to other countries once it reaches the Gulf of Mexico. If this is true and if we do not intend this oil for our own use, there is even more reason not to take the risks associated with this pipeline.	PN 07
Nancy Seaberg	March 14, 2013	Keystone XL….will not help make us energy independent. It is flowing from Canada through the US and exported from Texas to China, etc. Keystoe XL is owned by a Canadian Company which is owned by a Chinese Company.	PN 04
Nancy Seaberg	April 1, 2013	They are taking natural resources out of the United States and Canada and SELLING them to other countries. This is supposed to leave us energy independent. How I do not know.	PN 07
Nancy Seats	April 4, 2013	it will contribute to climate change that will affect all of humanity	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nancy Sebelius	April 15, 2013	In western Kansas and Nebraska, with the Keystone XL pipeline so perilously close, or above the Ogalallah Aquifer, and with so many oil spills, many Kansans and Nebraskans may have to choose between safe, clean water, and oil.	WRG 01
Nancy Tollefson	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will also result in… more global warming pollution.	CLIM 14
Nancy Tollefson	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will also result in more tar sands development	PN 06
Nancy Watts	April 9, 2013	All Americans, suffer the consequences of water pollution, air pollution, and death of species. Perhaps the dramatic uptick in Autism and other nerve disorders and immune disorders are due to the same facts...pollution and GE products.	ACK
Nancy York	April 10, 2013	...bitumen is junk energy. A joule, or unit of energy, invested in extracting and processing bitumen returns only four to six joules in the form of crude oil. Because almost all of the input energy in tar sands production comes from fossil fuels, the process generates significantly more carbon dioxide than conventional oil production.	CLIM 05
Nancy York	April 10, 2013	The most obvious reason to reject the pipeline is that tar sands production is one of the world's most environmentally damaging activities. It wrecks vast areas of boreal forest through surface mining and subsurface production. It sucks up huge quantities of water from local rivers, turns it into toxic waste and dumps the contaminated water into tailing ponds that now cover nearly 70 square miles.	CU 07, CU 02
Nanne Olds	April 22, 2013	A few thousand jobs is NOT worth poisoning our water and land. Why wont Canada run this pipeline across its own land? And this oil will NOT benefit the U.S. Once Canada has the oil in the refineries on the Texas coast, it will simply sell that oil to the highest bidder.	ALT 05
Naomi Franklin	April 20, 2013	Desecration of forests/lands by surface extraction (i.e. mountain top removal). Release of toxins: components of mined fossil fuels or of extraction process.	ACK
Naomi Franklin	April 20, 2013	Exaggerated release of carbon dioxide, thence Climate Change.	ACK
Naomi Franklin	April 20, 2013	Diversion of funding from Safe and Sustainable Energy development.	PN 03
Naomi Franklin	April 20, 2013	Likelihood of pipeline failures, thence oil spills from Canada to Texas, as now in Arkansas. Contamination of clean water sources.	RISK 07
Naomi Sobo	April 15, 2013	Tar Sands oil is a very dirty way to obtain energy and creates a mess that is almost impossible to clean up if there is a break in the pipeline.	RISK 08
Naomi Spinak	April 17, 2013	If we take a stand, Canada may decide it is not cost effective to develop the tar sands at all.	PN 06
Naomi Tellez	March 18, 2013	The investment into alternative energy sources such as wind and solar projects are of the highest public interest at this time.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Naomi Tellez	March 18, 2013	Today, with long-term environmental damage resulting from the use of fossil fuels, in addition to the economic climate, it is clear that the most widely beneficial energy projects for both the public welfare and for the economy are those dedicated to sustainability. Therefore, it is hard to believe that in 2013, a project as environmentally dangerous as this the Keystone XL Pipeline would even be considered	PN 05
Naomi Tepper	April 2, 2013	Oil pipelines spilling into our communities and wildlands is completely unacceptable.	ACK
Naomi Tepper	April 2, 2013	Invest in solar and wind.	ALT 01
Naomi Zurcher	April 3, 2013	The fuel is being exported once it arrives in Texas so it won't effect fuel supply in the States,[and] it's not going to provide all those promised (tongue in cheek) local jobs all along the path of the pipeline.	PN 07
Naples, Jean M.	March 16, 2013	Burning this oil will yield annual greenhouse gas emissions roughly 17 percent higher than the average crude oil used in the United States.	CLIM 12
Naples, Jean M.	March 16, 2013	….[report] fails to consider the cumulative year-after-year effect of steadily increasing production from a deposit that is estimated to hold 170 billion barrels of oil that can be recovered with today's technology…	CLIM 13
Naples, Jean M.	March 16, 2013	he environmental damage involves the destruction of the forests that lie atop the sands and are themselves an important storehouse for carbon, and the streams that flow through them.	CU 01
Natalia Emlen	April 18, 2013	As a country and a planet, we cannot afford the higher carbon emissions that the Keystone XL pipeline will lock us into for the foreseeable future.	CLIM 14
Natalia Emlen	April 18, 2013	The Pipeline will generate something like 35 permanent jobs, fairly insignificant when compared to its long-lasting ill effects.	PN 05
Natalie Giguere	April 8, 2013	Please say no to Keystone XL and help keep us and futur generations to be safe from ecological disasters like the one in Arkansas that poured 84,000 gallons of tar sands into Arkansas backyards	ACK
Natalie Glynn	March 11, 2013	Capitalism responds to incentives. Current incentives promote environmental degradation. In order to have a competitive economy, we must create incentives to move toward a renewable energy system as well as disincentives to move away from our dependence on oil and coal.	ALT 01
Natalie Joubert	March 21, 2013	the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Natalie Joubert	March 21, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Natalie Joubert	March 21, 2013	We respectfully request that the State Department expeditiously finalize the Draft SEIS and ultimately grant TransCanada the Presidential Permit necessary to begin building the pipeline.	PN 10
Natalie Joubert	March 21, 2013	the draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude amongst Gulf refineries. Even with these less attractive alternatives, rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands. With an additional 57 mitigation measures, Keystone XL is still the smartest choice. By supporting domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security.	PN 12
Natalie Joubert	March 26, 2013	I would like to commend the State Department for executing a thorough and transparent Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL project. In this latest iteration, the State Department again concludes that the Keystone XL project will have minimal environmental impact due to extensive mitigation efforts to be undertaken by TransCanada. I now urge the State Department to finalize the SEIS expeditiously in order to complete a second National Interest determination. Swift action now will allow this vital infrastructure project to move forward after four years of extensive study.	ACK
Natalie Joubert	March 26, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region . Alternative transport methods- namely rail and barge - will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions. Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods. For all these reasons, pipelines carry nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported domestically.	ALT 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Natalie Joubert	March 26, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2 .05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Natalie Joubert	March 26, 2013	With an additional 57 mitigation measures, Keystone XL is still the smartest choice.We respectfully request that the State Department expeditiously finalize the Draft SEIS and ultimately grant TransCanada the Presidential Permit necessary to begin building the pipeline.	PN 10
Natalie Macknight	April 9, 2013	It's become so clear in recent events that oil companies are incapable of preventing massive spills and even less capable of cleaning up and mitigating the damage. The Keystone XL pipeline will be no exception.	RISK 14
Natalie Schwarz	April 22, 2013	I have seen a map that already has a pipe cutting across Nebraska, what is wrong with this option? TransCanada doesnt have a problem with using this route, so why does the State Department?	ALT 03
Natalie Schwarz	April 22, 2013	I urge you as a Nebraskan and an eco-sensitive American that you change the path of the pipeline to NOT go through the Sandhills and over the aquifer...Think about the harm that can be done to the eco-system if and when there is an oil leak. You and the State Department are risking no only the Sandhills but the only viable water source for the state its population and farmers. I am not against getting oil from Canada but I am against having it endanger the ecosystem of my state. Find another route listen to the American people for a change and not be persuaded by corporate greed.	WRG 04, ALT 06
Natalie Shapiro	April 18, 2013	should be investing in cleaner sources of energy, such as wind energy.	PN 02
Natalie Shapiro	April 18, 2013	I am also concerned about the impact of Keystone on aquifers in the Midwest that are vulnerable to contamination by oil spills.	RISK 07
Nate Marino	April 15, 2013	After what happened a few weeks ago in Arkansas, you simply cannot approve this pipeline. Between the lack of effective cleanup methods, to the corporate denial of fiscal responsibility for a cleanup, and the inevitability of pipeline failure this is a non starter.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nate Morris	April 20, 2013	The Sandhills and Ogallala Aquifer are unique and precious natural resources that must be protected. Any oil spill through this region would contaminate one of the largest sources of fresh water used to produce food in the world, impacting the health of millions.	RISK 10
Nathalie Black	April 9, 2013	But even a spill from railway tank cars would not be as disastrous to an indispensable resource, the aquifer, as a pipeline spill contaminating the aquifer.	RISK 07
Nathalie Black	April 9, 2013	It is an especial concern that the pipeline would cross the Ogalala Aquifer, a source of water for several states. Any contamination of this major water resource could be calamitous for our nation, affecting a crucial agricultural area and also the daily ives of millions of citizens. Water, essential for life, is not just another consideration, another topic for analysis. Any risk to that resource must outweigh short term economic benefits,	WRG 01
Nathan Brandt	April 20, 2013	Increased oil and gas development and refinery activity creates more American jobs. Increased oil and gas development and refinery activity adds tax revenue to state and local governments.	SO 08
Nathan Empsall	April 23, 2013	Last month, we saw a tarsands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. This spill is yet one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. The Arkansas spill also highlighted numerous unanswered questions that must be addressed before we allow a tar sands pipeline nearly 10 times the size of the Pegasus line to bisect our country and run through one of our most important aquifers.	ACK
Nathan Empsall	April 23, 2013	Many of the administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if we also develop the tar sands.	CLIM 18
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Tribal stories and activities may now have to change to describe what used to be there, free of pipelines and ancillary structures, but will have to view the landscape, as long lineal feature, that abruptly interrupting the integrity of tribal cultural landscapes.	ACK
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline is expected to pipe 830,000 barrels per day, which could be absorbed by current and additional rail projects but without the environmental impacts and risks that oil pipelines can have.	ALT 04
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Air Quality sections of Affected Environment address federal and state air quality regulations, does not examine or consider tribal regulations...Because air quality will be impacted and transported across administrative boundaries, the SEIS must review any and all tribal air quality regulations/standards and address how tribal air quality would be impacted.	AQN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The PA is problematic because it establishes an agreement and included and excluded tribes from fair and reasonable participation in the NHPA process.	CR 01
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Tribal consultation was insufficient. Consultation did not occur with the [Shoshone Bannock] Tribes.	CR 01
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Cultural resource inventories must include tribal members and their resource specialists in both field surveys and final determinations ofNRHP eligibility.	CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Our Tribal members use affected tribal and federal lands for cultural purposes. There are culturally significant sites in the affected area and sites that are protected under state, federal and tribal laws that are likely to be impacted from the Keystone Pipeline.	CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Potential impacts on the environment and how it would impact [tribal] hunting and fishing rights protected by Treaty are never addressed.	CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	the lists of cultural resources under Table 3.11-2, Table 3.11-3, and Table 3.11-4 seem incredibly few for the length of pipeline and this greatly concerns our Tribe not only of because of misclassified cultural resources, but also ~t ~ultural resource rich area seem to have been missed or unreported resources.	CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Tribes were precluded from having any opportunity m the cultural resource assessments and final determinations of NRHP eligibility for historic and prehistoric sites, including lithic deposits, stone circles, and other prehistoric cultural resources important to the Tribes and other tribes. [As a result, the Tribes] are concerned about misclassifications of our prehistoric resources. which greatly reduces the number of NRHP eligible sites.	CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Tribes believe the inclusion of a large pipeline would adversely affect the integrity of the [Lewis and Clark] National Historic Trail, and those impacts would be difficult to mitigate.	CR 06
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The CEA does not accurately depict impacts from refmery expansions as may occur once Keystone Pipeline is in place.	CU 09
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA) uses a CEA matrix to illustrate subjective connected and cumulative impacts on certain subjective resource parameters. The determinations of those resource parameters that are included in the CEA matrices are incomplete and not fully representative of potential effects.	CU 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	CEA does not address past, present, future and connected oil releases on/in soil and water supplies that impact the all resources.	CU 17
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The Tribes are also concerned about the insufficient disclosure of environmental justice parameters of Native America people. Many areas along the proposed pipeline will disproportionately impact Native Americans, with much greater risk of adverse health and environmental impacts on adjacent tribal lands and/or culturally significant lands and sites.	EJ 01
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The FEIS and SEIS fail to consider major historic earthquake/seismic activity…No effort was made to include seismic activity before 1973.	GEO 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	[The DSEIS] fails to provide scenarios from which assessments of environmental impacts would be based. With the large dataset that is available on oil pipeline spills in the United States, construction of oil release scenarios and conducting corresponding impact analyses must be conducted	LEG 04
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The SEIS must illustrate the high and low risk areas [for potential releases] on maps so the reader can readily understand the risk areas.	LEG 04
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The visual baseline and analysis provided in the SEIS totally fails to recognize or address how the changed veiwscape impacts the Native American perspective of a cultural landscape.	LU 02, CR 02
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	The market analysis also errs in extrapolating and predicting future markets based on market fluctuations just within the last two years since the FEIS was released in 2011. No doubt there will also be market fluctuations. Predicting future markets based on a two-year interval snapshot not only is ripe with technical flaws, but it provides a misleading market baseline.	PN 12
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Because domestic oil exports have risen so sharply in the last decade, the concern that the Keystone Pipeline will greatly facilitate further oil exports rather than se-euring domestic oil for domestic users is a serious concern.	PN 13
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Later in the SEIS, the stance that exporting petroleum products from Gulf Coast refineries would not be economically feasible is reversed...If the demand is not foreign demand and if it is not domestic, then where is that demand? The SEIS is unclear on tllis point and switches between demands from foreign vs. domestic to justify different components of the SEIS.	PN 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	No data in the [DSEIS] market analysis indicates that exporting domestic oil supplies will change, especially in light of the fact that imports and exports are determined on market forces…The oil imports vs. oil exports data do not support the contention that oil is being secured for domestic users nor that the US is weaning themselves off of foreign supplies. SEIS at 1.4-15.	PN 13
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	While the market analysis estimates transportation costs of exporting oil products to foreign buyers from the Gulf Coast vs. West Coast under Table 1.4-2, the analysis fails to include any analysis of how much oil has been exported from the Gulf Coast historically and currently. If transportation costs of exporting oil from the Gulf Coast were sufficiently high to preclude selling and exporting to foreign buyers, then the SEIS must include an analysis of how much oil is actually exported.	PN 13
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	No alternatives address design features of the pipeline that would further decrease or eliminate altogether potential oil spills...Alternatives that address design improvements that would eliminate or greatly reduce spills must be included, regardless of costs.	RISK 14
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Real and effective mitigation must first and foremost be mitigation that avoids potential releases altogether, and with the extensive dataset available on past releases, this Project must use existing pipeline release data in designing pipeline and associated facilities and equipment that will not be subject to oil releases.	RISK 14
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	Section 3.5.4.6 fails to provide a sufficient synopsis of native plants used for traditional purposes. The plants listed under this section are few, not even close to a complete list and description of those traditionally important plants.	VEG 08
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	There is no subsection in Wildlife Resources or Fisheries Resources that addresses Native American traditional uses of fish and wildlife such as hunting, fishing and spiritual purposes. Nor does the SEIS provide any mention of bison in the areas potentially impacted by the Project.	WI 20
Nathan Small, Shoshone Bannock Tribes	May 3, 2013	ln the Water Resources section, the SEIS fails to evaluate pristine waters, protected waters, or wild and scenic rivers or other protected designations. Instead, the SEIS evaluates "Impaired or Contaminated Waterbodies" and attempts to establish a misleading baseline condition for water resources by selectively including this water parameter while excluding other important water parameters. The SEIS should evaluate the proposed routes in detail, designated area by designated area.	WRS 11, WRS 10
Nathan Taylor	April 20, 2013	The risk posed to the nation by climate change is very real and well understood by analysts in the defense industry and the pentagon. Increased severity of storms, drought, floods, and destabilization of foreign governments all pose real security risks to American citizens both directly and indirectly.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nathan Tom	April 17, 2013	In order to push the development of renewable energy it is important to place economic restrictions on the dirty fuel. Only then is the market place able to function as it should.	SO 16
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	Encouraging further development of tar sands is unconscionable.	ACK
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	Oil derived from tar sands results in significantly larger greenhouse gas emissions that oil from conventional drilling operations. For one, the extraction process is significantly more energy intensive. So is the refining process, as there are many more steps involved to convert the bitumen extracted from tar sands to useful products. Also, the mining of tar sands requires the destruction of Alberta's boreal forest, which releases the huge amounts of carbon stored in forest's biomass.	CLIM 05
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	The fact is that Keystone XL is key to expanding development of Alberta's tar sands, and that the further exploitation of these tar sands would release an unacceptable amount of greenhouse gasses. As a result, the Keystone XL is quite literally a fuse to a "carbon bomb".	CLIM 13
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	If the State Department and Sec. Kerry are serious about leading the world in climate action, then this project cannot be approved, and any environmental assessment must address the very real increase in greenhouse gas emissions that would result from it.	CLIM 18
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	I am disappointed that the State Department did not take a fresh look at the environmental impacts of the Keystone XL and tar sands mining. Instead it recycled old, disproved, industry arguments.	LEG 04
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	In conclusion, the State Department's environmental assessment of the Keystone XL pipeline fell far short of fully examining the risks and consequences of the project.	LEG 04
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	While our governor[in Nebraska] did approve the new route, I fear it was more a political move than an honest assessment of the environmental risks.	LEG 16
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	The notion that the tar sands will be developed regardless is blatantly false. The tar sands industry has admitted to the media and its investors that the Keystone XL pipeline is the linchpin for expanding development. Due to the opposition to other pipeline options, and the lack of capacity of truck and rail options, the Keystone XL pipeline is the only significant way to get tar sands bitumen to the global market.	PN 06
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	In particular, I am disappointed and strongly disagree with the assessment that the Alberta tar sands will be developed regardless of the final decision on Keystone XL, and thus the pipeline will have no real impact on greenhouse gas emissions responsible for climate change.	PN 06, CLIM 13
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	I hope that when the final analysis is done, the State Department will find that the project is not in the national interest and will recommend denying TransCanada a permit to build it.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	As a resident of Nebraska, I am still concerned with the possible impacts a spill could have on our water supplies and economy. Nebraska not only relies on clean water for drinking and home use, but water is the backbone of our agricultural economy. A spill similar to that in Kalamazoo Michigan two years ago, or more recently in Tyler County, Texas, could be devastating.	RISK 07
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	It [new pipeline route]... still crosses through sensitive areas similar to the Sandhills.	VEG 14
Nathan Van Velson	March 4, 2013	It [New Pipeline Route] still crosses over the Ogallala aquifer, in areas where the water table is very close to the surface	WRG 01
Nathan Van Velson	April 22, 2013	The extraction of tar sands is devastatingly destructive, greatly increases climate change causing greenhouse gasses	CLIM 14
Nathan Van Velson	April 22, 2013	The pipeline will do next to nothing for energy independence, little to create jobs, and will actually increase gas prices in the Midwest.	PN 04
Nathaniel Brown	April 11, 2013	spills could be particularly devastating. The recent spill in Arkansas is a stark reminder of the potential devastation that a spill could visit on America's Heartland.	ACK
Nathaniel Brown	April 11, 2013	I'm concerned that the draft environmental review your department released last month is inadequate. The climate impact of the tar sands oil is conceded in the review, but it is not really considered.	CLIM 12
Nathaniel Ranney	March 11, 2013	Dirty carbon energy producing fossil fuels NEED to be eliminated from production!!!!!!! I voted for President Obama in 2012. DO NOT LET ME DOWN ON YOUR COMMITMENT TO REDUCE CARBON EMISSIONS. THE PLANET DEPENDS ON YOU AND US!!!!	CLIM 18
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	I've also attached a map of the pipeline's proximity to a WRP easement in Hanson County, SD. There does not appear to be any potential infringement on this easement, but I wanted you and Keystone to be aware because one of the parcels in particular is not far away from the I-90 alternative route.	WET 09
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	NRCS has identified a Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) easement in Nebraska that would be affected by the Steele City alternative route. In fact, the route would go directly through this easement. It is located in Garfield County, Nebraska. Should this become the preferred alternative, it would be necessary to either go around this easement or apply to NRCS for an easement modification. Table 5.2-4 on page 5.2-12 should be updated to reflect the impacts to this WRP easement if they are not already included; and Table 5.2-9 on page 5.2-20 should be updated to reflect the impacts to this WRP easement.	WET 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	there may be an issue with the I-90 alternative route impacting one NRCS WRP easement in Davison County, South Dakota. When taking the buffer into account, the route is so close to the WRP easement line that NRCS is unclear whether there would be an infi:ingement on the easement. Unless Keystone can provide assurances the easement would not be impacted, please acknowledge in the Final SEIS the potential easement impact and the need to address it should the I-90 alternative be selected.	WET 09
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	Under the column titled "Agency" the name of NRCS is incorrect. It should be "Natural Resources …. " not "National Resources .. .. "	EDIT
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	under the column titled "Agency Action," please replace existing NRCS text with "Ensures integrity and functions of easements are preserved with limited authority to modify WRP easements."	EDIT
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	In the second sentence of the first paragraph in this section, there is a reference to "NRCS Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) agreements .... " "NRCS" in that context should be changed to "Farm Services Agency (FSA) Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) .... " (Note: the Farmable Wetlands Program is also an FSA program.)	EDIT
Natural Resources Conservation Service, Andrée DuVarney	April 22, 2013	Page 11, Appendix N: In subsection 2.1.6, "OWNER" is misspelled and in the first line of subsection 2.1. 7, "NRCS" is misspelled.	EDIT
Nazneen Ahmed	March 27, 2013	Saying no to Keystone would be a crucial step toward a safe and prosperous future. Saying yes will light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	ACK
Nazneen Ahmed	March 27, 2013	We can't fight climate change without getting rid of fossil fuel and the Keystone XL pipeline is no exception in this regard.	PN 02
Neal Allen	April 15, 2013	Safer methods of extracting fossil fuel need to be developed as well as utilizing alternate sources. The pipeline is a short term solution with devestating consequences.	ALT 01
Neal Baron	March 10, 2013	It is, to say the least, disheartening to learn that the recent report from the State Department on the XL Pipeline was written by an employee of TransCanada. In fact, it is disgusting.	PRO 01
Neal J. Coyle	March 16, 2013	Keystone XL will create thousands of jobs here at home and serve as a long-term investment in communities where our energy manufacturers and refineries will be benefit from this vital supply of reliable energy.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
neal nollette	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is the largest fresh water aquifer on the North American Continent extending from Northern Nebraska all of the way into Texas. It contains as much water as Lake Erie. The Ogallala Aquifer provides drinking water for 2 million people as well as the water needed to irrigate Nebraska crops and water Nebraska cattle which makes Nebraska's $17 Billion agriculture economy possible year after year. (That is "17" with "9 zeroes".) The Keystone XL Pipeline poses a grave threat to this unique, fragile, delicate, and pristine ecosystem. Articles in the news have stated that the current Trans Canada Pipeline has had 14 leaks in 14 months. With a track record like that, I do not put much faith or credibility in the claims that the XL Pipeline will be 'safe, reliable, and trouble free'. The issue of building the XL Pipeline through the Sandhills is not a question of "if" a leak will occur. Rather, it is a question of "when" a leak will occur. Even a small leak will do way more damage than even the 'best experts' can predict. Contaminated water in the Ogallala Aquifer will be impossible to clean. Contaminated water from the Ogallala Aquifer will force 2 million people to find other, more expensive sources for drinking water. Contaminated water from the Ogallala Aquifer will make it impossible for Nebraska farmers and ranchers to raise crops or livestock. And contaminated water from the Ogallala Aquifer will turn the 20,000 square miles of Nebraska Sandhills into a toxic wasteland.	RISK 08, RISK 07, RISK 24, RISK 26, WRG 01
neal nollette	April 22, 2013	I can guarantee you that if the XL Pipeline is built it definitely will break. Anyone who does not believe that is either naive or incredibly out of touch with reality. It is in America's "best interests" to preserve and protect a "sure thing": namely, 1) It is better to safeguard and preserve Nebraska's $17 Billion agricultural economy providing food to the nation rather than building the XL Pipeline that threatens to destroy this source of America's food. 2) It is better to safeguard and preserve Nebraska's $17 Billion agricultural economy so that Nebraska farmers and ranchers—unlike some of America's leading corporations and wealthiest individuals—can pay their income taxes rather than having oil pass through our nation through the XL Pipeline that most likely will not be taxed because—as some news reports have indicated—it will be shipped to Europe and Asia. 3) It is better to safeguard and protect the water in the Ogallala Aquifer so that there is safe, clean, uncontaminated drinking water rather than dealing with the issue of 2 million refuges within our own country because of the toxins that leaked from the XL Pipeline which was built through the middle of the Aquifer.	RISK 24, PN 07, WRG 01
Ned Lemieux	March 8, 2013	For anyone to even consider it, I accuse you now, and openly, of corruption and collusion. No permanent jobs, allowing foreign interests to use eminent domain on US citizens, using flawed and low grade steel, and the fact that the oil from the pipeline will NOT pay any duties to, nor will it benefit in any way, the country as a whole. These are the major concerns, but not all of them.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Neil Barrett	March 10, 2013	The Keystone project requires a tremendous amount of water which cannot be recovered for human consumption. Water is the most wasted of all our elements according to the experts.	CU 07
Neil Harrison	March 28, 2013	Unless this administration honestly considers human health and life less important than adding to the wealth of a few billionaires, rejecting this pipeline should be a no-brainer.	ACK
Neil Harrison	March 28, 2013	People in Canada are already suffering and dying due to the effects of this toxic nightmare.	RISK 07
Neil Shadle	March 10, 2013	If I were a cynic, I would tend to think that this recent State Department report is a set up, to provide the President and the Secretary some cover for approval of the pipeline. If you do approve it, you will clearly have broken faith with your constituents, who have believed your promises in regard to global warming and clean energy. This pipeline is a symbol of all that is wrong with our current approach to energy. You must not approve it.	PN 08, CLIM 18
Nels And Pat	April 3, 2013	The Keystone pipeline should be approved. The studies show a positive in economics, safetyl, energy produced and furthermore, fossil fuels do not , I repeat do not make a significant change in our climate.	CLIM 15
NelsonM	April 18, 2013	Natural gas and propane are clean burning fuels and engines last a lot longer and the oil in them stays clean so why would we want to even think of using the dirtiest fuel made?	ACK
NelsonM	April 18, 2013	Another worry is terrorism where some irresponsible person might blow up the line in four or five places --that could ruin the center of the United States!	RISK 04
NelsonM	April 18, 2013	Insurance companies have said they will cancel the farmer's liability insurance because such a claim could bankrupt the insurance company.	SO 18, SO 12
NelsonN	April 18, 2013	why has TransCanada refused to disclose their formula for adding other chemicals to the tar sand oil to enable it to flow through the proposed pipeline? And more importantly, why has our United States government and the EPA not insisted on this disclosure?	RISK 12
Nexen	April 18, 2013	Canada has one of the most comprehensive and transparent regimes among energy exporting nations. These high standards drive prodicers to continually improve environmental performance through technology and innovation. The Canadian oil sands industry has reduced greenhouse gas intensity by 26% since 1990, and is committed to making further progress.	PN 10
Nia Umoja	April 17, 2013	There has been a lot of back and forth regarding whether or not the pipeline will be built regardless of the decision the United States makes.	ACK
Nic Rosenau	April 4, 2013	Let us refocus our efforts from destructive programs like this one to constructive sustainable options.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nicholas Halsey	April 22, 2013	Turn your course and run the Canadian Pipeline to the shores of Canada. Ships can pick up along their shores!	ALT 05
Nicholas Halsey	April 22, 2013	Clean Energy must be put in place, not dirty oil with dirty intentions.	PN 02
Nicholas Judson	April 16, 2013	I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. The only way to stop CO2 emissions is to tax the fuel as it comes out of the ground, otherwise, low natural gas prices in the U.S. will mean that previously coal-fired electricity power plants in the U.S. switch to gas-fired generation, while the coal that would otherwise be burnt in the U.S. is shipped overseas to China or Europe, where cheap U.S. coal is now market-competitive. Allowing easy access-to-market for energy-intensive oil extracted from tar sands is NOT a good solution.	CLIM 12
Nicholas Kyle	April 3, 2013	Must we continue this collateral damage to our environment and neighborhoods! The Keystone oil is strictly for oil company profits and will be shipped abroad. It has nothing to do with our energy independence!	PN 07
Nicholas Schnell	April 22, 2013	If there was ever a minor accident it has the potential to create drastic effects on freshwater for cities and farming.	RISK 07
Nicholas Schnell	April 22, 2013	Do not allow the Canadian oil pipeline to cross the Nebraska sandhills. If there was ever a minor accident, it has the potential to create drastic effects on freshwater for cities and farming.	WRG 04
Nicholas Turecamo	April 22, 2013	There is no interest compelling enough to force people out of their homes without their permission. This is a simple land grab.	LEG 02
Nicholas Vanderborgh	April 19, 2013	Tar sand crude is full of asphaltenes, large sulfur containing molecules which polymerize into larger molecules. Builds up on pipe walls in a big way. There is also a good amount of silt and sand, which causes rapid erosion (wear). The stuff is wrecking refineries, and special designs and materials are necessary. The point: hard to refine means also hard to ship. This XL pipeline is moving into very tough engineering. The pipe line will plug. The pipeline will wear away from the inside. Quickly Continuously. So this is NOT another petroleum pipeline. It is not a chemical pipeline. The pipeline design needs to be done correctly.	RISK 27
Nicholas Yonezawa	April 16, 2013	Costs of treating water and air pollution generated from the construction, operation, or a disaster if it happens, will be exponentially greater than any economic benefits it may bring.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nicholas Yonezawa	April 16, 2013	The temporary economic gains should never outweigh the impacts to the environmental and public health. Costs of treating water and air pollution generated from the construction, operation, or a disaster if it happens, will be exponentially greater than any economic benefits it may bring.	PN 05
Nicholas Yonezawa	April 16, 2013	The temporary economic gains should never outweigh the impacts to the environmental and public health. Costs of treating water and air pollution generated from the construction, operation, or a disaster if it happens, will be exponentially greater than any economic benefits it may bring.	PN 05
Nicholin Quackenbush	March 14, 2013	The way forward for America is...the use of renewable energies, clean energies that will take our nation into the future without further damage to our climate	ALT 01
Nicholin Quackenbush	April 5, 2013	Do not approve something so bad for our planet, when we have the knowledge, expertise, and resources to create clean, sustainable energy sources for our planet that will not destroy life as we know it, for all of our children and the generations to come.	ALT 01
Nicholin Quackenbush	April 5, 2013	Keystone will push us past the tipping point for global warming and there will be no healing then.	CLIM 05
Nick Caniglia	April 22, 2013	Plus we need to stop encouraging further development in aging, limited, and environmentally damaging energy technologies and projects such as this.	PN 09
Nick Chandler	March 18, 2013	There are better smarter approaches to meet our energy needs.This would be a mistake our children will pay for.	ALT 01
Nick Engelfried	March 17, 2013	I was disappointed that the State Department's environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline failed to pay sufficient attention to the climate impacts of this misguided fossil fuel project. The report's central conclusion about climate - that carbon emissions will go up whether or not Keystone XL is built - is overly fatalistic and fails to take into account the potential for developing renewable alternatives to fossil fuels	CLIM 12
Nick Engelfried	March 17, 2013	The State Department's review does not refute the well-established fact that building the Keystone XL would result in significant new emissions of the gases responsible for climate change. But the report dismisses the importance of these new emissions, arguing they will occur anyway and that for this reason Keystone XL's impact on the climate will be negligible.This is defeatist reasoning, and is contrary to the intentions of NEPA.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nick Engelfried	April 21, 2013	The State Department's recently released review of environmental impacts from Keystone XL grants insufficient weight to the importance of carbon emissions from tar sands. Most of this review was conducted before you became Secretary of State, and now you have a chance to correct the error. You can refrain from using the flawed reasoning in the recently completed review, which assumes that carbon emissions from Keystone XL won't matter because they will come from somewhere else anyway. When Keystone XL is evaluated on its own merits, it becomes clear that carbon emissions from this project are not in the national interest.	CLIM 12
Nick Engelfried	April 21, 2013	http://forcechange.com/62129/review-environmental-impact-of-proposed-pipeline/	REF
Nick Sanders	March 11, 2013	I was very surprised to learn the conclusions of the State Department's report on the Keystone XL Pipeline project as "unlikely to have a substantial impact" on the tar sands and pipeline environment or on climate change. How can continued support of such polluting crude oil not make a substantial impact on the environment, from the extraction processing and the transport—added to the actual use of the oil as an energy source!	LEG 04
Nick Sanders	March 11, 2013	Furthermore, I have learned that TransCanada, which would construct the Keystone XL pipeline through the midsection of our country, is currently under an extensive audit for systematic violations of minimum safety regulations in the construction of its pipelines. I can imagine that we taxpayers would need to pay for that company's faults.	RISK 25
Nick Vogel	March 26, 2013	Approval of this pipeline will mean the end of the fight against climate change and clean energy	ACK
Nick Vogel	March 26, 2013	Approval of this pipeline will demonstrate to the world that we simply don't care - about us, other countries, the planet, wildlife, and ecosystems.	CLIM 18
Nick Yau	April 22, 2013	The use of tar sands may very well continue regardless of whether the Keystone XL is built or not, but how easy we make it MATTERS. Facilitating the tar sands industry will accelerate its release of carbon and pollution into the environment.	ACK
Nick Yau	April 22, 2013	(KXL) will cost the world valuable time in coming up with a viable solution to climate change. In the short term, the effect of the pipeline will be an increase in corporate profits and economic activity, but in the long term its effect will be measured in additional homes destroyed and lives lost because the catastrophic effects of climate change came on that much faster while the world tried to adjust.	PN 03, CLIM 16
Nicola Davies	April 2, 2013	You promised to let the science lead in fighting climate change- help save the people not kill them with climate chaos.	CLIM 14
Nicolas Gonzalez	April 21, 2013	Blocking the Keystone tar sands pipeline from the US will cancel its construction anywhere and allow the US and our neighbor to the north to instead focus on increasing our renewable energy capacity.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nicolas Gonzalez	April 21, 2013	The concentration of CO2 in our atmosphere is ALREADY too high. We need to decrease our consumption of fossil fuels immediately if we want to avoid the worst effects of climate change, which we have already been given a sneak preview in the forms of the Midwest drought, exponential increase in wildfires, and superstorms like Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina.	CLIM 14
Nicole Alesio	April 9, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis	CLIM 05
Nicole Alesio	April 9, 2013	Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 07
Nicole Alesio	April 9, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation	RISK 26
Nicole Altneu	March 27, 2013	Also, no climatologist was involved in writing the report. That is a grave miscarriage of justice. The long term environmental effects of building such a pipeline must be considered.	CLIM 01
Nicole B Cummings	April 22, 2013	I do not want an IRON WALL creating an East and West U.S. which will be owned by a foreign country. This wall will have check points were people may pass through but the foreign country owning the pipeline (along with mineral, and air rights) could say no one may cross. I say NO to FOREIGN countries owning U.S. land and dividing the country into TWO HALVES.	LEG 02
Nicole B Cummings	April 22, 2013	I also do not want the Ogallala Aquifer which is the fresh water resource for Wyoming South Dakota Colorado Nebraska Kansas Oklahoma New Mexico and Texas to become polluted with hazardous waste.	RISK 07
Nicole B Cummings	April 22, 2013	I also do not want the Ogallala Aquifer which is the fresh water resource for Wyoming, South Dakota, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas to become polluted with hazardous waste.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Nicole Church	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has used strong-arm tactics to intimidate Sandhills landowners. They have fed the public untruths about their operations to gain support for this pipeline. There is little integrity with this company.	LEG 02
Nicole Church	April 22, 2013	All oil pipelines leak. It is not a question of if but when this prposed pipeline would decimate the purity of the Ogallala Aquifer and the pristine landscapes of the Nebraska Sandhills.	WRG 01
Nicole Driscoll	April 1, 2013	Fossil fuels will run out, so stay ahead and divest - it's not just good for people and the environment - it's good business sense.	ALT 01
Nicole Driscoll	April 1, 2013	Invest in renewable energies. Invest in our renewable technology. It's the way of the future, and the future is now.	ALT 01
Nicole Driscoll	April 1, 2013	Tar sands oil is some of the dirtiest oil there is, and spills are inevitable.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nicole Dupre	April 17, 2013	There are better and more forward-thinking ways, including CLEAN ENERGY projects, to create the new jobs that the US needs.	SO 05, ALT 01
Nicole Lampe	April 21, 2013	Let's not invest further in dirty fossil fuels. Please deny Keystone XL and show the world we are serious about leading the clean energy revolution!	PN 02
Nicole Lampe	April 21, 2013	The recent spill in Arkansas just underscores the massive economic and environmental damages pipelines can create—spills are inevitable, and we can't afford to have more neighborhoods, wetlands, coastlines, and our water supply polluted.	RISK 07
Nicole Neighbors	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline would be a devastating thing to unleash upon the Nebraska Sandhills and the aquifer.	WRG 01
Nicole Schildcrout	April 10, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, tar sands, fracking for gas, drilling in our oceans and the Arctic, and the overall continued exploration of fossil fuels, must stop. Now that we have alternatives - lets get on board and use them.	ALT 01
Nicole Schildcrout	April 10, 2013	Just look at the continued destruction these practices cause to our environment, to our health, our rivers, oceans, back yards - and to our WATER supplies	RISK 07
Nicolette Schultz	April 8, 2013	We need to turn to clean energy. All of the time, money, and effort that goes into this pipeline could easily be converted to windmills or solar panels	ALT 01
Nicoli Tucker	April 22, 2013	We cannot have an accident with the KXL pipeline if it is built, it is not worth the jobs. Please give subsidies for clean sustainable energy instead. We must listen to our scientists and not big business.	PN 05, PN 03
Niki Spencer	April 4, 2013	The project will do little to yield any permanent new jobs in our country and since all the crude is set to go into the Export Pool, none of that will make US fuel prices any cheaper as it will all go to the highest bidder on the global markets.	PN 05
Niki Spencer	April 4, 2013	how can we be assured that our rivers, lakes and aquifers are in no danger to the same kind of damage? That is a lot of drinking water not on the for the citizens of our country, but also for the numerous crops and livestock in the heartlands.	WRG 01, RISK 14
Nikkel	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL jobs would not benefit this country.	PN 08
Nikki	April 5, 2013	We should be moving away from this polluting substance toward sustainable technology that we already have. And at the very least we should not be running this crap through and across the USA.	ALT 05, ALT 01
Nikki Cray	April 13, 2013	The pipeline idea is a joke. Why continue ? For oil that will last maybe , what, twenty, thirty more years ? And then what ? When the resources run out. We ravaged land just for that ?	PN 09
Nikki Nafziger	March 16, 2013	The U.S. State Dept.'s environmental review was done by a Trans Canada hiree.....therefore it SHOULD BE INADMISSABLE AS A CONFLICT OF INTERESTS....IT IS A LIE....IT IS NOT AN ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW...IT JUST RUBBER STAMPS WHAT TRANS CANADA WANTS.....IT IS AGAINST THE ENVIRONMENT AND SCIENCE AND WILD LIFE AND AGAINST WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT!	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	[Our organization] firmly believes TransCanada should have followed the first pipeline route TransCanada built further east in the clay soils.	ALT 03
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	We are less than sure...pipeline crossings [of historic trails] have been adequately addressed.	CR 06
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	"Private roads ... would only be used with the permission of the affected landowner ... " If a landowner declines, will eminent domain be applied? Who bears the cost associated with use?	LEG 02
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	The failure of the State ofNebraska to have appropriate siting and routing authority in place allowed TransCanada to propose its first route through Nebraska's vulnerable Sandhills in the absence of state siting and routing guidance.	LEG 13
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	NeFU believes that…[Legislature Bill] 1161 will be rendered unconstitutional. LB 1161 was special interest legislation...designed to avoid the oversight role of the Public Service Commission defined in the Nebraska Constitution relative to the use of siting, routing, and eminent domain. If the legal challenge against LB 1161 is successful, the current route lacks state approval.	LEG 17
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Our hopes for an open, transparent, conflict of interest free process disappeared when our Nebraska DEQ chose to hire HDR from Omaha despite the fact they had previous contracts with TransCanada for a variety of services.	LEG 17
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	While the Nebraska DEQ held public information sharing sessions with landowners and the public, the particular concerns of landowners along the route were ignored.	LEG 17
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	The EIS says that "[landowners will be consulted] to address visual aesthetic issues that arise as a result of construction ... " Of concern is the fact that Nebraska does not have formal guidelines for managing visual resources for private or state-owned lands.	LU 02
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Regarding agricultural productivity, Keystone agrees to pay for the differential between pre- and post-construction earning capacity for three years, at 100% for losses in year one, 75% in year two and 50% in year three. Any damages after three years "would be negotiated," according to the EIS; the key word here is "would," which does not mean "must." This is absolutely not acceptable.	PD 01
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Based on NeFU's direct contact with landowners along the proposed route and familiarity with the physical landscape, NeFU finds an abundance of inappropriate siting and routing decisions. The route goes within a few feet of houses, wells, and through environmentally sensitive areas with reckless abandon. Environmentally and wildlife sensitive areas were not avoided.	PD 03
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Based on numerous newspaper accounts of tar sands ownership...Chinese and foreign ownership share of the tar sands continues to increase as they acquire additional domestic companies. We once call on the State Department to gather the pipeline oil ownership and final destination and release this information to the public.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Nebraska Farmers Union is deeply disappointed in the State Department's inability to remedy its internal conflict of interest process in hiring third party consultants. The work product of the State Department once again needs to be set aside because the work product itself is badly tainted with special interest influence.	PRO 01
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Relative to the hiring of ERM to help conduct the Supplemental EIS for the alternative route, the State Department…Did not follow the OIG guidance when it hired ERM. It failed to independently identify the accuracy of conflict of interest statements made by ERM on its OCI Questionnaire.	PRO 01
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	When it became clear that ERM had materially misrepresented its oil industry conflicts of interest, the State Department attempted to conceal ERM's past relationships with TransCanada, in clear violation of the OIG's specific recommendations the Department agreed to follow for conflict screening and the Department's own Interim Guidance document.	PRO 01
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	formal comments of the Nebraska Farmers Union	REF
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	Dr. John Stansbury, University ofNebraska at Lincoln Professor in the Environmental and Water Resources Engineering Department conducted a study that forecast the KXL pipeline would result in 91 spills over the 50 year life of the pipeline.	RISK 13
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	there are no oil pipelines through the Sandhills. There is no real oil pipeline experience on which to derive any appropriate comparative data.	RISK 14
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	At issue are topsoil degradation, soil compaction and introduction of rock. Keystone pledges to put it all back the way it was: soil, vegetation, etc., but historic experience with large scale soil disruption (e.g., the mining industry, road-building, etc.) has demonstrated the tragedy of this kind of overly simplistic and optimistic faith in the ability of human beings to recreate what nature took millions of years to produce.	SOIL 05
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	The heat of the pipeline itself will have an additional and unknown impact on efforts toreestablish appropriate vegetation.	VEG 04
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	We know that much of the route is prone to groundwater contamination because it is prone to nitrate leaching, and must be carefully managed. The overwhelming majority of our landowners on this proposed route believe this route is not responsible or appropriately sited.	WRG 01
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	The relationship between groundwater and surface water along the proposed second route is very strong and direct. We have spring fed streams and rivers, wet meadows, and over 100 miles of light, sandy soils a few feet from groundwater on the proposed route.	WRG 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikki Skuce	April 17, 2013	the risk to Nebraska's groundwater and aquifer from the…[SEIS] route is virtually identical to the [FEIS] proposed route: The [SEIS] pipeline route, as did the [FEIS] proposed route, overlays the Ogallala Aquifer from the north end of Nebraska to the south end; The [SEIS] proposed route, as did the [FEIS] route, includes virtually the same 100 miles of extremely light, sandy, porous soils subject to leaching virtually the sameshort distance to the underground water table.	WRG 06
Nikola Lakic	March 10, 2013	I would like to inform you that there is a new breakthrough technology for production of electricity by harnessing limitless geothermal energy. No Fracking needed. It uses completely closed loop system. Zero pollution. It doesn't need hydrothermal reservoir although not limited to hot rocks. It doesn't depend on sunny or windy days produces electricity 24/7.	PN 02
Nikolai Giefer	April 22, 2013	Invest resources in renewable technologies instead. Give this country the foundation to energy independence and a cleaner more sustainable planet.	ALT 01
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The project is inconsistent with NEPA because the analysis regarding soils, potential spills, and impacts to water quality is incomplete and not sound. NEPA imposes a duty on Federal agencies to take a "hard look at environmental consequences" (Natural Resources Defense Council v. Morton, 458 F.2d 827, 838 (D.C. Cir., 1972).	LEG 04
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers' report in 2012 stated: Production from oil sands currently comprises 59 per cent of western Canada's total crude oil production. In this forecast, oil sands production rises from 1.6 million b/d in 2011 to almost double at 3.1 million b/d by 2020 and 4.2 million b/d by 2025 and 5.0 million b/d by the end of the forecast period in 2030. If the only projects to proceed were the ones in operation or currently under construction, oil sands production would still increase by 54 per cent to 2.5 million b/d by 2020 and then remain relatively flat for the rest of the forecast. Therefore, the No Action Alternative should instead state that tarsands production would fall flat by 2010 as a result of the No Action Alternative	PN 06
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers' report in 2012 stated: Production from oil sands currently comprises 59 per cent of western Canada's total crude oil production. In this forecast, oil sands production rises from 1.6 million b/d in 2011 to almost double at 3.1 million b/d by 2020 and 4.2 million b/d by 2025 and 5.0 million b/d by the end of the forecast period in 2030. If the only projects to proceed were the ones in operation or currently under construction, oil sands production would still increase by 54 per cent to 2.5 million b/d by 2020 and then remain relatively flat for the rest of the forecast.	PN 12
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers' report in 2012	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The project does not analysis the potential effects of a Dilbit release. I am concerned that the effects to water quality could be very high and are unknown.	RISK 07
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Project does not correctly analyze the potential for petroleum releases because it incorrectly concludes that "petroleum releases from that proposed Project would only affect water quality in portions of the NPGAS near the ground surface", and incorrectly assumes "impacts would be limited to within several hundred feet of the release source". As described in section ES.5.2.1, the proposed Project route would impact waterbodies in three states and would cross approximately 1,073 waterbodies. In July 2010, according to the EPA, pipeline 6B ruptured heavy oil and contaminated 40 miles of the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. If a very similar pipeline carrying nearly identical crude mixtures has already contaminated a huge area, why does this analysis conclude "large-scale releases would typically be limited to within several hundred feet of the release source"?	RISK 07
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	What is the potential for a large release to affect farm jobs when groundwater and surface water become contaminated. What would be the effect to jobs if mitigations are ineffective and prime farmland soil is lost to erosion?	RISK 07, LU 01, RISK 24, SO 12
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	Table ES-1 states "there are 2,537 wells within 1 mile of the proposed Project, including 39 public water supply wells and 20 private wells within 100 feet of the pipeline ROW". The socioeconomic analysis fails to address the potential impact of well contamination on long term health and how that could affect socioeconomics. Following the gulf oil spill, 25 percent of coastal residents said they might have to move away from the Gulf Coast. If groundwater is contaminated due to the Project, this would displace residents and have a major socioeconomic impact.	SO 13
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The socioeconomic analysis fails to consider the potential impact of petroleum releases on jobs. Following the recent gulf oil spill in Louisiana and Mississippi, twenty percent of households reported a drop in income since the oil spill, and 8 percent reported job loss. These losses were most likely to hit those who were already economically vulnerable: households with incomes under $25,000 a year.	SO 13, RISK 09
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The soils analysis incorrectly concludes that loss of valuable topsoil is a minor, localized impact. The analysis incorrectly assumes that construction mitigations would be effective to salvage topsoil. Stockpiling of soils would impact soil structure and the impacts and effectiveness of tackifiers and water to limit erosion must be analyzed by the Project. Because half of soils are highly erodible to either wind or water, valuable topsoil would erode.	SOIL 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	Construction mitigations do not require mulching on cultivated areas, within wetland boundaries, or on areas inactive for less than one month. The bare soil percentage is the dominant control on post-fire sediment yields, followed by rainfall intensity (Pietraszek, 2006). When soil cover is removed, soil particles are more easily detached from falling rain and can be removed from the site. Therefore topsoil is likely to erode and the project could potentially impact 4,715 acres of prime farmland soil.	SOIL 03
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The small white lady's slipper (Crpripedium candidum) is a threatened species under Nebraska state law. I am concerned by the statement "if this plant were to be observed within the proposed Project route in Nebraska, appropriate mitigation measures would be developed and implemented in consultation with state agencies". This analysis fails to take a "hard look analysis" as required by NEPA. What is the likelihood of occurances? Who would observe for the species and when? Is this species visible year round? I am concerned that snow or observances at the wrong time of year may miss occurrences of this threatened species.	TES 03
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	In addition, the main sources of contamination to the GPA come from agricultural fertilizers and pesticides. Because contamination is currently an issue from surface and underground pollutants, it is very likely that releases from the proposed pipeline would affect water quality in this aquifer.	WRG 01
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Project analysis incorrectly concludes that petroleum releases from the proposed Project would not extensively affect water quality in the NHPAQ. Agriculture from South Dakota to Texas has been supported solely by irrigation from the High Plains aquifer for nearly a century. Overuse is a critical issue facing this aquifer. The general shallow depth of the High Plains aquifer makes it extremely susceptible to run-off contamination. The over-application of various herbicides and pesticides become diluted into run-off rain water and eventually percolate into the underlying aquifer unit. Therefore, petroleum releases would likely percolate to a similar degree and affect water quality in this aquifer group.	WRG 01
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The Project erroneously concludes 'it is very unlikely that any releases from the propose pipeline would affect groundwater quality in the Great Plains Aquifer'. The USGS has concluded that point source contamination is a problem, specifically from underground storage tank spills in the Great Plains Aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nikos Hunner	April 10, 2013	The socioeconomic analysis fails to consider the impact of groundwater contamination on socioeconomics, specifically food prices. The Project has a high potential to impact groundwater which is already in short supply and has affected food prices. The 2012 drought in the Midwest was the worst since the 1950s and food prices increased 4 to 5 percent. The Project could have a major impact on food prices, because it could affect groundwater and impact climate change. Both would have a major impact to food prices and affect the socioeconomics of the entire country.	WRG 01, SO 13
Niles Rowe	April 3, 2013	I might also add that the petroleukm obtained via the tar sands is "junk petroleum" in the sense that $1 is spent in the extraction of petroleum for every $6 obtained versus the average ratio for petroleum obtained through usual oil well (vertical) drilling of $1 spent to obtain $15 worth of useable (refined) oil.	PN 05
Niloufer Mackey	April 2, 2013	We've had the Enbridge spill which fouled the Kalamazoo river where I live. The were numerous violations, before, during and after the spill. Now we have a spill in Arkansas. Both times the companies involved have shamelessly downplayed the risks.	RISK 23
Nils Pearson	April 19, 2013	It's time to switch from non renewable resources to wind, sea, atomic and water energy. We can't afford to continue to heat up our atmosphere with the use of non renewable energy resources.	PN 02
Nina Friscia	April 9, 2013	Spending money for clean-ups, relocating families after accidents will become more and more common place and costly. The cost of gallons of fossil fuels needed to run these operations is astronomical and the yield is low. Health issues that arise from contamination is very present in Alberta and it will become more frequent here in areas near the pipline.	CU 02
Nina Kidd	April 17, 2013	The environmental impacts of Keystone were not adequately studied in the EIS. Key items lacking serious investigation includes cumulative impacts of other tar sand projects…	CU 01
Nina Kidd	April 17, 2013	We need to be investing in developing new technologies that will power our homes and vehicles now and for hundreds of years in the future.	PN 02
Nina Kidd	April 17, 2013	The environmental impacts of Keystone were not adequately studied in the EIS. Key items lacking serious investigation includes…Impacts of oil spills like the recent catastrophe in Arkansas.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Nina Klooster	March 10, 2013	The tar sands are acdestructive dirty source of energy. The mining process release more green house gas than is prudent. The process fouls the drinking water with carcinogins. Once in the pipe line, this crude is more corosive than ordinary crude. The pipes will easily leak. This filthy crude cannot be cleaned up. Witness Kalamazoo, which is still fouled from the Embridge spill.	PN 02, CLIM 17
Nina Nelson	April 22, 2013	The only way to totally protect our precious water supply is to NEVER JEOPARDIZE it in the first place! No pipeline can guarantee this.	ACK
Nina Nelson	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala aquifer is of major importance to the state of Nebraska and the Midwest in general. It supplies clean, safe fresh water for drinking water, agriculture, irrigation, industry -- in other words it is VITAL to our health and economy. We MUST NOT allow the routing of the XL Keystone Pipeline to be any where near the Ogallala aquifer!	WRG 01, RISK 07, WRG 04
Ninya Loeppky	March 29, 2013	Please keep the long-term safety and security of Americans and our ecosystems in mind and deny the permit for this pipeline!	PN 08
Niri Halperin	April 13, 2013	After the tragic tar sands oil spills in Mayflower, Arkansas and Otter Tail County, Minnesota, it's clear that tar sands oil is not safe and not worth the risk.	RISK 14
Nita Johnson	April 12, 2013	Until the oil and gas corporations can prove that they have the means and resources to clean up the spills that occur, no new pipelines, etc should be approved. The disaster in Arkansas at this time, is proof that Keystone XL should not be approved. There are too many oil spills that are wrecking havoc with the environment	RISK 08
Noah Armstrong	March 25, 2013	Please take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prevent catastrophic climate change.	CLIM 14
Noah W	March 18, 2013	… cries of independent scientists sounding the alarm on the tar sands' effects on Climate Change.	ACK
Noah W	March 18, 2013	We cannot develop further and even dirtier means of extraction when the International Energy Agency states that the amount of carbon ALREADY in the fossil fuel industry's reserves is 3x the amount that can be safely burned to prevent runaway Climate Change!	CLIM 13
Noah W	March 18, 2013	the only argument for the pipeline (ignoring the looming climate impacts) is refuted in the same document, which states that US energy independence will likely be achieved without it!	PN 04
Noah W	March 18, 2013	The argument that there will be little effect on Climate Change because they will be developed and sold no matter what is a fallacy (leaving aside the absurdity of the argument that "x is evil, but someone will do it so it may as well be us").	PN 06
Noah W	March 18, 2013	I will not even touch the fact that the State Department environmental review was written by those linked to TransCanada.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Noel Boardman	April 20, 2013	It boggles my mind that we keep being subjected to evermore risky and environmentally devastating sources for more fossil fuels: We have brilliant scientists and think tanks to recommend solutions to environmental devastations caused by human beings and dependence on fossil fuels so why aren't we moving forward to cleaner and more promising energy sources???	PN 02
Noel Kaufman	April 2, 2013	The transition to a smart energy economy and way of life will certainly take decades, and oil and gas will continue to be an important and significant part of the energy mix while we make the transition. That does not mean that we should accept the promotion of even dirtier and more harmful forms of energy (like tar sands) while we are in this period of transition. We must pivot hard away from fossil fuels and building a pipeline to transport tar sands across North America, while certainly economically beneficial for oil companies, is wrongheaded on just about every level of thinking. It's short sighted, grab-the-profits-while-you-can attitude does not take into account the very real near term costs to our environment. Yes, our fuel might wind up costing more without such a pipeline, but it should... Because it really does cost more to keep relying on this environmentally disastrous fuel source.	PN 02
Noel Smith	March 11, 2013	Now that we know the Keystone evaluation was authored by a Keystone employee, we have no other alternative in good conscience but to reject it totally. And whoever authorized this travesty should be fired.	PRO 01
Noel Urban	March 11, 2013	Why would the government take such a short-term perspective and approve this proposal? The jobs gained in building the pipeline will last at best a couple of years.	PN 05
Noelle Mccleaf	April 11, 2013	DO NOT SACRIFICE THE CLEAN WATER OF THIS PLANET THAT IS PARAMOUNT TO OUR SURVIVAL FOR DIRTY OIL MONEY.	RISK 07
Nora Handel	April 15, 2013	dirty oil spills are more rampant than we want to admit, and far more damaging than most currently understand.	RISK 14
Norlin	April 18, 2013	But we have to look at what is happening in Alberta, Canada as well. Even if no drop of oil ever leaked here, these tar sands release 475 million gallons of toxic waste a day, nine times more than the amount of oil produced. Unlined tailing ponds leak nearly 3 million gallons a day. They kill thousands of birds a year, mistaking those tailing ponds for the lakes. It doesn't stop with the birds. The tar sands are responsible for the second fastest rate of deforestation on the planet, second only to that of the Amazon Rainforest. Each two and a half square kilometers of boreal forest supports 500 breeding pairs of migrant birds, home to wolf, lynx, cougar, black bear, grizzly bear, wolverine, bison, moose, caribou and beaver.	CU 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Norlin	April 18, 2013	You have heard about the more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010. And in 2010 to 2011 after TransCanada claimed the Keystone will, quote, continue to meet or exceed world class safety and environmental standards, the company saw 12 oil spills from its brand-new state of the art pipeline with once -- with one six-story geyser dumping 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota. This is the pipeline we're asked to approve? A pipeline crossing more than 1,000 water bodies across three states and 875 miles? I think not.	RISK 26
Norm & Jan Frankel	April 9, 2013	As well, any review should acknowledge that financial analysts and oil executives agree that the Keystone XL decision will make or break tar sands development in Canada.	ACK
Norm Conrad	March 19, 2013	Global climate change...will cause widespread devastation at the very least. Super storm Sandy, Texas wildfires and shriveled corn and wheat crops are just the beginning. And you know it. The tar sands project near Ft. McMurray, AB, and its proposed clones across the western mountain states, represent the greatest source of dirty energy.	CLIM 16
Norm Conrad	March 19, 2013	1. Please write your own reports. 2. Actually study the issue. 3. Support the people of the US instead of the oil, gas and coal lobbies. This brings into sharp focus the underlying question of exactly on whose behalf the State Dept. works. Is it the American people or is it multinational corporations? Are you our public servants or their puppets?	PRO 01
Norm Keegel	March 16, 2013	it makes it possible for the particularly dirty tar sands to be burnt which would add to the already dangerously high level of CO2	CLIM 14
Norma Campbell	April 13, 2013	The route is too long and the danger to great, those two facts outweigh any benefit we might derive from the Keystone XL.	PN 05
Norma Grant	March 23, 2013	My faith in our representation in the Senate has hit a new low. I do not understand how persons elected to represent the best interests of ALL the American people, let alone the global community, can sell their votes in order to be re-elected. Perhaps it is really time to consider one-term limits for senators, who would then not have to worry about just pleasing their large donors. This is a new low for the Senate.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Norma Jeanne Foust Ewinger	April 17, 2013	I feel strongly that we need to be investing in other clean, renewable forms of energy and stop our dependence on fossil fuels. We need to spend our time, energy and finances into developing good clean, renewable power sources. We do not have the ability to do both and we have come to a fork in the road for the future. I vote we take the road for new forms of energy in our future, not keep on the road to more contamination of our planet with fossil fuels.	PN 02
Norma Johnson	April 13, 2013	This pipeline will NOT help the US and, more importantly, it will speed up the ruination of our planet.	PN 05
Norma M. Miller	April 22, 2013	I ask you to help stop the construction of the Transcanada Pipeline above the sandhills aquifer. It could be routed further east in Nebraska and accomplish the same result..	ALT 06
Norma M. Miller	April 22, 2013	I definitely do not want this underground pipeline to cross Nebraska above the Ogallala Aquifer under our sandhills. According to the map the route will be over the eastern edge of the aquifer & if there is ever a leak it would contaminate the entire aquifer in time which would destroy the water for personal use as well as for livestock and for irrigation. And if a leak should occur it would not be discovered immediately it would take at least a week or two befroe its detection.	WRG 04, RISK 07
Norma M. Miller	April 22, 2013	I definitely do not want this underground pipeline to cross Nebraska above the Ogallala Aquifer under our sandhills. According to the map the route will be over the eastern edge of the aquifer & if there is ever a leak it would contaminate the entire aquifer in time, which would destroy the water for personal use as well as for livestock and for irrigation. And if a leak should occur it would not be discovered immediately, it would take at least a week or two befroe its detection.	WRG 04, RISK 15
Norman Bishop	April 11, 2013	Lost among the many human health reasons for denying the pipeline's construction is the devastating effect of tar sands mining on the taiga and its unique wildlife: caribou and wolves. In response to the destruction of caribou habitat, which threatens their existence, the Canadian government has simply accelerated killing of wolves.	CU 01
Norman Sharp	April 2, 2013	I lived in Nebraska and have been in the Sand Hills canoeing. A spill in this area would be very hard to clean up and would reach the high water table very quickly.	RISK 08
Norman Wagner	April 22, 2013	Wit oil spills in America averaging one a day, can we really afford transporting some of the most dirty stuff from tar sands to refineries in the U. S.just so it can then be exported to India and China. How does this help us environmentally?	PN 07
Nyssa Bryant	March 10, 2013	I believe that cleaner energies such as wind and solar will serve us much better as we move towards an even brighter future for America.	ALT 01
Nyssa Bryant	March 10, 2013	Building the Keystone XL pipeline would accelerate climate change and destroy one of the largest forests in North America	CLIM 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
O Kelly	April 13, 2013	Nobody should have to be told that their land is being taken away from them, especially another country, for any reason!	LEG 02
Oakey Pruett	April 19, 2013	the refining and burning of this filthy oil source will add an unacceptable amount of carbon into our already-unstable atmosphere	CLIM 14
Oakey Pruett	April 19, 2013	This pipeline poses a very real threat to our precious and dwindling freshwater resources upon which much of America depends.	RISK 07
Oberon	April 3, 2013	This Arkansas spill is just a taste of the kind of disaster we are courting by piping this poison over a major water supply. It MUST NOT HAPPEN.	RISK 14
Oceanah D'amore	April 15, 2013	I am also aware that this proposed pipeline passes through the homeland of the Sioux Nation. It is immoral to continue to displace First Nation peoples and poison their land and waters. All the citizens along this route would have their lives displaced. Democracy protects the rights of minorities.	ACK
Ohdith Mildiu	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL will contribute dramatically to climate change. The DOS confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more GHG intensive than conventional fuel. Building a new pipeline now will lock us into higher carbon emissions…when we should be investing in renewable energy.	CLIM 14
Ohdith Mildiu	April 18, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us into higher carbon emissions…when we should be investing in renewable energy.	PN 03
Ohdith Mildiu	April 18, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and will still cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches.	WRG 06
Okoneski	April 18, 2013	The First Nations people are united in Western Canada to prevent the tar sands pipeline going to the west coast, so they [energy companies] are forced to try to send it to Texas to export.	ACK
Okoneski	April 18, 2013	The basic premise on which the question rests is unacceptable. That is the premise that the tar sands @ Alberta Canada will be exploited, therefore we should try to get the purported benefits for the United States.	PN 06
Old Rick Riendeau	March 10, 2013	Science magazine recently released a new study looking at 11,000 yhears of climate temperatures by using fossils of tiny organisms to reconstruct global temperatures back to the end of the last ice age. It shows how the globe for several thousand years was cooling -- until the 20th century! The study author, Shaun Marcott, says 1900 to 1910 was one of the coolest decades in the past 11,300 years. Just one century later we've had the warmest decade.	ACK
Oliver Bueno	April 11, 2013	Let's power the USA with renewable energies that will drive employment up and our dependence on fossil fuels and foreign source of energy down	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Oliver Horton	April 21, 2013	Removing the forests , digging out the tar sands, heating and stiring in the benzine and etc . All of this would take lot's of energy and by the tfime it went through the refilnery ther sadd there wouldn't be much gain and would cause a very large carbon foot print.	CLIM 12
Oliver Horton	April 21, 2013	As for the jobs it will make; the previous pipeline didn ' t help much and there will be less sinse the workers are union and are bringing their own trailers and food service.	SO 08
Oliver Horton	April 22, 2013	concerned about taxpayer dollars going to a refinery owned by Saudi Arabia for upgrades to handle tarsands, also concerned being a local township elected official with the liability of spills	RISK 03
Olivia Lim	April 17, 2013	A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the emissions from over 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants.	ACK
Olson	April 18, 2013	Since coming, I have met some landowners and it's clear that TransCanada is not playing fair ball. They have given reckless, reckless contracts to the landowners. One landowner told me that a pumping station needs to be over a half a mile away from a house. Well, his proposed pumping station is within a half mile of three houses. TransCanada wanted land to park their trucks and he said, well, can you park them at the pumping station? And they said, no, we can't rip up our sod.	LEG 02
Olson	April 22, 2013	We rely on the aquifer for irrigation and drinking from Nebraska through Texas. Thats just how important it is to protect the aquifer.	ACK
Olson	April 22, 2013	Canada keep his dirty oil there and ship it out through the Great Lakes.	ALT 05
Olson	April 22, 2013	We need alternative energy and much more fuel efficient cars NOT more destruction of our environment.	PN 02
Olson	April 22, 2013	This absolutely must not go through the fragile Nebraska sandhills the largest land formation of its kind in the world.	WRG 04
Oneechan	March 19, 2013	Keystone XL must not go through the United States. Canada rejected Trans-Canada's pipeline on its soil. Why should America take on something Canadaa doesn't want from one of its own corporations? Americans don't even get to keep any of the oil going through the pipeline, unless it spills. This is completely bogus.	ACK
OnnenR	April 18, 2013	The pipeline is supposed to run just a couple hundred yards from our house and our yard. We have been sent harsh letters, threatening us with eminent domain. And to me that's bullying and intimidating. And it's not forthright.	LEG 02
OnnenR	April 18, 2013	The spill in Arkansas is giving me even greater concern. With the size of this pipeline, the barrels per day being 10 times more	RISK 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Orem	April 18, 2013	For us the waters of the high plains aquifers are the catalyst for which we can invest our families, our futures and our fortunes on these plains, feeding our nation and our globe through our honest toil. The Keystone XL Pipeline is a direct threat to that pursuit of life and livelihood. The aquifer is the life-giving resource for us, not just an obstacle to be crossed. Eventually all things manufactured will fail. That is inevitable … And TransCanada has proven repeatedly that they're not very good at building safe pipelines.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Orion Bobo	April 2, 2013	It will not lower our gas prices if the US based oil continues to be priced on a world market.	PN 04
Orion Walsh	April 22, 2013	We need to be investing the tax payers money into clean renewable engery sources and rely less on oil.	PN 02
Orion Walsh	April 22, 2013	The current proposed route of this pipeline goes through the nations largest underground water source, the Ogallala Aquifer. As Nebraskans we can not afford to have oil spilt into our water source.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Ostdiek	April 18, 2013	What people need is better mass transit systems and they need to lobby their governments for better bus systems, better bike lanes, light rail, walkable neighborhoods, and communities so people do not have to drive. The dependence, the need for the oil is based on these horribly unliveable neighborhoods that we have, that people have to drive everywhere. And as far as vehicles, light weighting of vehicles through carbon fiber composite bodies, that makes electrical vehicles possible. All of those technologies are underway. They are having improvements each year. As it goes on, things get better.	ACK
P Yb	April 21, 2013	[Cultural] Surveys conducted for the SEIS are wholly inadequate and incomplete.	CR 02
P Yb	April 21, 2013	I am also concerned about the loss of lives and impacts to the health of [pipeline construction] workers: who is adding up these costs?	RISK 14
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Canada's oil sands industry has always been carefully and responsibly developed with very comprehensive regulatory oversight.	ACK
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL is not about how much oil U.S. chooses to use, but rather it is about where the U.S. chooses to gets its oil.	ACK
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	oil sands producers are required to reclaim and restore land impacted by development to a standard equivalent to pre-disturbance.	ACK
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Producers are also required to support world-class environmental monitoring to ensure that overall air, water and land impacts remain below highly protective environmental thresholds.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Working with Canadian governments, the industry is aggressively pursuing continuous improvement in all aspects of environmental performance.	ACK
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	The US Congressional Research Service has concluded that Keystone XL will have a negligible impact on US greenhouse gas emissions.	CLIM 15
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Recent reports predicting US energy independence are based on an assumption that we will continue to import millions of barrels of oil per day from our reliable friend and ally - Canada.	PN 04
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	[The Project] will improve America's energy security by replacing oil imports from less friendly, and less secure suppliers such as Venezuela and the Middle East.	PN 10
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Approval of the Keystone XL pipeline will ensure continued opportunity for companies like ours to benefit from ongoing development of this vital North American resource.	SO 07
P. Welch Goggins, Jr.	April 18, 2013	Canadian oil sands development contributes to jobs and economic prosperity for my business, and there are many other U.S. businesses that benefit from the Canada-U.S. energy relationship.	SO 09
PageE	April 18, 2013	Things on [Native American] reservations can be very difficult. They struggle in so many ways. And to impede on what little we have given back to them, to take from the few lands that we have let them have, which it just seems to me so brazen and just -- didn't we learn anything from the past 100 years? And it seems very unfair and very unjust.	EJ 01
PageE	April 18, 2013	It is not a matter of if there is a spill, there will be a spill, it is only a matter of when.	RISK 21
PageE	April 18, 2013	TransCanada has an absolutely dismal record when it comes to pipeline spills. The fact that we would look at their record with anything but alarm is fundamentally ignorant.	RISK 25
PageM	April 18, 2013	[Approving Keystone XL is a] Negative impact on a comprehensive strategy to address climate change	CLIM 18
PageM	April 18, 2013	I think the proper name for this pipeline project is Keystone export pipeline because there is no energy security from this pipeline. All the refined product is going overseas to places, like, Asia, Europe and South America. There's no obligation to reserve this fuel for American consumers.	PN 01
PageM	April 18, 2013	- No obligation to reserve this fuel for American consumers	PN 07
PageM	April 18, 2013	-Refined product will be sold for maximum profit to consumers in Asia, Europe, South America	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
PageM	April 18, 2013	In terms of health, Denver itself had its own pipeline spilled, tar sands oil in 2011, that caused the closure of a technical service facility at Suncor Refinements - - Refinery, in Denver, caused workers to wear respirators. Their risk to drinking water, agricultural, wildlife habitat and chemical release of these tar sands oils released benzene, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, both carcinogens, hydrogen sulfide, which has a very high acute toxicity, and bitumen, which is very harmful to the environment. … The Keystone I pipeline had 30 spills over its 3-year lifetime. It's only three years old. The predicted spill rate was once every 7 years, but they've had 30 in 3 years.	RISK 07
PageM	April 18, 2013	• Lack of information on diluents - Diluents still under study by American Academy of Sciences - Not due for completion until 2014 - Other researchers have found that dilbit is ABNORMALLY hazardous to	RISK 12
PageM	April 18, 2013	The first EIS done by the EPA on this project had an inadequate rating because of the lack of information on the diluents	RISK 12
PageM	April 18, 2013	• Keystone1 has had 30 spills over its lifetime (summer 2010) - Predicted spill rate was once every 7 years	RISK 26
PageM	April 18, 2013	• Far more jobs could be created by the - Development of a clean energy economy and infrastructure - Water and sewage pipelines - Transportation infrastructure - Energy conservation - Electric grid - Public transportation	SO 05
PageM	April 18, 2013	• Cornell University's Global Labor Institute • Most jobs will be temporary and non local • Pipeline steel manufactured outside the US	SO 11, SO 03
Paige Geimer	April 15, 2013	The money that is funding this project could go into research and development for cleaner energies. The damage the pipeline will do to the environment, health of the people around it, and our economy greatly outweighs the short term benefits.	PN 05, PN 03
Paige Leytem	March 31, 2013	We already have clean/renewable energy sources powering parts of our nation in both the public and private sector. The capital that would have been used for this pipeline should instead be invested into continued research into renewables as well as natural resource management.	ALT 01
Paige Mcnamara	March 1, 2013	there is ample evidence that tar sands mining AND refining is a major pollutant that releases toxic carcinogens in the… water	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paige Mcnamara	March 1, 2013	there is ample evidence that tar sands mining AND refining is a major pollutant that releases toxic carcinogens in the air	CU 04, CLIM 17
Paige Mcnamara	March 1, 2013	http://earthfirstnews.files.wordpress.com/2013/02/tsb-spotty-welding.jpg this photo was taken by activists from within a section of pipe that was subsequently LAID IN THE GROUND	RISK 23
Paige Mcnamara	March 4, 2013	http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/WEBBothWeldPics.jpg this pictures, taken inside pipe on the 'Gulf Coast Project', the southern half of KXL, very clearly show the welds are flawed	RISK 23
Paige Murphy-young	April 15, 2013	The purpose and need for Keystone XL cited in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) responding to the “market demand of refineries” for heavy crude oil (acknowledged in the SEIS to primarily consist of diluted bitumen -- dilbit -- a toxic substance). No challenge to the legitimacy of this “need” is set forth in the SEIS. The State Department admits that much of the refined Keystone will be exported to China and other countries but does not acknowledge that nations’ efforts to avoid pollution and global climate change is reducing all nations’ demand for fossil fuels. (Even the United States use of fossil fuels is declining.) Far from a satisfying national “need”, any benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline are starkly limited to pecuniary interests of its corporate owners, operators, consultants and lobbyists.	PN 07, CLIM 18
Paige Murphy-young	April 15, 2013	Environmental impact statements are subject to the conflict of interest standards set forth in 15 CFR § 1506.5(c), namely: a person cannot enter into a contract with a federal agency to prepare an EIS when that party has at that time and during the life of the contract pecuniary or other interests in the outcomes of the proposal. The initial EIS for the proposed Keystone XL was infected with conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest have not been cured in the SEIS currently being considered. The State Department can reduce public concerns about conflict, about possible fraud, involving the Keystone project by improving transparency. Full explanations of the role of TransCanada contractors played in the Environmental Resources Management’s (ERM) preparation of the Keystone Report are an essential first step.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paige Murphy-young	April 15, 2013	The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) is the agency primarily responsible for regulation of the Keystone XL pipeline, including enforcement of critical safety and environmental standards. Subject to serious Congressional scrutiny and several DOT Inspector General audits over the decades, PHMSA is chronically understaffed and underfunded, relying extensively on self-regulation by the pipeline operators themselves. Under the current political and economic conditions, it is highly improbable that PHMSA will receive the funding and political backing necessary to provide the governmental oversight necessary to prevent catastrophic spills and accidents. We're learning from the continuing BP disaster how easily a project subject only to superficial understanding/control by a small agency can create monumental, long enduring devastation. We don't need another, a worse, tragedy to reinforce the lesson.	RISK 03, LEG 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paige Murphy-young	April 15, 2013	The environmental threats of the proposed Keystone XL Project -- not to mention current spills in older parts of the pipeline system that will be used to transport toxic and corrosive dilbit -- are inaccurately described in the SEIS. The economic impacts of these spills (which are admitted to be unavoidable) to agriculture, health care and taxpayers (who must pay for most of the remediation costs) are largely trivialized or dismissed entirely in the SEIS. The largest spills described in Appendix K, Historical Pipeline Incident Analysis (PHMSA data) are limited to 20,000 barrels (840,000 gallons). Considering data collected from January 2002 through July, 2012, the PHMSA doesn't distinguish crude oil from the Bakken Crude diluted with other substances (dilbit). The devastating Enbridge pipeline spill, which has reached the Kalamazoo River, occurred in July 2010, but apparently was not included in the SEIS/PHMSA report of spill magnitudes. According to a recent Congressional Research Service report, EPA had estimated that over 1.1 million gallons of dilbit crude were released by the Enbridge pipeline spill, a spill contaminating over 220 acres. Such "very large spills" were not included in the PHMSA database. Of particular relevance is the fact that TransCanada's Keystone pipeline had 14 spills in its first year of operations, one in South Dakota, releasing 21,000 gallons. The SEIS sanguinely estimates that releases of "crude" to groundwater could spread oil on water table up to 1, 2114 feet with dissolved components, such as benzene (a hazardous, carcinogenic substance) possibly spreading another 1,050 feet. According to the SEIS, pipeline spills to surface waters, such as Enbridge's near Kalamazoo River and Exxon's near Mayflower, Arkansas, "are expected to be no greater than 1,214 feet from the release point." Tragically, the Enbridge and Exxon spills demonstrate that pipeline spills of dilbit materials have a far greater reach than the SEIS' wishful thinking. Assertions about Keystone's impacts on water resources simply cannot be factually supported. Thus, the SEIS' environmental analyses and its assessment of alternatives do not comply with NEPA.	RISK 26
Paige Shea	April 5, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate and its significant risk for toxic spills.	RISK 14
Paige Smith	April 21, 2013	The crude [in this proposed pipeline] being transported to Texas will do little to nothing to make the U.S. more energy independent…[because] the refineries are planing to send the majority of the refined product to oversees markets.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pak Shem	April 4, 2013	Tar sand contains benzene, which is a toxic chemical enables people who contaminated with it to develop leukemia.	RISK 30, RISK 12
Pam Camp	April 4, 2013	President Obama said, “We must be the generation that ends the tyranny of oil.” The Canadian tar sands oil is the vice-tyrant here, after #1 Saudi Arabian oil fields, in terms of abundance. The tyranny of oil must stop here and now because tar sand oil that would be in the Keystone XL Pipeline is so damaging to the environment: our own health depends directly on the health of the environment.	PN 05
Pam Camp	April 4, 2013	the construction jobs are temporary, and that just as many people could be hired to instead rebuild parts of our existing infrastructure that are dangerously deteriorated.	SO 05
Pam Camp	April 4, 2013	most of the oil to be shipped and refined is ultimately destined for foreign export, and that from a tax-free zone. As a result, America will not even receive tax revenues for allowing a foreign company to “throw away” oil that we ourselves could be using.	SO 14
Pam Fenton	April 17, 2013	Do not risk more of our country to the dangers of tar sands and oil spills!	ACK
Pam Johnston	March 4, 2013	I would encourage approval of Keystone Pipeline for jobs and energy independence.	PN 10
Pam Niedermayer	March 28, 2013	if you want to sell junky, expensive oil to the Chinese, let the Canadiens do it themselves. There's absolutely no reason this pipeline needs to enter the US	PN 05
Pam Ramirez	March 28, 2013	We are making progress with alternative and renewable energy. Promoting Keystone Pipeline and fossil fuel will undermine this.	ALT 01
Pam Ramirez	March 28, 2013	Any jobs that are a part of this project are a red herring as they will be very temporary again not worth the long term risk.	SO 04
Pam Sorrell	April 20, 2013	Have you seen the photos of the wasteland where they extract this "oil"? That was the boreal forest where North American bird species went in the summer.	ACK
Pam Sorrell	April 20, 2013	The tar sands oil is a dangerous and bottom-of-the-barrel commodity. XL is desperately trying to get rid of it now before renewable energy sources are even cheaper and more available. It is obvious that the ethical and wise thing to do is to forge ahead with wind and solar, with natural gas as a back-up. Why would we sacrifice our beautiful planet to the greed of Transcanada? They should be investing in renewables to balance their bad investment in the tar sands.	PN 05
Pam Sorrell	April 20, 2013	It is horrible that we would endanger the precious aquifer that will only grow more valuable with time. We will see the time when clean water is more valuable than any other commodity on the planet.	WRG 01
Pam Terrell	March 27, 2013	A transparent, thorough review would include following the money. Since the oil is meant for export to faraway buyers, not U.S. citizens, and because U.S. citizens stand squarely in the path of risk while gaining insignificantly in jobs numbers -- why would U.S. decision makers approve such a project?	PN 07
Pamela Bergdall	April 3, 2013	Why are we not going all out to invest in the clean and renewable energies that will bring us the life of the future?	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pamela Brandt	March 17, 2013	Please do not sacrifice the health of the living creatures on this earth for the sake of the profits of a few...The Keystone pipeline should NOT be allowed to pollute our land and water, divide and diminish wildlife habitat, and negatively impact the future for all of us. The big energy interests that wish to ignore science for the sake of financial gain do not act in the interests of our world.	PN 05
Pamela Butler	April 15, 2013	Spend the money it would cost on green energy initiative and technology and encourage consumers to be more aware of their carbon foot prints.	ALT 01
Pamela Carson	April 13, 2013	Here in Utah we have had several pipeline leaks that have caused damaged and killed plants and animal and made the land toxic until it was cleaned up. Please keep you eye on these fossil fuel companies and the pipelines.	RISK 13
Pamela Check	March 30, 2013	Substandard materials are being used; it is a danger to our water and land.	PD 06
Pamela Daniel	March 7, 2013	Extraction and refinement of tar-sands oil produces two to three times more greenhouse gases than conventional oil. It also represents a massive new source of fossil fuels that would be catastrophic for the climate.	CLIM 12
Pamela Daniel	March 7, 2013	Development of the tar sands is leading to the destruction of millions of acres of boreal forest and requires three barrels of fresh water for every barrel of oil produced in the process; The Keystone XL pipeline will cross over a thousand water bodies, including the Yellowstone and Platte rivers. A spill into any of these waters would be a disaster.	CU 07, CU 01, RISK 07, WRS 09
Pamela Daniel	March 7, 2013	An existing pipeline called Keystone 1 has already leaked 14 times since it began operations in June 2010 -- including one spill that dumped 21,000 gallons of tar-sands crude	RISK 29
Pamela Daniel	March 7, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is also a disaster for endangered species, including whooping cranes, American burying beetles, pallid sturgeon and other	TES 14
Pamela Elliott	April 22, 2013	Please do not approve any other tar sands pipeline until the industry is able to effectively clean up its inevitable spills. The spill in Wazoo, Missippe has still not been completely cleaned up after 3 years. Now there is a neighborhood in Arkansas that is suffering due to the mismanagement of the pipelines. We do not know how to clean tar sand spills. Just think of what would happen if one of these spills contaminates underground water supplies?	RISK 08
Pamela Glaze	March 11, 2013	We need to work together to discover and implement the most sustainable methods of living in our world....and the XL is not it. Please consider the science and ignore the politics...this one time.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pamela J. Richart	April 22, 2013	Refining tar sands oil is dirtier than refining conventional oil, and results in higher emissions of toxic sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxide. These emissions cause smog and acid rain and contribute to respiratory diseases like asthma. Communities near the refineries where the Keystone XL pipeline would terminate, many of them low-income and communities of color, already live with dangerously high levels of air pollution.	CU 04
Pamela J. Richart	April 22, 2013	In addition, experience tells us that spills along its 1,179 mile course are inevitable -- over 1 million gallons of oil have spilled in the Americas only in the last month! Tar Sands is so heavy that it sinks in water, making it almost impossible to clean up if it gets into our waterways or aquifers.	WRS 04
Pamela Keltie	April 3, 2013	The XL Pipeline is polluting our fresh water systems and fresh water is our last clean resource	ACK
Pamela Keltie	April 3, 2013	Look towards spending money on clean energy and creating jobs from clean energy.	ALT 01
Pamela Levesque	April 9, 2013	I have been watching with horror the reports of the oil spill in Arkansas and combined with the other disastrous spills over the years am more than concerned. I am looking to you, my former senator, to act appropriately and help to end our dependence on dirty energy.	RISK 13
Pamela Lewis-pike	March 16, 2013	This will not produce jobs, for employment it's a temporary fix	SO 01
Pamela Mandler	April 19, 2013	Extracting crude from tar sands is not an environmentally sound thing to do. This is even before the problem of burning the refined oil an adding to greenhouse gases.Climate change is real and is worse than predicted. If we stop burning fossil fuels today, we still will have major problems with ocean acidity, drought, storms etc. But to not only continue on obliviously, but add to the greenhouse gases in a significant way is beyond gross negligence and right into malicious action.	CLIM 14
Pamela Moreno	April 22, 2013	No foreign corporation should be allowed to come to this United States and try to "push their weight around". There should be no eminent domain for a risky pipeline such as KXL.	LEG 02
Pamela Moreno	April 22, 2013	All this dirty tarsands oil is headed for export to another world country that will pay top dollar. How can this be in "the national interest".	PN 07
Pamela Myers	March 13, 2013	We must take serious action to reduce the world's use of fossil fuels.	PN 02
Pamela Oldham	March 30, 2013	Tar sands pipelines have already proven to be unsafe -- an Exxon pipeline ruptured just yesterday in Arkansas, spilling tar sands oil, the dirtiest oil in the world, throughout a residential subdivision and into a lake and displacing dozens of people.	RISK 13
Pamela Pickinpaugh	April 22, 2013	The U. S. needs to move away from oil and focus on alternative energy sources that are less harmful to the environment	PN 02
Pamela Popovich	April 4, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline [will] … be destructive to the natural environment.	ACK
Pamela Popovich	April 4, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline …[will add] to the problems of climate change.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pamela Scrape	April 13, 2013	"Clean-up," when it comes to an oil spill is an oxymoron. It's never fully cleaned up. Residue is in the land and water for ever more. And that's my issue with this and other projects.	RISK 08
Pamela Speight	April 21, 2013	The State department's environmental review of KXL amounts to a cover-up. It attempts to hide the fact that this pipeline would increase the extraction of the dirtiest carbon on Earth, along with the devastating effects of global warming.	CLIM 12
Pamela Speight	April 21, 2013	It (tar sands development) contaminates water, making people sick and killing wildlife. Protection for people and animals who happen to live near the tar sands is woefully inadequate. In fact it is deliberately ignored.	RISK 07
Pamela Speight	April 21, 2013	It has become increasingly obvious that dilbit is highly corrosive and causes leaks that devastate water supplies and wildlife and human habitat, making neighborhoods unlivable. The deadly combination of dilbit and human error make accidents inevitable.	RISK 14
Pamela Speight	April 21, 2013	arms-length studies conducted by economists who do not have a vested interest in in the oil industry -- in both the US and Canada -- have shown that any economic gains from this proposed pipeline would be non-existent or negligible at best.	SO 08
Pamela Wall	March 11, 2013	We must convert to clean energy...now!	ALT 01
Pamela Witman	March 31, 2013	When are we going to stand up as a nation and do the right thing. clean water trumps everything...i don't want to change the water into wine, i want to change the water into more pure water	ACK
Parkin	April 18, 2013	This project promises to wield destruction from start to finish- from the devastating strip mining…use of massive amounts of fresh water…threatening America's heartland farms, tribal lands, and aquifers….	CU 07, CU 02, RISK 06, RISK 07, WRG 01
Parkin	April 18, 2013	The Draft EIS is deeply flawed--assuming this dirty oil will be burned and the CO2 released, but Canadians are blocking pipelines to the E&W, which is why TransCanada is pushing so hard for this pipeline.	PN 06
Parkwood Consulting	April 20, 2013	Parkwood Consulting is a clear example of Canadian oil sands development contributing to jobs and economic prosperity for US businesses. Parkwood consulting has engaged professional management consultants directly in the Ft. McMurray oil sands industry providing income to consultants in Minnesota, Florida, Maine, Colorado, and California.	SO 09
Pastor David	April 13, 2013	Limitations on pipeline transport would force more crude oil to be transported via other modes of transportation, such as rail, which would probably (but not certainly) be more expensive.	ALT 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat	April 22, 2013	Jobs created by the pipeline will go away as soon as the project is completed. If Nebraskans want jobs on the oil pipeline, they could certainly travel to the other states to participate on the jobs created. Its done all the time. The jobs could be filled by non-residents of the state anyway.	SO 04
Pat	April 22, 2013	Jobs created by the pipeline will go away as soon as the project is completed.The jobs could be filled by non-residents of the state anyway.	SO 04
Pat Almonrode	April 2, 2013	Bear in mind that we would face all of these risks and negative impacts for the sake of a handful of permanent jobs	PN 05
Pat Almonrode	April 2, 2013	http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-13/keystone-s-thousands-of-jobs-fall-to-20-when-pipeline-opens-1-.html	REF
Pat Brunson	March 1, 2013	I have seen entire communities over the last 5 years rise up and tell just how much and how bad this pipeline impacts the US and its' citizens. From having their land contaminated just feet from their front door to ground and water being contaminated, to having their DRINKING WATER coming out of the pipes in their homes catch fire due to the pollutants from Keystone XL and fracking.	ACK
Pat Brunson	March 1, 2013	It has been said that the amount of greenhouse gasses will be the same weather we allow the pipeline or not and that it will not change the impact of the atmosphere. Find another alternative besides blowing up the ground beneath us and poisoning our land, water and air.	CLIM 13
Pat Caren	March 20, 2013	the risks the Keystone XL pipeline pose to the environment outweigh any possible economic benefits.	PN 05
Pat Cook	April 11, 2013	If we simply must have the petroleum products, locate the refining process closer to the source material. The Gulf Coast already has more than its share of petroleum related risks.	ALT 08
Pat Evans	March 14, 2013	I am extremely concerned that the Keystone XL pipeline project will worsen global warming through the tar sands mining. We need to be concerned with the long view of our global needs	CLIM 14
Pat Gilbert	March 11, 2013	Tar sands oil…Emits significantly more global warming pollutants than fuels made from conventional oil.	CLIM 12
Pat Gilbert	March 11, 2013	Tar sands oil is one of the dirtiest, costliest, and most destructive fuels in the world. Unlike conventional crude oil, unrefined tar sands is hard to extract, and in order to mine this resource, oil companies are digging up tens of thousands of acres of pristine forest in Alberta, Canada and leaving behind a toxic wasteland. Extracting tar sands: Destroys enormous swaths of important ecosystems in the boreal forest; Produces lake-sized reservoirs of toxic waste;	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Gilbert	March 11, 2013	Tar sands oil …Releases toxic chemicals into our air when it is refined in the U.S. And Canada;	CU 04
Pat Halderman	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will not create jobs. This pipeline will not help the Americans have "more oil." The oil will probably be purchased by China.	PN 07
Pat Halderman	April 22, 2013	This pipeline will leak. It will pollute our water, kill wildlife and endanger the Prairies.	RISK 07
Pat Hoerth	March 6, 2013	To protect the environment and all its inhabitants, we must do everything we can to stop the production of the tar sands oil. The United States has the responsibility and the opportunity to do that—by not allowing it to be transported through the U.S.	PN 01
Pat Lind	April 13, 2013	Stop investing in the most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet and start bringing about real change by subsidizing photovoltaic cells for households and businesses.	PN 02
Pat Marriott	April 2, 2013	Tar sands production wrecks vast areas of boreal forest through surface mining and subsurface production. It sucks up huge quantities of water from local rivers, turns it into toxic waste and dumps the contaminated water into tailing ponds that now cover nearly 70 square miles.	ACK
Pat Marriott	April 2, 2013	A joule, or unit of energy, invested in extracting and processing bitumen (from tar sands) returns only four to six joules in the form of crude oil. In contrast, conventional oil production in North America returns about 15 joules. Because almost all of the input energy in tar sands production comes from fossil fuels, the process generates significantly more carbon dioxide than conventional oil production.	PN 05
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around. Tar sands production sucks up huge quantities of water from local rivers, turns it into toxic waste and dumps the contaminated water into tailing ponds that now cover nearly 70 square miles. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production. New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands under-estimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because they don't account for a high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal: petroleum coke.	ACK
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer	CU 04
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	EJ 02
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	Canada is true to type (for a petro-state). When demand for tar sands energy was strong in recent years, investment in Alberta surged. But that demand also lifted the Canadian dollar, which hurt export-oriented manufacturing in Ontario, Canada's industrial heartland. Then, as the export price of Canadian heavy crude softened in late 2012 and early 2013, the country's economy stalled. Canada's record on technical innovation, except in resource extraction, is notoriously poor. Capital and talent flow to the tar sands, while investments in manufacturing productivity and high technology elsewhere languish.	PN 05
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	ECONOMICS: There are ramifications beyond job claims. See "The Tar Sands Disaster" By THOMAS HOMER-DIXON http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/01/opinion/the-tar-sands-disaster.html?hp&_r=0 Canada is beginning to exhibit the economic and political characteristics of a petro-state. Countries with huge reserves of valuable natural resources often suffer from economic imbalances and boom-bust cycles. They also tend to have low-innovation economies, because lucrative resource extraction makes them fat and happy, at least when resource prices are high.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Marriott	April 10, 2013	Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources. A Cornell study concludes the pipeline would kill more jobs than it would create, by reducing investment in the clean energy economy that already employs 2.7 million Americans. http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/Keystonexl.html. Only 10-15% of the workforce is expected to be hired locally. A state-by-state jobs breakdown reveals very few jobs created in the states along the pipeline, which would disappear after project completion. KXL's U.S. Project Budget is $3.3 billion, NOT $7 billion, a figure arrived at by including $1.6 billion that will be spent in Canada and approximately $2.6 billion already spent or committed, including steel pipe manufactured outside the U.S. A much smaller budget means a lot fewer jobs.	SO 05, SO 02, SO 11
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	* The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. * The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production. * New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands under-estimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because they don't account for a high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal: petroleum coke. devastating tar sands spill.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	JOBS: Claims of new jobs are exaggerated. * Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources. * A Cornell study concludes the pipeline would kill more jobs than it would create, by reducing investment in the clean energy economy that already employs 2.7 million Americans. http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/Keystonexl.html * Only 10-15% of the workforce is expected to be hired locally. A state-by-state jobs breakdown reveals very few jobs created in the states along the pipeline, e.g., 6-18 jobs in Kansas; 90-248 jobs in Nebraska; 41-113 jobs in Oklahoma. These construction jobs would disappear after project completion. * KXL's U.S. Project Budget is $3.3 billion, NOT $7 billion, a figure arrived at by including $1.6 billion that will be spent in Canada and approximately $2.6 billion already spent or committed, including steel pipe manufactured outside the U.S. A much smaller budget means a lot fewer jobs.	ACK
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	* Tar sands surface strip mining and subsurface production wrecks vast areas of boreal forest. It has already destroyed an area the size of Chicago in Canada's boreal forest.	CU 01
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	* This "oil" is really a toxic sludge. Two tons of tar sands produces only one barrel of low-grade, high sulfur crude that requires extensive refining (along with carbon pollution) to become fuel. * Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04, CLIM 12
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	* The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around. * Tar sands production sucks up huge quantities of water from local rivers, turns it into toxic waste and dumps the contaminated water into tailing ponds that now cover nearly 70 square miles. * The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	WRG 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Marriott	April 13, 2013	TransCanada's first pipeline had over 12 spills in the U.S. in its first year, with one spewing 21,000 gallons of oil in North Dakota. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010. Last July, a tar sands accident dumped 42,000 gallons of oil into the Yellowstone River.	WRS 01, RISK 26
Pat Russell	April 20, 2013	I see little hope for the future of this planet if a project like this is allowed to continue, with its dirty oil spill potential…	ACK
Pat Russell	April 20, 2013	I see little hope for the future of this planet if a project like this is allowed to continue,... the further threat… air pollution.	ACK
Pat Russell	April 20, 2013	I see little hope for the future of this planet if a project like this is allowed to continue, with... the further threat to climate…	CLIM 14
Pat Ryals	April 18, 2013	…you surely understand the near certainty of disastrous 'accidents' and the danger to water aquifers and that the ecological costs will outweigh short-term benefits.	PN 05
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	The net energy gained by mining tar sands oil is at least 15% less than conventional oil sources.	PN 02
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	There is a clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives that blocking the Keystone XL pipeline will have negative impact on further development of the Tar Sands in Canada	PN 06
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	To be able to ship oil with the consistency of peanut butter, you have to add some very toxic chemicals like benzene just to get it to flow. The added chemicals are very toxic- they are known carcinogens and hormone disrupters	RISK 07
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	This dense tar-like oil does not float, making cleanup of any spill near to impossible	RISK 08
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	There have already been a number of spills in other pipelines carrying this type of oil	RISK 14
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	Despite TransCanada's assertion that more than half a million jobs will be created, the State Department concludes that only 42,100 temporary jobs will occur, and only 35 permanent jobs	SO 02
Pat Simons	March 20, 2013	The area potentially affected by a spill in the Keystone XL includes the Ogallala Aquifer. The regions overlying this aquifer are some of the most productive for ranching cattle and for growing corn, wheat and soybeans	WRG 01
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	In addition, the places this crude will be used are already polluting at the cost of their own citizens' health and that pollution effects our atmosphere, water sources and carries to our country and others.	ACK
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	There is a clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives that blocking the Keystone XL pipeline will have negative impact on further development of the Tar Sands in Canada	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	The net energy gained by mining tar sands oil is at least 15% less than conventional oil sources.	CLIM 05
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	Please do not allow this devastatingly polluting oil cross our lands, especially when it brings no measureable long term gains for our people.	PN 05
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	To be able to ship oil with the consistency of peanut butter, you have to add some very toxic chemicals like benzene just to get it to flow.	RISK 07
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	This dense tar-like oil does not float, making cleanup of any spill near to impossibl	RISK 08
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	There have already been a number of spills in other pipelines carrying this type of oil	RISK 14
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	Despite TransCanada's assertion that more than half a million jobs will be created, the State Department concludes that only 42,100 temporary jobs will occur, and only 35 permanent jobs.	SO 02
Pat Simons	April 1, 2013	The area potentially affected by a spill in the Keystone XL includes the Ogallala Aquifer. The regions overlying this aquifer are some of the most productive for ranching cattle and for growing corn, wheat and soybeans.	WRG 01
Pat Stallings	March 11, 2013	Aside from the disastrous climate impact, I am particularly concerned about the destruction of the northern boreal forest as this type of mining expands. Many of our songbirds go to these forests to nest each summer and this is another assault on the birds who suffer from numerous other challenges just to survive. And there are many mammals who are being displaced with the woodland caribou being pushed to near extinction.	CU 01
Pat Stallings	March 11, 2013	The potential for disaster (leaks and spills) from the Keystone XL pipeline is not worth the short-term gain of a relatively few jobs to build it.	PN 05
Pat Stallings	April 4, 2013	How can you in good conscious inflict this disaster on the American people? Particularly, when the refined fuel will be exported, not benefiting our people at all.	PN 07
Pat Steinbrick	April 17, 2013	Green energy, wind turbines and solar power were "key" to our pressing energy needs.	PN 02
Pat Strange	March 14, 2013	he pipeline has and will leak. Welds that have been done so poorly that daylight can be seen through the welds have been pointed out and yet they went right ahead and put them in the ground	RISK 23
Pat Tobiason	April 22, 2013	Water is probably our most important resource and affects all areas of life-our lives the animals we raise to eat and that we use to irrigate the land we raise our crops on. Let them find another route that does not endanger our livelihood.	ACK
Pat vauck	April 22, 2013	Are there plans for the removal of the pipeline when the "tar sands" are exhausted in the Canadian area?	PD 02
Pat Webb	April 5, 2013	REJECT the XL Pipeline and start a Clean Energy approach	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patience Sharp	March 14, 2013	The danger of spills in such a crucial natural area which is the staging area for many cranes and other birds is too awful to think about.	RISK 07
Patrice Holmlund	April 9, 2013	It's time to move on into the 21st century and clean energy.	PN 02, ALT 01
Patrice Pare	April 22, 2013	Tapping the tar sands for energy would create an enormous release of carbon into the atmosphere at a time when it is critical for us to reduce the amount of carbon we emit.	CLIM 14
Patrice Pinette	April 17, 2013	scientists are clearly warning us of dire consequences - ... air pollution…	ACK
Patrice Pinette	April 17, 2013	scientists are clearly warning us of dire consequences -… global warming.	ACK
Patrice Pinette	April 17, 2013	Act in strength and peace on behalf of more ecological choices, clean energy, and hope for the planet and all who dwell upon it!	PN 02
Patrice Pinette	April 17, 2013	scientists are clearly warning us of dire consequences - toxic spills…	RISK 10
Patricia Abdullah	March 28, 2013	The oil which might be retrieved is already slated to be refined in Texas near the Gulf and shipped to other countries. How this will help employ the many Americans who need jobs and make America energy independent is a mystery.	PN 05
Patricia Amazalorso	April 15, 2013	It would be unconscionable to have the Keystone XL pipeline cross our states, lands, and aquifers. Please stand firmly in your promises for clean energy and for refusing to acquiesce to such a potentially disastrous spill (as in Arkansas, not to mention numerous others) that the aquifers would be damaged for eons - and we already have water scarcity!	WRG 01, RISK 13
Patricia Amazalorso	April 22, 2013	It clearly goes without saying that the Keystone XL would irrevocably damage our water, land, and air as well as our people and all living things	PN 05
Patricia Bily	April 9, 2013	We should put more attention on alternate sources of energy that are at this moment serving many communities throughout the USA and worldwide with SAFE energy at lower cost to the people.	PN 02
Patricia Brenner	April 9, 2013	Let them build a pipeline across their own territory (Canada), not ours....then they will be responsible for the clean-up and contaminated water, not us.	ALT 05
Patricia Campbell	April 22, 2013	This toxic pipeline should not be run right through our country risking the pumping of this tar sands sludge through our prairies and fields.	PN 05
Patricia Carroll	April 19, 2013	Live up to the responsibility and don't accept obviously flawed EIRs and arguments from complicit lobbyists and regulators.	ACK
Patricia Chang	April 3, 2013	The Obama Administration, with its corrupt alliance with Big Oil, seems determined to help destroy the planet.	ACK
Patricia Cook	April 6, 2013	the destruction of land, wildlife and humanity to build it is unacceptable	ACK
Patricia Cook	April 6, 2013	the product it is carrying is something we should be fazing out to protect our atmosphere and land.	PN 02
Patricia Cook	April 6, 2013	The potential for a rupture and spill is just about inevitable	RISK 21

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patricia Cortez	April 22, 2013	The oil produced will not be for the benefit of the American people. American jobs will not be great enough to justify the grave risk tar sands oil production presents for the environment.	PN 07
Patricia Downing	March 16, 2013	In particular, the SEIS fails to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada; * account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil; * protect sensitive wildlife habitat and natural resources along the pipeline route, in particular the Ogallala Aquifer and Sandhills region; * adequately address safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks posed by tar sands.	ACK
Patricia E. Dunn, Ma, Mfc	April 2, 2013	We cannot afford greenhouse gas spewing oil fromKeystone XL	CLIM 14
Patricia Frey	March 28, 2013	The time is now to move swiftly and with national will to a clean, renewable energy course to free us from foreign and domestic sources of fossil fuel.	ALT 01
Patricia Frey	March 28, 2013	The science is clear. Releasing the CO2 bound in the tar sands reduces any chance we have to slow global warming and the climate change it generates to virtually zero	CLIM 12
Patricia Frey	March 28, 2013	There are many voices that agree having the pipeline will not result in significant job growth; will not help us get to self sufficiency in oil needs	PN 05
Patricia Frey	March 28, 2013	[The pipeline] will result in spills that are potentially disastrous to water, land and wildlife habitat. More than 20 years after the Exxon Valdez, we are still seeing the negative impact of oil spills. More than 2 years since the massive oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico there are continuing findings of ongoing damage	RISK 24
Patricia Fuller	March 5, 2013	Production of tar sands oil could add as much as 240 billion metric tons of global warming pollution to the atmosphere, that will certainly hasten the arrival of some of the worst effects of global warming.	CLIM 05
Patricia Fuller	March 5, 2013	Is it in our national interest to increase pollution in this country by refining this product, which will be shipped to other countries?	PN 05, CLIM 14
Patricia Fuller	March 5, 2013	Your report states that tar sands in Western Canada will be developed for oil production regardless of whether the Keystone XL pipeline is approved. This may be true but will it progress at the same rate with as much economic benefit to the producers? Can they possibly match the 800,000 barrels of diluted bitumen with tar sands shipped by rail?	PN 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patricia Fuller	March 5, 2013	Is it in our national interest to risk any of our rivers and aquifers, given the existence of the current drought?	WRG 03, RISK 07, WRS 04
Patricia Fuller	April 22, 2013	A president who has repeatedly identified climate change as one of the worlds most eminate dangers cannot in good conscience approve the Keystone XL, a project that — even by the State Department's most cautious calculations — can only add to the problem.	CLIM 18
Patricia Fuller	April 22, 2013	But your acknowledgement understates the environmental damage involved: the destruction of the forests that lie above the sands and are themselves an important storehouse for carbon, and the impact on streams that flow through them.	CU 01
Patricia Glasgow	April 13, 2013	Furthermore, the recent spill in Arkansas, and the attempts of Exxon to censor the display of pictures of that mess, emphasizes the risks that the transportation of corrosive fluids like the tar sands across our lands.	RISK 08
Patricia Greenwald	April 13, 2013	And no one addresses the fact that this nasty oil is not even for our use. It will be put on ships and sent to China and Europe for them to process and use.	PN 07
Patricia Harland	April 22, 2013	Not one person will benefit from oil leaking into the water supply, distroying natural habitat and the fragile ecosystems, fouling the air as well... One picture is indeed worth a thousand words - paper towels strewn across the landscape in a laughable but tragic attempt to clean up the tar sands disaster.	RISK 07
Patricia Heithaus	April 11, 2013	I am concerned about the failure of the United States to take a more active lead on addressing the threat of climate change. Supporting the Keystone XL pipeline is one of many examples. It is not just a question of how to safely transport this oil but a question of should we support such a polluting resource. We already know that accidents can and will happen along pipelines. We also know that the tar sands are a very "dirty" energy resource	PN 02
Patricia Holm	April 19, 2013	It will not provide the jobs it claims to provide. There will only be a few good jobs and then only temporary.	SO 04
Patricia Hunting	March 16, 2013	Why are we even still considering this filthy way to produce energy, when we have so many other alternatives that are clean and progressive?	PN 02
Patricia Jones	April 22, 2013	Nebraska would be better off with any of the alternatives to the Keystone Pipeline. We could transport oil by rail or with shorter pipelines to Montana or Wyoming refineries (so it would go to US citizens, not Chinese). Better yet, we could reduce production of tar sands oil, looking for alternative energy rather than increasing demand for fossil fuels.	ALT 04, ALT 01, ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patricia L. Nelson	April 17, 2013	Area where the report can be enhanced: The discussion of GHG emissions and life cycle analysis states that oil sands crude emits 17 percent more GHG's on a life cycle basis than the average barrel refined in the United States in 2005. We find the statement irrevelevant and misleading for the following reasons: (a) the 2012 report by HIS-CERA "Oil Sands Dialogue Getting, The Numbers Right' indicates that new oil sand projects are 2-5% higher in GHG emissions than the average barrel refined in the US in 2005. Keystone XL will provide access to ne markets for oil sands products in the US Gulf Coast which will primarily be fed by new growing production. This lower range is relevant to the discussion. (b) The oil sand crudes transported by the pipeline are in the form of diluted bitumen. This project will allow these products to compete against and displace heavy sour crudes imported into the USGC market. According to the 2012 report by HIS-CERA "Oil Sands Dialogue Getting the Numbers Right" Venezuelan and Mexican crudes have life-cycle GHG emissions of 3-4% higher than the referenced average barrel refined in the United States in 2005. They should be compared to those crude types and not the average barrel refined in the US in 2005 with the result that there is no increase in life cycle GHG's resulting from the project. (c) These increases are referenced against a 2005 crude mix. World crudes are getting heavier over time and an 8 yr old reference point may not be relevant.	CLIM 08
Patricia L. Nelson	April 17, 2013	the report can be enhanced by addressing the corrosivity of the product. While the National Academy of Science study of this aspect of environmental risk remains a work in progress, two other studies, the Alberta Innovates Energy and Dilbit and Conventional Crude", Septermber 2011 and the UK study by the Penspen Integrity entitled "State of the Art Report on Dilbit Corrosivity", February 2013, indicate that oil sands crude oils do not pose any increase risk of corrosion over other petroleum products transported by pipeline.	PD 04
Patricia L. Nelson	April 17, 2013	Areas where the report can be enhanced:" Discussion of the socio-economics of the operating phase of the project should include the tax revenue generation from the project in addition to the job creation figures noted. Tax generation during pipeline operation is a positive and significan benefit of the project."	SO 14
Patricia L. Nelson	April 17, 2013	Sinking Oil referenced at the bottom of page - Although this is an area of continued study by a number of organizations, the product transported by the project s diluted bitumen and Bakken light oil. These are not sinking oils and should not be referred to as such.	EDIT
Patricia Mettenbrink	April 22, 2013	There are other ways to devise clean energy without using tar sand and piping this toxic substance across our ranchlands/farm lands and Aquif	ACK
Patricia Nazzaro	April 9, 2013	I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patricia O'connor	March 31, 2013	[KXL would reslut in]more destruction of our clean air	ACK
Patricia O'connor	March 31, 2013	[KXL would result in more]... health issues…	ACK
Patricia O'connor	March 31, 2013	[KXL would result in]More destruction of our environment and its wildlife	ACK
Patricia O'connor	March 31, 2013	[KXL would result in] more destruction of our clean water aquifers	WRG 01
Patricia Perrier	April 11, 2013	Why aren't we following up with different and new technologies--biorefineries for example--with lignocellulosic biomass feedstock.	PN 02
Patricia Plowman	April 20, 2013	Actions have consequences. The next oil spill by rail or boat will be your fault!	ACK
Patricia Priest	April 6, 2013	say No to the pipeline and show that we must wean ourselves off oil to stave off the worst of global climate change.	CLIM 14
Patricia Rivard	April 18, 2013	This pipe should not go through our country- no more oil spills and contaminated water!	ACK
Patricia Rivard	April 18, 2013	This thick sludge is too dangerous to process and burn, and it will pollute the earth, ruining it for humanity	CLIM 14
Patricia Schalk	April 9, 2013	Secretary Kerry, I know you've probably heard of the American Indian saying: We did not inherit the earth from our fathers, but we are borrowing it from our children. I do not want to leave this earth in such a state that my children and my grandchildren and, God willing, their children will have even the problems from the Keystone XL to deal with in their lives. Thank you for your consideration of this major issue.	ACK
Patricia Storrer	March 28, 2013	Would Canada allow us to dictate its domestic policy? Not likely! This is an attack on U.S. sovereignty over our air, land and water resources.	PN 08
Patricia Todd	April 5, 2013	WE NEED CLEAN SUSTAINABLE ENERGY OPTIONS!	ALT 01
Patricia Vogler	April 22, 2013	The risks associated with pipelines are far greater than any benefits that would be gained. There would be few permanent jobs created, and the chance of oil spills is too great. The U.S would gain no energy security from this project since the oil will be destined for export.	PN 01
Patricia White	March 28, 2013	Instead of encouraging further production of this dirty, inefficient carbon-intensive fuel that is laying waste to huge tracts of native lands and natural habitat, please use your leadership to raise fuel standards and encourage development of electric vehicles drawing power from solar, wind, geothermal and other clean energy technologies.	ALT 01
Patricia White	March 28, 2013	Finally, heavy, sludgy tar sands oil requires chemical treatment to be transported through a pipe, thus cancelling out much of the cost advantage pipeline transport would have over the present method of shipping by rail	PN 05
Patricia White	March 28, 2013	.Please note that the report that the State Dept is relying on was prepared by a firm that was hired by TransCanada, which makes its information highly suspect..	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patricia White	March 28, 2013	I don't buy the idea that Keystone XL will create many new jobs. In actuality the number of permanent jobs it would create is well under 100--in fact, more in the vicinity of 5	SO 02
Patricia White	April 2, 2013	Despite this plethora of recent spill incidents, the report prepared for the State Dept.by a company named Environmental Resources Management (ERM) concluded that the XL pipeline would be safe. However, it turns out that rather than being an independent, unbiased source, ERM was under contract to TransCanada. I am shocked and outraged that the U.S. government would be basing the very crucial XL pipeline decision on such compromised and suspect information.	PRO 01
Patricia White	April 2, 2013	The March 29, 2013 pipe spill of 500,000 gallons of tar sands crude in Mayflower, Arkansas is only the latest in a string of similar incidents in the past three years: - In 2010, an Enbridge Energy pipeline in Michigan broke and spilled more than 800,000 gallons of toxic tar sands crude into the Kalamazoo River -- and it still hasn't been fully cleaned up. - Also in 2010, TransCanada, the company that wants to build the Keystone XL pipeline now, built a pipeline that experienced 12 separate spills in a single year. - In 2011, one of Exxon Mobil's pipelines in Montana ruptured and contaminated the Yellowstone River. - And just last week, a train derailed in Minnesota and spilled 30,000 gallons of tar sands crude. The spill in Arkansas happened even though supposedly advanced spill prevention technology was in place. This, and the number of recent spills, leads one to question the petroleum industry's assurances that the Keystone XL pipeline would not pose damage to the environment. The record speaks otherwise.	RISK 14
Patricia Williams	April 11, 2013	And the Keystone XL pipeline will not benefit the people of the USA--except the oil industry executives!	PN 08
Patrick	April 17, 2013	New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands under-estimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because they don’t account for a high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal: petroleum coke.	ACK
Patrick Colleran	April 22, 2013	Fact: Building the Keystone XL will directly impact the expansion of tar sands, and in turn speed up climate change.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patrick Colleran	April 22, 2013	Fact: The KXL holds more economic risks than profits. The job creation claims being made by pipeline supporters and some media outlets are wildly exaggerated. While Rush Limbaugh says the KXL will create up to a million jobs, an independent study done by Cornell estimates the number to be closer to 2,000 temporary jobs, and that the KXL could kill more jobs than it actually creates. The most recent State Department EIS estimates that the KXL will only create 35 jobs.	SO 05
Patrick Goodhall	April 22, 2013	Build Refineries where the oil is (Canada / North Dakota), not Gulf Coast for Export.	ALT 08
Patrick Litzinger	March 10, 2013	Additionally, it is unethical for the State Department to use one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write a climate impact report! How can such a report be trusted as factual when a major concern who has a vested interested in seeing the pipeline approved helps write the report?	PRO 01
Patrick Mllegan	April 16, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	ACK
Patrick Mllegan	April 16, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada’s first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010.	RISK 26
Patrick Pinel	April 22, 2013	The hiring of a subcontractor with close ties to the industry whose’s impacts it must analyze brings serious questions as to the impartiality of this report	PRO 01
Patrick Pinel	April 22, 2013	http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/24/usa-keystone-rail-idUSL2N0DB23P20130424	REF
Patrick Post	April 17, 2013	It would be better to build new refineries in Canada than to build and maintain a 2000 mile pipeline to Texas...Major hurricanes occasionally occur in the U.S. gulf coast states and they threaten U.S. energy supplies..Building several new refineries in Alberta, Canada would diversify and safeguard America's energy supplies...Refined Keystone oil could then be sent by rail or through new pipelines running only to U.S. northern states.	ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patrick Post	April 17, 2013	12. There is a major earthquake fault zone that is 200-400 miles from existing and proposed pipeline routes. 13. This zone is near the Mississippi River 150 miles south of St. Louis, MO and 100 miles north of Memphis, TN. 14. It is called the New Madrid Seismic Zone and in 1811-12 it created four of the largest earthquakes in U.S. history. 15. These earthquakes were felt from Canada to Mexico because the deep soft wet plains soil became liquefied from the earthquake. 16. News articles during these times stated the American Plains looked like an ocean with ten foot high swells. 17. Scientists have indicated there is a 50% chance that new earthquakes could occur within the next 50 years. ...THE NEW MADRID FAULT ZONE FOUR MAJOR 7.0-7.5 EARTHQUAKES IN MIDWEST DEC.1811 - FEB.1812 EARTHQUAKES FELT OVER 33% OF U.S. - ONE MILLION SQUARE MILES 50% CHANCE OF A MAJOR EARTHQUAKE WITHIN THE NEXT 50 YEARS 18. If a major earthquake occurs again at New Madrid, this would destroy all pipelines within a 750 mile radius.	GEO 01
Patrick Roy	April 18, 2013	an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created. Nebraska families, small businesses and ag producers are struggling with record-high gasoline and diesel prices and this expanded energy infrastructure can provide relief and long-term energy security.	ACK
Patrick Schnell	April 15, 2013	Has anyone conducted a probabilistic calculation of the likelihood of spills per mile of pipeline and per unit of time? What are the associated clean up costs and what is the projected environmental damage?	RISK 10
Patrick Stuart	March 14, 2013	The job that would be created by this project were initially highly overstated and have since come down significantly from those initial estimates to where it is clear that this is not a meaningful "job creator"	SO 02
Patrick Turney	March 15, 2013	Not only are the Tar sands very destructive to their local enveironment but this very dirty oil that is extracted will when processed release even greater amounts of pollution. Please deny this permit	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Patrick Ward	March 14, 2013	This project would do wonders for the U.S. economy. It would boost job numbers and provide a major economic stimulus for local governments, businesses, and communities across the country. The Keystone XL pipeline-:--which is privately funded- is a project ·that will stimulate the economy and create real jobs for :highly trained, skilled workers. It will create 13,000 new construction jobs, 7,000 manufactUring jobs, and up to 118,000 additional jobs in related fields.	PN 10
Patti Dorr	April 4, 2013	No corporation should be allowed to take American property for the transport of foreign toxic material for export and corporate gain.	LEG 02
Patti Holmlund	April 20, 2013	It's time to put our efforts into renewable energy, fix infrastructure, and turn away from fossil fuels and the handful of men who care only of money.	PN 02
Patti Jackson	March 10, 2013	Most likely, this fossil fuel will go to other countries and not reduce our dependence.	PN 04
Patty Deyoung	March 28, 2013	Additionally, it is disheartening to not only learn that the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement pushed aside the significant risk for toxic spills and the pipeline's adverse impact on the climate, but to hear that its "authors" have previously worked for TransCanada, which company stands to make the most in financial gains from the pipeline.	PRO 01
Patty Pantano	March 10, 2013	When, oh when, is our government and the Obama administration going to stand up against the greedy profit motives of big oil and gas corporations. We cannot remedy the kinds of environmental disasters that the completion of this pipeline will rain down upon us. Do what you know is right for the next generations to come, please	PN 05
Patty Saul	April 22, 2013	The project will only employ about 50 people after it is built.	PN 05
Paul Alfieri	March 26, 2013	The pipeline would endanger the boreal forest…	CU 01
Paul Alfieri	March 26, 2013	There is also the inherent possibility of spills and leakages	RISK 21
Paul Alfieri	March 26, 2013	The pipeline would endanger…wetlands…	WET 03
Paul Alfieri	March 26, 2013	The pipeline would endanger… rivers and water supplies along its path.	WRG 01
Paul Amalfitano	April 9, 2013	risks our most vital aquifers to help Canada ship it	ACK
Paul Amalfitano	April 9, 2013	This pipeline that goes across major aquifers is ONLY GOOD FOR CANADA so they can ship it overseas and boost other economies and exploit cheap labor.	PN 05
Paul Amalfitano	April 9, 2013	It provides no new American jobs	SO 02
Paul And Karen Larson	April 22, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in r enewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 03
Paul And Karen Larson	April 22, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	WRG 01
Paul Beaudette	April 14, 2013	* account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil;	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Beaudette	April 14, 2013	* examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada;	CU 01
Paul Beaudette	April 14, 2013	* adequately address safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks posed by tar sands.	RISK 14
Paul Beno	March 24, 2013	Why should we use the power of eminent domain to force land owners to sell their farm land to this Canadian Corporation. It seems that the whole proposal violates the property rights of every US citizen along the pipeline route with no corresponding benefit our society.	LEG 02
Paul Booker	March 28, 2013	This country requires bold leadership on climate change and we thought you were going to provide it.	CLIM 18
Paul Burks	March 19, 2013	I cannot believe that the state of California, with its environmental leadership, would support tar sands oil when the nation is focusing on phasing out oil of every kind, but especially the dirtiest. Those who have spoken out most strongly are the most well-informed energy experts. California most continue to lead on energy directions and sustainability. Please do so! Perhaps the construction of the pipeline has been made less problematic by rerouting. But the use of that oil has not been. And as Thomas Friedman said recently, "We are driving toward a cliff in the fog. The best thing to do is SLOW down." We must slow down the extraction of this oil, and hope our Canadian enviromnetalist cohorts will do so as well. I was among the thousands who demonstrated in San Francico last month.	ACK
Paul Camina	April 2, 2013	Why aren't we just building windmills EVERYWHERE, creating jobs and free energy ???	SO 05, ALT 01
Paul Carmody	March 3, 2013	The report’s recognition that the bitumen reserves will continue to be developed and produced is the key finding in the report. Those who oppose the pipeline have the naïve expectation that if the pipeline is stopped the oil will stop being produced.	ACK
Paul Carmody	March 3, 2013	Your report makes clear to me that: 1) the development of WCSB will proceed regardless of the pipeline approval	PN 06
Paul Carmody	March 3, 2013	Once it is conceded that development will happen the next step is to make the best choice possible, which happens to be the Keystone XL pipeline.	PN 09
Paul Carmody	March 3, 2013	Your report makes clear to me that…The pipeline is the superior choice among the available alternatives.	PN 09
Paul Darlow	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow this pipeline to be built across the aquifer! Similar pipelines are springing leaks far quicker than the builders claimed! A leak in this area would be devastating for the farmers ranchers and wildlife that depend on the aquifer for their supply of clean water.	RISK 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Darlow	April 22, 2013	Similar pipelines are springing leaks far quicker than the builders claimed! A leak in this area would be devastating for the farmers, ranchers and wildlife that depend on the aquifer for their supply of clean water!	RISK 14
Paul Digiammarino	March 9, 2013	Finally, tar sands destroys our environment, our clean water, our clean air and dramatically accelerates climate change.	CLIM 17
Paul Digiammarino	March 9, 2013	The tar sands oil will be shipped overseas and will likely increase the price of gasoline in the Midwest. The primary reason TransCanada wants to build the pipeline is to sell tar sands oil outside the US at world market prices.	PN 07, PN 04
Paul Digiammarino	March 9, 2013	Tar sands oil spills will pollute our water. Tar sands pipelines have a history of many more spills than light crude pipelines. In fact the first Keystone pipeline had 12 spills in the first 12 months of operation. And tar sands spills are extraordinarily difficult to clean up.	RISK 13
Paul Digiammarino	March 9, 2013	The pipeline will only create 2,500 temporary jobs - and if history is any indicator - most of those jobs will go to Canadians.	SO 09
Paul Elkins	April 18, 2013	Why isn't the refinery to process the tar sands build where the tar sands are located? Then we are talking about shipping the oil and associated products to where it needs to go, which will have to happen regardless of where the refinery is located.	ALT 08
Paul Fellows	April 22, 2013	A larger environmental impact which we must consider is the effect of millions of barrels of tar sands oil being burned into our atmosphere.	CLIM 10
Paul Fellows	April 22, 2013	Following that logic, then, there is no reason to build a pipeline, particularly a pipeline that most people know will be used to transport Canadian tar sands crude to super-ports in the Gulf states so that the oil may be exported to second world countries who will burn it willingly as they attempt to catch up with the first world.	PN 07
Paul Jackson	March 14, 2013	http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/110/hr6/text	REF
Paul Jacobson	April 8, 2013	The past two weeks there have been oil spills in MN, AR, and TX. Now it's more clear than ever that pipelines are dangerous to the people and animals nearby. This doesn't even include the dangers Keystone XL brings to climate change.	RISK 13
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Section 5.1 the no action alternative should also forecast a scenario under the assumption that production will not be increased and that the political support for increased production in the government of Canada will wane with time.	ALT 09
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Section 3.11 and 4.11 the EIS is lacking in mandated tribal consultation in both of these sections. The major issue is that many sites are not yet evaluated and that State historical preservation officers are consulted but not tribal historical preservation officers. This is a major oversight and shortcoming in both the original draft EIS and in this version.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Section 4.11 discusses the details of consultation with BLM but not the details of consultation with the tribes (THPO) who have a right to consultation on the preservation of cultural resources, detail of the tribal consultation process must be explicit on p4.11-3.	CR 01
Paul James	March 3, 2013	The statement on page 4.11-4 " Given the temporary nature...are anticipated." should be evaluated by Tribal leaders based upon Executive Order 13175 requiring proactive tribal consultation, and: [NAGPRA], [ARPA],[AIRFA], [NEPA--tribal consultation], and [NHPA].	CR 01
Paul James	March 3, 2013	[section 4.15.3.3] repeatedly states the assumption that impacts will be low IF "properly implemented and maintained mitigations" occur in regards to surface and groundwater impacts. The problem is that this assumption ignores the fact that over a ten year period spills will occur and cleanup, if completed as required by law, will significantly increase these 'cumulative impacts'. This section must be expanded to account for the cumulative impacts of spill response scenarios and the conclusion [on page 4.15-42] should be updated accordingly.	CU 17
Paul James	March 3, 2013	On p 4.11-2 "Federal agencies…measures as necessary. " should also include affected tribes and the legislative requirements should include NAGPRA [104 STAT. 3048 PUBLIC LAW 101-601--NOV. 16, 1990] and amendments as well as NHPA. In this section many importatn details are allocated to the later treatment plan as opposed to including them in the EIS, this is unacceptable as it does not give tribes sufficient time to review the actual impacts nor does it give the president an accurate representation of the full impacts in this area.	LEG 03, CR 02
Paul James	March 3, 2013	In the methods used to assess the impacts of alternatives the criteria pollutants measured air pollutants (CO, NOx, SO2, PM 10, PM 2.5) but not the hydrocarbon pollutants from spills under the different alternatives. The hydrocarbon spill impacts should also be assessed for the alternatives in detail here and in the sections that discuss them.	RISK 07, ALT 07
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Pipeline age should be accounted for when making the assertion that Alberta products are not more corrosive as I believe they are due to greater presence of fine particle sand, sulfur and water.	RISK 11
Paul James	March 3, 2013	The detail in this section is very cursory when dealing with the unknowns such as ground cover and soil dispersion and water dispersion.	RISK 11
Paul James	March 3, 2013	general statements like "Chemicals in the oil could dissolve into groundwater and then migrate away from the release site." are vague and should instead discuss the impacts of Petroleum, Hexane, Benzene, Toluene, Xylenes, Benzene ethyl-, Hydrogen sulfide (H2S) in soils and groundwater.	RISK 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul James	March 3, 2013	In section 9 the following properties are listed as unavailable and need to be determined: Flash Point, Evaporation Rate, Lower Flammability Limit, Upper Flammability Limit, Vapor Pressure, Auto-ignition Temperature and VOC content, wt. %.	RISK 12
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Sections 11 and 12 should also have real detail added in these areas 'Ecotoxicity: (other species added) Persistence I Degradability: Not available. Bioaccumulation I Accumulation: Not available. Mobility in Environment: Not available.' …it is somewhat concerning that the composition varies widely between the dissolved bitumen products and the solutes yet multiple MSDS forms are not required.	RISK 12
Paul James	March 3, 2013	The conclusion [of Section 4.13.2.5] is flawed by not controlling for the age of the pipelines, the pipelines in Alberta are newer than the pipelines in the US so the contribution of corrosive elements over the shorter life of the pipelines carrying Alberta bitumen products is likely greater then suggested by the 37.7 percent contribution compared to the 34.4 percent due to corrosion in the US pipelines.	RISK 13
Paul James	March 3, 2013	This appendix proposes many spill prevention and control techniques but does not mention oversight regulation and enforcement. This detail should be added.	RISK 23
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Section 4 Composition provides a very large range for the composition of the Dilbit from 60-100% Petroleum. This is misleading and should have 99% as a maximum and some more detailed explanation for why this range is so large and what other components constitute the other 40%.	RISK 27
Paul James	March 3, 2013	the statemetns 'Hazardous Decomposition Products: Not available.' and 'Possibility of Hazardous Reactions: None known.' Must be completed with known information especially for Benzene and Toluene components where these are significant and known!	RISK 27
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Third party assessment of Alberta bitumen product corrosiveness should be carried out.	RISK 28
Paul James	March 3, 2013	Section 10 states "Stable under normal storage conditions." But should state specifically what normal storage conditions are.	EDIT
Paul Johnson	April 21, 2013	I can not reach a balance between the risks to the US environment and economy and the benefits the US could possibly realize. On a worldwide basis, increasing tar sands oil extraction will be devastating to the carbon levels that are increasing global warming.	PN 05, CLIM 05
Paul Karsh	April 1, 2013	[spill hazard] in addition to the long-term damage that strip-mining of tar sands and burning the fuel extracted from these tar sands will cause.	ACK
Paul Karsh	April 1, 2013	The Mayflower, Arkansas pipeline burst exemplifies the immediate environmental hazard that the Keystone XL pipeline presents.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Karsh	April 5, 2013	The rupture of the pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas that was transporting tar sands oil points out once again how much of an environmental hazard such a conduit is. Even a brand new pipeline can leak. To permit such a hazard is a gross abdication of responsibility on the part of any government. The State Department and/or any other agency that would contemplate allowing such a thing needs to conduct extensive and rigorous analysis by independent, disinterested, expert organizations to make sure the public safety is maintained.	RISK 14, LEG 04
Paul Kavich	April 22, 2013	It is time for us to move in the right direction and build alternative energy sources. Wind creates good paying American jobs, solar does the same.	PN 02
Paul Kavich	April 22, 2013	I know the value of water. Without this valuable resource, we cannot feed the world. Many farmers and ranchers rely on the Ogallala Aquifer to irrigate their land, feed their livestock, and if this resource becomes contaminated with tar sands, a multi billion dollar industry is at risk. On one of our farms near the Aquifer, a simple garden trough dig will expose ground water. Putting a 30 foot pipe in this fragile land is NOT in the national interest of the United States.	WRG 01
Paul Kelleher	April 22, 2013	we believe it is important to invest responsibly in our country's economic health and take care of creation. Our leaders must carefully weigh the potential negative impacts of projects like the Keystone Pipeline. Together, we are praying that our nation's business leaders and policymakers put the livelihoods of American farmers, ranchers, and their families above special interests.	PN 05
Paul Kelleher	April 22, 2013	After the tragic tar sands oil spills in Mayflower, Arkansas and Otter Tail County, Minnesota, it's clear that tar sands oil is not safe and not worth the risk.	RISK 14
Paul Kida	April 11, 2013	I cannot understand how these "climate altering impacts" are being overlooked.	CLIM 12
Paul Kida	April 11, 2013	This is especially disheartening if the companies are not going to be held financially responsible when there is a burst in the pipeline	PD 01
Paul Lachelier	April 4, 2013	Shouldn't we be moving away from dirty fuels that pollute and poison us and our environment?	CLIM 18
Paul Lauenstein	March 28, 2013	Our generation has a sacred responsibility to arrest greenhouse gas emissions and restore planetary ecosystems to the condition we inherited from our parents and grandparents for the sake of our children and grandchildren. Lighting the Keystone fuse to the tar sands carbon bomb is not consistent with that responsibility.	CLIM 14
Paul Mayer	April 2, 2013	INSTEAD OF TAR SANDS, WE NEED TO MOVE TO ENERGY CONSERVATION AND RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES.	ALT 02
Paul Pellegrini	April 17, 2013	I see no economic benefit to the citizens of the USA for this project. According to media reports, the oil and its refined byproducts will not be used in the US but will be sent to other parts of the world. Do not allow this to happen. … In addition, it can only cause environmental harm/damage in the areas where the pipeline is placed.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Ramos	April 2, 2013	Pipes leak... they always do. This pipeline would be running over ecologically sensitive lands and aquifers at a time when the country is facing massive drought.	RISK 07
Paul Roden	April 5, 2013	the Feb. 2013 issue of Energy Policy has indicated that the State of New York could provide for all of their energy needs, for electricity, heating, cooling transportation and manufacturing with existing technology and existing resources within the State of New York without using fossil fuel or nuclear power by 2030... a similar study …. in the March 2011 issue of Energy Policy and the Nov. 2009 issue of Scientific American (reached) the same conclusion but for the latter, for the whole planet. Fossil fuel and nuclear power are too dangerous, too expensive and totally unnecessary for the energy needs of the United States and the world. The solution to global warming, energy independence, full employment is not an "all of the above energy strategy". It is a safe, clean, renewable, sustainable energy strategy without fossil or nuclear fuel.	ALT 01
Paul Rowe	April 10, 2013	The current technology used to extract and move the tar sand oil will have catastrophic results. There are already almost 70 square miles of catch pools in Canada associated with this type of effort. One pool alone killed over 1,600 birds.	ACK
Paul Rubin	April 22, 2013	Getting petroleum by way of the Keystone XL Pipeline would be much more polluting and dangerous than most other sources of energy, and there isn't even any guarantee than the petroleum from it would all be available to this country	PN 02
Paul Rubin	April 22, 2013	And it poses a particularly disastrous potential hazard in regard to the Oglalla aquifer, which supplies a large amount of household and agricultural water to people in 11 mid-country states. This enormous source of water has little or no drainage, so if there were ever any accidental spill of oil or other chemicals during construction or operation and it got down into the aquifer, there is no way to restore the aquifer to a clean condition.	WRG 01
Paul Schwartzman	March 19, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is the wrong direction to take at the crossroads at which we find ourselves. It represents increased pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, and maintaining the dirty status quo of fossil fuels for as long as possible.	CLIM 14
Paul Schwartzman	March 19, 2013	That alternative path at the crossroads is to focus on energy efficiency and conservation, as well as all the various sources of renewable energy, especially wave and tidal energy, which have such huge potential.	PN 02
Paul Sisk	April 22, 2013	Protect the Ogallala Aquifer by routing the transCanada pipline farther to the east.	ALT 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Spatz	April 22, 2013	I have with me today, a copy of The Groundwater Atlas of Nebraska - Resource Atlas of Nebraska Number 4a published in 1998 by the Conservation and Survey Division - Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR)- The University of Nebraska Lincoln. Among other things, it contains color keyed maps of geological and hydrological regions of Nebraska as the prestigious land-grant university published them in 1998 with descriptions of the regions contained therein. An examination of the maps and descriptions of Topographical Regions, Groundwater Regions, the High Plains Aquifer (credits to Weeks and others 1988) pages 8, 10 and 12 respectively, among others and together with the Atlass system of scientific method employed for the study is contradictory with the mapping now being widely distributed as fact and in the Omaha World-Herald issue of Dec 5, 2012. Further, the Atlas is precedent setting in that it was compiled well before the Keystone projects were envisioned or planned. That is to say it was compiled with no regard to the eventual siting of a 36" tarsands meagapipeline through the Nebraska Sandhills totally unlike the subsequent mappings widely being used to influence a State Department decision. The Atlas proves that the current siting being proposed for approval, in fact, DOES cross the sand hills region according to mapping done, not by the the Nebraska Dept. of Environmental Quality (NDEQ) nor agents of TranCanada, Inc. , but by a truly independent source prior to involvement of the NDEQ and TranCanada in the process for approval. Said another way, the two presentatione are incongruent with one another with one appearing to show a pipeline avoiding the Nebraska Sandills but the other, independent mapping, showing the that the proposed routing is in the sandhills region and coincides with the proposed pipeline route for a distance of approxiamatly 63 miles diagonally through Holt and Antelope Counties here in Nebraska. This is conclusive and indiputable proof that NDEQ and TransCanada are at best mistaken and, at worst, involved in an attempt to deceive the public in general and the approval authority in particular by providing fictitious claims about the validity of the re-siting process after the original siting was rejected by Nebraskans including Governor Heineman. I urge the U.S. State Department to investigate my evidence	SOIL 08, RISK 27, WRG 06
Paul Stebner	April 22, 2013	The importance of the Ogallala aquifer to the economy and welfare of the United States cannot be overstated. Any damage would be irreparable. Please do not allow this permit to be granted, and please protect the aquifer as the National treasure that it is.	RISK 07
Paul Strand	March 11, 2013	My wife and I are deeply concerned about mining the tar sands in Canada--destroying a major boreal forest--a sanctuary for many bird species--many who migrate to our United States, also.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paul Strand	March 11, 2013	We understand the oil will be shipped through the pipeline to our gulf coast to be refined there. Also, it is our understanding the oil will be sold elsewhere in the world.	PN 07
Paul Swanson	April 22, 2013	Environmental damage at the site of extraction is devastating.	ACK
Paul Swanson	April 22, 2013	Pipeline leaks are certain regardless of construction expertise. …….. Clean fresh water is more important to the United States (also the World) than the Worlds most toxic source of oil.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Paul Tipton	March 10, 2013	The entire Keystone pipeline from Alberta to the Gulf Coast is of no advantage to the USA. That oil is not intended for the US market. It is intended for the international market via tankers, not our refineries.	PN 07
Paul Wesneski	March 11, 2013	Besides, why is the pipeline spanning the entire width of the U.S. and ending at the Gulf? Is it because--like the Alaska Pipeline--which promised oil independence for the entire western U.S.--will be shipping oil to foreign ports. If it's supposed to be oil for America, construct a refinery nearby and eliminate the "need" for the pipeline and the (real) risks to the environement.	PN 07, ALT 08
Paula	March 15, 2013	I am not convinced that the "facts" about it are true, and I believe we endanger the ground water supply as well as the many other environments the pipeline will run through.	ACK
Paula Bishop	April 22, 2013	For the National Interest and the future of our country and our planet, I urge you to reject this pipeline. What we really, desperately need, are clean energy alternatives.	ALT 01
Paula Cooke	March 11, 2013	The jobs gains could never outweigh the huge risks to our environment and climate. There are so many other ways to create jobs, environment and climate friendly jobs. Our children and grandchildren deserve a safe, clean world, as well as a booming economy. We and they can have both!...We need clean energy and that industry will bring as many, if not more jobs than the Keystone XL! Its only common sense.	SO 05, PN 05
Paula G	March 11, 2013	2 US supporting oil that increases carbon emissions more than double of traditional fossil fuels not only in our country but in Canada. Support of this agenda is environmentally destructive to land, water, air and any living creature, more so for those in ground zero area. 3 Global warming/climate change mitigation will not be possible if we further exploit tarsands and continue current coal policy. 4. A pipeline is a permanent structure and a permanent commitment to the carbon excessive production method it supports. We cannot lead with real solutions to global warming if we continue to advance projects that are creating more carbon than their predecessor. We will be propelling climate change not mitigating. Bringing this oil to be refined to US adds to our carbon footprint while also allowing the same technology to advance on our own soil [shale oil]and continuing current coal emission policy.	CLIM 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paula G	March 11, 2013	1 US supporting a pipeline through our nation to a corporation from Canada. Allowing non-sovereign corporation permanent access to US land to carry environmentally toxic product for profit across the width of the US.	PN 05
Paula G	April 21, 2013	Enbridge's tar sands spill into the Kalamazoo River in 2010, resulting in the largest and most expensive onshore pipeline accident in U.S. history, was caused by external corrosion. Moreover, much of Enbridge's line 6B, which was one of the first pipelines to move significant volumes of tar sands diluted bitumen into the United States, had to be replaced due to hundreds of corrosion abnormalities. Natural Resources Defense Council highlighted the risk of external corrosion on high temperature diluted bitumen tar sands pipelines in comments to U.S. pipeline regulators in early 2011. And yet, industry's silence on the general risk of high temperature tar sands pipelines and external corrosion speaks volumes.	RISK 13
Paula Griffin	March 29, 2013	XL is wrong for US 1 US supporting a pipeline through our nation to a corporation from Canada. Allowing non-sovereign corporation permanent access to US land to carry environmentally toxic product for profit across the width of the US. 2 US supporting oil that increases carbon emissions more than double of traditional fossil fuels not only in our country but in Canada. Support of this agenda is environmentally destructive to land, water, air and any living creature, more so for those in ground zero area. 3 Global warming/climate change mitigation will not be possible if we further exploit tarsands and continue current coal policy. 4. A pipeline is a permanent structure and a permanent commitment to the carbon excessive production method it supports. We cannot lead with real solutions to global warming if we continue to advance projects that are creating more carbon than their predecessor. We will be propelling climate change not mitigating. Bringing this oil to be refined to US adds to our carbon footprint while also allowing the same technology to advance on our own soil [shale oil] and continuing current coal emission policy.	PN 05
Paula Griffin	April 2, 2013	A comprehensive and independent spill risk assessment for the Keystone XL pipeline has yet to be conducted. Such an assessment is needed in order to thoroughly consider both the risk of spills and their economic consequences, including negative impacts on employment.	RISK 06
Paula Griffin	April 22, 2013	Government regulators need to identify risks associated with tar sands pipelines and develop safety regulations to address those risks.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Paula Griffin	April 22, 2013	Data from states in the northern Midwest, which have seen the greatest volumes of tar sands diluted bitumen over the longest time period, is alarming. Pipelines in North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan spilled 3.6 times as much crude per mile than the national average between 20010 and 2012.	RISK 29
Paula Hodgkiss	April 9, 2013	We are impacting the health and future generations exclusively for the profit of the gas and oil industries.	ACK
Paula Hodgkiss	April 9, 2013	These pipelines don't insure that we will have more energy resources for the benefit of our citizens because oil and gas are traded as commodities internationally.	PN 07
Paula Holmes	April 10, 2013	Ignoring the effects of the Arkansas spill is irresponsible, especially since the Keystone pipeline has an even greater potential for damage.	RISK 13
Paula Perretty	April 5, 2013	Is this energy source worth destroying the lives of citizens, the forever pollution of our lands and waters.	ACK
Paula Phipps	April 13, 2013	Stopping the pipeline will send a clear signal to the world that America is willing to face reality. That is our responsibility as the adults of our species and you should be taking the lead.	CLIM 18
Paula Rusterholz	April 2, 2013	Clean energy is the way we need to move forward. The American public is increasingly understanding of this - if we tell them the true facts. We will create good jobs in clean energy generation, and save our planet - if we move fast.	PN 03
Paulette Zimmerman	April 10, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Pauline Duffy	April 11, 2013	The tar sands oil that the pipeline would transport is toxic and dangerously corrosive. It is the most carbon-intensive source of oil on the planet - the State Department has acknowledged fuel derived from tar sands fuel up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel.	CLIM 12
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Pawnee Business Council would like to have the following questions answered: How far apart are: a. the isolation valves? b. the pump stations?	ACK
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Pawnee Business Council would like to have the following questions answered: How will the pipeline construction be conducted? a. Start at one end and work to the other? b. Start at both ends and work to the middle? c. Work in several sections at the same time?	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Pawnee Business Council would like to have the following questions answered: What is the depth, breadth and thickness of underground layers and pockets which may be penetrated by boring machines?	ACK
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Pawnee Business Council would like to have the following questions answered: Where are the transmission lines?	ACK
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	PA - Page 11 - Paragraph F(3), last sentence. Consultation must be initiated to estabilsh qualification requrements for Pawnee Tribal monitor who is paid for by TransCanada.	CR 01
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Page 30, paragraph 1, 3rd full sentence. We were told this meeting was scoping.	CR 01
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	….several Pawnee Sacred Sites are in the path of the KXL. These Sites are located on the Loupe and Platte Rivers and we believe they will satisfy all requirements to qualify the area between approximately Genoa and Fullerton Neb as a Historic Landscape.	CR 02
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	FIRST, to avoid any mistrust and harm coming to objects falling under the jurisdiction of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act encompass most However, make no mistake, the Pawnee people demand their monitors be employed and on-site during each phase of the construction.	CR 02
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	When boring under rivers, how close does the tunnel get to the aquifer?	PD 07
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	How do you clean up oil spills 40 feet under the ground?	RISK 08
Pawnee Nation	April 19, 2013	Page 25. Bulleted text. Senetences 2-5. Establish a deadline date for providing this information so it can be published in the final version.	EDIT
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	And then we need to reject the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.	ACK
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	It also means that we need to give health and environment a fair shake in the environmental review of a dirty energy project such as the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline.	ACK
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	Rail is a pretty expensive alternative.	ALT 04
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	This [tar sands industry's expansion plans] amounts to real climate pollution that affects real people here at home and around the world.	CLIM 05
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	Once again, the State Department acknowledges that tar sands are dirtier than conventional oil and will make climate change worse.	CLIM 13
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	Yet the draft environmental review prepared by the State Department for Keystone XL misses what folks in industry themselves are saying: the Keystone XL project is necessary for expansion of tar sands. We know this means that Keystone XL will make climate change worse.	CLIM 13
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	Our friends around the world are looking to us for climate leadership and it starts with drawing the line at tar sands expansion.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	We need a clear evaluation of the damage to our health and environment that will result from this dirty energy project.	LEG 04
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	Global energy consultant Wood McKenzie found that "a lack of visibility on available transportation capacity and, in turn, the prices that may ultimately be achieved could impact oil sands projects' commercial viability." To me that means that without ways to get tar sands to the coast for export, the price of this very expensive to extract oil is going down making it a risky investment.	PN 05
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	the tar sands industry's expansion plans are not possible without the proposed Keystone XL pipeline project and delay in deciding the fate of Keystone XL has already affected expansion.	PN 06
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	And most clearly from an economist: "Unless we get increased [market] access, like with Keystone XL, we're going to be stuck."	PN 06
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	So how, can it then not tell us about what this means for our climate? Somehow, the State Department claims that tar sands will be developed anyway so it doesn't need to look at the harm done by expansion.	PN 06
Peaceful Jeff	March 4, 2013	TD Economics, a major Canadian Bank, talks about pipeline capacity constraints as "a serious challenge to long term growth" of the tar sands.	PN 06
Peaceful Jeff	March 5, 2013	"The prospects of keeping climate change below that (2-degree goal) are fading away," Tans says. Referring to a Yahoo.com article: http://news.yahoo.com/us-scientists-report-big-jump-183612249.html?.nx=count%3D5%26sortBy%3DhighestRated%26isNext%3Dtrue%26offset%3D5%26pageNumber%3D1	CLIM 14
Peaceful Jeff	April 18, 2013	Here’s all you ever really need to know about CO2 emissions and climate: •The peak warming is linearly proportional to the cumulative carbon emitted •The warming you get when you stop emitting carbon is what you are stuck with for the next thousand years •The climate recovers only slightly over the next ten thousand years •At the mid-range of IPCC climate sensitivity, a trillion tonnes cumulative carbon gives you about 2C global mean warming above the pre-industrial temperature. http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/09/18/866441/how-the-federal-government-greatly-underestimates-the-true-cost-of-carbon-pollution/	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peg Mitchell	April 9, 2013	Earth cannot absorb the CO2 that will be emitted from the burning of this oil by anyone. Will the tar sands just get extracted anyway? Maybe, but any obstacle that can be put in the path of preventing this from happening should be aggressively pursued. We already have seen investment reports that show that the business side of this pipeline certainly thinks that this is the key to extraction and without it will be highly difficult or unlikely. We already know that the First Nations peoples are fighting to block an Enbridge pipeline to their West coast for export. And we know that most of the oil planned for our Port Arthur refineries is planned for export as well...Will this be a job creator? Yes, for some and for a temporary time period. We already know that it will not create anything near the 20,000 jobs touted by TransCanada and the Republicans. We already know that the number of permanent jobs post construction will be minimal (35). We already know that some labor unions support the pipeline for job purposes, and I understand that is a political factor for the President.	PN 05, CLIM 14, PN 06, PN 07, PN 08, SO 02, SO 06
Peg Thompson	April 17, 2013	We do not need the oil and by it's high hydrocarbon profile it will exacerbate climate change.	CLIM 14
Peg Witek	April 17, 2013	Jobs would be few, and mostly short-term, and there would be no change to our domestic supply. Let's create jobs with green energy.	SO 04
Peggy Babcock	April 11, 2013	We do not need new sources of oil so badly that we lose precious resources, like land and water, in the process. Health comes first!!	PN 05
Peggy Brem	March 16, 2013	I am concerned about the groundwater pollution this project will likely bring.	ACK
Peggy Bruton	March 23, 2013	I have learned from an article in Mother Jones http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/03/keystone-xl-contractor-ties-transcanada-state-department and other sources that consultants hired to prepare the Keystone XL DEIS appear to have significant and substantial financial interests at stake in the project, and that the Department of State apparently redacted information that would have informed the public of these connections. I believe on this basis that the DEIS must be considered invalid, and a new process must be initiated, with the work in the hands	PRO 01
Peggy Bruton	April 19, 2013	At the very least, a new EIS process should be initiated. The EIS on which the public is now invited to comment is irreparably flawed, in that the consultants hired to do the work stand to profit greatly from the project.	PRO 01
Peggy Fry	April 16, 2013	every issue cannot be reduced to dollars and sense, but that permanent values, such as the general health and welfare of not only our citizens, but of our environment are every bit as compelling and necessary as making money or adding jobs	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peggy Gilges	April 10, 2013	To purse the KXL, you have to ignore a host of factors: destruction of boreal forest, further pressure on species diversity, loss of carbon sink, polluted air and water, extensive use of energy to extract the bitumen from the sand, extensive use of fresh water resources, extensive use of toxic chemicals such as benzene, risk of spill, inadequate preparation for and knowledge of how to clean up bitumen spills, risk of terrorism/sabotage to a largely unprotected length of pipeline through the heartland.	CU 01, CLIM 06, CU 07, RISK 04
Peggy Hartzell	April 22, 2013	It seems to be a very shortsighted endeavor compared to investing in renewable energy which benefits the citizens directly with jobs and locally produced energy not dirty oil for export.	PN 03
Peggy Lee Payne	April 9, 2013	I'm not a mining engineer; but it doesn't look like these tailings ponds are even lined. It takes so little oil to poison the groundwater.	ACK
Peggy Lee Payne	April 9, 2013	I don't know how the indigenous people of that part of Canada will be able to remain there with all the contamination.	CU 05
Peggy Warnock	April 11, 2013	Please revise your review and report the whole picture of what tar sands oils can is has done to our environment.	CU 01
Peggy Weber	April 1, 2013	We need to be moving toward more renewable, Earth-friendly energy sources, not expanding the portions of America threatened by fossil fuel products.	ALT 01
Penelope Manners	April 4, 2013	Oil spills are an inevitable side effect of drilling, transporting, and refining oil They occur regularly and should be considered as an environmental consequence of using oil. To expect that the industry will be "clean" is wishful thinking or worse-- deception.	RISK 07
Penelope Post	March 11, 2013	Please include EPA rules in your Keystone determination. For example, the effect on agricultural contamination, especially organic farming. And,of course, future effects of pipeline effluents with ground settling, freeze-and-thaw, and earthquakes over the full distance of the pipeline! These effects, local, national, and economic, are irreversible.	RISK 14
Penney Feller	April 9, 2013	until a company can guarantee no leaks put this idea on hold.	ACK
Penney Morse	April 4, 2013	The total carbon pollution of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes.	ACK
Pennie Pyle	March 30, 2013	And they want to drive this filthy thing right through America's Tornado Alley???	RISK 05
Pennino	April 18, 2013	The [companies responsible for pipeline spills are] often long gone or incapable of replacing the [contaminated] water supply, so the taxpayers must pay the millions of dollars to fund new sources of water or build treatment plants. In many cases, the taxpayer ends up paying the cost of monitoring and treating the residual contamination left in the groundwater.	PD 01
Pennino	April 18, 2013	I have worked on hundreds of petroleum releases, and have never seen one where all of the soil and groundwater contamination can be removed.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pennisi	April 18, 2013	Not only will it eventually leak, but its production and the use of its product will be enormously detrimental to the environment.	RISK 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Summary statements about wildlife impacts should all be properly qualified as expected to be negligible.	ACK
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	community noise standards based on levels of “highly annoyed” or damage to human hearing are not appropriate standards for national parks where many people go to get away from the clamor of everyday life.	AQN 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	further information and analysis of the cumulative effects of noise on visitors and natural resources...with respect to NPS units [is needed]	AQN 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Overall, the document states that it “will not affect any national parks.” We believe that the analysis fails to adequately assess noise impacts to all NPS lands, specifically, Niobrara NSR and the National Historic Trails that would be affected by the project.	AQN 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Pump Station 24 – Fullerton, Nebraska, Pump Station 11 – Fort Peck, Montana and Pump Station 13 – Prairie, Montana, are relatively close to National Historic Trails. We recommend that the Final EIS consider noise levels appropriate for all the neighboring land uses as well as the resource management objectives of national park units.	AQN 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The [noise] analysis [for NPS resources] should be similar to that conducted for other noise sensitive areas, and, at a minimum, should include predicted noise levels from pipeline activities that would occur on NPS lands in the vicinity of the pipeline and pumping stations.	AQN 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	in section 4.12.4.3...The Department [of the Interior] recommends that “units of the National Park Service and National Historic Trails” be added to this list of noise-sensitive places where more aggressive noise mitigation is warranted.	AQN 02
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Section 4.6 of the DSEIS mentions low-level helicopter or airplane overflights. We recommend that the Final EIS can provide additional information about the frequency and levels of noise generated from this activity.	AQN 03
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Distance should not be the primary gauge for how, if, and when noise could impact an area. Other factors such as existing ambient sounds levels, types of sounds present, frequency of sound waves, duration of sounds, timing of sounds, and cumulative effects of sounds should all be considered. If multiple sources of these loud sounds are in operation at one time, noise impacts could be much more significant than outlined in the DSEIS.	AQN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Additional mitigation for noise from pipeline construction, operation and maintenance activities should be addressed. Efforts to reduce noise from operation of the pumping stations and ancillary equipment (e.g. power tools, construction equipment, and other machinery associated with the facility) should be implemented and noise reducing treatments (barriers, curtains, enclosures, silencers, mufflers, etc.) should be used where appropriate.	AQN 05
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The Hagen Site National Historic Landmark (NHL) in Dawson County, Montana, is located along the west bank of the Yellowstone River. This is an exemplary archaeological site associated with a circa 1550- 1675 Crow village. The DSEIS does not provide specific enough information to determine the location of the proposed pipeline with its various proposed alignments in relation to this NHL, which leaves the possibility that the project may cause impacts to the NHL.	CR 05
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Page 4.15-47...The statement that, “The duration of impacts are all temporary and short term with negligible effects on wildlife resources” is inaccurate and should be revised. Impacts to wildlife that are associated with power line and substation construction will be permanent for the life of these facilities. This will not be a temporary or short term impact on wildlife.	CU 13
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Pages 4.15-108 and 109...This section acknowledges potential impacts to fish and aquatic invertebrates in the event of fuel spills or leaks. Yet there is no acknowledgement of the potential impacts to wildlife in the event of spills or leaks.	CU 17
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The Council on Environmental Quality’s NEPA regulations cite the requirement for a monitoring and enforcement program be adopted and summarized in the record of decision where applicable for any mitigation. (40 CFR 1505.2(c)) We were unable to locate a reference in the DSEIS or determine whether any such program has yet been developed.	LEG 14
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The Missouri NRR and Niobrara NSR have regulatory authority over water resource projects within the bed and banks of designated segments, as well as above or below the designation and on tributaries to any designated segments, in accordance with section 7(a) of the WSRA (16 U.S.C. § 1278).	LU 03
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The proposed pipeline route crosses land that may drain into the Niobrara National Scenic River (NSR) designated reaches; the Niobrara River; and approximately 22 tributary streams (and numerous smaller contributing drainages to those tributaries) to the Niobrara River upstream of the Missouri NRR designated reaches.	LU 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Lighting needs, lighting types, light pollution and lighting impacts are not adequately addressed in the document. Site plans for aboveground installations (from previous planning documents) do not include lighting schematics. Further information and analysis regarding lighting along the pipeline and in the vicinity of national trails and the Niobrara NSR is recommended in order to assess the impacts to park resources.	LU 04
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Much of the proposed pipeline route has little anthropogenic light and, therefore, has high quality night skies. The cumulative effects of the project could adversely impact the quality of the night skies and the overall photic environment.	LU 04
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The Department [of the Interior] recommends that: additional analysis of the direct and cumulative effects from lighting in this project be conducted; aboveground facilities be located as far away from park units as is feasible; mitigation measures such as shielded, full-cutoff lighting, timers, and motion sensitive switches should be used, where possible; and the minimum amount of illumination be used for tasks commonly carried out along the pipeline.	LU 04
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	At a minimum, the project should employ HDD at perennial and lake/pond waterbodies and intermittent waterbodies that have State Designated Aquatic Life Use.	PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) occur at all perennial stream crossings…The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner.	PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested…elimination of mainline valves located in floodplains by substituting upland locations for the location of mainline valves to protect water quality. The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner	PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	There is one pump station identified as being in proximity to the Loup River that will require an access plan addressing issues caused by flooding. Table 4.3-3 indicates the location of a mainline valve within the Yellowstone River floodplain. Our request for elimination of mainline valve floodplain locations should be augmented to include elimination of pump station locations within floodplains as well. Siting pump stations over intermittent streams is ani nvitation to degrade water quality if failure would occur. Pump stations should not be sited over an intermittent stream or located within a floodplain.	PD 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS addresses the issue of scour and lateral migration at stream crossings through the use of "qualified personnel" to assess individual waterbody crossings "in the design phase of the Project"...There is no indication in the DSEIS of what constitutes "qualified personnel" and whether they are independent from the project or the contractor hired to perform the pipeline construction. We believe the assessment of waterbody crossings is one of the most important considerations in protection of water and ecological resources and suggest that the "qualified personnel" be independent of the project sponsors as much as possible.	PD 09
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS asserts that the project agrees to conduct inspections of valves and unmanned pump stations during the first year of operation, but there is no indication of the frequency of these inspections, and so does not address the previous NPS comment [on the DEIS] regarding frequency of inspections.	PD 09
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	We recommend a monitoring and enforcement program be developed to provide accountability and environmental oversight of mitigation implementation, which would be funded by the applicant but independent of the applicant's control. Monitoring should be done by independent party with qualifying credentials, involve on-the-ground inspectors for each area for preconstruction surveys and as construction occurs, with procedures for frequent reporting to regulatory authorities. (The FERC employs similar monitoring procedures for oversight of environmental stipulations for pipeline construction.) The program should report on adherence to fish and wildlife environmental mitigation measures specified by Department of State. We suggest that a description of that monitoring and enforcement program be added to the FEIS.	PD 09
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The proposed pipeline installation is not close enough for direct human disturbance to [least tern, piping plover and pallid sturgeon. in the Missouri NRR] to be a likely threat; however, we are concerned that activities surrounding hydrostatic testing (changes in water level, turbidity, and sedimentation) and infrastructure development (primarily roads and power lines) could represent threats to these species.	TES 04
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Page 4.8.16. Also not considered is how the process of water intake and return may affect turbidity and sedimentation and whether these processes are likely to have negative impacts to [pallid sturgeon].	TES 05
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS states that, "Impacts to the pallid sturgeon from temporary water withdrawals during hydrostatic testing in the lower Platte River Basin would be avoided since the volume of water needed would be withdrawn at a rate less than 10 percent of the baseline daily flow and returned to its source within a 30-day period" (Section 4.8, p16). This statement seems unsupported and requires further documentation.	TES 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	[The DSEIS] does not address the long term impacts on larval sturgeon, potential impacts on reproductive development, or lifecycle disruption	TES 06
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The following mitigation measures are recommended [to protect black-footed ferrets]: restrict domestic pets from camps and worksites, educate construction workers about disease transmission and actions they can take to minimize such transmission, and report any sick or dead wildlife to the proper authorities. We suggest these measures be included in the portions of South Dakota where black-footed ferrets have been re-introduced.	TES 10
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested...a greater commitment than "availability of seed at the time of reclamation" for revegetation activities and use of seed from native short- and tall-grass prairie communities…The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner	VEG 06, PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS assessment of plant re-growth is limited to State listed noxious weeds. The Department recommends that companies and their contractors consult with State Natural Heritage Programs, Native Plant Societies and/or Natural Area Managers to identify exotic species that threaten native ecosystems, including smooth brome (Bromus inermis Leyss.) and other species purposely seeded for agriculture. In addition, companies and/or their contractors should follow BMPs to ensure contractor equipment is checked and cleaned for non-native plants/seeds and provide for staging areas for such activities. Finally, as a mitigation action, companies should apply high rates of native annual forbs and grasses to conventional reclamation seed mixture in the pipeline corridor to minimize invasive species establishment. Fertilizers should not be used in disturbed areas as they promote undesirable species.	VEG 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) occur at all...wetlands greater than one quarter of an acre in size…The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner.	WET 06, PD 07, WRS 01
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested...avoidance of wetlands during construction and operations...The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner.	WET 07, PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Bird strike mitigation devices/bird diverters are recommended for infrastructure adjacent to the Niobrara River	WI 03
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	The proposed Project route would cross through the North Valley Grasslands IBA in Montana and the Rainwater Basin IBA in Nebraska. An oil spill occurring in either of the areas could severely impact critical habitat for migratory birds that spend part of their life cycle on Department managed lands.	WI 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Table 4.6-4 contains multiple timing restrictions and multiple distance buffers for the same resources, with various agency designations. The text does not explain how these are to be interpreted and implemented.	WI 13
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Text at page 4.6-12 indicates that construction timing restrictions and buffer zones, “such as those described in Table 4.6-4 would be developed” (emphasis added). This wording suggests actual parameters to be implemented by the project have not yet been determined.	WI 13
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	all construction activities should avoid the most sensitive nesting season from April through August when possible.	WI 14
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Explain whether the analysis [in Section 4.6] is based on the entire footprint of the project or just the pipeline right-of-way. We believe the scope of analysis of impacts to wildlife needs to be the entire footprint of the project with all its related components.	WI 15
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Somewhere in this chapter expected impacts to Birds of Conservation Concern should be acknowledged and an evaluation of these impacts should be presented.	WI 16
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Table 4.6-3. This table is apparently based on Whittington and Allen (2008) Guideline for Raptor Conservation in the Western United States. However Whittington and Allen (2008) was strictly a draft product that has yet to be finalized. Thus citing that document and using it as a basis for this Table is not appropriate. The USFWS can provide appropriate sources for nest buffer recommendations.	WI 17
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Also in addition to concerns listed [on p.4.6.15] for increased perches for raptors and the related predation on ground nesting birds the same concern applies to Corvids as well.	WI 18
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Table 4.6-2, Habitat Types and Related Fragmentation Issues. For several habitat types under the “Nest Parasitism”, “Facilitated Predator Movements”, and “Disturbance-Construction Maintenance” columns the current Table version has some habitat types as “unchecked” indicating that the impact type does not apply to that habitat type. It is unclear why these impact types would not apply to all wildlife habitats. Also the “Habitat Types” in Table 4.6-2 should match the “Vegetation Community Classification” categories used in Table 3.6-1.	WI 19
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Page 4.15-46 stating that, “The anticipated overall absence of permanent impacts to wildlife resources from the propose Project…” Constructing an 875-mile pipeline with related infrastructure such as roads, pump stations, power lines, and substations will result in some permanent impacts to wildlife resources. These will include at least some permanent alteration or loss of habitat, habitat fragmentation, species displacements, barrier effects, etc. This statement and all other related statements in this chapter should be revised to acknowledge that some permanent impacts that will result from this project.	WI 25

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Page 4.15-46...The text states that,"The majority of the potential effects to wildlife resources are indirect, short term or negligible, limited in geographic extent, and associated with the construction phase of the proposed Project only." This statement is inaccurate and should be revised…Impacts to wildlife are not just related to project construction. Impacts to wildlife from this infrastructure will occur throughout the life of the project. Also some of these project impacts will be direct such as wildlife collisions and electrocutions from power lines and vehicle collisions with wildlife on project access roads.	WI 25
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	Page 4.15-48...The statement "In summary with respect to wildlife, permanent impacts are not expected" is not accurate. There will be several types of permanent impacts to wildlife that will result from this project. This statement should be revised to reflect actual permanent impacts associated with this project.	WI 25
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	In comments previously provided on the earlier Draft EIS, [the Department of the Interior] requested that...intermittent stream crossings should occur only during dry conditions….The DSEIS does not address these comments in any substantive manner	WRS 01, PD 07
Penny Cragun	April 29, 2013	the DSEIS assigns a classification of minor, intermediate, and major to waterbodies the pipeline would cross if constructed, based on waterbody width "at the time of construction." This classification appears to be arbitrary, in that it does not address the ecological significance of a small perennial waterbody located in a landscape with little flowing water. It downplays the significance of effects from selected crossing methods under comparison, and waterbody widths can vary considerably during seasonal discharge levels.	WRS 08
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	In Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, several sections are prefaced by a qualifying statement that the following discussion of environmental impacts is based on potential mitigation measures...However, the DSEIS does not clearly distinguish between "mitigation" and "potential mitigation," nor does it indicate the likelihood that mitigation measures will be adopted.	PD02
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	DSEIS Table 2.1-17 documents that Keystone has identified only 14 perennial streams for employing the HDD method. Table 3.3-3 identifies that there are 15 waterbodies with State Designated Aquatic Life Use for Montana; Table 3.3-5 identifies that there are 10 waterbodies with State Designated Aquatic Life Use for South Dakota; and Table 3.3-7 identifies that there are 40 waterbodies with State Designated Aquatic Life Use for Nebraska. These numbers given in Chapter 3 do not match the numbers found in Appendix D. The Final EIS should clarify why these numbers are not the same.	PD07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The NPS, acting for the Department, needs to be included in Section 3.4.4 as a regulating agency for federal activities (including permitting) that could affect the free-flowing condition or that may have an impact on the values for which such river was designated as part of the wild and scenic river system.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	We recommend that the approach used in Chapter 3.6 to break wildlife into categories such as big game animals, small game and furbearers, waterfowl and game birds, etc., be replaced instead with taxonomic ordering. Major categories of taxa would be Invertebrates, Amphibians, Reptiles, Birds, and Mammals with further subdivisions under each of these. Likewise, we recommend that sections 4.1 through 4.6.3.5 be revised and reorganized	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Section 4.6.3.2, "Small Game Species and Furbearers," incongruously discuss[es] impacts to snakes, lizards, burrowing rodents and mice.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The "Waterfowl and Game Birds" subsection incongruously refers to "burrow abandonment" and to ravens.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The content of Table 4.6-4 does not match the title of the table. Buffer distances in the table conflict with information in the accompanying text.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Miles of component habitat areas potentially impacted by electrical distribution lines do not equate to the total length of the distribution lines.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The subsection "Non-game Animals" consists of a confusing mix of descriptive impacts to insects, reptiles, bats, non-game birds, and small mammals.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	At Page 4.6-9, the DSEIS text states that direct impacts to nesting migratory birds would be avoided by limiting construction to non-nesting periods during late summer through winter. Also, page 4.6-12 states cutting trees with active raptor nest trees during the nesting season would be prohibited. However, other statements appear to be in conflict with these statements. For example, page 4.6- 8 states that direct impacts of the project on small game bird species could include "loss of eggs or young, or death." At page 4.6-9, the text states that cutting trees would result in loss of nests, eggs, and young. Statements on page 4.6-13 appear to equivocate whatever limitations on construction will used by stating: "If construction would occur during the nesting season….[then certain practices to locate nests would be followed]." It is unclear why measures specified for protecting ground-nesting birds in a single county, Phillips County, Montana, (page 4.6-13) should not apply throughout the project route. For these reasons, in addition to the other USFWS concerns identified above, we recommend that sections 4.6.1 through 4.6.3.5 of the DSEIS be revised and clarified.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	both Table 3.6-1 and the related discussion in Chapter 3.6 should be revised to reflect the full footprint of the project and account for all acres of wildlife habitat that will be impacted by the project, not just those that comprise the pipeline right-of-way.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	At several locations in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, the DSEIS states, "Additional relevant information is pending and will be included in this review as part of the Final EIS." (See sections, 4.6.3; 4.6.5.1; 4.6.5.2; 4.6.5.3) The nature of the additional relevant information is not stated. However, these particular sections of the DSEIS in-part refer to USFWS administered lands or to wildlife resources within USFWS' legal jurisdiction. We recommend that the Department of State inform USFWS in advance of additional relevant material to be added, and provide USFWS with adequate time to review, and if necessary, recommend revisions to drafted text before it is finalized for the FSEIS.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Table 3.6-1. We recommend that the "Grassland/Pasture" vegetation category be further divided and reported as those acres that are managed pastures (typically introduced grass species) vs. intact native grassland/prairie acres. The two cover types are distinctly different vegetation communities with different ecological attributes.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Table 3.6-4. We recommend that a table of the Birds of Conservation Concern that are known or likely to occur in the project area be added to this section. Birds of Conservation Concern are a distinct subset of migratory bird species that Executive Order 13186 directs federal agencies to take actions to protect. These species should also be addressed in the chapter on environmental consequences.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS text states that, "Construction of the proposed Project would result in disturbance of about 12,696 acres…" However, section 2.1.2 of Chapter 2 states, "Approximately 15,493 acres of land would be disturbed during construction." These statements are not in agreement.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Also, at page 4.6-2 in the second paragraph there is a partial listing of components of the project. However, this excludes many other project components discussed in Chapter 2.1. Since all project components will impact wildlife in some manner there should be a complete listing of these in this section and the impacts of all components should be evaluated in the FEIS.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Other, additional ways this project will impact wildlife include species displacement, barrier effects, increased predation rates and predator travel lanes, increased nest parasitism, vehicle collisions with wildlife, fugitive dust, invasive plant species, increased wildfire risk, lower wildlife density, increase in collisions with power lines and electrocutions on power poles, increase in off road vehicle use (quads, dirt bikes, etc.), increase in trash/human waste, and increase in poaching. The list should be expanded to cover the full extent of impacts (both direct and indirect) to wildlife associated with the project and all these impacts should be evaluated in this chapter.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Pipeline operation, maintenance, and inspection actions after construction will also likely impact wildlife species so these activities should be listed in the FEIS and their related impacts on wildlife should be evaluated in this chapter.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The statement on the top of the page in the first sentence is unsupported: No data is presented on estimated habitat acres lost so how does the reader know that it “would likely be small.”	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	in the second paragraph on this page there could also be noise impacts to wildlife as part of pipeline operations and maintenance after construction.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	We recommend that the discussion of specific Federal wildlife laws be up front at the beginning of Chapter 4.6 and that the discussion for each wildlife law be broken out and separated under its own header.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The DSEIS references nest and rookery surveys conducted in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. The FEIS should be revised to include descriptions of all wildlife surveys conducted for the project and results from all these surveys should be at least summarized in the EIS.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Page 4.6-13. First bullet point at top of the page. Why does this mitigation measure only apply to one county in Montana?	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Page 4.6-16 at bottom of page. Another bullet item should be added to the FEIS indicating that avian-safe designs and methods are described in APLIC’s Reducing Avian Collisions with Power Lines: The State of the Art in 2012 document (APLIC 2012).	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Page 4.8-16. “Impacts to the pallid sturgeon from temporary water withdrawals during hydrostatic testing in the lower Platte River Basin would be avoided since the volume of water needed would be withdrawn at a rate less than 10 percent of the baseline daily flow and returned to its source within a 30-day period.” This statement is scientifically unsupported in the SDEIS. Before a decision is made as to scope of effect, consideration should be given, based on all available scientific information, as to how a 10 percent drop in daily flow may affect this species.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	The [Cumulative Effects] chapter should provide some assessment of how the cumulative impacts, including climate change, may affect fish, wildlife and plant resources.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Chapter 4.16...The first sentence on this page should be revised. Data or literature citations presented are not adequate to support the statement that " … there would be no significant impacts … " The statement should at least be properly qualified to indicate that significant impacts to most resources are not expected.	EDIT
Penny Cragun, USDOI	April 29, 2013	Page 4.16-3...The construction of this project will result in impacts to wildlife. Hence the first sentence under the "Construction" column here is not accurate. It refers only to potential impacts when in fact if this project is built there will be a number of impacts to wildlife that will occur including permanent long-term impacts. We recommend replacing "Potential" with "Expected."	EDIT
Penny Livingston	March 10, 2013	The keystone pipeline will allow the dirtiest oil in the world, the production of which will decimate thousands of acres of precious carbon sequestering arboreal forest, to reach a shipping port to ultimately be shipped to China. I don't believe for a moment that 100% of this oil is going to relieve our energy need, or that the Keystone pipeline is being built solely to get to a refinery. I believe it is being built so that the oil can be exported and the corporations can make more profits.	PN 05, CLIM 06
Perry Bonney	April 11, 2013	With my technical skilles from the US Navy and AT&T, Inc., if the Keystone XL pipeline were to be approved, it believe that it would be much easier or me to find work	SO 02
Perry Bonney	April 11, 2013	With my technical skilles from the US Navy and AT&T, Inc., if the Keystone XL pipeline were to be approved, it believe that it would be much easier or me to find work.	SO 02
Perry Grissom	April 4, 2013	In addition, the damage done while mining tar sands will have a huge, irreversible effect on larges areas of boreal Canada. Even if we discount Canada's damage, it also affects us, especially in the loss of migratory birds that grace our skies and yards every fall and spring, and perform untold so-called environmental services in the U.S. as they pass through, especially eating 'bugs' and pollinating our plants, plus a myriad of other relationships that we still don't even know or understand, in our infant-like ignorance of our own world.	ACK
Perry Grissom	April 4, 2013	In addition, there is no accounting for the massive amount of carbon used to mine the tar sands, and the carbon and pollutants that will be produced as a result.	CLIM 07
Perry Grissom	April 4, 2013	The State Department review of environmental impacts for the Keystone pipeline was apparently written by myopic, uninformed or biased people because it does not accurately assess its enormous environmental impacts.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Perry Grissom	April 4, 2013	Clean up efforts are slow and unable to significant major environmental damage even when the spills happen right in people's back yards (literally), with good roads and easy access. How will a spill be addressed in the middle of a great expanse of otherwise undeveloped land?	RISK 08
Persis Worrall	April 9, 2013	Please revise your department's review. A revised evaluation must be: Report the impacts that this pipeline will have on land, air, water, health and climate.	ACK
Persis Worrall	April 9, 2013	Please revise your department's review. A revised evaluation must be: Assess the threat the Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sand	RISK 20
Pete Kaufmann	April 22, 2013	We need to do a better job of developing alternate sources of energy and weaning ourselves from our dependency on oil.	PN 02
Pete Morgan	April 22, 2013	I have reviewed the tar sands pipeline proposal, and I do not believe that the pipeline will provide adequate protection of natural resources in the event of a rupture under worst-case scenarios.	RISK 07
Pete Olson	April 19, 2013	The pipeline will improve national security by reducing our reliance on unstable foreign sources of oil and improve our trade balance. Tapping Canadian and Bakken crudes will allow us to continue decreasing imports of non-North Americal oil	PN 01
Pete Olson	April 19, 2013	The piepline will provide a safer, more efficient and environmentally preferable transportation of crude, as it will lessen the need for use of rail and barge to bring this energy to market	RISK 14
Pete Olson	April 19, 2013	The pipeline will create tens of thousands of construction jobs, both temporary and permanent, that will inject billions of dollars into local economies and aid our fragile recovery	SO 10
Peter Anderson	April 22, 2013	Number of jobs is was over inflated. It would not help the American energy supply. It would be shipped out. Who wins?	PN 01
Peter Bertoncini	April 19, 2013	there is already a surplus of oil pipeline capacity in the US.	PN 06
Peter Bertoncini	April 19, 2013	Most of the crude oil this pipeline will transport is destined for export after refining.	PN 07
Peter Bradshaw	April 17, 2013	Let us invest in renewable energy instead of the high-CO2 tar sands operation, and dangerous pipelines.	ALT 01
Peter Ciurczak	March 7, 2013	first and foremost is the fact that ERM, the consultancy group that did the environmental assessment for the State Department also has very close ties to TransCanada. If that is not a conflict of interest I don't know what is.	PRO 01
Peter Covach	April 20, 2013	I am in support of the building of the keystone pipeline. It is true that the future is in other energy sources, however there is a significant capital investment in the current energy platform. The middle class cannot afford to change their investment strategy by the whims of the government.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peter Debes	March 13, 2013	The environmental costs are equally monstrous, with destruction of vast areas of boreal forest with no guarantee they will quickly recover- the disappearance of wildlife from these areas, the release of much more CO2 from the decomposition of the peat and humus in the soils and the carbon stored in the wood.	CU 01
Peter Dowben	April 22, 2013	We depend on ground water for our home - if that gets contaminated, we have nothing.	RISK 07
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	These oil sands lie under approximately 140,000 square kilometers of the boreal forest in northern Alberta, which is being destroyed for its extraction	ACK
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	According to a study by the Canadian Pembina Institute, if constructed, the Keystone XL pipeline would be the largest and most significant proposed oilsands pipeline in the world with a capacity of 830,000 barrels per day. The pipeline would enable a 36 per cent increase in oilsands production, the equivalent in annual greenhouse emissions of over 4.6 million passenger vehicles.	CLIM 11
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	Most of the oilsands is destined for export, contradicting the claim that KXL will improve the US's energy independence.	PN 04
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	http://fcnl.org/issues/energy/keystone_dismaying_notfinal_setback/	REF
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	The SEIS also does not adequately consider the demonstrated higher risk of pipeline failure due to external corrosion in high temperature pipelines like Keystone XL. The spill of 1.2 million gallons of oil sands into 30 miles of the Kalamazoo River in 2010 tangibly demonstrates the expense ($800 million) and unprecedented difficulty in cleaning up this kind of oil.	RISK 14
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	The SEIS, based on TransCanada's own numbers, shows that at the most 3,900 temporary, construction jobs, only 35 permanent jobs will be created by the pipeline, and that only 10% of the total workforce will be hired locally.	SO 02
Peter Ehrhorn	March 6, 2013	An IRS decision exempts tar sands refiners from paying the 8-cents-per-barrel excise tax applied to other crude oil and petroleum products that funds the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.	SO 15
Peter Farrelly	April 4, 2013	his heinous oil brings with it many: Public Health Risks from spills Public Health Risks from the climate change it accelerates	ACK
Peter Farrelly	April 4, 2013	This heinous oil brings with it many: Environmental Risks from spills and climate change	RISK 07
Peter Giacobbi, Jr.	March 25, 2013	I question the approach, methodology, validity, and independence of this report. Indeed it would appear that TransCanada wrote the environmental impact report itself.	PRO 01
Peter Huntington	April 15, 2013	Death of lakes, rivers, streams and those landscapes that make America a great place to live in.	WRS 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peter Jardine	April 20, 2013	Please protect our planet for future generations by revising your environmental impact statement to reflect what we all know to be true: that the Keystone XL pipeline is all risk and no reward.	ACK
Peter Joseph	March 27, 2013	I understand that no climatologists were involved in drafting the report, which is an egregious and unacceptable oversight.	CLIM 01
Peter Joseph	March 27, 2013	I understand that the consequences to the global climate were not taken into account because it was assumed that the "oil" would be produced regardless, which is not necessarily true.	CLIM 13
Peter Joseph	March 27, 2013	There are enough carbon reserves in the ground to cook the planet if consumed, which threatens our very civilization. Where do you draw the line?	CLIM 14
Peter Joseph	March 27, 2013	I understand that the State Department did not take into consideration the international and humanitarian crises that you will be managing in a warmed planet.	RISK 06
Peter Kraniotakis	April 20, 2013	100% of the oil produced in North America should be used for North America supply	PN 01
Peter Krones	April 9, 2013	I UNDERSTAND THAT FOR THE NEAR FUTURE, WE ARE OIL-DEPENDENT. BUT THERE MUST BE SAFER WAYS TO KEEP FLOWING THAN THE TAR SANDS!!!!!	PN 05
Peter Lenoach	March 1, 2013	Our policy should be to encourage the exploration of oil to keep the supply ample, and tax it to encourage long term conservation.	PN 07
Peter Lenoach	March 1, 2013	Not letting it [pipeline] go through our country naively assumes that the oil will not find its way on to the world market without our support.	PN 10
Peter Lenoach	March 1, 2013	Ensure the the US taxpayers are properly compensated for the use of the pipeline, and move forward.	SO 10
Peter Leonard	April 22, 2013	global warming disaster	ACK
Peter Limburg	April 11, 2013	Not only does the extraction of the oil from the tar sands cause massive local pollution of the water and require immense amounts of energy to liquefy the tar, an accident is almost certain to occur. Two have occurred already, and we do not want a third. However, corporate cost-cutting tends to result in inferior materials and workmanship and deficient maintenance (think of BP's Deepwater Horizon disaster), and human error is always waiting to happen. Furthermore, a pipeline is scarily vulnerable to malicious damage by vandals and terrorists. The short-term gains from construction of the Keystone pipeline are far outweighed by the long-term losses.	RISK 14, CU 02, RISK 23
Peter Mccaughan	April 5, 2013	True, it is humans in the poor design and execution of the pipeline, and unanticipated environmental forces that cause an accident.	RISK 22
Peter Mceachern	April 21, 2013	Our home the earth is already heating up and in dire trouble. This pipeline will only make a bad situation worse.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Peter Meyer	April 15, 2013	the jobs that the pipeline will provide are overwhelmingly temporary, The refinery jobs being a small fraction of the total claimed. The oil has long been defined as for export, so we do not need it to lower our reliance on the Middle East or Venezuela.	PN 07
Peter Meyer	April 15, 2013	The accident costs to communities --such as that now being experienced in Arkansas -- can easily outweigh the economic gain from the construction of the pipeline and the jobs created. Therefore the pipeline does not make economic sense.	RISK 09, PN 05
Peter Mills	April 5, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 12
Peter Mills	April 5, 2013	Fortunately, environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, and stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands.	PN 05
Peter Sickinger	March 19, 2013	Until we solve the energy problem, please do not make our citizens import the petroleum products we need from our enemies and let us use our own vast resources and imports from our friends.	PN 01
Peter Stickney	April 13, 2013	The probably damage this will cause in the long run will eliminate any positive profit to the American people	PN 05
Peter Stickney	April 13, 2013	Consciously putting a large portion of the US and its vital aquifers in harms way by approving this project is foolhardy.	WRG 01
Peter Stocker	April 3, 2013	The fact that the State Department's recent draft environmental review of the pipeline was based on work done by Big Oil's contractors only confirms that this pipeline is being built to benefit the oil industry, not the American People.	PRO 01
Peter W. Nichols	April 18, 2013	Canadian oil through Keystone XL will also replace the declining foreign oil that currently feed Gulf Coast refineries.	PN 10
Peter W. Nichols	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL is not about how much oil US. chooses to use, but rather it IS about where the U.S. chooses to gets its oil.	PN 10
Peter W. Nichols	April 18, 2013	Many...U.S. businesses...benefit from the Canada-U.S. energy relationship [incluidng] not only the construction and engineering sector, but many others such as advanced technology and environmental and health & safety services. These businesses are not limited to states close to the Canadian border, but include businesses of all sizes in almost every state of our nation.	SO 09
Peter Winkelstein	April 20, 2013	I strongly object to sending very dirty oil from canada through our country at great risk with no benefit to us as it will all be shipped to other countries.	PN 07
Peters	April 18, 2013	The route change is a sham because it still crosses very fragile, sandy soil with a very high water table.	SOIL 07
Peters	April 18, 2013	The proposed keystone XL pipeline poses a major threat to this land and, especially, the Oglala Aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ph D. David H. Klassen	April 17, 2013	this pipeline will contribute significantly to our intensifying crisis of increased levels of greenhouse gas, and global warming catastrophes. • I would prefer that we not embark upon the "game over" scenario eloquently described by Dr. James E. Hansen, Director of NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies, and the first scientist to measure carbon dioxide in the atmosphere (in 1970). Dr. Hansen concludes that increasing our reliance on dirty (i.e. high carbon content) oil from these Canadian oil sands will doom efforts to address climate change and looming climate catastrophes. His assessment, titled, "Silence Is Deadly - I'm Speaking Out Against The Canada–U.S. Tar Sands Pipeline" can be found at this link: http://www.climatestorytellers.org/stories/james-hansen-silence-is-deadly/	CLIM 14
Ph D. David H. Klassen	April 17, 2013	A direct quote: "CBS News collected reported incidents for 2010 at wells and pipelines from three federal agencies and 23 of 33 oil and gas producing states. Not counting the BP disaster, we found at least 6,500 spills, leaks, fires or explosions nationwide - that's 18 a day. Overall, at least 34 million gallons of crude oil and other potentially toxic chemicals were spilled. That's triple the size of the 1989 Exxon Valdez spill." Since this CBS report was only able to obtain data from 23 of 33 states, the actual totals must be presumed to be significantly higher.	RISK 14
Ph D. David H. Klassen	April 17, 2013	I have read reports that claim the pressure will be 2,200 psi (pounds per square inch). I have seen a report that includes a picture of pipes stacked on one of the construction sites for the southern portion of the pipeline. Stenciled on these pipes is the claim that they have been tested to withstand 1,800 psi. So apparently the pipes are not even being manufactured to withstand the pressures planned for them. Also, the higher the pressure, the more dilbit will spill before even the most advanced safety systems can shut down the pipeline.	RISK 14
Ph D. David H. Klassen	April 17, 2013	There is no proven technology to contain a spill of dilbit or to clean it up.	RISK 14
Ph D. David H. Klassen	April 17, 2013	The Cornell University Global Labor Institute has produced a study, "Pipe Dreams? Jobs Gained, Jobs Lost By The Construction Of Keystone Xl," that argues persuasively that the industry claims for job creation by this project cannot be substantiated. This study reports that "The project will create no more than 2,500-4,650 temporary direct construction jobs for two years, according to TransCanada's own data supplied to the State Department." The study also finds that the pipe used in construction is being manufactured in India and Canada, not in the United States as claimed by TransCanada. In summary, we won't get pipe manufacturing jobs, we won't get significant construction jobs, and we won't get the oil.	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Phebe Watson	April 15, 2013	Exxon and other oil companies have proven that they either are not ABLE to prevent spills or effectively clean up their impact on our environment; OR they do not have the WILL to do so.	RISK 14
Phil Berger NC General Assembly	April 9, 2013	Strategic energy infrastructure is important to not only North Carolina but the nation as a whole.	PN 01
Phil Berger NC General Assembly	April 9, 2013	[North Carolinea] is reliant on numerous products from Gulf Coast refineries,including natural gas, diesel, and gasoline as well as the numerous products that contain refined hydrocarbons as their feedstock.	SO 08
Phil Berger NC General Assembly	April 9, 2013	Many of these industries are time sensitive- and even a day or two without fuel to run farm equipment, natural gas to heat livestock houses and cure tobacco, and petrochemicals to fertilize crops can cost producers (and eventually consumers) millions of dollars.	SO 08
Phil Berger NC General Assembly	April 9, 2013	Refined hydrocarbons from the Gulf Coast provfde'ttie ehergy and chemicals necessary for [agriculture] to operate.	SO 08
Phil Blackwood	March 12, 2013	I find the Environmental Impact statement to be lacking a realistic evaluation of the impacts of this project on the climate.	CLIM 12
Phil Carmody	March 28, 2013	[The DSEIS] ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	PN 06
Phil Fry	April 4, 2013	Probably hundreds of thousands of people are put at risk by this pipeline, and certainly thousands will suffer by the certain failures it would experience in a decade.	RISK 21
Phil Lipari	April 22, 2013	We have seen with the recent ExxonMobile pipeline spill in Arkansas that it is not a matter of if but when the next spill will take place, especially considering the track record of the oil companies with numerous pipeline spills.	RISK 24, RISK 13
Phil Seymour	April 20, 2013	Add to that the future damages it will cause by encouraging the use of more fossil fuel, except for that which fouls the land and water in America's agricultural breadbasket, refined Dilbit that will be sold to other countries, and this is simply a terrible proposition.	PN 07
Phil Seymour	April 20, 2013	Building a 2,000 mile long unprotected pipeline across America's heartland, filled with toxic sludge that could poison the Ogallala aquifer, (30% of America's fresh water), would be an open invitation to every terrorist that wants to attack our country.	RISK 04
Philip Allen	April 2, 2013	Today, after more than a decade of study into the effects of climate change and industrial pollution, I urge my colleagues and compatriots to deny TransCanada the authority to plow through vulnerable American prairie with its load of junk crude.	CLIM 12
Philip Armour	April 19, 2013	Spend the money on developing green energy instead—solar, in particular.	ALT 01
Philip Armour	April 19, 2013	It's construction would be an environmental disaster, not to mention a violation of private property rights.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Philip Bisesi	March 10, 2013	An equal amount of money invested in solar and wind energy would have a better return on investment and retard global warming. It is vital that total economics and scientifically based life cycle cost/benefit analysis with external costs and enviromental impact be used in every decision.	PN 02
Philip De Vos	April 13, 2013	I SEE ONLY ONE WAY FORWARD, A SIGNIFICANT TARIFF ON ALL TAR SANDS TRANSITING OR REFINED IN THE U.S. AND THE OIL COMPANIES SUBSIDIES BEING ENDED.	SO 16
Philip M. Ross	April 22, 2013	This is a short-sighted project: little economic benefit with guaranteed contamination of a critical resource (the aquifer). Nebraskans are against this!	PN 05
Philip Navarro	April 22, 2013	We are not using the oil here in America so why is the question I ask. We need a reality check when it comes to this type of oil. Stop this pipeline!	PN 07
Philip Richman	April 11, 2013	Most of the products of the oil is expected to be exported. This means that we are putting our land and people in jeopardy for the sake of foreign profits. Is it necessary to do this?	PN 07
Philip Rose	March 4, 2013	Short term gain is not the generational impact of such projects as Keystone and hydrofracking.	ACK
Philip Rose	March 4, 2013	Alternatives need to be pursued with rigor and science and urgency.	ALT 01
Philip Smith	April 4, 2013	why on earth don't they refine the tar sand at its source in Canada? Many ways already exit to ship and distribute refined oil products. No special pipe line should be necessary.	ALT 08
Phillip Lamoureux	April 4, 2013	Kalamazoo hasn't recovered yet. The clean up crews didn't even clean up, they just poured some sand over the mess and swept it under the carpet. Crooked standard operating procedure. It'll all be the same, it's the same company, no Keystone pipeline!!	RISK 14
Phillip Matthews	March 19, 2013	It just makes sense to approve this pipeline and bring that fuel to the U.S., to grow our economy, provide jobs for our workers and power our businesses and homes. Americans have waited nearly five years for this pipeline to be approved and for America's government to increase our energy security.	PN 10
Phyllis Ann Maples Cole	April 16, 2013	This pipeline is a great target for our enemies! Just drop one bomb and take our half of the country! Great thinking for people who have been elected to protect this country!	RISK 04
Phyllis Fryzel	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL will also be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy.	ACK
Phyllis Jean Crothers	April 16, 2013	Tar sands oil will not help meet our energy needs. The purpose for the Keystone XL is to transport oil to the gulf where it will be sold to other countries. Construction in the US would simply provide a few jobs during construction, after which the jobs would dry up.	PN 07
Phyllis Katz	April 17, 2013	We need to work hard at solar, wind and hydro energy for the sake of our grandchildren. What once worked well is now unhealthy for our larger world population	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Phyllis Krystal	March 11, 2013	It also was discovered that the State department report was writen by someone chosen by the owner, to reflect the neutrallityof the project!	PRO 01
Phyllis Magal	April 4, 2013	Canadian oil only wants to come through the US because the native population there will not allow it to cross their lands.	ALT 05
Phyllis Meshulam	March 17, 2013	Perhaps the CONSTRUCTION of it and even the use of it, with the improved routing, would not be a major risk. But the burning of these exceptionally dirty fossil fuels IS a huge risk to the climate and environment of our globe.	CLIM 13
Phyllis Meshulam	March 17, 2013	…. if the US does not permit them to cross our borders, environmentalists in British Columbia will take up the challenge and likewise refuse to have this toxic brew pass over their territory. I believe this will be the case. And that the US, having contributed more than our fair share to the greenhouse gases that now threaten civilization, has a responsibility to do the right thing within our abilities. And then support other countries as they attempt to do the same.	PN 05
Phyllis Pengelly	April 4, 2013	The destruction of the Boreal forest in Canada is devastating to the environment and the birds and animals that make that forest their home. The Boreal forest is THE major nesting area for. Oat of our songbirds.	CU 01
Phyllis Pircher	April 4, 2013	There is a graph that shows there has been no decrease in spills over the years although we are told that there is massive improvement in the way the oil is moved.	RISK 14
Phyllis V. Coral Rooney-dietz	April 15, 2013	Spend the money on alternative energy sources.	PN 02
Pi Crowley	March 11, 2013	Also there is a large wolf habitat in and around where the tar sands are "mined." Each day these magnificent animals are shot to "protect" the workers. What a shame.	CU 01
Pia Alm-basu	March 28, 2013	it is also devastating for the local communities and farmers directly impacted by the pipeline running through their lands. Many of these Americans have been farming for generations, and will have to see their livelihoods finally ruined for good.	SO 12, LU 01
Pipeilne Fighters	March 18, 2013	http://boldnebraska.org/press_lb1161	REF
Pipeline Fighters	March 18, 2013	Yesterday, the state of Nebraska lost its motion to prevent landowners from adding requests for injunctive relief and lost its motion to block landowners from adding moreclaimsof unconstitutional acts.	ACK
Pipeline Fighters	March 18, 2013	The lawsuit against theState of Nebraska, filed by three landowners. Is moving forward in theLancasterCounty court with a full trialexpected thissummer.The outcome wouldaffect theKeystone Xlpipeilne route and the power of eminent domainand any possible forced approval of the pipeline that Congress iscurrently considering.	LEG 02
Pipeline Fighters	March 18, 2013	The state law passed in Nebraska establishing a new approval process of the current preferred route for Keystone XL pipeline is being challenged with this lawsuit.	LEG 17
Pippa White	April 22, 2013	I oppose the pipeline but if we must have it PLEASE dont rout it through the Sandhills and the precious acquifer!	ALT 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Pippa White	April 22, 2013	The Ogallala Acquifer does not just supply clean water to Nebraska but to all the states between Nebraska and Texas. It is an irreplaceable source of clean beautiful water. … The sandy soil in Nebraska over this priceless water supply is NOT the place for a pipeline.	WRG 01
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	The oil is not coming to us but is headed for the world market, the jobs, based on your estimates will be modest, fuel prices in the Midwest will rise….	PN 04, PN 01
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	The job numbers have been grossly exaggerated ever since the first sign of opposition, the oil is going to China and India..	PN 07
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	The XL will leak, too, and one of the leaks will contaminate the aquifer.	RISK 07
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	And why dont the "jobs" of farmers and ranchers, who put food on our tables and whose livelihoods will be threatened by the KXL, ever enter the conversation when Pipeline Jobs are discussed? Why didnt TransCanada use state-or-the-art construction on the Keystone 1, which leaked 14 times in its first year? Oil from our friendly neighbor to the north? TransCanada has never denied that this oil is going on the world market, not to us. THERE IS NO GOOD REASON WHY THIS PIPELINE SHOULD BE BUILT! Its going to leak into the aquifer,	RISK 26, RISK 14, SO 12, WRG 01
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	TransCanada is using inferior steel from India, they are not using state -of –the- art equipment, and tar sands dilbit is heavy, corrosive and already responsible for four bad pipeline leaks in our country. Four bad leaks.	SO 11, RISK 11
Pippa White Lawson	April 22, 2013	One of America's most precious resources, the High Plains Aquifer, will be contaminated when the bad leak happens. ……. The "heartland" produces your food. The aquifer provides water for your food.	WRG 01
Pirnie	April 18, 2013	Currently this oil -- currently this oil is being transported by trains. And the odds of having a train wreck are substantially greater than having a big spill from this pipeline. Plus, the pipeline does not generate greenhouse gases moving the oil from the origin to the destination like the railroad does.	ALT 04
Pj M	April 5, 2013	The oil co pipelines are basically self regulated, phmsa has no teeth or even the knowledge to be effective in securing the pipelines as mayflower and kalamazoo and yellowstone have shown withou a doubt.	RISK 23
Pjcomo54	April 15, 2013	The damage to the environment [from the Keystone XL Pipeline would be] … permanent.	ACK
Pjcomo54	April 15, 2013	Climate change is real [and] Keystone XL will promote it.	CLIM 14
Pjcomo54	April 15, 2013	Until we have full knowledge of what is in the pipelines ... we should postpone keystone xl until we can assess ACTUAL safety, based on full disclosure.	RISK 12
Pjcomo54	April 15, 2013	The majority of the jobs created [by the Keystone XL Pipeline] are temporary.	SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
PollackJ	April 18, 2013	When you burn all of that stuff, you get half the global warming we've had so far from all sources, according to a study in Nature Climate Change, March 2012, by Scientists Schwartz and Gruber, which somehow your study did not seem to find, even though it's in the published, well-known scientific journal that specifically evaluated the climate impact of the oil sands in Canada.	CLIM 05
Polly Ohman	March 8, 2013	Concurrence with online document (specifically, Canadian impacts): http://www.dioceseofmackenzie.com/files/Tar_sands_statement_on_letterhead.pdf	REF
Polly O'malley	March 14, 2013	As one of our leading Climate Scientists has stated, approval of the Keystone XL pipeline would be "GAME OVER" for the PLANET!	CLIM 14
Polly O'malley	April 11, 2013	Tar sands oil is thicker, more acidic and more corrosive than conventional crude. Transported under high pressure, it poses a far greater risk of leaks along the pipeline route.	RISK 14
Polly Tarpley	March 28, 2013	Too many of our citizens have already experienced the bullying tactics used in seising their properties for an "early start" on this projected hideous and …..	LEG 02
Polly Tarpley	April 5, 2013	Transcanada should be held responsible for all damage	LEG 06
Polly Wilson	April 4, 2013	We definitely should NOT take that kind of risk here. I say no to leaking toxic chemicals and sludgy oil in the U.S. There IS NO zero risk, or even a low risk way to attain and transport this substance! And, as we know from past experience even one mistake has drastic, unacceptable consequences. (Remember the Valdez and the Leak in Louisiana)	RISK 14
Pradeep Gajjar	April 15, 2013	Renewable energy sources like solar and wind should first be exhausted before considering fossil fuel dirty sources like tar sand. The potential for solar in US is huge, yet we get less that 0.1% of energy from solar.	ALT 01
Prairie County Commissioners	April 2, 2013	The main reason to support the building of the Keystone XL pipeline is to have a source of energy that is stable and predictable	PN 01
Prairie County Commissioners	April 2, 2013	The increase in our tax base will be 300% because of this one project.	SO 14
Preston Lawrence	March 20, 2013	So I am deeply disappointed that the State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest fuel on the planet. Tar sands oil production creates three times the global warming pollution as traditional oil production.	CLIM 12
Preston Lawrence	March 20, 2013	A comprehensive review would include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development, the major refinery pollution it will produce here in America and the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Priscilla Burnham	April 4, 2013	The recent devastating pipeline leaks in Michigan and Arkansas are simply another strong reason NOT to expose the aquifer and the surface environment to the potential risks of additional hundreds of miles of pipeline, which no on can guarantee are safe and won't break, leak, rust, etc,	RISK 07
Priscilla Hall	April 21, 2013	We must decrease our dependence on fossil fuels, develop alternative energies, and most importantly seek to decrease our energy dependence. We must aggressively combat climate change,	PN 02
Priscilla Rich	April 11, 2013	Sec Kerry: you are one of my heroes. You can make clean energy the hallmark of your career, by sending a BIG message to Canada on the Keystone XL, that while Canada is 63% clean energy, why does it need to jeopardize the rest of who, who aren't even halfway there? We should be putting 100% of our energies into going clean, not continue the policies of the 19th century!	PN 02
Priscilla Yacovoni	March 28, 2013	Very few jobs, and even fewer long-term jobs, will be created with the pipeline and most, if not all, of the oil is to be exported to Asia.	PN 05
Probst, Richard	April 21, 2013	For the future security of the United States, stop this pipeline now!	ACK
Probst, Richard	April 21, 2013	The effects of the current levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are already terribly apparent, and the Keystone XL pipeline will only serve to increase this problem. We do not need to make it easier to pump greenhouse gases into our air.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Prochnow	April 18, 2013	According to TransCanada web site, the composition of tar sand oils consists of clay, sands, DNAPL, which is dense nonaqueous phase liquids, which is denser than water and it will not dissolve in water. It will sink in the aquifer. It also consists of NLAPL, light nonaqueous phase liquids, that are dense - - less dense than water and tend to accumulate at the top of an aquifer, which rises at the surface, which can be transported through rain runoff. Contaminants, according to TransCanada web site, state that they have BTEX, which is benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylene. These are very volatile organic compounds. They also have a low flash point. And as we saw on the news this morning with a fertilizer explosion in Texas, that has a higher flash point than what these volatiles do. The explosion in Texas this morning leveled three blocks of a community, leveled the houses out. A lot was said already about abutenton (phonetic). Let's do the health concerns. Benzene can cause drowsiness, dizziness, unconsciousness. Long-term benzene exposure causes effects on the bone marrow and can cause anemia and leukemia. Benzene has been found in at least 1,000 of 1,684 national priority list sites identified by the EPA.	RISK 20, RISK 12, RISK 30
ProsokiKa	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL Pipeline is threatening our livelihood and our clean water.	ACK
ProsokiKa	April 18, 2013	After learning the real story, I cannot understand how anyone would want the risk of having this pipeline anywhere, let alone going through our high water table and our highly sensitive soils. The Keystone XL Pipeline is all risk and no reward	WRG 01
ProsokiKe	April 18, 2013	They want to buy our legacy, our family farm with their perpetual easements for another country to pump their tar sands and their toxic chemicals like benzene and whatever other cancer-causing products. Then to be shipped to a foreign-owned port and exported to another foreign country and at the expense of our only source of clean drinking water. And that is not acceptable.	PN 07
ProsokiKe	April 18, 2013	This XL tar sand pipeline will be placed at a depth of 7 feet, which our water table's only 4 foot or less in places in the reroute. It will leak right into our sand and gravel textures of the soil. Our groundwater travels at a rate of 3foot or more a day. And that being said, our house, our livestock wells, which are only 15 feet deep, will hold less than a year of safe, clean drinking water to drink and bathe in.	WRG 05, RISK 10
ProsokiKe	April 18, 2013	Well, if TransCanada gets this pipeline in, look out, Columbus, Schuyler, Fremont, Omaha and Lincoln. The train is coming at 1,600 pounds of pressure and 140 degrees. These cities get all their water supply from the Loup and the Platte Basins.	WRS 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ptasnik	April 18, 2013	I have personally dealed with oil & gas pipeline companies and they take advantage of land owners and minimally compensate for their damages and future risk…[this pipeline will] damage our climate, water, and soil.	RISK 06, LEG 02
Purdycm	March 30, 2013	Redirect the funds proposed for the pipeline into finding a safer energy solution, one that will not destroy our air and weather.	PN 05
Purdycm	March 30, 2013	The Keystone pipeline would enable the tar sands project in Canada, with disastrous impact on the health of the USA's environment. If Canada wants to travel this dangerous road, either stop them or let them do it without our aid.	RISK 07
Qayyum Johnson	March 15, 2013	The SEIS fails to adequately address the myriad repercussions of this project by failing to do the math on increased drought, flood, hurricane that will result from doubling down on dirty fuel sources.	CLIM 17
Qayyum Johnson	March 15, 2013	The SEIS fails to adequately address….the spills that will happen	RISK 07
Qayyum Johnson	March 15, 2013	Everyone else (besides the oil companies) suffers from the release of more carbon into the atmosphere, from the inevitable leaks in the line as it travels over vitally important aquifers, from the industrial extraction in Canada that leaves scarred, toxic landscapes devastated and denuded.	RISK 07, CLIM 14, WRG 01
R Capozzelli	April 9, 2013	Your new evaluation must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution that will result from the tar sands that will flow through the pipeline.	PN 06, CLIM 13
R. Zimmerman	April 22, 2013	We have a clean and productive state and that all could easily be lost due to a break in the pipe that was delivering oil to the gulf and basiclly ruining our states water suppply production and cleanliness.	ACK
R.j. Michaelson	April 11, 2013	The assessment is a joke. Serious scientists who aren't in the pockets of Big Oil need to prepare a serious report that takes into account the appalling over sites, understatements and willful misrepresentation of the facts.	PRO 01
R.L. Caldwell	April 20, 2013	When disturbing the natural native grass of the Sandhi lis it takes a century of more to repair the damage done.	VEG 01
R.L. Caldwell	April 20, 2013	It disturbs me that individuals including an MIT professor that seem to think that it is OK to build a pipeline through fragile Sandhills terrain with a very large aquifer under it.	WRG 01
Rabbi Paula Reimers	March 18, 2013	The Canadians are sending it through the US because they don't want this dangerous pipeline, with its dirty oil, going through their country. But the US is stupid enough to consider it - all for oil to be refined in Texas and shipped abroad!!!	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rachael Langley	April 15, 2013	Tar sands results in more greenhouse gas pollution than conventional oil and has acidic and corrosive properties in pipelines that can lead to more frequent spills that are more difficult to clean up. Increasing the flow capacity of this pipeline poses significant risks to the environment, waterways, and climate that must be examined, and should require a new Presidential Permit and environmental impact statement.	RISK 11, RISK 07
Rachael Nolting	March 23, 2013	There are other ways to get oil, other ways to help create jobs, and I'd rather see our countries energies put into researching solar energy or the power of wind as opposed to this draining of fossil fuels which will only push us closer to the brink of exhausting our planet's natural resources	PN 02
Rachael Nolting	March 23, 2013	No matter how many jobs this thing creates, or how much oil it brings into this country, no amount of the possible positives will outweigh the risks inherent in such a venture. This type of idea is detrimental in the long run to our country and would have serious repercussions if it were to ever have a hiccup. Which such things inevitably do... because big business loves to take shortcuts if they are 'cost efficient'.	PN 05
Rachael Nolting	March 23, 2013	please think about the natural habitats that such an undertaking would destroy. It could hasten the near extinction of several species	WI 21
Rachael Wooten	March 28, 2013	Please look at the massive destruction this project entails. From wiping out nesting grounds for millions of birds, to destroy ancient boreal forest, to creating irreversible damage for the climate.	CU 01
Rachana Bhatia	April 16, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and this was the reason that Gov. Heineman, Sen. Johanns and President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	WRG 06
Rachel	April 17, 2013	the future of energy lies in renewable sources [as opposed to oil]. Not only is [renewable] energy home grown, it is also better for the environment.	ALT 01
Rachel Arbaugh	April 5, 2013	This is moronic...we are supposed to be moving into the future and finding clean energy. Instead of buying this pipeline why not invest in more solar or wind energy sources!?	PN 02
Rachel Arbaugh	April 5, 2013	Even a small leak could taint the entire aquifer…	RISK 10
Rachel Brian	April 22, 2013	It is made clear by the state department that the Keystone XL will increase the green house gases as if you added another 626,000 passenger cars more a year. Does the earth need more greed house gases? We cant breath now. The EPA and the Lung Association has made is clear that breathing smog cause emphysema	CLIM 16
Rachel Denham	April 23, 2013	Please vote against this pipeline. It is dirty, has few long-term jobs (35), is dangerous. Note the recent spills and impossible clean-up. Please get the facts about this pipeline, instead of the hype by TransCanada and their American supporters.	PN 08
Rachel Gordon	April 16, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate and its significant risk for toxic spills.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	building this pipeline and bringing the tar to market will have long-term negative impacts for our economy…rising fossil fuel costs that will continue to occur unless we wean ourselves off of fossil fuels and invest in a new clean energy future.	ALT 01
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	Many more jobs can be created by focusing our national resources and effort entirely on energy efficiency and conservation, alternative transportation, and on smart grid and renewable technologies.	ALT 02
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	to suggest that the pipeline would have no significant climate impacts is wholly inaccurate	CLIM 13
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	the Canadian Tar Sands are destined for export and foreign markets. As a result, building the pipeline will have no perceivable impact on oil prices or American dependency on foreign oil.	PN 04
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	America will simply be used to transport dirty foreign oil to foreign markets putting our communities, aquifers, and land/wildlife at risk.	PN 05
Rachel Hangley	April 7, 2013	the 42,000 jobs is a very high estimate. Other independent studies put that number well-below 10,000 and some around 2,000. All studies conclude that almost all of those jobs are temporary.	SO 02
Rachel Kaplan	March 19, 2013	The processing of this oil has been said by scientists to be "game over" for climate change. We need to quickly and inexorably move away from dirty fossil fuels if we want to survive as a species.	CLIM 14
Rachel Kaplan	March 19, 2013	Keystone XL must be rejected -- the creation and distribution of this oil is a disaster for the environment, the economy and our people.	PN 05
Rachel Kaplan	March 25, 2013	Scientists decry this proposal. Indigenous people whose lives and livelihoods are being destroyed in Canada decry this pipeline. Anyone who cares about climate change and a future for our children decries this proposal.	PN 05
Rachel Kaplan	March 25, 2013	It has the capacity to further spoil our waters and our lands. It will transport some of the dirtiest oil out of Canada and into the rest of the world, thereby creating an opportunity for further environmental degradation and destruction	RISK 07
Rachel Leone	March 28, 2013	So many other countries are investing in renewables. We do not NEED the tar sands oil. Canada doesn't even need the oil because they are using more renewable resources every year!	ALT 01
Rachel Milliron	April 2, 2013	Do not continue to support this project. It will only propel our society to destruction. It is not fair that the people of America suffer while the rich reap the benefits.	ACK
Rachel Stone	April 15, 2013	It is very naive of the government to proclaim that the pipeline has no environmental impacts, when it obviously does.	ACK
Rachel Stone	April 15, 2013	The pipeline would go through U.S. communities, six rivers and two aquifers. If the pipeline breaks, the environment is done for.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rachel Stone	April 15, 2013	The government also says that the Keystone XL pipeline will bring jobs, when investing in renewable resources would create three times the amount of jobs as fossil fuels do. We need to be investing in renewable energy instead of tar sands.	SO 05
Rachel Theo-maurelli	April 22, 2013	Keystone will only create about 300 jobs long term	SO 04
Rachel Vorlander	April 13, 2013	The only reason to build this pipeline is to expand TransCanada's profits and further expand tar sands production in Canada.	PN 05
Rachel Vorlander	April 13, 2013	TransCanada has already arranged to export the oil shipped through this pipeline, allowing them to pad their bottom line and pump more money into tar sands development.	PN 07
Rachel Vorlander	April 13, 2013	Keystone XL … is simply not in our national interest.	PN 08
Rachel's Mail	March 25, 2013	We need solutions for the future that are sustainable, and that will help us repair the damage that we are doing to the earth with the oil that we burn, not something that will be temporary and increase the CO2 being released.	ALT 01
Rachel's Mail	March 25, 2013	You need an independent voice review the information, study the environmental impact, and show the people of this country that the XL Keystone pipeline will not contribute to global climate change!	PRO 05
Raederle's Graphic Design	April 1, 2013	Instead of continuing our reliance on fossil fuels, why not support a sustainable future with alternative energy?	ALT 01
Raederle's Graphic Design	April 1, 2013	A.k.a. diluted bitumen, this substance releases 17% more green house gases … than conventional crude oil.	CLIM 05
Raederle's Graphic Design	April 1, 2013	...and Keystone won't decrease our dependence on "unfriendly" oil imports either.	PN 05
Raederle's Graphic Design	April 1, 2013	A.k.a. diluted bitumen, this substance … is more difficult to clean up than conventional crude oil.	RISK 08
Raederle's Graphic Design	April 1, 2013	Let's think outside of the box and focus on alternative energy – the money and time spent cleaning up spills could be used for more sustainable resources that create green jobs.	SO 05
Rael Nidess	April 2, 2013	Further, it is now evident that the majority of the so-called 'study' justifying the KXL's construction by negating the environmental risks was written by shills for companies with vested interests in seeing the pipeline built; thus the entire study should be considered 'tainted' and thrown out in favor of one conducted according to recognized standards of transparency and scientific accuracy.	PRO 01
Rael Nidess	April 2, 2013	I am concerned that the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on the Keystone XL pipeline massively underestimates the pipeline's health and environmental risks.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rael Nidess	April 4, 2013	Lastly, considering the SEIS has now been shown to have been written (at least in part) by industry shills, the entire document must be considered 'tainted' and discarded in favor a new study conducted by impartial observers without industry ties and with complete transparency.	PRO 01
Rafael D. Velez	April 4, 2013	Do not give them an alibi from doing the right thing which is to build new refining capability closer to the source of the crude. That would have a positive impact on gasoline prices for the rest of us, instead of locking up the processing to their existing refining facilities that don't cost them anything but serves as an excuse to continue to keep prices up where they derive the most profit.	PN 05
Rahman Carr	March 1, 2013	Other nations around the world have conclusively PROVEN that clean alternative energy sources can work on an industrial scale as well as compete on price.	PN 02
Ralph Glick	April 6, 2013	Will another even larger Katrina or Irene destroy even more of our coastal cities? Will droughts and water pollution effect our food and water supplies? Will floods in other areas wash away roads, bridges, houses and farmlands.	CLIM 17
Ralph Glick	April 6, 2013	Your children and grandchildren will suffer from the effects of man made climate change along with everyone else. It is time to have a real discussion on the subject without bowing to pressure from the fossil fuel industries.	PN 05
Ralph Palmer	March 19, 2013	Please consider the source of the oil, as well as the effect of momentum (approval of the pipeline) on extraction and use of the oil.	ACK
Ralph Palmer	April 17, 2013	We need to concentrate on moving away from non-renewable energy sources, and toward conservation and renewable resources.	ALT 01
Ralph Perman Jr	March 30, 2013	The amount of resources needed to refine the tar sands and bring it to market far outweighs the benefits that the sales will create.	PN 05
Ralph Unger	March 19, 2013	Big business is making money polluting our planet... So please stop pipeline project so we have time to stop tar sands overall.	ACK
Randa Robinson-anderson	March 28, 2013	WE MUST TIGHTEN OUR BELTS WHILE PURSUING CLEAN ENERGY, NOT RISKING OUR HEALTH AND WATER QUALITY BY GOING WITH THE EASY, BUT DIRTY, SHORT-TERM SOLUTION TO OUR ENERGY CRISIS.	ALT 01
Randall Smith	April 22, 2013	It is not the answer to the energy demands of the United States or any other part of the world that would receive the contents of the pipeline. The money and resources being used for this project would be much better spent on developing sources of clean energy generation and distribution resulting in a more sustainable solution.	PN 03
Randall Tracy	April 13, 2013	Let them use other means to haul their oil, even if it is more expensive for them. American citizens and the environment shouldn't have to take all the risk with a pipeline just so oil companies can maximize profits.	PN 05, ALT 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Randell J Brewer	April 1, 2013	If allowed to go from Canada to Texas to be refined, the products produced will not lower fuel prices in the U.S.- the myth perpetuated by Big Oil. The fuel will be sold to China, not U.S. citizens.	PN 04
Randell J Brewer	April 1, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline, if allowed to be built, will, in time, ruin the environment of every state it runs through, not to mention others where this caustic poison will be carried by the rivers, lakes, watersheds, and aquifers to how many unknown places?	RISK 07
Randell J Brewer	April 1, 2013	We already have 1000's of miles of pipeline, some of it over 70 years old, and no one, especially the Oil Companies who profit from it, have bothered to inspect it, much less replace that which is old and vastly outdated. The pipelines we already have are going to start spilling at an alarming rate, because none of the oil companies are replacing the old lines. The damage to the environment will be astronomical when the existing pipelines start breaking down- they crisscross the entire nation.	RISK 13
Randell J Brewer	April 19, 2013	Trans-Canada was going to run the tar sands oil across Canada until Canadian citizens rose up and denied access to it.	ACK
Randell J Brewer	April 19, 2013	At the present rate, it won't be many years until every river, aquifer, and wetlands are contaminated with oil and there is absolutely no way to clean it up once it's polluted.	RISK 07
Randell J Brewer	April 19, 2013	There are 120,000 miles of underground oil pipeline in the U.S. that are mostly uncharted, mostly 45 to 65 years old, and there is absolutely no way to inspect all of them. There is an oil spill every THREE DAYS in the U.S. Just one "tar sands oil" spill in Michigan has cost over $1 Billion to clean up and it still isn't cleaned up. There are also 8 more spills just in Mich. alone. The oil companies ARE NOT PAYING TO CLEAN THESE SPILLS, THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER IS.	SO 15, PN 05
Randi Levin	April 17, 2013	Over all, the Bottom Line is the fact that the pipeline is not secured and leaks provide a huge risk to life, communities and People.	RISK 04
Randolph Sharpe	April 2, 2013	Please … consider the damage already done and continually being done to Canada's environment.	ACK
Randolph Skrovan	March 15, 2013	I strongly oppose the Keystone XL, due to the effect on our climate	CLIM 14
Randy E. Velarde	April 1, 2013	… you have an opportunity to change the direction of our country's energy, economic, and national security, by approving this pipeline.	PN 10
Randy E. Velarde	April 1, 2013	If approved, this project is expected to create thousands of American manufacturing and construction jobs in the United States and billions in tax revenue to the Keystone XL corridor states.	PN 10
Randy E. Velarde	April 1, 2013	Projects, such as the Keystone XL Pipeline, will spur economic growth by providing a stable supply of energy and generating thousands of new jobs and billions in revenue.	PN 10
Randy E. Velarde	April 1, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is clearly in our country's national interests. It will provide a long-term stable energy supply to the United States, create jobs, spur economic growth, and strengthen trade with one of strongest allies.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Randy E. Velarde	April 1, 2013	With the Keystone XL Pipeline, our Canadian neighbor could supply us with four million barrels a day by 2020, which is twice what we currently import from the Persian Gulf.	PN 10
Randy Embertson	March 28, 2013	There are thousands of people along the Kalamazoo River who have proof of Keystone's, and our federal government's, inability to deliver the capacity promised to protect our properties and environment. Show us the costs of this accident when it is finally cleaned up, which it still isn't, and then tell us how good the KXL will be.	ACK
Randy Fulara	April 16, 2013	In short, the Keystone XL pipeline diverts our nation from more secure, cleaner, and cheaper energy resources.	PN 03
Randy Mayes	April 20, 2013	The only thing I ask is for Canada to be more pressured to assure the tar sands are treated more carefully and that the quality of the oil put through the pipeline be is improved before sent to the US. What I understand is the problem with tar sands oil lies at the base of pipeline in Canada and their care of the site and oil is the only truly remaining obstacle. Please try to address that issue carefully in reviewing this project.	CU 01
Randy Reading	April 20, 2013	Please move forward with this project as there is no danger to our aquifers or environment that cannot be avoided.	ACK
Randy Rolfe	April 20, 2013	Federal money would be much better spent on encouraging renewables.	PN 02
Randy Salzman	April 15, 2013	http://thinkinghighways.com/publications/issue/?issue=6471&view=true	REF
Randy Wrozek	March 26, 2013	It will provide thousands of jobs. It will make us less dependent on the Middle East, unfriendly oil producers.	PN 10
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	[DOS] review should include the climate impacts of expanding tar sands development	CLIM 13
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	We cannot promote climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL.	CLIM 14
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	Our government should not invest in Tar Sands people down stream from the mines in Canada are suffering rare cancers and the water land and air are poisoned for miles around.	CU 02
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	[DOS review should include] the major refinery pollution it will produce here in the United States,	CU 08
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	As well, any review should acknowledge that financial analysts and oil executives agree that the Keystone XL decision will make or break tar sands development in Canada.	PN 06
Raphael Cordray	March 18, 2013	[DOS review should include]the grave risk to our communities from toxic pipeline spills	RISK 06
Raphael Kosek	April 13, 2013	Please block this pipeline because we know all the assurances about its safety are not true. This is a potentially very dangerous situation for us and our planet.	RISK 24
Ravenfeather	April 18, 2013	To make things worse, we [TransCanada] are wanting to sell this [bitumen] to one of the most blatant polluters on earth…CHINA.	PN 07
Ray Dizefalo	April 4, 2013	Better yet, expend our energies and our financial resources on alternatives which are cleaner, less dangerous and will provide needed jobs for the long term.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ray Dizefalo	April 11, 2013	Personally, I find no great benefit to the USA for allowing this to go through. Despoiling lands, potential water pollution and all the other detrimental aspects associated with the pipeline will not be easily eradicated once the accident happens.	PN 05
Ray Hayes	March 11, 2013	I'm disappointed that this study released by the State Department appears to suffer from the same use of insiders that fueled the financial crisis. This needs to stop. Have an independent study done.	PRO 01
Ray Pace	March 19, 2013	This is an environmental nightmare and a boondoggle for contractors to fleece the public. Wake up and do the right thing. Stop this insult to the planet.	ACK
Ray Welch	April 21, 2013	To bestow a reasonable hope of a sustainable future for our children, including a robust economy, we have to move away from capital-intensive, revenue-concentrating investments like massive oil pipelines to a more diverse and dispersed model. Oil is environmental leverage for which we have not yet paid. We have seen the damage that poorly managed leverage can do in the recent credit crisis and countless example before that. It is called living within our means—a very conservative idea.	PN 05
Raylon Smith	April 23, 2013	The benefits to the United States are minimal; the pipeline will not create sustainable jobs nor will it add to US energy security.	PN 05
Raylon Smith	April 23, 2013	The DSEIS does not adequately address the safety concerns raised by constructing and maintaining a diluted bitumen pipeline in rural areas, including a lack of emergency response infrastructure to deal with inevitable spills.	RISK 05
Raylon Smith	April 23, 2013	The DSEIS does not take into account the amount of lost good agricultural land and resources, nor the risk to water supplies that sustain South Dakota's agricultural producers.	SO 12, LU 01
Raymond Hebda	April 22, 2013	I own a family farm, farming is my way of life. Water is vital to my operation. Clean water feeds my family as well as the livestock. I depend on irrigation to feed the growing crops. Putting the Keystone Pipeline through or near my land endangers the existence of operating my farm. Food is needed world wide it is more valuable than oil. Nothing is so safe that an accident is impossible to happen. If the chemicals that carry the tar sand should infiltrate our water not only will Nebraska suffer but also the food supply to feed the growing population.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Raymond Moller	April 22, 2013	As a Nebraska land owner, I find it appalling that you would consider allowing a foreign, private company to use eminent domain on land owners for a tar sands pipeline that is meant for export purposes. I was told this 2 yrs. ago by one of Trans Canada's land agents that the oil would be sold on the world markets.	LEG 02
Raymond Moller	April 22, 2013	As a Nebraska land owner, I find it appalling that you would consider allowing a foreign, private company to use eminent domain on land owners for a tar sands pipeline that is meant for export purposes. Their strong arm tactics to get easements signed are appalling!	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Raymond Moller	April 22, 2013	I also DO NOT want this pipeline going thru the Nebraska Ogallala Aquifer! The surface depth to ground water in our area is only 3-5' and thus putting a 3' diameter pipeline with 4' of cover will immerse the pipeline within the aquifer. Their best leak detection methods would allow "seeps" of 500,000 gallons per day go undetected, using their own figures!!! This is unacceptable! This would be like injecting tar sands oil into our drinking water with a giant hypodermic needle! Would you allow them to insert the pipeline into the City of Lincoln or Omaha's water mains? I don't think so. Why are the rural citizens less important?	WRG 05
Raymond Moreland	April 11, 2013	It will be the height of criminality to allow the Keystone XL Pipeline to continue. This disaster in recent days proves the recklessness of big oil and its greedy money hungry efforts to make big bucks at the expense of the lives of Americans and the environment.	ACK
rb	March 3, 2013	The short-sighted analyses of present state only; no thought is given to end-game, to what happens when inevitable future developments negatively impact this project, to future states that are easily predictable as likely.	ACK
rb	March 3, 2013	The section on alternatives considered only alternative routes, and not alternative technologies...875 miles of 100 foot wide allowances? The same surface area in solar collectors in Arizona or Texas on undeveloped wasteland would cost less than the pipeline and its proposed adjuncts to build with current US multi-junction hybrid technology, cost a fraction of the pipeline to operate, and produce more than three times the energy of the pipeline -- enough that such energy could be stored as hydrogen, synthetic natural gas, or other convenient fuel at a lower cost than tar sand fuel.	ALT 01
rb	March 3, 2013	The issue of downstream environmental impacts. Water, air and migratory species that cross the border are all profoundly negatively affected, even by this activity so deep within Alberta. It's visible from the space station; how can anyone ignore or doubt that it will pollute and destroy well into US boundaries?	CU 02
rb	March 3, 2013	Suppression of infant industries. So heavily concentrated is financing, subsidy, land, government attention and infrastructure on tar sands, alternatives are actively discouraged in the US. This interference with technology migration and development is bankrupting advancement and cementing X-inefficiency in the US economy.	PN 03
rb	March 3, 2013	Market impacts: at present, tar sands are refined in Alberta and sold in the US at US domestic prices. The Keystone XL pipeline will give international access to a supplier that at present can sell only to the US domestic market. Where will the tar sands synthetic fuel end up? Not in the US domestic market. What will happen to US domestic fuel prices? They will skyrocket.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
rb	March 3, 2013	ES.5.5.2 - it is impossible to comment on this report without being shocked at the simple failure of this section. The market analysis fails to acknowledge the elasticity of the market, confusing a rise in price with a simple fall in production. What buyer will choose a 2% to 4% higher priced commodity over a lower priced one? Denial of Keystone XL won't drop the demand for tar sands by 2% to 4%, but by the ratio of buyers who would spend less to the ratio of buyers who would spend so much more in a competitive industry. Put another way, ES.5.5.2 essentially argues like the engineers at Kalamazoo: a leak the size of a schoolbus can be compensated by increasing pressure in the pipeline.	PN 12
rb	March 3, 2013	Subsidies. Canada currently subsidizes, and has for four decades, the tar sands. Canada currently subsidizes, and has for over a century, its rail. Canada subsidizes and backs in multiple ways the Keystone XL proposal. These are not small subsidies, but staggeringly large ones, on a scale relative to the Canadian economy not dissimilar to the amount the US spends on the military over the same periods. Once the USA has its neck in the TransCanada noose, and Canada pulls out its lucrative subsidies, it will be too late for the USA to save its head and pull out.	PN 12
rb	March 3, 2013	The issue of bad faith. We have seen repeatedly from across the industry examples of bad faith dealings in such applications. From Kalamazoo to the Gulf of Mexico to Alaska, we know information is frequently hidden by the industry in applications, mistaken, miss-stated, suppressed, manipulated, missing or maliciously worded. Truly independent research is required to confirm every claim from this bad faith business.	PRO 01
Realty Transacts, Inc. - Transaction Support	March 19, 2013	WE ALREADY HAVE PIPELINE SPILLS THAT ARE YEARS IN ON CLEANUP and NO END IN SIGHT	ACK
Realty Transacts, Inc. - Transaction Support	March 19, 2013	EIR's conducted by conflict of interest special interests are VERY TRANSPARENT THERE ARE BETTER ALTERNATE SOURCES The US as a World Leader should NOT be rubber stamping such a monumental project that is so damaging	PRO 01
Realty Transacts, Inc. - Transaction Support	March 19, 2013	It does nothing for this country - VERY FEW JOBS on a short term basis. Shipping the product to other countries - we do not benefit even if it were anything other than the wrong thing to do.	SO 04
Reanne R	March 16, 2013	Where is your LCA or remediation framework and analysis?	CLIM 05
Rebane	April 18, 2013	It is doubtful that the pipeline would actually create net jobs--fossil fuel production and transportation are very capital-intensive businesses.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rebecca	March 1, 2013	…if I can be held accountable for dumping my car oil, or a quart of oil, or a gallon of oil into my front yard than someone needs to have his or her name right out at the front of this report saying he or she will take full responsibility of the report ids found to be false, or in error.	PRO 01
Rebecca	March 1, 2013	This pipeline (these pipelines) will, undoubtedly, spill thousands of gallons/barrels of oil onto our earth, damaging the environment – and at what consequence?	RISK 07
Rebecca Eisel	March 10, 2013	It's inexcusable that TransCanada's own contractors were allowed to help write the latest report on the Keystone pipeline. I expect government reports to be unbiased.	PRO 01
Rebecca Hansen	April 22, 2013	It is past time to move forward with our energy needs instead of clinging to the past. We have the technology to use safer more effective energy sources.	PN 02
Rebecca J. Key	March 4, 2013	Please approve the Keystone Pipeline as soon as possible.	ACK
Rebecca J. Key	March 4, 2013	There are already thousands of miles of existing pipeline crossing the United States. One more will not make any impact in global warming.	PN 09
Rebecca J. Key	March 4, 2013	The building of the pipeline will create thousands of direct jobs and many more spin-offs.	SO 02
Rebecca Kolar	April 2, 2013	Please reject the KeystoneXL tar sands pipeline. It is far too environmentally risky in terms of a spill and in terms of the perpetuation of dirty, climate warming energy production. We should be investing instead in clean energy research and production.	ALT 01
Rebecca Kolar	April 2, 2013	Please reject the KeystoneXL tar sands pipeline. It is far too environmentally risky in terms of a spill and in terms of the perpetuation of dirty, climate warming energy production. We should be investing instead in clean energy research and production.	ALT 01
Rebecca Lavash	April 2, 2013	Let's get jobs from Green Energy not from dirty oil. We need to break free of fossil fuels. The shale gas will provide all the fossil energy we need plus more left to sell.	ALT 01
Rebecca M Williams	April 22, 2013	How dare a foreign corporation have the right to hold eminent domain over US land?	LEG 02
Rebecca M Williams	April 22, 2013	What makes this even worse is that most of the bitumen passing through the pipeline will simply be passing through the USA before being refined and sent and sold elsewhere.	PN 07
Rebecca M Williams	April 22, 2013	Pipeline fitters want jobs and business people want the business that comes from the building of the pipeline. They assert that the state and local economies will have more revenue as a result. But this is all temporary gain! It is short sighted.	SO 04
Rebecca Mackenzie	March 11, 2013	Please disregard the State Dept. report and focus on the more sustainable and just alternatives to energy policy development and implementation.	ALT 01
Rebecca Mcgoldrick	March 16, 2013	exacerbate the problem of climate change	ACK
Rebecca Mcgoldrick	March 16, 2013	it will fail to produce substantial reductions in fuel costs, will create temporary jobs,…	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rebecca Mcgoldrick	March 16, 2013	will damage the largest aquifer that so many Americans in drought-stricken areas depend upon to survive.	WRG 03
Rebecca Nielsen	April 22, 2013	This oil is headed to Port Arthur so that the Koch Brothers can ship it to China and make even more outrageous profits. Our energy costs in the midwest will GO UP	PN 04
Rebecca Pennington	April 9, 2013	It is intolerable how many communities of First Nations/Native Americans the pipeline route will negatively impact. As so often has been the case, these communities are disproportionately negatively impacted by the pipeline route.	EJ 01
Rebecca Perkins	April 5, 2013	We should all be making the switch, on a large scale, to clean, renewable energy sources.	ALT 01
Rebecca Pierce	April 7, 2013	And while all oil contributes to greenhouse gases, traditional oil is not nearly as bad as tar sands oil because- the Tar sands oil is literally goopy sands that they dig up with large machinery. It's like strip mining, but for oil. So all the associated problems with mining (like causing all the nearby surface water to be polluted and toxic), but also add in oil. Then, you have the emissions from all the equipment digging up the ground, you have the actual end-product emissions from burning oil as gasoline in your car, and you also have a bunch of extra emissions from the refining process which is more intense than regular oil	CLIM 05
Rebecca Pierce	April 7, 2013	What we are seeing now though is that many of the newer pipelines transporting tar sands oil are bursting much sooner than anticipated.	RISK 13
Rebecca Ramsay	April 17, 2013	In addition, the assessment underestimates the dangers a pipeline of this type in this location poses to vast quantities of interconnected underground drinking water reserves.	ACK
Rebecca Ramsay	April 17, 2013	It [DEIS] acknowledges then dismisses increased global warming resulting from this type of energy production.	CLIM 13
Rebecca Schedler	March 7, 2013	The track records of oil companies is ABYSMAL causing spills all over the place every day.	RISK 13
Rebecca Seth	April 22, 2013	We can continue to extract and burn fossil fuels causing greater damage to our planet, or we can take positive steps toward vastly increasing the amount of energy we get from clean sources, creating many jobs in the process and becoming a world leader in this area. It would be good for our economy and it might save the planet for our grandchildren. I support a tax on carbon with the revenue being returned to households, with border tariffs that protect the value of our exports.	SO 16, PN 02
Rebecca Stoner	April 4, 2013	Besides, we wouldn't be benefitting from cheaper oil in the US, just the pollution of transporting it across our beautiful country and the stench of refining it near our Gulf. Why pollute US when Canada ought to do it themselves. We don't get the oil anyway so let someone else build it, refine it and have it. All of that oil is going to be shipped from our gulf to whatever country will pay for it at the highest price they can get and it won't be us.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rebecca T	March 27, 2013	[DEIS] downplays the key role Keystone XL will play in developing Canada's highly polluting tar sands.	PN 06
Rebecca T	March 27, 2013	[DEIS]downplays the likelihood (and TransCanada's intention) that the oil refined from the tar sands will not be sold or used in the United States but instead exported for sale to foreign countries.	PN 07
Rebecca T	March 27, 2013	[DEIS] exaggerates the permanent jobs by about three orders of magnitude.	SO 02
Reg Jones	April 11, 2013	This is a litmus test for this president and this administration. If the Keystone XL pipeline is allowed to exist it will be proof that you care less about our planet, its climate, and the people on it (that is US!) than you do about the interests of the huge corporate polluters who do not care about the externalities involved in their reckless drive for profits.	ACK
Regina Hutchison	March 11, 2013	We really need to change our attitudes towards our water supply as well. It would be irresponsible at this point in time to use water this fashion. Please, please use sense when considering these types of proposals in the future.	ACK
Regis White	April 2, 2013	If we complete the XL pipeline, will the oil companies pay a tax? They are sending it to the Gulf ports to sell over seas. They pay no US taxes for overseas sales. They are paying little or no US taxes now.	SO 14
Rema Loeb	March 6, 2013	Before you approve this pipeline, you need to do a health study of the effects of refining this crude oil upon local populations.	CU 04
Rema Loeb	March 29, 2013	…then please reject this pipeline, which will give many fewer jobs than a real renewable energy program.	SO 05
Renate & Jeff Shotwell	April 22, 2013	Thick and paste-like tar sands have to be heated, dilluted and pushed thru a pipe line under high pressure; containting sand it is also abrasive. Under high pressure it is likely to burst the pipe and very difficult to clean up.	ACK
Renate & Jeff Shotwell	April 22, 2013	Climate change is happening right now, its a fact. By allowing the Keystone pipeline to go forward you are disregarding the dangers of climate change. It harms the environment to extract, transport, refine and ultimately use the tar sands oil.	CLIM 14
Rene White	March 14, 2013	Further, the USA will not receive one drop of oil from this possible pollution.	PN 07
Rene White	March 14, 2013	Pipelines have not been tested for safe transport.	RISK 14
Renee Gannon	March 17, 2013	We don't need the increased carbon dioxide emissions from tar sands production,	CLIM 13
Renee Gannon	March 17, 2013	The EIS for this pipeline is not acceptable since the consulting firm that created it also works for TransCanada.	PRO 01
Renee Gannon	March 17, 2013	… not to mention the environmental impact a spill would cause	RISK 07
Renee Limoge	March 25, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Renee Limoge	March 25, 2013	I would like to commend the State Department for executing a thorough and transparent Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL project. In this latest iteration, the State Department again concludes that the Keystone XL project will have minimal environmental impact due to extensive mitigation efforts to be undertaken by TransCanada. I now urge the State Department to finalize the SEIS expeditiously in order to complete a second National Interest Determination. Swift action now will allow this vital infrastructure project to move forward after four years of extensive study.	ACK
Renee Limoge	March 25, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Renee Limoge	March 25, 2013	With an additional 57 mitigation measures, Keystone XL is still the smartest choice.We respectfully request that the State Department expeditiously finalize the Draft SEIS and ultimately grant TransCanada the Presidential Permit necessary to begin building the pipeline.	PN 10
Renee Miron-alimpich	April 17, 2013	We need to move away from the use of the toxic use of this oil.	ACK
Renee Pound	March 24, 2013	Canada is STRIPPING CLEAN their precious Boreal forests in their quest to get richer. How those same forests are HOME to an AMAZING ASSORTMENT of wildlife including many of our songbirds and bears, elk, moose, badgers, wolverines, wolves, deer, hawks, eagles etc.? How they are polluting with horrible toxins the streams and rivers of central Canada, HOME to tribal native indians, who are PEOPLE by the way that RESPECT the land and water and air.	CU 01
Renee Pound	March 24, 2013	The recently released report 'from' the State Dept. that has been exposed as having been written by a company paid for by Trans-Canada and then attempted to be passed off as a genuine State Dept. study, shows the depth to which our government has been corrupted by big business and is now a document that has NO VALUE!!	PRO 01
Renee Pound	March 24, 2013	Will you tell us how it is a huge dirty bomb on the climate and will pollute the heartland with toxic and UN-CLEANABLE spills (remember the Kalamazoo river in Michigan).	RISK 07
Representative Charisse Millet	April 9, 2013	[Pipelines are traditionally the safest and most reliable form of transport for hydrocarbons.]	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representative John D. Ragan	April 2, 2013	Currently, the Southeast's gasoline and diesel supply depends upon Mideast seaborne deliveries through one pipeline from the Gulf Coast refinery complex. The Keystone will supply those same refineries with hundreds of thousands of additional barrels of oil a day from Canada and the United States instead of the Middle East. Such an increase in supply will have a huge impact in lowering energy prices across the Southeast as well as enhancing US defense and prosperity.	PN 10
Representative Kathy L. Rapp	April 11, 2013	Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods. For all these reasons, pipelines carry nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported domestically.	ALT 07
Representative Kathy L. Rapp	April 11, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region. Alternative transport methods- namely rail and barge- will require signiticantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions.	CLIM 02
Representative Kathy L. Rapp	April 11, 2013	However, the draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude a,mongst Gulf refineries. Even with these less attractive alternatives, rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands. With an additional 57 mitigation measures, Keystone XL is still the smartest choice. By supporting domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security. Access to affordable, stable supplies of petroleum remains one of the most vital components for a growing economy.	PN 10
Representative Kathy L. Rapp	April 11, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42, I 00 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services.	PN 10
Representative Kathy L. Rapp	April 11, 2013	These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers willsee thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	SO 19

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representative Pete Olson	April 19, 2013	The benefits the State Department should keep in mind include: • Tens of thousands of construction jobs, both temporary and permanent, that will inject billions of dollars into local economies and aid our fragile recovery; • Improve national security by reducing our reliance on unstable foreign sources of oil and improve our trade balance. Tapping Canadian and Bakken crudes will allow us to continue decreasing imports of non-North American oil; and • Safer, more efficient and enviromnentally preferable transportation of that crude, as it will lessen the need for use of rail and barge to bring this.energy to market.	PN 05
Representative Rodney W. Moore	March 28, 2013	In the Southeast, the vast majority of our gasoline and diesel is delivered via one pipeline form the Gulf Coast refinery complex. With Keystone XL online, those same refineries would receive an extra 830,000 barrels a day of highly discounted oil, as it will be coming from Canada and the United States instead of the Middle East. When crude oil makes up 80 percent of the price of a gallon of gasoline, such an increase in supply can have a big impact, leading to lower prices for energy consumers across the Southeast.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representative Scott W. Craig	April 23, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy. As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region. Alternative transport methods – namely rail and barge – will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions. Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods. For all these reasons, pipelines carry nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported domestically. However, the draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude amongst Gulf refineries. Even with these less attractive alternatives, rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands. With an additional 57 mitigation measures, Keystone XL is still the smartest choice. By supporting domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security. Access to affordable, stable supplies of petroleum remains one of the most vital components for a growing economy.	SO 02, PN 10
Representative Stalzer, Jim	April 19, 2013	Keystone XL will not only reduce our dependence on oil from the Middle East, it will provide needed jobs and economic activity in South Dakota. In addition it will provide additional tax revenue to help restore programs and services that had to be cut in recent years as well as helping provide lower cost energy to stimulate our economy.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The SETS must quantif~' air pollution from refining and analyze the health impacts on already burdened communities.	ACK
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	Additionally, the SEIS must detail the fulfillment of the Department of State's federal trust responsibility for government-to-government consultation with Indian tribes on the natural and cultural resources impacts of the pipeline.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	the SEIS must detail the fulfillment of the Department of State's federal trust responsibility for government-togovernment consultation with Indian tribes on the natural and cultural resources impacts of the pipeline.	CR 01
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	Refining tar sands oil…emits more pollution than conventional crude oil and results in higher emissions of toxic sulfur dioxide and nitrous oxide. Those emissions cause smog and acid rain and contribute to respiratory diseases like asthma.	CU 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS fails to adequately assess the effects of the pipeline on low-income and minority communities, including Indian tribal communities, which will be disproportionately impacted by the Keystone XL pipeline.	EJ 01
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	Refining tar sands oil would increase air pollution in refining areas which could further exacerbate the health impacts on the mostly low-income and minority communities in those areas. The SETS must quantify air pollution from refining and analyze the health impacts on already burdened communities.	EJ 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS mistakenly claims that Keystone XL would not have a significant impact on tar sands oil production — and thus carbon pollution — because it is likely that the oil would eventually be delivered to market through other means. [If Keystone were denied,] any future import pipeline construction would have to go through the same process as Keystone XL, meaning tar sands transport, production, and associated pollution is not predetermined.	PN 06
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS mistakenly claims that Keystone XL would not have a significant impact on tar sands oil production — and thus carbon pollution — because it is likely that the oil would eventually be delivered to market through other means. As the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce found in December, “Canada needs pipe — and lots of it — to avoid the opportunity cost of stranding over a million barrels a day of potential crude oil growth.” Without the Keystone XL Pipeline, there is currently no other practical means of importing that much oil.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS mistakenly claims that Keystone XL would not have a significant impact on tar sands oil production — and thus carbon pollution — because it is likely that the oil would eventually be delivered to market through other means. As the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce found in December, “Canada needs pipe — and lots of it — to avoid the opportunity cost of stranding over a million barrels a day of potential crude oil growth.” Without the Keystone XL Pipeline, there is currently no other practical means of importing that much oil.	PN 06
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The SEIS must include a detailed analysis of the impacts that the pipeline would have on natural resources and wildlife in the area surrounding the construction corridor, along with extensive information on the inevitable effects of tar sands oil leaks and spills.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The SEIS must include a detailed analysis of the impacts that the pipeline would have on natural resources and wildlife in the area surrounding the construction corridor, along with extensive information on the inevitable effects of tar sands oil leaks and spills.	RISK 07
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The SEIS must include an assessment of the economic impacts on workers and communities as a result of environmental degradation, air pollution, and water contamination from the pipeline.	SO 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS does not adequately consider the impacts of leaks and spills as well as increases in greenhouse gas emissions on employment and the economy.	SO 13
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The SEIS must include an assessment of the economic impacts on workers and communities as a result of environmental degradation, air pollution, and water contamination from the pipeline.	SO 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	Water contamination resulting from leaks and spills could have significant economic costs and could result in job loss in [the agricultural and other] sectors.	SO 13
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The Draft SEIS does not adequately consider the impacts of leaks and spills as well as increases in greenhouse gas emissions on employment and the economy.	SO 13, PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	Spills and leaks would also threaten wildlife, such as whooping cranes and bald eagles that rely heavily on the surrounding areas for survival.	TES 01
Representatives Jan Schakowsky; Raul M. Grijalva; Keith Ellison, Earl Blumenauer; Donna M. Christensen; Judy Chu; David Cicilline; William Lacy Clay, Jr.; Emanuel Cleaver, Steve Cohen; John Coyers, Jr.; Susan Davis; Sam Farr; Alan Grayson; Alcee Hastings; Rush Holt; Jare	April 18, 2013	The route crosses countless private family wells that are used for drinking water and agriculture.	WRG 01
Rev. Angie Hlava	April 22, 2013	Fact: Building the Keystone XL will directly impact the expansion of tar sands, and in turn speed up climate change. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/10/opinion/game-over-for-the-climate.html http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/aug/23/tar-sands-keystone-xl-climate http://priceofoil.org/2013/01/17/petroleum-coke-the-coal-hiding-in-the-tar-sands/	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rev. Brena Hadjian	April 22, 2013	The U.S. Pipeline Safety Administration has not yet conducted an in depth analysis of the safety of diluted bitumen (raw tar sands) pipeline, despite unique safety concerns posed by its more corrosive properties. Keystone XL will cross through America's agricultural heartland, the Missouri and Niobrara Rivers, the Ogallala aquifer, sage grouse habitat, walleye fisheries and more. The agency was not adequately accounting for threats to wildlife, increased pollution in distressed communities where the crude may be refined, or increases in carbon emissions that would exacerbate climate change, and a variety of other issues.	CU 10, CLIM 14, FISH01, RISK 07, RISK 11, TES 08, WRG 01
Rev. Brena Hadjian	April 22, 2013	I have to ask, is the Eminent Domain land grabs, harm to the environments worth 50 jobs? 100 jobs?	LEG 02
Rev. Brena Hadjian	April 22, 2013	By draining Midwestern refineries of cheap Canadian crude into export-oriented refineries in the Gulf Coast, Keystone XL will increase the cost of gas for Americans. TransCanada's 2008 Permit Application states "Existing markets for Canadian heavy crude, principally PADD II [U.S. Midwest], are currently oversupplied, resulting in price discounting for Canadian heavy crude oil. Access to the USGC [U.S. Gulf Coast] via the Keystone XL Pipeline is expected to strengthen Canadian crude oil pricing in [the Midwest] by removing this oversupply. This is expected to increase the price of heavy crude to the equivalent cost of imported crude. The resultant increase in the price of heavy crude is estimated to provide an increase in annual revenue to the Canadian producing industry in 2013 of US $2 billion to US $3.9 billion." Independent analysis of these figures found this would increase per-gallon prices by 20 cents/gallon in the Midwest.	PN 04
Rev. Brena Hadjian	April 22, 2013	Put simply, KXLs job creation potential is relatively small, and could be completely outweighed by the projects potential to destroy jobs through rising fuel costs, spill damage and clean up operations, air pollution and increased GHG emissions.	PN 05
Rev. Dr. Frodo Okulam	April 21, 2013	we see the Earth herself as sacred. This pipeline violates her integrity in at least three ways: destruction of sensitive habitat and indigenous homelands in the tar sands region, danger of large oil spills destroying ecosystems across a wide region, and adding to the pollution and greenhouse gases in the atmosphere causing global warming.	RISK 07, CLIM 12
Rev. Dr. Janet Adair	April 22, 2013	We believe that renewable and sustainable energy sources that don't imperil public health or damage the earth should be a priority. We are concerned that tar sands, being low-grace and corrosive, will end up having a low return - costing more in energy to produce and transport than other sources of energy. The more low-return energy we use, the less we have for anything else, like cleaning up disasters.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rev. Glen A. Halbe	April 5, 2013	Pipelines are the safest transportation method for crude oil - that does not make the pipelines safe. The answer is to invest government and private money in alternative energy	PN 02
Rev. Heather Hanson	March 14, 2013	Temporary construction jobs that disappear in 12 months are not a good risk ratio	PN 05
Rev. Janet	April 22, 2013	It is claimed that pipelines are safer than rail, but the data is dubious. Rail spills have been caught quickly and the damage has been much smaller.	ALT 04
Rev. Janet	April 22, 2013	(1) If the pipeline is built, it will expedite the exploitation of the tar sands, thus destroying any chance we might have of avoiding extreme climate change.	CLIM 13
Rev. Janet	April 22, 2013	The proper use of fossil fuels is to prepare for the day when we won't have them, and to expedite carbon sequestration through soil cultivation, reversing desertification, planting forests for carbon sequestration, and of course rehabilitating all our buildings and infrastructure to conserve instead of wasting. We started some of this in the 1970's, and stopped. We must at least make an attempt now, while there is still any possibility it is not too late.	PN 02
Rev. Janet	April 22, 2013	The State Department's impact statement was written in part by contractors who have ties to oil companies and pipeline proponents. It bears little resemblance to reality.	PRO 01
Rev. Janice Ewers	April 10, 2013	[Our nation should focus funding on alternative energy sources and making them affordable for all.]	PN 02
Rev. Jeffrey Spencer	April 16, 2013	If approved, the Keystone XL would encourage more clear-cutting and strip mining of Canada's boreal forest to get at the tar sands. The clear cutting of these forests will drive entire herds of Caribou to extinction. Keystone XL would also run along the route of endangered whooping cranes, and any spill like the one we just saw in Arkansas, would pose an immediate threat to their future.	CU 01
Rev. Jeffrey Spencer	April 16, 2013	As far as I know, the Draft SEIS does not take into account the environmental impact the Keystone XL will have on water resources for the Lakota Nation. It should; safe drinking water is an environmental issue, too.	WRS 13
Rev. Ken Turley	April 19, 2013	If the money and resources being invested in this whole tar sands attempt to squeeze more oil out of a rapidly depleting supply were to be invested in furthering other means for "running our engine" we would be far better off.	PN 02
Rev. Ken Turley	April 19, 2013	The Oil Industry is a behemoth that is rapidly going extinct and flailing away in the attempt to preserve itself at our cost. We would be far better served preparing ourselves for the inevitable transition to other energy sources.	PN 02
Rev. Talitha Arnold	April 20, 2013	I oppose this pipeline that will do nothing to decrease our country's dependence on fossil fuel, foreign or domestic, and instead will threaten one of our most important aquifers and other parts of this country.	WRG 01, PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rev.antoinette Pezet	April 13, 2013	This technology for refining and transport of one of natures dirtiest deposits having been around for 50 years I was not suprised to learn recently that my city has been piping tar sands oil through this region for many years. While - has had some small `spills' of oil insofar as our harbour is one of the key fuel storage areas in the nation, I am deeply concerned with the US continuing more of the same with the XL Pipeline.	RISK 14
Rewey, Mikayla	March 14, 2013	Considering that we already have a pipeline in place that runs from the Tar Sands of Alberta into the United States and can be connected to the Texas section, I personally feel that we should not be constructing the midwest section.	ALT 03
Rewey, Mikayla	March 14, 2013	TransCanada predicts 11 major spills over the course of the next 50 years, while the University of Nebraska put out a number closer to 40 spills over the next 50 years.	RISK 13
Rewey, Mikayla	March 14, 2013	…the pipeline will run directly on the ground to cut down on costs, but the freezing temperatures will degrade the steel at a faster rate if it remains on the ground. This is troubling because if the pipeline lays directly on the ground leaks may go undetected due to the lack of visibility.	RISK 14
Rewey, Mikayla	March 14, 2013	Considering all of this [pipeline] is occuring above the only source of water that makes our Bread Basket a fertile area, I think that constructing the new pipeline is unwise and not in the best environmental interests	WRG 01
Rex W. Tillerson	April 20, 2013	I believe that you and ExxonMobil Board of Directors are not exercising fiduciary duty, given the abundance of information that you have explicity acknowledged in public interviews…Continuing to expand the carbon-based infrastructure -- including tarsands excavation and the Keystone XL pipeline -- run counter to fiduciary duty, not to mention morality.	PN 09
Rhiannon Hutchinson	April 2, 2013	Our days of reliance on carbon-based fuels will end, sooner or later; they are finite and will run out. So what we should be doing, NOW, is investing in clean energy sources--not tar sands pipelines.	ALT 01
Rhiannon Hutchinson	April 2, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis	CLIM 05
Rhiannon Hutchinson	April 2, 2013	Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 07
Rhiannon Hutchinson	April 2, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation.	RISK 26
Rhiannon Parker	April 21, 2013	I can not in good faith believe that the Keystone XL pipeline is a benefit to our country. I feel strongly that the hazards of such, the risks, far outweigh any benefit that might be gained.	PN 05
Rhoda Schlamm	April 20, 2013	It is time to stop permitting oil and gas drilling in America and start investing in clean, renewable energy for the long term-	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rhonda Pardue	April 12, 2013	It will create jobs and we will be keeping the money in our country and with our allies that don't want to blow us up.	PN 10
Rhonda Paulson	March 28, 2013	Hence, job creation can not even be considered as counterbalance to the damage this pipeline would cause.	PN 05
Ric Evans	March 10, 2013	There is not enough money put aside to clean up the spills that will occur here. Using the same logic that we use to fund the Postal Service retirement to fund the clean up researve fund would be a good start. When that is in place I'll agree to this.	LEG 08
Ric Scheele	April 1, 2013	please make sure its safe!	ACK
RiceJ	April 18, 2013	Why was an environmental impact report farmed out to industry specialists and not to objective or disinterested scholars and scientists?	PRO 01
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://boldnebraska.org/pipelinetochina	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://boldnebraska.org/uploaded/pdf/clockwork_contamination-071120112[1].pdf	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://boldnebraska.org/uploaded/pdf/worst-case-keystone-spill-study-stansburyEmbargoeduntil11amEDTJuly11.pdf	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://dirtyoilsands.org/whattheadsdontsay	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://madvilletimes.blogspot.com/2010/12/transcanada-keystone-leak-4-hartington.html	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://priceofoil.org/2011/08/31/report-exporting-energy-security-keystone-xl-exposed	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/aswift/the_first_keystone_tar_sands_p.html	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://www.dominalaw.com/template_view.cfm?PageID=292"Domina Law Group website "http://boldnebraska.org/uploaded/pdf/pipeline_for_profit_071120113[1].pdf	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI_KeystoneXL_Reportpdf.pdf	REF
Rich	April 9, 2013	http://www.publicbroadcasting.net/netradio/news.newsmain?action=article&ARTICLE_ID=1782287	REF
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	Only by putting our nations capacity to convert to solar derived energy sources can be find real national and world wide security. The solar energy path is in fact the same path that can bring us and our world to greater stability and peace. We must get off the fossil fuel habit, and move toward truly environmentally sustainable paths of energy choices. Tars sands is one of the worst possible paths to take....and our nation must not be a party to this. Sustainability is not continuing to do the things of the past. We must totally change our course. It is about sustaining life, not sustaining past practices and repeating past mistakes.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	Your EIS review must honestly deal with climate disruption, global warming, melting of the ice caps and glaciers, flooding and destruction of coastal land areas, total loss of island nations, and destruction of major population centers, disruption of the food production systems, increases in likelihood of diseases, loss of thousands of vulnerable species and the support biosystem services they provide for all life, increase in wars and conflict from resource wars and human population displacement, drying up of rivers from loss of glacier fed rivers, and many many other huge impacts.	CLIM 17
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	The US would be used as a corridor to potentially be polluted from accidents and from the pollution of refining that may occur on our shores, and ultimately the potential disasters in our off shore waters from spills. Our gulf coast waters have already seen the insults and losses from the BP disaster. We should not be continuing that potential from oil freighter wrecks	CU 13
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	I call on the U.S. Department of State to conduct a full and honest environmental impact statement of the Keystone XL Pipeline and all that it represents in damages to our world. The current review is grossly inadequate, … Unless your impact statement reviews thoroughly all of these ramifications of the XL Pipeline, it is clearly faulted and would not comply with NEPA.	LEG 04
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	The short term view that it will provide jobs during construction is just that, short term thinking	PN 05
Rich Andrews	March 11, 2013	This is a matter of national security. The Defense Department and the CIA have recognized this fact for years. Thinking that national security is found by destroying our natural world is the wrong path	PN 05
Rich Clarke	March 18, 2013	I'm also worried about the unintended environmental costs to my grand children's, generation and beyond, of cherry picking data from the total possible impacts of the Keystone Project.	ACK
Rich Egeland	April 1, 2013	We need jobs and freedom from some oil-supplying nartions.	PN 10
Rich Wingerter	March 1, 2013	Are there other alternatives that would have less impact? [regarding global warming]	ACK
Rich Wingerter	March 1, 2013	We know that the amount of available fossil fuels in the ground greatly exceeds the ability of the atmosphere to absorb emissions if we use it for energy.	CLIM 05
Rich Wingerter	March 1, 2013	How much additional global warming will be caused by approval of this pipeline?	CLIM 12
Richard & Katherine Lynn	April 21, 2013	There is nothing that I know of to assure that the petroleum products would not be exported, thus we are not assured that it would lessen our dependence upon overseas imports.	PN 07
Richard & Katherine Lynn	April 21, 2013	We would be left with a pipeline whose integrity, although probably fairly high, could not be high enough to assure that there would never be a spill, with undetermined consequences.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard & Katherine Lynn	April 21, 2013	If the pipeline were approved, there would be some construction jobs, but they would go away	SO 04
Richard Adler	April 12, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline starts as a pollutant without even an accidental failure.	RISK 14
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	Through the pipeline operators' ability to force state governments to apply rules of eminent domain in order to obtain land for the pipeline, property rights of any who oppose the pipeline and would refuse access through their properties for the pipeline will be contravened, effectively putting both Federal and state governments in positions of taking private property by force for the benefit of foreign corporations and foreign interests.	LEG 02
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	Very little, if any, of the tar sands oil would be refined into petroleum products to benefit the USA. Published materials by both investigators and the pipeline operators show that the resulting refined petroleum products are primarily destined for export.	PN 07
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	The only consistent justification that supporters for granting the Keystone XL pipeline are still trying to make is that if the USA doesn't allow it, then someone else will. That is nothing but a profit motive justification that benefits the few corporate interests at the expense and detriment of the general population of the United States. Analysis by independent think tanks has shown that attempted justification to be flawed and erroneous.	PN 11
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	The frequency of pipeline spills over the last few months from existing pipelines, some of them being dilbit spills, shows that the estimates of safety of pipeline operation are extremely optimistic at best and outright lies at worst. In either case, the environmental risk is huge considering that the companies have already demonstrated in the Kalamazoo spill and the recent spill in Arkansas how difficult it is to clean up and how little effort the oil and pipeline companies are willing to put into either preventing damaging spills or taking remedial action after a spill.	RISK 08
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	Independent investigations, as well as published interviews of executives of the company building and operating the Keystone XL pipeline, have shown the estimated jobs created to be grossly overstated and little more than exaggeration for marketing effect and political posturing.	SO 02
Richard Archer	April 22, 2013	Because the point of breaks in the pipeline cannot be controlled by the pipeline operator, they have no way of ensuring that a leak would not result in dilbit spills contaminating the environment in locations where faults in the ground and bedunderlying rock would allow leakage into and pollution of the primary aquifer that America's Bread Basket relies on for water to grow the main grain crops that feed the country and that represent a large part of the US agricultural exports.	WRG 01, RISK 24
Richard Barnett	April 9, 2013	The whole Keystone scheme is a fraud that will contribute nothing to US energy independence and nothing but trouble in the way of consequences.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Brigham & Sally Stapp	March 14, 2013	Please study the cumulative programatic environmental impacts of the Keystone XL Pipeline project, including but not limited to: 1.) the entire tar sands oil extraction operation in Canada - particularly the effects on lakes, streams, First Nations people, aquifers, drinking water wells, etc. 2.) spillage during the loading of this dirtiest of sludges into the pipeline at the tar sands site 3.) the inevitable leaking at every seam along this 3000 mile long pipeline over the lifetime of the project 4.) the huge impact from a damaged pipe - caused by the effects of nature, animals or human beings or any combination of these effects 5.) the inevitable spillage of this dirty sludge at the terminal while being loaded into ships 6.) the catastrophic effects of sinking, capsizing or collisions of these super sized ships on jobs, tourism, fisheries, waterways etc. during their entire route from US to markets in Asia and other countries 7.) the well studied, documented and understood effects of burning fossil fuels on increasing global warming. 8.) the well documented increase in CO2 absorption into the oceans causing ocean acidification, particularly the effect on the shellfish industries 9.) the increase in the likelihood of civil disobedience when citizens realize big oil owns congress and the State Department	CU 05, CU 02, CU 14, CU 17
Richard Brown	April 15, 2013	Additionally, oil coming through the Keystone XL goes onto the world market, it will only benefit the oil companies. It is time to make a stand against corporate greed.	PN 07
Richard Burdo	March 19, 2013	You didn't consider the toxic effects of burning this stuff.....and the carbon released. The pipeline will only speed this up. What a crime on nature.	CLIM 10
Richard Buttny	April 22, 2013	Much of this oil is intended for export overseas. Most jobs will be temp, few permanent jobs.	PN 07
Richard C Silvestri	March 21, 2013	American citizen-property owners are having their land taken by eminent domain by KXL lawyers who are hiding behind "in the national interest to make s energy independent", a trumped up excuse for eminent domain. They are using a lie to influence our courts to enforce eminent domain-the lie being outlined by me several paragraphs back.	LEG 02
Richard C Silvestri	March 21, 2013	The DEIS the US Dept. of State was written by a consulting firm whose client is the owner of the KXL Pipeline. It it packed with lies, untruths, mis-truths, overstatements, understatements and such, using whatever of these best serves the interests of private money.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard C Silvestri	March 21, 2013	Studies by several other government bureaus and some think-tanks with no ties to KXL and are neutral state that the permanent jobs created by KXL will be between fifteen and up to 35-maybe!	SO 02
richard chilton	April 22, 2013	Concerned that the Keystone XL pipeline would increase air pollution in the communities surrounding the refineries that the pipeline would service where people of color, Indigenous peoples, and poor people are already experiencing high rates of cancer and respiratory illness	CU 04
richard chilton	April 22, 2013	Recalling that TransCanada's permit application to the Canadian government for the Keystone XL pipeline said it will increase oil prices in the United States by $4 billion per year; Acknowledging that the Keystone XL pipeline is not designed to provide the United States with energy security and that industry documents indicate Gulf Coast refineries operate in a free trade zone and plan to refine tar sands oil into petroleum products that are intended for export overseas	PN 04
richard chilton	April 22, 2013	Concerned that tar sands crude oil is more toxic, corrosive, and abrasive than conventional crude oil and poses additional pipeline safety risks that have not been fully assessed by the U.S. Department of State in its final Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL pipeline.	RISK 27
richard chilton	April 22, 2013	Recognizing TransCanada's extremely poor safety record for the Keystone pipeline, it is probable that the Keystone XL pipeline will have frequent spills because it will have similar design specifications; Concerned that oil spills from the Keystone XL pipeline would destroy live-sustaining water resources, including the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides drinking water for millions of people and farmland irrigation throughout the Midwestern United States	WRG 01, RISK 25
Richard Creswell	March 14, 2013	Its [the Pipeline] impact on unemployment would only be a temporary hiccup on the 2% of labor that all of mining represents.	SO 01
Richard Curtis	March 10, 2013	We must focus on new advanced forms of energy production and not support archaic, destructive technologies.	PN 02
Richard Dekoyer	March 11, 2013	Please work towards clean natural energy not dirty oil. Support legislation on wind, solar and other forms of clean non polluting energy. We do not need the tar sands pipeline.	ALT 01
Richard Dickson	April 22, 2013	Big Oil has created a deceptive image that KXL will mean more fuel for our cars and tractors. It is more about exporting not only Canadian tar sands, but also U.S.-produced oil. Investors, oilmen and elected officials gain, while U.S. resources are exploited internationally.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard E. (dick) Shore	April 10, 2013	Arguably the most important moral crisis of our time is environmental protection, specifically stopping and mitigating the massive quantities of greenhouse gases we are putting in our atmosphere. For protection of the environment and human health this is the big one, it cannot be left out of any environmental review.	RISK 07, CLIM 14
Richard E.. Edwards	April 11, 2013	It has been two weeks since the ExxonMobil spill of 500,000 gallons of tar sands crude in Mayflower, Arkansas. The proposed Keystone XL will be pumping 10 times that amount. It is not a question of when a pipeline will fail, but where and how much damage. The oil companies rake in the money and the American people are left with ruined communities. The Gulf Coast still has oil from BPs spill and probably will have for many, many years to come. BP acts like everything is back to normal. Try asking the residents if they feel this way.	RISK 14, RISK 13, RISK 18
Richard Esten	April 5, 2013	The Canadian government refused to approve building the pipeline to ports in that country that could have been used to export the oil overseas because they saw the imminent danger to their environment, so exactly why, if Canada could see that, why does the America government seem to be blind to the dangers that the pipeline would pose for America	PN 06, ALT 05, PN 08
Richard Evans	April 17, 2013	My aquifer for my private well is polluted with oil waste ,primarily from Alabama which prohibits Haz UIC wells. The real problem is state {primacy} control as Ala. is by the 401 rules and Ms. is control is through realm of the coin. The UIC in my case is one quarter mile away from my well and also the UIC is in a fault at such a shallow depth,1400 feet, with no confining rock as to let the haz fluid move with the geology to an open bore next to my house and thence to my pump. EPA has no authority over private wells but does over Haz UIC's. Most states have primacy and this is one of the reasons XL is so dangerous. All oil and gas production,transport,waste disposal,etc. need federalism. Regulation, as opposed by Republicans, could be done with Executive Order in increments.	RISK 07
Richard Fairfield	April 11, 2013	To profit the oil industry by shipping the oil out of the USA? Can't even have the excuse that the oil will be used exclusively within the USA?	PN 07
Richard Fox	April 20, 2013	…won't improve our energy security since most of this oil is intended for export.	PN 01
Richard Fox	April 20, 2013	From what I've read, this project does not create many jobs (relatively speaking	SO 02
Richard Fragaszy	April 10, 2013	The future is renewable energy, not energy that destroys our planet.	ALT 01
Richard G. Mills	April 9, 2013	I urge you to put our health and climate above oil industry profits and give the Keystone XL the in-depth environmental review that we deserve	LEG 04
Richard Gale	April 9, 2013	Incidentally, I hope that you are now aware of who wrote this piece of crap -- a paid consultant hired by the owners of TransCanada (easy for you to verify!)	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Gale	April 11, 2013	There exists NO reasonable justification for allowing this heinous project to go any further -- unless, of course, you believe that the health of our environment (which is your environment, too!), the health of our population (of which you are a member), and the future of our planet (which is your planet, too - God help us all!) are of no consideration at all, and that further enrichment of the already filthy rich Koch brothers and all the other investors in TransCanada is all that matters!	PN 08
Richard Garner	April 5, 2013	Surely the State Department and President Obama are not unaware that the International Energy Agency in 2011 issued a report that documented the overwhelming evidence that if the world does not take major action by 2020 to curb our emissions of greenhouse gases climate change will become irreversible. Scientists are telling us that the effects of climate change are showing every sign of becoming even worse than they originally thought, with the threat of an increase in the average global temparture of as much as eight degrees over the course of this century being very real. Buidling this pipeline will make the problem of climate change impossible to solve … The effects of climate change will be felt for thousands of years. And if this possible eight degree temparture rise leads to a significant melting of the frozen methane hydrates at the bottom of many regions of the world's oceans, climate change may lead to nothing less than the end of life on Earth.	ACK
Richard Garner	April 5, 2013	The oil industry needs this pipeline to fully develop and market the tar sands oil. More importantly, President Obama and his administration have an absolute moral obligation to lead all the nations of the world in rejecting the development of tar sands oil, wherever it might happen to be found and adopting major changes to our way of life that will effectively end our reliance on fossil fuels and forestall the threat of climate change	PN 05
Richard Gast	March 11, 2013	the SEIS fails to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada; * account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil; * protect sensitive wildlife habitat and natural resources along the pipeline route, in particular the Ogallala Aquifer and Sandhills region; * adequately address safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks posed by tar sands.	CU 01
Richard Gingras	April 17, 2013	The industry's plan is to pipe that oil to the Gulf coast and ship it to other countries; if we're not going to benefit from it, why should we take the risk?	PN 07
Richard Groves	March 28, 2013	We must stop investing in the infrastructure of the dying second industrial revolution and start investing in the infrastructure of the next one.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Guhl	April 13, 2013	Let's face it. The claim that the Keystone pipeline will help us achieve energy independence is baloney! All the refineries at the end of the line are either foreign owned or dedicated to exports. Quit peddling the lie! Keystone does nothing for us.	PN 07
Richard Hawley	March 6, 2013	Apparently your report states that the pipeline would not have a substantial impact on climate change. Well, that could be said with assurance for virtually each project, by itself. When the totality of projects around the world is considered, however, the impact will be more than substantial. In fact, it is the sum total of millions of “insubstantial” individual projects that has brought us to the point of impending planet disaster.	CLIM 13
Richard Heggen	March 30, 2013	Every aspect of the proposed Keystone XL project goes against serious environmental concerns, including… the US, loading the planet with more carbon emissions.	CLIM 14
Richard Heggen	March 30, 2013	Every aspect of the proposed Keystone XL project goes against serious environmental concerns, including direct environmental damage in Canada…	CU 02
Richard Hendricks	April 2, 2013	Now that we all know that a cover-up to hide the dangerous effects related to the Keystone XL pipeline debacle in the U.S. State Department's safety review that was planned by a 'hiree' from TransCanada have been exposed, many Americans have bravely spoken out against it and 53% of us wants Congress to stay out of the Keystone XL debacle, which gives our fight against climate change another challenging boost and another bold step in the right direction for out fight against climate change.	PRO 01
Richard Johnson	April 18, 2013	I am writing to comment on the Keystone XL pipeline and the Environmental Impact Statement that ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills. The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, and will still cross more than 1,000 waterbodies across 3 states and 875, miles threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches.	ACK
Richard Johnson	April 18, 2013	I am writing to comment on the Keystone XL pipeline and the Environmental Impact Statement that ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate. Keystone XL will contribute dramatically to climate change. The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production. Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions.	PN 02, CLIM 14
Richard Kiefer	April 13, 2013	Benefits to Americans of The proposed Keystone Pipeline will be minimal, as almost all of the refined product will be sold overseas, most jobs will be temporary (and there will likely be many fewer than promised,) and the carbon footprint of our country will be immeasurably greater.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Korth	April 1, 2013	Plus, it will also supply thousands of union jobs, somthting Democrats crave and support.	SO 06
Richard Kropf	April 22, 2013	If we really need all that extra oil, why not build some new refineries close to the US-Canadian border, and thus create more permanent jobs than those afforded by a pipeline project which, when finished, those extra jobs will promptly disappear.	ALT 08
Richard Lawrence	April 5, 2013	It's time to get serious about climate change. Not just talk but action. We don't need the dirtiest crude to infest our environment.	CLIM 18
Richard Ludwick	April 18, 2013	Additionally, an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created.	ACK
Richard Ludwick	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL will ensure American energy security and create jobs and economic opportunity in Nebraska.	PN 10
Richard Ludwick	April 18, 2013	Nebraska families, small businesses and ag producers are struggling with record-high gasoline and diesel prices and this expanded energy infrastructure can provide relief and long-term energy security.	PN 10
Richard Luedtke	April 18, 2013	I have multiple relatives/friends waiting to get back to work and this is the BEST opportunity they have in the whole of the USA	SO 02
Richard Lyons	March 10, 2013	We already know, from sad experience, how impossible to clean a "tar sands" disaster is. Since this ill-advised pipeline also runs over a major aquifer for much of this country's farmland, to risk a leak - OF ANY SORT OR DEGREE - would be to imperil many hundreds of thousands, not to say, millions, of lives.	WRG 01, RISK 08
Richard M Carpenter	April 3, 2013	I would think oil gushing down the streets of Mayflower, AR would be sufficient reason to stop bowing to the oil industry and allowing them to destroy the environment!!!!	RISK 14
Richard Mccorkle	April 10, 2013	I'd also like to point out that President Obama's remarks that climate change is not a priority for struggling families (and, therefore, we should move forward with the Keystone XL pipeline) were made without considering the incredible externalities associated with pipelines, air pollution and climate change, such as much higher rates of respiratory illnesses and cancers, higher health-care costs associated with these illnesses, and all of the economic impacts of climate change related to droughts, floods, sea-level rise, ocean acidification, worsening storms, dying coral reefs, collapsing fisheries, climate refugees, etc..	CLIM 18
Richard Mccorkle	April 12, 2013	The health effects associated with air pollution from oil refineries and other sources of fossil fuel combustion tend to fall disproportionately on low-income families who are relegated to dirty, run-down sections of our nation's cities (e.g., next to oil refineries).	EJ 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Mccorkle	April 12, 2013	President Obama's remarks that climate change is not a priority for struggling families (and, therefore, we should move forward with the Keystone XL pipeline) were made without considering the incredible externalities associated with pipelines, air pollution and climate change, such as much higher rates of respiratory illnesses and cancers, higher health-care costs associated with these illnesses, and all of the economic impacts of climate change related to droughts, floods, sea-level rise, ocean acidification, worsening storms, dying coral reefs, collapsing fisheries, climate refugees, etc.	RISK 07, CLIM 16
Richard Meek	April 11, 2013	greater our energy independence from unstable areas of the world	ACK
Richard Miller	April 10, 2013	I believe that Canada is only trying to avoid building a pipeline across western Canada to reach the Pacific, and plans to export much of the dirty tar sands oil to China. [The Project puts] our citizens and water at risk to enable Canada to sell their oil offshore.	PN 05
Richard Murphy	April 4, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous, dirty, and destructive.	ACK
Richard Nordland	April 11, 2013	cause catastrophic damage to our environment and to our health as a nation	RISK 07
Richard Nordland	April 11, 2013	There isn't a pipeline built today that hasn't leaked or had a major spill of crude oil.	RISK 21
Richard Patten	March 11, 2013	The U.S. produces more (and cleaner) oil than it needs. We have no need of tar oil-or of the certain toxic spiils that will occur.	PN 12
Richard Patten	March 17, 2013	The Obama legacy may very well be causing more pollution and environmental devastation by approving the XL pipeline that spills toxic crude so heavy that it cannot be effectively cleaned. This has happened in the Kalamazoo river, where the heavy gobs have sunk to the bottom, and it will happen wherever the pipeline goes. The few temporary jobs installing pipe will go to Canadians. Producing the XL Krud also produces excessive air pollution.	SO 04, CLIM 12, WRS 04
Richard Pauwels	April 5, 2013	Also of great concern is the destruction of hundreds of thousands of Acres of Canadian forest.	CU 01
Richard Pieters	April 22, 2013	Please consider alternate energy sources and do NOT despoil the land from Canada to the Gulf in support of the continued use of oil. This is not about energy but about the priority of outdated, polluting, non-renewable over renewable, clean energy (wind, sun.) Our planet in more precious for our future than oil.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Pucko	March 11, 2013	Mr. President, where is the breakout of industrial solar panel construction? How could it even be that a stimulus built solar company could relocate to China! Solar power in the hands of the people at the low prices that solar panels, like all other electronics leaps, would do more to redistribute wealth and empower the lower classes of our society. The obvious impact on the electric grid and those that control it would be to devalue profit as meters roll backwards from small homes. Tough. Don't give me any, "We need the electric companies for...". Investments go elsewhere for stock portfolios. Some of the poorest Americans could have heat, light and power without debt. The huge majority of Americans would have more spendable income. It keeps being said that small business and their customers really run the largest part of the economy. How about helping them instead of big business? No, I'm not naïve, I just hoped the spirit of your elections and who voted you in (as opposed to those who paid for your campaign) would translate as some form of revolutionary improvement in our lives. When I can see how much a domestic solar industry could help America, it angers me that it's not being taken advantage of.	PN 02
Richard Reinert	April 2, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline seems to allow the risk of oil spills to be offloaded to America while the Canadian owners collect all the profits	PN 07
Richard Reinert	April 13, 2013	Why should the USA put up with enriching Canadian Tar Sands Oilmen and the refinery owning Oilmen in Texas at the expense of inevitable Tar Sand oil spills here in the USA?	ACK
Richard Reis	April 13, 2013	It's thicker and cannot flow through pipes without great pressure and by being diluted.It still contains sand and is thus abrasive to the pipes it has to travel through. When it gushes out of pipeline breaks, it sinks to the bottom whenever it encounters water. It is thus very hard to clean up.	RISK 14
Richard Ring	March 31, 2013	You want to create jobs? Have truck drivers drive the oil down. Or have it shipped via rail.	ALT 04
Richard Ring	March 31, 2013	This pipeline doesn't help the environment or the people. Please lead the people and fight for them.	PN 05
Richard Roose	April 19, 2013	After 2 years, we still have not cleaned up the pipeline spill that dumped one million gallons of heavy Canadian bitumen, or tar sands oil, into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. Do you seriously think that a similar spill is out of the questions for the Keystone XL?	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Saxon	April 10, 2013	The oil that would cross this nation's mid-section would be loaded onto ship and sent to foreign countries and not benefit the United State of America's energy situation at all.	PN 07
Richard Saxon	April 10, 2013	The number of jobs this proposal would generate has been exaggerated with the actual majority of jobs in Canada. The large percentage of jobs that would be generated would be temporary at best.	SO 09, SO 02
Richard Schneider	April 2, 2013	The State Dept report favorable to the Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline was a puff job by industry insiders and lobbyists	PRO 01
Richard Schwager	April 21, 2013	We CANNOT REALLY CLEAN even these SMALL SPILLS and this is the MOST TOXIC OIL. PIPES ALWAYS SPILL and this MOST HARSH, CAUSTIC AND ABRASIVE OIL is MORE CERTAIN TO BE SPILLED!.	RISK 11, RISK 08
Richard Schwagerl	April 16, 2013	Let’s start using that stimulus money to Create green jobs.	ACK
Richard Seese	April 22, 2013	Weve got the Oglala Aquifer underneath where the pipeline is planned to go, which serves 46% of the drinking water for the whole nation. One leak will poison the whole thing for everybody.	WRG 01, RISK 10
Richard Sereque	April 13, 2013	Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. This spill is yet one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil.	RISK 08
Richard Shepherd	March 11, 2013	The Keystone pipeline cuts across the largest aquifer in the US. Have we lost our minds, if this tar sands oil gets in the aquifer it is going to be devastated. We can not afford this, we already have to many pipelines threatening the aquifer. If nothing else force them to route it away from the aquifer.	WRG 01
Richard Smyth	March 25, 2013	1) Please extend the comment period so that all voices have a chance to be heard, and 2) In the spirit of accountability and transparency, ensure that the public comments are easily accessible to all by posting them publicly online as most agencies do.	PRO 04, PRO 02
Richard Stein	April 13, 2013	My principle concern is that it provides a way to futher the use of oil as a fuel, the burning of which will add to the carbon dioxide burden of the atmosphere. As a member of both the National Academies of Science and of Engineering, I believe their conclusions that this will futher global warming.	CLIM 14
Richard Stockton	April 9, 2013	Keystone XL would carry nine times more tar sands than the broken Arkansas pipeline. The track record of the other Keystone tar sands pipeline speaks for itself. A similar tar sands spill happened in Michigan's Kalamazoo River in 2010, and nearly two years later, it still hasn't been fully cleaned up	RISK 18, RISK 13, RISK 26
Richard Stockton	April 9, 2013	[referencing the Kalamazoo spill in relation to KXL] Families faced toxic health effects for months, and some even lost their pets.	RISK 29

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Storm	April 19, 2013	You must be aware that over 80% of America's Energy is provided by Coal, Oil and Natural gas? The War on Fossil Fuels is ludicrous and harmful to America's National Security.	PN 10
Richard Turner	April 9, 2013	The risk of constructing a pipeline of this nature is not worth the misery a potential spill would cause.	PN 08
Richard Turner	April 9, 2013	I have several points I want the committee to consider before the final decision is made regarding the Keystone project. 1. Most pipeline companies hire only a few local people as some of the work is considered skilled labor/union. 2. Most jobs other than skilled are tempory and low wage positions, usually field prep and cleanup….. 6. Pipeline construction does not create permanent jobs and nowhere near 100,000 jobs as is being stated.	SO 04, SO 03
Richard Utt	April 17, 2013	While the EIS assessed “Climate Change Effects on the Project,” the impact of increased greenhouse gasses on citizens of United States was not addressed. This impact is the essence of any national interest determination that examines Keystone XL and similar projects.	ACK
Richard Utt	April 17, 2013	The EIS conclusion that since other methods of transport are available therefore Keystone XL has only a marginal impact on greenhouse gas emissions is tragically flawed logic.	PN 05
Richard Villastrigo	April 19, 2013	The United States desperately needs new models of energy consumption and conservation. The old fossil fuel model including "clean" natural gas is wasting precious time.	ALT 01
Richard W. Emmons	March 6, 2013	The U.S. MUST instead develop alternate energy sources: wind, solar, and hydroelectric power, and cut back significantly on dependence on fossil fuels.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Richard Wallsgrove	April 22, 2013	Socioeconomics. The DSEIS performs a faulty analysis of the pipeline impact on direct, indirect, and induced effects of the pipeline, because that analysis does not fully account for negative direct, indirect, and induced effects. The negative direct and indirect effects would include losses to property values, jobs, and other economic metrics as the result of a fossil industrial complex bisecting America's heartland. The negative induced economic effects will include potentially massive losses due to climate change impacts, and the cost of adaptive efforts necessary to gird against those impacts. Furthermore, the DSEIS fails to analyze any impact on sustainable energy resources. By incentivizing and enabling a market for some of the dirtiest and most destructive fuels on earth, the pipeline will create a disincentive for sustainable sources of energy. Hawai'i has no indigenous fossil fuel resources, and so fossil fuel incentives do us no good. In essence, the socioeconomic analysis in the DSEIS paints an overly rosy picture by looking at only one side of the balance sheet.	SO 13
Richard Watson	April 4, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	ACK
Richard Watson	April 4, 2013	This dirty pipeline poses a threat to the environment, our climate, and American families.	PN 08
Richard Watson	April 4, 2013	this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 07
Richard Watson	April 4, 2013	We cannot allow any more of the dirtiest, most toxic oil on earth to spill into our lands and waterways.	RISK 07
Richard Watson	April 22, 2013	The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is woefully inadequate in that it only seriously investigated the regional climate change impacts of the pipeline itself and not how the increased use of carbon-intensive oil would impact global climate change.	CLIM 12
Richelle Colucci-nunn	March 17, 2013	investing in RENEWABLE ENERGY rather than scrabbling for every ounce of fossil fuel is better for both human health and safety as well as for the health of future generations and of our planet.	PN 03
Richmond Talauega	April 13, 2013	Water, solar, electric, & human energy is all we need	PN 02
Rick Bodlaender	April 22, 2013	Build a new refinery that is specifically designed to handle this type of "crude" in Canada and have them deal with all these uncertain issues...instead of exporting all these unknowns to the US. The colder climates in the north are where the heating oil markets are and more sense less cost to refine the tar crude closer to the source. The saved expense from this pipeline would pay for the new refinery.	ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rick Bodlaender	April 22, 2013	The idea of pumping this dangerous mix across thousands of miles of American country side to outdated, all of them 25+ years old, seemingly poorly maintained, US refineries in the worst possible Hurricane prone Gulf area, where the US Coast Guard estimated 7 million gallons of crude oil were spilled during Hurricane Katrina from various sources including many pipelines, is not in America's best interest. On June 16th, 2012 during the House Energy and Power Subcommittee hearings it was stated by Carl Weimer, director of Pipeline Safety Trust, "there are questions about the corrosiveness, abrasiveness, pressure, and temperature that need to be answered" before pumping this tar mix. During the same hearing the administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Administration when asked about required guidelines for building, maintaining, and operating safe pipelines for tar sands crude, replied that there are no design criteria for a "tar sand crude oil" pipeline that distance!...During the same hearing the administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Administration when asked about required guidelines for building, maintaining, and operating safe pipelines for tar sands crude, replied that there are no design criteria for a "tar sand crude oil" pipeline that distance!	RISK 27, RISK 08
Rick Doolittle	April 22, 2013	The pipeline is not worth all the Risks.water is a Tremendous resource and we Do not want to have it Ruined.	ACK
Rick Ernst	April 3, 2013	the State Dept. did not write the EIS: it was prepared by a consulting firm that works for TransCanada.	PRO 01
Rick Harlan	March 16, 2013	"The study does discuss "http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/documents/organization/205619.pdf"'Climate Change Impacts on the Proposed Project,' but not the proposed project's impacts on climate change. It finds that climate change will have no significant impact upon either the construction, or the operation, of the Pipeline." If true, I'm embarrassed to be a voter for the President and his administration of theExecutive department and in particular of the State department.	CLIM 12
Rick Heisler	April 15, 2013	IF that's not enough then how about this?: There will be less than 50 permanent jobs created. The oil is destined for Asia. This oil is corrosive, has already led to disastrous pollution in oil spills last week in Arkansas, is destined for Asia, and will not bring down the price of oil, or decrease American demand.	PN 07
Rick Lakata	April 15, 2013	Please seek "21st century climate change/energy shortage solutions" for the country and planet.	PN 02
Rick Levering	April 9, 2013	there are tens of thousands of Canadians that want us to say no to this project because of all the distruction of land, water and qulity of life that this method of mining and transporting oil has imposed on the people of Canada.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rick Levering	April 9, 2013	I would like someone to tell me how they plan to clean up a spill when it happens during a major flood like we had just two years ago that covered millions of [acres] of ranches and farm land all through the midwest.	RISK 29
Rick Neuenswander	March 11, 2013	The need is not More Oil but Energy Alternatives and Conserving.	ALT 02
Rick Piltz	April 22, 2013	The Draft SEIS tries to make the tar sands climate change impacts issue go away by contending that Canada will develop and transport the tar sands regardless of whether they do it via the Keystone XL or an alternative method. Thus, the Draft SEIS suggests it is hopeless to try to stop tar sands development. But an essential premise of the Draft SEIS, that rail transport is a viable alternative to the Keystone XL for moving tar sands from Canada to the Gulf Coast, has been challenged by independent analysis that concludes the Draft SEIS makes misleading assumptions about transportation costs. A U.S. decision on the pipeline permit is likely to play a major role in the economics of whether full-scale development of the tar sands will be expedited.	ALT 09
Rick Piltz	April 22, 2013	The argument that the pipeline and the tar sands oil it would deliver would enhance U.S. national security and energy independence is misleading. The way to enhance national security vis-à-vis oil is to break the stranglehold of oil over the transportation system, by dramatically reducing demand and developing alternative transportation energy sources. Building new infrastructure to lock the system into producing a major new source of oil supply takes us in the wrong direction, regardless of whether the oil is used in the U.S. or exported.	PN 03
Rick Piltz	April 22, 2013	There are conflicts of interest in the relationship between TransCanada and the consultants who developed the Draft SEIS, which appears to compromise the independence of the assessment.	PRO 01
Rick Piltz	April 22, 2013	Difficult-to-remediate spills from the pipeline are likely and threaten to degrade and pollute land and water resources and have harmful impacts on human health and wildlife. The tar sands pipeline spill in the Kalamazoo River, for which InsideClimate News recently won a Pulitzer Prize for reporting on, is an example of what could be expected from the Keystone XL.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rick Robins	March 11, 2013	"Environmental Resources Management (ERM) was paid an undisclosed amount under contract to TransCanada to write the statement, which is now an official government document. The statement estimates, and then dismisses, the pipeline's massive carbon footprint and other environmental impacts, because, it asserts, the mining and burning of the tar sands is unstoppable. Because the impact statement was written by a TransCanada contractor, not by State Department officials, it should come as no surprise that it presents a worldview of a global economy inevitably dependent on dirty fossil fuels that is entirely at odds with the expressed views of Secretary of State John Kerry."	PRO 01
Rick Siegfried	March 28, 2013	You are actively trying to kill us us and the planet on which we depend, so self-defense is morally justified. Attack us, we will attack you. Massive civil disobedience is next. You have been warned. Take this seriously.	ACK
Rick Simon	April 13, 2013	I believe what leading scientists around the world have said regarding global climate change crisis brought about by human activity and this pipeline is a large step in the wrong direction.	CLIM 14
Rick Vargas	March 21, 2013	As an educated, intelligent American you know tha our country needs a diversified portfolio of energy sources. More importantly, we need to strengthen our bonds to our closest, most dependable suppliers.	PN 10
Rick Wigington	April 22, 2013	Theres sunshine and abundant wind in the proposed pipeline area. Create jobs in the solar and wind energy industries.	SO 05
Rick Yoder	April 22, 2013	First, several First Nations groups continue to indicate opposition to the development of this resource and the pipeline. If the US supports this development, it follows a lamentable history of seizing resources from indigenous peoples for corporate gain in the name of a national interest. And in so doing, it destroys their culture by removing resources necessary to support it while destroying our culture by escalating the power of the corporatocracy.	ACK
Rick Yoder	April 22, 2013	I am troubled by the iterative move towards an equivalency of corporate interests with national interests. The taking of private property for corporate interests is just not what the eminent domain laws were intended to do, in my way of thinking. The national interest is long term, not short term. The overstated short term jobs and profits benefits identified by this corporate development hold intrinsic dangers for the long term well-being of US security.	LEG 02
Rita Grady	March 10, 2013	I also want to express outrage at the biased report that was generated. Using one of TransCanada's own contractors to help write the report is an undeniable, inexcusable conflict of interest.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rita Hodge	March 14, 2013	Is it no wonder that there is so much talk of revolution among the young and savvy? You can certainly see the trend on television toward shows that include some form of revolution or post apocalyptic world, shows where the heroes defy their government because it has become evil under the control of the oligarchs.	ACK
Rita Hodge	March 14, 2013	We know that industry insiders pretty much wrote this propaganda that masquerades as an environmental impact statement, at the invitation of the government.	PRO 01
Rita Lemkuil	March 13, 2013	I DON'T WANT THAT FREAKING PIPELINE BUILT	ACK
Rita Rice	April 9, 2013	I saw on television last night where Exxon was tying to clean up the tar oil spill with a whole bunch of paper towels just strewn on the surface. These companies haven't a clue--NONE whatsoever-- about how to prevent or clean up oil spills!	RISK 08
Rita Varley	March 28, 2013	everything we need to do to address global warming has potential to be very good for the economy of the middle and lower classes.	SO 05
Ritachilders	March 8, 2013	[Solar] would be a better focus for the trillions of $ that would be directed toward developing yet another hazardous pipeline that would only bring more carbon into our atmophere and be a threat to life with spills and leakage and air pollution.	ALT 01
Ritachilders	March 8, 2013	Renewables are where it's at for us and this is where the investment needs to be directed.	ALT 01
Rivera, Isaac	March 4, 2013	Keystone XL will make climate change worse.	CLIM 14
Rivera, Isaac	March 4, 2013	the Keystone XL project is necessary for expansion of tar sands	PN 06
Rivera, Isaac	March 4, 2013	We need a clear evaluation of the damage to our health and environment that will result from this dirty energy project.	RISK 30, CLIM 16
Rivko Knox	April 9, 2013	The assessment states that there are climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil. However, it then turns around and says such need not be considered!!!!!!	CLIM 13
Rivko Knox	April 9, 2013	It doesn't adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	RISK 14, RISK 13
Rixey Browning	March 26, 2013	We cannot afford to poison our public water supply	ACK
RJ Harrington, Jr.	March 22, 2013	Trillions of dollars in economic development await if a level playing field is given to renewable energy.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rj Hughes	April 17, 2013	what about showing some concern for the current millions already suffering impacts of air and water pollution and climate change, and the potential tens of millions and more that will suffer and die due to the effects of an out of control climate catastrophe due to accelerated global warming?? Already, in the region and area where I live we are seeing the impacts of climate change and a warming planet as we enter into yet another year of one of the worst droughts this region has known on record, resulting in shrinking water supplie s, increased wildfires… For many, including yourself based upon your own assertions and statements, climate change is no longer a theoretical scenario, it is a reality, and the time to act responsibly and aggressively to offset or at least mitigate the impacts of this change…	CLIM 16, CLIM 14, CLIM 17
Rj Hughes	April 17, 2013	Whatever economic impact in the immediate present and near future such a project may bring (and that's very doubtful and in question as to what any real value it would bring the American public, in any case) is hardly worth the risks of the potential consequences of allowing such a project to go through, the economic devastation caused by climate change is going to far out pace any economic gains made, if any.	PN 05, CLIM 14
Rob	April 4, 2013	The oil that travels the pipe it's for export only and as we've seen in Arkansas, Big Oil cannot guarantee for our citizens and the environment.	PN 07
Rob Belke	April 5, 2013	I recently saw video footage of last week's tar sand pipeline break in Arkansas. With the inadequate regulation of these pipeline projects, this is what we are in store for with the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. A replication of the tar sand pipeline spills that have occurred in 2010 in Michigan's Kalamazoo River and in 2011 in the Yellowstone River only on a massively larger scale.	RISK 14
Rob Dekker	March 26, 2013	substantiate the numbers presented in the "Market Analysis" chapter, including the expected growth to 5 million bpd by 2030, with or without the Keystone XL pipeline present.	PN 12
Rob Dekker	March 26, 2013	Please provide the references to the studies that substantiate your assessment that the Keystone XL is "unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development" of Alberta tar sands…	PRO 05
Rob Dekker	April 17, 2013	if approximately 3 barrels of water are needed to process and produce 1 barrel of bitumen, then this would imply that the 830,000 barrels per day capacity of the Keystone XL will produce some 500,000 ton of toxic waste water.	CU 07
Rob Dekker	April 17, 2013	How much do they [talling ponds] leak into the Athabasca river, how much into ground water, how much and which toxins will evaporate, and which toxins are in the tailing ponds, and in which concentrations ?	RISK 07
Rob Gold	April 9, 2013	We MUST move forward in areas of conservation and explore alternatives to carbon based fuels.	ALT 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rob Gold	April 9, 2013	Do the right thing - make decisions based on 100 years from now not the next financial quarter.	PN 05
Rob Goodman	April 5, 2013	The XL pipeline is dirty and dangerous, creates 35 or less new jobs, and will not provide any oil for the US as it is all set for export.	PN 05
Rob Morey	April 19, 2013	You could also consider some sort of bonding to ensure that responsible parties always have funds set aside for environmental disaster and cant hide behind shell companies and LLCs.	LEG 08
Rob Mrowka	March 11, 2013	The development and the tar sands, like fracking and horizonal drilling will lead to irreversible changes in climate and an end to life as we know it.	CLIM 14
Rob Schupbach	April 22, 2013	Nitrate and Nebraska Small Community Water Supplies	ACK
Rob Snyder	April 3, 2013	Dirty Oil does not solve any economic problems - just creates more pollution!	ACK
Rob Soto	April 6, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will undoubtedly rupture just like the first attempt and the recent spill in Arkansas. You know this pipeline is the wrong direction for our country.	RISK 14
Rob Tietze	March 11, 2013	I believe that approval of this project will set-back the clock by decades in achieving cleaner fuels. We must keep moving forward in achieving the goal of cleaner and more renewable resources.	ALT 01
Robbie Wright	April 8, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 07
Robert & Audrey Stelloh	April 16, 2013	It appears the refined products would not even be used to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, but would rather be sent to China.	PN 04
Robert Acker	April 11, 2013	the plans call for these tar sands to be refined and shipped overseas rather than distributed in the U.S.,	PN 07
Robert Ahlschwede	April 19, 2013	The biggest benefit goes to the owners of the pipeline and the companies--non-US--who will ship thru the line. Greatest downside or threat is to the places in the US where the pipeline will leak--which it will do!!--and that will destroy the area wherever it spills this crap across the land.	PN 05
Robert Ahlschwede	April 19, 2013	If one studies the information available, we find out that there is no benefit to the US except a few temporary jobs, and those are only a few.	SO 04
Robert Alexander	April 5, 2013	I would rather see solar and wind technologies further exploited and developed than I would like to see this pipeline project completed.	ALT 01
Robert Allpress	April 22, 2013	They have not shown any evidence that there is a long term good or benefit for the United States. All they can show is a few hundred TEMPORARY construction jobs and only 35 total permanent jobs once the pipeline has been completed.	PN 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Andrews	March 10, 2013	I really find it most abhorrent that the State Department could think of using a TransCanada contractor to help write their report. (] Song, Lisa. "Critical Part of Keystone Report Done by Firms with Deep Oil Industry Ties." InsideClimate News. 6 March 2013.)	PRO 01
Robert Auld	March 26, 2013	The pipeline will make it easier to sell this oil on the world market, ensuring that more of it will be produced and burned, releasing carbon into the atmosphere and exacerbating climate change effects.	CLIM 14
Robert Auld	March 26, 2013	Keystone XL will be a large pipeline, traversing many environmentally sensitive areas of the U.S., carrying highly toxic tar-sands-derived heavy oil	RISK 14
Robert Barton	April 13, 2013	These mined tar sands are a tragedy for the Canadian boreal forest, one of the largest remaining in the northern hemisphere.	CU 01
Robert Barton	April 13, 2013	This pipeline is offering a major terrorist objective as an easy objective.	RISK 04
Robert Barton	April 13, 2013	Jobs? Gone in just a few years, with nothing to replace them	SO 04
Robert Blum	April 9, 2013	Our long term health care costs demand we reduce harmful emissions that lead to billions of dollars of annual medical bills and thousands of early deaths in our cities. The adverse impact on the environment we live in requires we change our ways. The economic cost of fossil fuels in all these areas is unsustainable and will lead to a drastic decrease in our stand of living.	CLIM 10
Robert Blum	April 9, 2013	You will know the "energy security, health, environmental, cultural, economic, and foreign policy concerns" of inaction on reducing carbon emissions are huge and the biggest long term challenge we face as a species… The consensus on global warming is absolutely clear and based on sound scientific analysis resulting from years of careful, peer reviewed study.	CLIM 16
Robert Boobar	March 11, 2013	Proponents say that it will create jobs, but a new estimate of jobs once the pipeline is built is a scant 20 permanent jobs.	SO 04
Robert Booz	April 1, 2013	Moving away from oil is the right, albiet, tough choice.	ALT 01
Robert Butler	March 19, 2013	The oil companies collectively have shown an inability to avert disasters of horrendous consequences. This method of oil delivery as well as its tar sands defects are not worth an unglly scar accross the U.S. landscape.	RISK 25
Robert C Brown	March 14, 2013	... the oil is NOT for the US, but is to be piped to LA ports to be shipped overseas. How exactly is that good for our own energy needs?	PN 07
Robert Carroll	March 14, 2013	The answer is not to stop the pipeline project, but to create more similar projects-in order to keep America's infrastructure sound, and the country at the forefront of resource transportation and management.	PN 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Carsen	April 5, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes	ACK
Robert Chapman	April 15, 2013	We should be focusing on solar and wind power which don't pollute our environment. We don't want big money destroying our environment when there is no need!	PN 02
Robert Cohn	April 8, 2013	I am a cancer survivor and so is my wife. How many more people will be stricken just due to the environmental disaster the XL can, and likely WILL bring? Imagine the children with asthma, and the increased cases of skin problems.	RISK 30
Robert Conradi	April 2, 2013	The dangers of oil pipelines in America has recently been demonstrated again, this time in Arkansas, where about 500,000 gallons of tar sands oil poured into a neighborhood. A larger such spill occurred in Michigan, in 2010, when almost a million gallons of this sticky toxic goo poured into the Kalamazoo River. Spills of tar sand oil are especially difficult to clean up. Efforts in Michigan continue.	ACK
Robert Cruder	March 28, 2013	Just why would we want a pipeline running through our region and transporting that same petrolium to the gulf coast to be sold internationally? That profits the producers, the pipeline and the refiners who already are making record profits but imposes a cost increase, an effective "tax" on our regional economy.	PN 07
Robert Davis	April 14, 2013	These billions of dollars in energy investment need to be funneled to local alternative sources rather than a dirty and dangerous carbon and greenhouse gas form.	PN 02
Robert Doupe	April 2, 2013	Not only is the pipeline an environmental hazard with no value to the U.S., almost of it will be shipped overseas, the oil will be a contributor to global warming. It will continue the expanded use of fossil fuels, when the US needs to le a leader in encouraging and enforcing fossil fuel use reduction	PN 07, PN 03
Robert Farney	April 21, 2013	The petroleum products derived from the Gulf Coast refining won't even help American motorists...the products will be shipped to China	PN 07
Robert Fisher	April 20, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is an environmental disaster waiting to happen, just to facilitate the landscape scale environmental disaster which is the mining of the tar sands.	ACK
Robert Fuchs	April 22, 2013	The State Department report on the Keystone XL pipeline does not adequately address the threats to climate change or to the environments affected by local spills.	RISK 06, CLIM 12
Robert G. Wanek	April 22, 2013	Trans Canada is making an overt attempt to trample not only our natural resources and environment, but the rights of American landowners.	LEG 02
Robert G. Wanek	April 22, 2013	This project will do nothing to help our energy independance goals, since it will all go on the international market.	PN 04
Robert G. Wanek	April 22, 2013	They will, admittedly, not be liable for environmental damage caused by leaks, spills and ruptures and are lobbying to avoid liability by not classifying their produce as "oil".	SO 15

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	The Bakken Fields are much better served by alternate pipelines already under consideration…[such as a planned Enbridge] pipeline to distribution facilities on Lake Superior and then to other Midwest US cities.	ALT 10
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Bakken producers are unlikely to mix their product with Tar Sands in a Keystone XL scenario.	CU 13
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL will not material impact the US gasoline market – except for the Midwest, where a glut of oil (which Keystone XL is meant to address by increasing capacity to the Gulf Coast) has produced lower gasoline prices – up to 50 cents lower than coastal prices12. The new pipeline capacity has the potential to increase Midwestern gas prices 10-20 cents per gallon.	PN 04
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Tar sands are only economical because of the high price of oil. Should oil prices drop, tar sands become even less economic. Keeping high oil prices is critical to tar sands extraction, thus a large benefit to consumers of oil products isn't to be expected.	PN 04
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	If the XL pipeline is not built the draw-down of the tar sands would continue, but likely at a much slower rate, providing valuable time to pursue other energy sources.	PN 06
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Valero, which accounts for 20% of the pipeline capacity, is focused on an export model.[Refineries that would receive bitumen from the Project] are also in a Foreign Trade Zone, which exempts their production from federal or state taxes, as well as custom duties...Valero's refineries in the Free Trade Zone are rigged to be particularly efficient at producing diesel fuel which is in much higher demand in Europe and Latin America than the United States.	PN 07
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	A pipeline which had been planned from Bakken to Cushing Oklahoma (the same place Keystone is going) has been already scrapped because the pipeline operators deemed the Cushing market "too saturated" to be able to absorb the additional oil.	PN 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	http://www.scribd.com/doc/34640697/EPA-Blocks-Canadian-Oil http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/aswift/tar_sands_pipeline_safety_risk.html http://stateimpact.npr.org/texas/2012/04/18/keystone-xl-pipeline-will-canadian-crude-make-it-leak/ http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/03/27/v-fullstory/3309550/dilbit-sinks-in-enbridge-oil-spill.html http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/31/us-exxon-pipeline-spill-idUSBRE92U00220130331 http://priceofoil.org/content/uploads/2012/05/Irrational_exemption_Calcs.pdf http://news.wpr.org/post/enbridge-moving-ahead-25-billion-bakken-fields-superior-pipeline http://trib.com/business/energy/oneok-cancels-wyoming-pipeline-for-bakken-oil/article_cbdd15d9-25d1-5fd1-8e91-5606435e2aa7.html http://unconventionalenergy.blogs.ihs.com/2012/12/20/new-pipe-caters-to-sweet-bakken-crude-steers-clear-of-oil-sands-flow/ http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/globallaborinstitute/research/upload/GLI_KeystoneXL_012312_FIN.pdf http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/OCIkeystoneXL_2011R.pdf http://www.nbcnews.com/business/why-keystone-pipeline-would-boost-pump-prices-223667?streamSlug=businessmain	REF
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	contrary to information provided in the DSEIS, dilbit acts significantly differently from traditional crude oil in a spill. Laboratory research suggests that dilbit “floats” like other lighter oils, making it easier to clean up. Actual experience is different. In the Michigan spill it was found that the lighter elements of the mix evaporated off or separated (possibly due to the action of typical other matter found in a natural waterbody which was not properly modeled in the laboratory experiments) and the heavier aspects of the product sank to the bottom of the waterbody, significantly complicating the cleanup	RISK 07
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	The job benefits of the pipeline (referenced in ES section 4.5.2) are vastly overstated and will result in mostly temporary employment.	SO 04
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Subtracting the portion of the pipeline already under construction from Oklahoma to Texas, as well as the Canadian portion of the pipeline, that leaves only about $3-$4 billion of the pipeline’s total $7 billion expense.	SO 08
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	[Economic] figures [in the DSEIS] do not include negative economic impacts of Keystone XL including future environmental and property damage and higher Midwestern fuel prices.	SO 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	At the very least, we suggest approval of Keystone XL be condition upon a revision of the IRS ruling that exempts tar sands derived oil from contributing to the fund.	SO 15
Robert Garrity	April 22, 2013	Under an IRS rulemaking tar sand-derived dilbit is determined to be a “synthetic oil” exempt from collection of the $0.08 per barrel levy that funds the Oil Spill Liability Trust…the increased incidence of leaks from dilbit-carrying Keystone XL could require increased appropriation from the fund, while not contributing to it.	SO 15
Robert Germann	April 13, 2013	The keystone project is to fullfill obligations in the US/China Aviation Agreement.. This fuel will be put back into the atmoshere by China's planes. China's growth rate in aviation is estimated at 15% a year, planes need fuel to burn. Latin Americia is next in line to sign an agreement for its planes.	PN 07
Robert Glass	March 6, 2013	Spills are next to impossible to clean up from tar sands oil, and there are always spills.	RISK 08
Robert H. Berry	April 13, 2013	In the last 30 days there have been 13 spills .	ACK
Robert H. Chalker	April 18, 2013	The Draft Supplemental EIS does not adequately indicate that Keystone will implement or address changes to their testing or pipeline assessments as industry standards or regulations change.	RISK 19
Robert Haney	April 5, 2013	It is obvious that developers are not upholding their responsibility to maintain the infrastructure of their current pipelines. Don't approve the Keystone XL until they have upgraded their current pipelines.	RISK 11
Robert Haslag	April 11, 2013	By definition, this pipeline must pass over, under or through the Missouri River. After Arkansas' pipeline failure, we must consider the costs to one of the great fresh water rivers in our country.	WRS 09
Robert Haw	April 17, 2013	We need to be objective about the Keystone XL pipeline. An objective EIS would use science to quantify the climatic impact of tar sands extraction and eventual burning, and not use qualitative words similar to "the pipeline will have negligible impact on the climate" and leave it at that. CO2 buildup in the atmosphere is real and the tar sands industry is set to release a tremendous amount of CO2. That is a fact. The climate is changing rapidly even now and the Keystone XL pipeline is a risk not worth taking.	CLIM 14, CLIM 13
Robert Haw	April 17, 2013	No significant benefit accrues to this country from its construction and it abounds with risk - e.g. leaks over the Ogalalla aquifer.	PN 05
Robert Haw	April 17, 2013	Deny the Keystone XL pipeline as it is not in the best interests of this country. Neither for current residents, nor for future citizens who will have to cope with hotter temperatures, longer droughts, fiercer storms and higher sea levels - all of which will be aggravated by Keystone XL products. If climate disruption is not an acceptable risk, then you should take a stance that the Keystone XL is not an acceptable risk either.	PN 08, CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Hinrichs	April 22, 2013	The Transcanada Pipeline is not merely possibly not merely likely but guaranteed to dump volatile poison into the nations largest underground source of fresh water. … If this pipeline is allowed to run through the Ogallala Aquifer it is guaranteed to leak and probably in a spectacular manner	RISK 14
Robert Hoekstra	April 13, 2013	There are numerous issues and concerns that must be addressed before we allow a tar sands pipeline to bisect our country. Running through an important aquifer that extends for miles, stopping Keystone XL before it begins will deter more tar sands mishaps and catastrophes from happening in that area of the US.	ACK
Robert Hyde	March 29, 2013	Instead of continuing to allow oil company contractors to determine what is in our national interest, I hope the Obama administration will step up and reject this pipeline once and for all.	PN 10
Robert Israel	April 11, 2013	It's time to get on with it and start down the necessary road of North American energy independence. It will be better for the United States, for our security, our economy, and our children to come!	PN 03
Robert John	April 2, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline will not help up address any of the energy or environmental issues confronting the world. We only want green, renewable distributed energy development.	ALT 01
Robert Johnson	March 15, 2013	Anyone who reads the conclusions of experts on Global Warming, or Climate Change, would have to agree that this would be a disaster for our environment.	CLIM 14
Robert Johnson	March 15, 2013	-The number of jobs that that the project will create are grossly inflated by many reports.	SO 02
Robert Jordan	April 11, 2013	The risks, including spills, that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands.	RISK 20, CU 04
Robert Kalayjian	March 15, 2013	Our forests suffered until we stopped using high sulfur containing coal. Our planet, climate and children will suffer if we persist in digging this dirtiest of oil out of the ground. We are accomplices to a Canadian travesty if we don't stop this pipeline!!	CLIM 14
Robert Keller	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow this pipeline to cross thru the only pure water in our nation. Why would you put at risk such a vital priceless resource that if contaminated would jeopordize our states agrirculture livlihood?	PN 05
Robert Keller	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow this pipeline to go through the Ogallala aquifer. Why risk destroying such a vaulable resource as pure water when it could be placed only 50 miles out of the way and not endanger it???	WRG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert King	April 9, 2013	The NRDC tells me that the draft environmental review your department released last month for the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline has some errorw. They say that It concedes the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, but claims they need not be considered. It fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	CLIM 13
Robert Kittredge	March 12, 2013	Then, after we perform some initial refining in Texas, we'll be stuck with, and have to handle and dispose of, thousands of barrels per day of highly contaminated waste material.	PN 05
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	We are all in agreement that the Keystone XL Pipeline should not go forward because of the environmental impact on Canadian arboreal forests and indigenous peoples, the pipeline route through the US and its affected residents, and the citizens of the planet who will be affected by the increase of carbon into the atmosphere destroying our ecosystem.	ACK
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	>The pipeline will not benefit US citizens with increased supply because the oil will be shipped to China. >The pipeline will not add to our GDP in any meaningful way and will put our water and land resources at risk. >The pipeline will impact the entire ecosystem of the planet to the point where we will not be able to deal with it.	PN 07
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	We are going to be taking all the risks and reap no benefits and most uncertainly do harm to ourselves and the planet overall.	PN 07
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	1. SEIS report was prepared by industry insiders. 2. You have attempted to conceal the SEIS report writers' connections to the industry that wants to build the pipeline. This is a clear conflict of interest.	PRO 01
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	The pipeline will most probably cause environmental catastrophes along its route in the US, because the track record of these pipelines is not good regarding leakage and the insufficient attempts at clean up.	RISK 13
Robert Koopman	March 25, 2013	The pipeline will not provide any meaningful contingent of jobs.	SO 02
Robert Kuljian	April 11, 2013	If Canada chooses to become a vassal state to the energy conglomerates that control Tar Sands oil that is their choice, but the United States should in no way promote the environmental devastation that some Canadians are willing to accept for short term economic benefit. These deposit also have no value in our security or energy independence.	CU 02
Robert Levin	April 23, 2013	These tar sands are the dirtiest type of oil, and refining it will hasten global warming	CLIM 05
Robert Longoni	April 6, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will create very few permanent jobs. The few permanent jobs it will create are not worth the risk of damage to the environment.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Ludwig	April 4, 2013	The latest oil spill in Arkansas (500,000 gallons) should be proof that the oil companies are not able to transmit oil safely over land.	RISK 14
Robert Mac Nish	March 14, 2013	There is great resistance to all alternative routes to export tar sands oil and there is good reason to believe that resistance will prevail	ACK
Robert Mac Nish	March 14, 2013	The argument that the tar sands will be developed anyway is flawed	PN 06
Robert Mc Laughlin	April 17, 2013	This pipeline remains one of the largest opportunities our country has to become energy independent.	PN 10
Robert Mc Laughlin	April 17, 2013	When it is completed, it will enable the oil industry to employ thousands of new workers while driving down our energy costs. The pipeline would also support employment at critical refineries on the Gulf Coast.	SO 02
Robert Mcchesney	April 20, 2013	If you are interested in the creation of jobs, push for clean energy solutions. There are jobs to be had in research, development, building, operating and maintaining clean energy systems.	SO 05, PN 02
Robert Miller	March 2, 2013	The risk of spills into major aquifers and local environments is just to great to the health of the people and the nation.	PN 05
Robert Millette	April 4, 2013	Promoting the tar sands development of Canada continues to facilitate burning of fossil fuels and accelerate global warming.	CLIM 14
Robert Millette	April 4, 2013	It [Keystone XL Pipeline] will further the ongoing destruction of the boreal forests that are home to a vast variety of songbirds and other wildlife.	CU 01
Robert Munsey	April 11, 2013	WE hear talk about "rapid clean-up" but that is after-the-fact talk. If we get this "oil sands" project stopped we won't have to deal with clean-up. Prevention is the favored action.	RISK 14
Robert Olofson	April 4, 2013	Please protect our planet for future generations by revising your environmental impact statement to reflect what we all know to be true: that the Keystone XL pipeline is all risk and no reward.	ACK
Robert Pezick	March 28, 2013	in the event of a rupture and/ or spill. Why don't you require a study be done which would outline possible safeguards for a rupture, along with costs? I believe there are solutions which could be engineered and implemented to greatly reduce or eliminate possible environmental damage from a rupture or spill.	RISK 14
Robert Phillips	April 19, 2013	The oil industry takes all of the profits while citizens absorb the risk	PN 05
Robert Robertson	April 11, 2013	The recent spill, even with the media restricted from covering it, should convince you that we don't need this.	RISK 13
Robert Ross	March 11, 2013	Coal, oil, nuclear, and gas are filthy and toxic. We must lead the world on clean green energy alternatives such as wind, solar, geothermal, biofuels, geo-electric, conservation and efficiency.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Ruyle	April 22, 2013	I live in Nebraska and I believe that the risks have not been adequately addressed.	LEG 04
Robert Schuster	March 11, 2013	Importing heavy oil from Canada to our refineries that are optimized for heavy oil is much more sensible than the current purchases of heavy oil via ship from Venezuela...The idea that if we don't build the pipeline Canadian oil companies will not drill this resource is a farce. If we don't build the pipeline they will build one to the West Coast and ship the oil to China. Again, it is better for the larger environment and our economy to build the pipeline.	PN 10, PN 06, PN 12
Robert Scott	March 11, 2013	Let's promote investment in wind and solar, both have immense potential to produce the power needed without any more atmosphere destroying fossil fuel development.	PN 02
Robert Sherrell	April 14, 2013	Where the pipeline would enter the U.S., we should build a massive refinery and process the oil for usage here in America. The pipeline would not have to stretch across the whole of America, and our two nations would be directly benefiting each other, plus enabling us to remain free of foreign entanglements for protecting the flow of oil from nations that do not like us except for our money, which is draining America. It is a win-win for everyone.	PN 07, ALT 08
Robert Soper	April 5, 2013	"The draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on the Keystone XL pipeline underestimates the pipeline's health and environmental risks…As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas), several major rivers (including the Missouri, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers), and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland…The dangers from tar sands oil were made vividly real last Friday when thousands of barrels of tar sands oil gushed out in Arkansas, forcing residents to flee their homes. A similar accident in North Dakota spilled 21,000 gallons of oil and in one year, Keystone I, which runs from Canada through Illinois, had 14 reported leaks.	RISK 26, RISK 07
Robert Spector	April 16, 2013	Clean water, clean air, and a healthy sustainable future are not the destination if we open up KXL.	PN 05
Robert Sprich	March 10, 2013	Any break in this pipeline--through accident or terrorism--could foul the water in our heartland. We have seen that the methods for dealing with such a spill are primitive.	RISK 07
Robert Strauss	April 4, 2013	One issue no one is talking about is how vulnerable the Keystone pipe line is to terrorist attacks. Guarding it would be horribly expensive and ineffective. A truck full of explosives over or close to the pipe line near an aquifer could cause immeasurable damage that would be near impossible to clean up. This is a risk that must be avoided - ignoring it is truly irresponsible!	RISK 04
Robert Swenson	March 19, 2013	America should not be helping Canada pollute the atmosphere with CO2 on a massive scale by allowing its pipeline to cross our land. Let them build their own pipeline in Canada.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robert Terrell	March 28, 2013	I hope you will consider major development of alternative energy sources. It's looking like they won't happen for decades now, with fracking and etc. As long and more and more pipelines are built, and more and more fracking occurs, well, there's no push for anything else.	ALT 01
Robert Turner	April 22, 2013	We have over 30,000 pipelines in America. More jobs would be ceated if we did annual inspections of the pipelines we have and have the oil companies pay for it. Even people with cars have to pay to inspected them annually.	ACK
Robert Vavala	April 22, 2013	We are being forced to accept a pipeline belonging to a foreign corporation which intends to ship their refined product out of the country.	PN 07
Robert Walker	April 15, 2013	It does not benefit the United States.	PN 08
Robert Watson	April 9, 2013	It would not lower the cost of gasoline or make us energy independent but as pipeline experience shows it would result in more environmental damage.	PN 05
Robert Weidner	April 20, 2013	Energy is the life blood of the American economy and having lower energy prices benefits EVERY American. Green energy is far from being a cost effective alternative to fossil fuels. Forcing high priced (and subsidized) alternate energy on the American people will drive down the standard of living for everyone.	PN 04, PN 02
Robert Weitzel	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is totally unnecessary. I has nothing to do with transporting our countrys oil for our use. It is what the Canadians want to sell their dirty oil to the Chinese.	PN 07
Robert White	April 22, 2013	This is not the direction we should be going. We will be better off developing more renewable energy sources and reducing our need for oil and coal through energy efficiency research.	PN 02
Robert Worlock	April 11, 2013	We need to move quickly to a non-petro based energy future and the benefits that this project brings is far out-weighed by the problems, dangers and destruction that it brings. You know the data. Please act ethically in rejecting this pipeline.	PN 05
Robert Zweben	April 13, 2013	Tar sands oil is the worst product. Climate change is serious and will affect your children and mine.	CLIM 14
Roberta Brown	April 18, 2013	Before [Keystone] had permission, they assumed they would get it and went to ranchers, farmers and land owners in the US, said they would take their land, even if the owners did not want them on their property. This is to say nothing of what they did to the Canadian First Nation people, who lost their land and their health.	LEG 02, CU 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
roberta hall	April 22, 2013	To reject it, we need to accept something else: serious efforts to reduce our individual AND collective use of fossil fuels. HOW? by creating more electricity from sun and wind, of course; and also by cutting our usage---in the defense department; in government; in homes and apartments; and in businesses. In transportation of course, but much more. These things must be done and those who are and would be employed in resource exploitation need to be re-employed in these positive developments. When the US went to war in the 1940s the focus of the economy shifted. We need a different type of shift but one of the same magnitude, and I mention it because it shows that this can be done.	PN 02
Roberta Jachym	April 15, 2013	Wind, solar and hydro are the only energy sources that should be getting our money and attention	PN 02
Roberta Wade	April 23, 2013	Haven't we already done enough damage to our world without running a pipeline directly through the heartland of the United States! The money dedicated to this project would be so much better spent developing wind and solar energy sources	PN 02
Robin Barnhill	April 2, 2013	This oil is not for American and even if it was it is not worth the risks. Additionally, information concerning jobs etc. has been lied about - how can we trust any entity that is so blatant about falsehood?.	PN 05
Robin Blier	March 19, 2013	We already have sustainable energy alternatives. It's time to end our dependence on Oil & Gas. not just foreign Oil, but dirty energies for ancient combustion engines. We HAVE the technology!	ALT 01
Robin Blier	March 19, 2013	The risk assessment of the proposed XL pipeline was determined by the owner of the pipeline? I do not accept their determination.	PRO 01
Robin Cohen	April 3, 2013	Furthermore, the potential for leaks, spills, fires, explosions, and ensuing contamination of ground water supplies and environmental disaster is huge. The oil industry's failure to prevent and handle previous catastrophic accidents has been deplorable.	RISK 24, RISK 14, WRG 01
Robin Forman	April 16, 2013	There are alternatives that have been in exsistence for centuries are just starting to get implemented: WIndmill power, electric, solar energy, ethanol and possibly more this is where it is a win win this is where we are headed if we all work together and then we all will profit.	PN 02
Robin Iller	March 26, 2013	don't trash our beautiful country with a pipe that WILL leak!	ACK
Robin Kinney	April 22, 2013	KXL is not in the publics interests. The United States will not see oil prices reduced if this pipeline is approved, and it will not reduce our dependence on foreign oil.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robin Kinney	April 22, 2013	In the plains states, clean drinking water is a commodity we cannot afford to risk contaminating. The Ogallala Aquifer is the source of irrigation and drinking water for the bread basked of the United States. We cannot chance contamination by tar sands.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Robin Mcdonald	April 15, 2013	We have had at least 4 oil spills in the last two weeks, including the tar sands spill in Arkansas. This current pollution of our environment, killing of wildlife, damaging of the water table, necessity to evacuate Americans, along with the fact that oil companies are unable to remediate these spills (when by some fluke of law they are required to actually pay for cleanup), makes the Pipeline a no-brainer decision, as they say. It is simply wrong for our country...The oil companies won't even reveal what they have been adding to the tar sands to make them pumpable, which means that millions of gallons of unidentified chemicals would be mixed into the poisonous tar sand sludge when it, inevitably, spills throughout the United States	RISK 12, PN 05
Robin Mclean	March 10, 2013	Dump Keystone and show Americans and industry that you believe to stop global warming and climate change (if possible) we must stop approving the big projects, like Keystone, that may generate short term cash, but will certainly further the long term oil addiction that is changing our lands, oceans, and life on Earth forever	CLIM 18
Robin Pappas	March 14, 2013	yes to wind, solar, water power,	ALT 01
Robin Romaine	April 9, 2013	Develop fuel cell, solar, wind and water technology here in the USA. Why isn't Florida the leader in solar power ?	PN 02, ALT 01
Robin Romaine	April 9, 2013	it is a disaster waiting to happen. There are NO SAFEGUARDS in place when an oil spill happens	RISK 14
Robin Roush	April 17, 2013	“Between 2008 and 2012, U.S. pipelines spilled an average of more than 3.1 million gallons of hazardous liquids per year, according to "http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/SigPSI.html?nocache=5779#_liquidon"data from the Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, the nation's pipeline regulator. Those spills -- most commonly caused by corrosion and equipment failure -- caused at least $1.5 billion in property damage altogether.	RISK 14
Robina Quale-leach	March 28, 2013	And living as I do in Michigan, where the damage done to the Kalamazoo River Valley by the failure of the Enbridge pipeline two years ago has yet to be overcome,	RISK 13
robinson	March 2, 2013	we must start spending our time and money on renewable reasources that don't polute the enviroment	ALT 01
Robyn Blaisdell	April 15, 2013	This is important - for without our protection, the caribou and other wildlife that live in these areas will perish. We have to make sure they are protected or another species will be eliminated.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robyn Bowman	April 20, 2013	The companies that cause these environmental disasters should have to pay every last penny from the company, and all executive salaries and bonuses should go to pay for any disasters that may occur, as the executives in charge know the risks and the rewards, so when a disaster occurs, they pay, since they reap the rewards at the expense of all of the rest of us and at the environment's expense.	LEG 08
Robyn Bowman	April 20, 2013	We need to invest in clean energy. Let's become a leader in new clean energy technologies instead of letting oil companies do whatever they want and ruin this land for all of us.	PN 02
Robyn Little	April 9, 2013	It [DSEIS] must acknowledge that Keystone XL will be a major driver of even more tar sands development, and thus account for the global warming pollution	ACK
Robyn Little	April 9, 2013	It concedes the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, but claims they need not be considered	CLIM 13, CLIM 12
Robyn Little	April 9, 2013	It fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	RISK 20
Robyn Martin	March 11, 2013	With the latest information coming from NASA "Amplified Greenhouse Effect Shifts North's Growing Seasons: March 10, 2013: Vegetation growth at Earth's northern latitudes increasingly resembles lusher latitudes to the south, according to a NASA-funded study based on a 30-year record of ground-based and satellite data sets."	CLIM 14
Robyn Prochnow	April 22, 2013	http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1990-10-22/news/9003280514_1_radioactive-waste-waste-site-boyd-county	REF
Robyn Prochnow	April 22, 2013	http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/F2/970/421/269911/	REF
Robyn Prochnow	April 22, 2013	according to Transcanada they plan to use In-Situ pumping to retrieve the spilled oil according to their report in the EIS. Their plan submitted in the EIS does not disclose the remediation plan for clean up in the vadose zone nor the Ogallala aquifer.	RISK 05
Robyn Prochnow	April 22, 2013	I want to see a more defined remediation plan for the different soil types and ground water… cannot use bioremediation in parts of Holt county because of the water leaching properties of the sandy soil and the high nitrates already in the ground water this will only increase the nitrate level in the sandy area…33ppm nitrates already exist in section24 township29 range 10	RISK 10
Robyn Schrock	March 6, 2013	What is not mentioned is the cost of not putting the pipeline in.	PN 01
Robyn Schrock	March 6, 2013	I support putting the Keystone XL pipeline in. If we don't put the pipeline in, the oil will still come in by over-sea carrier. If there is a pipeline leak, you can see it, and contain it. Exxon Valdez showed what happens with ship leaks. Of the two options, the pipeline would be far less of an environmental impact when there are leaks.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Robyn Weber-Prochnow	April 22, 2013	Many issues of EIS still needs to be addressed!!!!... Letting the Keystone Pipline pass is on the same level as trying to put in a low level neculear waste facility in Boyd county Nebraska.	ACK
Rock Barrett	April 16, 2013	As a climate scientist I am writing to state that the State Department's initial report on the climate impacts of approving and operating the Keystone XL pipeline is flawed. The 181 million metric ton carbon footprint of the pipeline has been documented in a recent research report, an amount that would have drastic impacts on our climate.	CLIM 11
Rock Barrett	April 16, 2013	At a time when we must begin transitioning from fossil fuel-based energy sources, it is clear that the pipeline is neither in our national interest or in the planet's interest. Mining tar sands for energy production is a clear indication that we have reached peak oil.	PN 08
Rod	March 2, 2013	Climate scientists are nearly unanimous in saying - in no uncertain terms - that we MUST stop putting CO2 into the atmosphere. One calculation is: for every barrel of oil transported through the Keystone pipeline, another 433 kg of carbon dioxide (nearly half a ton) will end up in the atmosphere.	CLIM 05
Rod	March 2, 2013	Part of is the blatant deceit, in alleging that oil does 'not' pose any significant adverse environmental impact. *NOT* true! The State Department's declared position in its recent draft report on the Keystone issue is obviously ignorant, and it deserves to be condemned as dishonest.	LEG 04
Rod	March 2, 2013	Support for the oil industry is slowing development of alternative energy resources.	PN 03
Rod Supencheck	April 22, 2013	Dilbit oil is heaver than normal crude oil. It is more corrosive and requires more chemicals, heat and pressure to move it through a pipeline. This pipeline will run at a pressure of 1440 PSI and heated up to 158 degrees, compared with conventional crude that generally run at ambient temperatures and lower pressures. This will be a thirty six inch pipe delivering around 900,000 barrels of oil per day across the Sand hills and the Ogallala aquifer. Do we really want to take the risk? Remember the Enbridge pipeline? Almost three years has gone by and they are still trying to clean it up.	RISK 11
Roddy Erickson	April 22, 2013	The likelihood of oil spills, and contamination of aquifers and waterways, is too high. Tar sands oil is high in CO2 impact, and its extraction is a regional environmental disaster. This oil would not help our dependence on foreign oil, but would substantially worsen global CO2 releases, harming our national security	PN 02, CLIM 14, PN 05
Roddy Erickson	April 22, 2013	Even the draft EIS was faulty, having been drafted by a biased source.	PRO 01
Roderic Krapf	April 15, 2013	Pro pipeline speakers say that if we don't take the tar sand oil, Canada will just sell it to Asia. I say, let the Canadians decide if they want to build a pipeline to ports along their coast and risk the destructive results of a spill.	ALT 05
Rodger Parsons	March 11, 2013	For any government report to be so shamefully inaccurate is a traqvesty.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rodney D. Birkmann	April 22, 2013	why chance ruining our water table just so Canada can cross our land to provide oil to other countries and not ours?	PN 05
Rodney L. Olsen	April 17, 2013	Why can we not focus our creative efforts on jobs with more positive and lasting consequences?	SO 05
Rodrigo Treviño	March 13, 2013	I went over the Draft SEIS. Although it mentions possible environmental impacts as a an effect of building the pipeline, it understates the threat level that this poses to the environment and to US citizens. It is scientific consensus that we should burn much less fossil fuels to slow down global warming. Building the pipeline will only make these matters worse. And the state department should care about this, because increasing global temperatures destabilize developing societies which are concentrated around large bodies of water. This instability can be a threat to the stability in the US. The US Military has has accepted that global warming poses a threat to US security; it is time the state department recognizes it too and that it does not support the construction of this pipeline.	PN 05
Roger And Joan Givens	April 16, 2013	It seems to me that it would be far more responsible to build a refinery on our Northern border where the pipeline first enters the US.	ALT 08
Roger Carrier	April 10, 2013	Additionally, an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created.	ACK
Roger Freeman	April 22, 2013	We are strongly opposed to the development of the Keystone XL pipeline and respectfully express our deep disappointment and disagreement with the findings of the State Department in its draft environmental impact statement (Draft EIS). We believe the statement is both incomplete, failing to account for all negative impacts, and inaccurate in its determination that the net environmental impact will be minimal because the Tar Sands will be exploited with or without the pipeline. Such logic is specious and indicative of the flawed nature of the report. Moreover, we understand that the authors of the report have previously worked for many of the major oil companies that stand to benefit from the construction of the pipeline. If true, such clear conflicts of interest reduce the legitimacy and credibility of the report. In short, this Draft EIS is inadequate, inaccurate and not credible. It should be rejected and re-done.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Roger Freeman	April 22, 2013	Furthermore, contrary to the State Department findings, there are many energy industry executives and financial analysts that full development and exploitation of the Tar Sands fuels is not in fact financially viable without the U.S. Government's approval and resulting development of the XL Pipeline. If the Tar Sands developers are forced to rely on traditional methods of transportation such as truck and rail, the project may not attract investments required to fully develop the resources.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Roger Freeman	April 22, 2013	One key flaw in the Draft EIS is that it does not take into consideration the fact that regardless of whether the Tar Sands in Alberta Canada are eventually exploited, construction of the pipeline will accelerate the processing of Tar Sands fuels thereby increasing carbon emissions at a faster rate than if the pipeline was not built. The timing and rate of carbon injection into the atmosphere is a critically important factor that cannot be ignored. There is nearly universal scientific consensus that Anthropogenic Global Warming presents a serious threat to mankind and our habitat on planet earth. Both President Obama and Secretary Kerry have acknowledged this fact, and committed to take action to protect our habitat. As we are in a race for time to slow carbon emissions and the resulting climate change effects, a rapid exploitation of the Tar Sands -- locking us into further fossil fuel development -- will likely have a devastating impact on global efforts to slow climate change. By rejecting the pipeline, the Administration will stand with the American people who seek a habitable environment for our children and future generations. Finally, given the President's acceptance of the proposition that Anthropogenic Global Warming presents an existential threat to the American People, the Administration should be developing and implementing a sound Energy Policy that is rational and required by the circumstances to force the corporate internalization of the true costs of fossil fuels development and use. Simply put, we need a system of fair energy accounting and pricing. Only then will the market work efficiently. Currently, the costs of Climate Change are large borne by the public at large, through health impacts, economic damage from dramatic weather events like Hurricane Sandy, or excessive heat waves and droughts that have cost the American people billions in lost agriculture and reduced productivity. Also externalized are the health care costs of burning fossil fuels including asthma and cancer. A fairly accounted energy policy could involve a cap and trade system or a carbon tax or other policy mechanisms to mitigate and reduce the enormous expenses related to carbon emissions. If the Administration and a more progressive Congress were able to pass a rational energy policy, then the Tar Sands projects may well become unaffordable and uneconomic. If this future contingent logic seems specious because it relies on one potential future outcome to rationalize a current policy decision, we suggest that is no less compelling than the same logic (but opposite conclusions) drawn in the Draft EIS – i.e. that net environmental impacts are nil because the resources will be developed with other transport means. The extraction and processing of such a dirty fuel as Tar Sands under a rational and fairly accounted energy policy would likely render the project as unaffordable to investors as facilitating the transport of such fuel would be unaffordable for the American people and planet earth. There is nearly universal scientific consensus that AGW and associated climate change presents an existential threat to the American public as well as mankind in general.	PN 06
Roger Gordon	April 20, 2013	I believe that approval of the Keystone Pipeline initiative, under strict federal guidelines including but not limited to Federal and State oversite and an environmental safety responsibility bond (a billion dollar escrow should do it), would be a good source of not only needed petroleum products, but also thousands of high paying sustainable jobs.	PD 01, LEG 08, PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
roger hull	March 3, 2013	"We're mystified as to how the State Department can acknowledge the negative effects of the Earth's dirtiest oil on our climate, but at the same time claim that the proposed pipeline will 'not likely result in significant adverse environmental effects.' Whether this failure was willful or accidental, this report is nothing short of malpractice.	CLIM 13
roger hull	March 3, 2013	"Tarsands does not expand unless Keystone XL is built," Kleeb said. "The State Department's assumption that tarsands development does not change with or without this pipeline is wrong and laughable. … Without this pipeline Canada stays at 2 million barrels a day, with it they get 3 million barrels a day.	PN 11
Roger Hull	March 17, 2013	Global Warming's Terrifying New Math: Three simple numbers that add up to global catastrophe - and that make clear who the real enemy is by: Bill McKibben	ACK
Roger Jao	April 7, 2013	Also, might I remind you that the proposed pipeline will lay directly on top of the nation's largest water aquifer. This is a disaster waiting to happen.	WRG 01
Roger Reinking	March 27, 2013	Fossil-fuel driven climate warming, as it destroys our food production and water resources systems, will soon become the greatest global economic and environmental disaster of all time.	CLIM 16
Roger Reinking	March 27, 2013	It is designed to export dirty tar sands Canadian oil, which will raise the price of that oil, with a huge negative impact on the U.S. economy.	PN 04
Roger Reinking	March 27, 2013	Contrary to distorted estimates, it will employ only a handful of people permanently and only two or three thousand people temporarily to build it.	SO 02
Roger Schmidt	April 13, 2013	THE POLLUTION FROM MAKING THIS GUE IS ALSO VERY VERY BAD. THAT IS VERY VERY BAD FOR CLIMATE CHANGE BECAUSE OF THE HUGE AMOUNT POLLUTION PUT IN THE AIR WE BREATH. PEOPLE ARE DYING FROM CANCER THAT LIVE DOWN STREAM FROM THIS.	CU 02
Roger Schmidt	April 13, 2013	HOW CAN YOU JUSTIFY THIS? FOR A FEW SHORT TERM JOBS TO MAKE A PIPE LINE TO MAKE OIL COMPANY'S EVEN MORE WEALTHY BY SHIPPING IT OVER SEAS.	PN 05
Roger Schmidt	April 22, 2013	Then the short term jobs for a few thousand will be gone and we will be lift with the dangers.	PN 05
Roger Schmidt	April 22, 2013	When the pipe line brakes and it will, it could end up in lakes and rivers and this stuff sinks! They don't even know how to clean it up.	RISK 08
Roger Schmidt	April 22, 2013	The process that is used to get toxic tar like substance pumps tons of poisons' in the air and water. People that live downstream from there are getting cancer from the run off. Hundreds of Geese land in an overflow pond and were all dead in minutes!	RISK 30, CU 02
Roger Schmidt	April 22, 2013	The cancer rates are 1 in 2 guys in their life time and 1 in 3 women in theirs in the USA. We do not need a product like the one that comes from tar sands that 2x as toxic as other oil.	RISK 30, CU 15

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Roger Twitchell	April 19, 2013	When used a gasoline feedstock for cars, you get negative net energy return on investment from Alberta Tar Sands oil. The energy made available at one's wheels is less than the energy used to extract the oil in the first place, so it should simply be left in the ground. As extraction happens deeper and deeper, the energy return on investment will only get much worse. Now it's 5:1 Alberta Tar Sands oil energy out : extraction energy in, reduced to 3:1 by refining to gasoline, then reduced to less than 1:1 by gas engine inefficiency. That will be nearly cut in half when needed deeper extraction requires higher energy inputs, reducing the ratios to 3:1, less than 2:1 and less than 0.6:1 in the future. The very high viscosity of the diluted bitumen output to be pumped requires higher pumping losses than regular crude oil, reducing energy return on investment even further while increasing the likelihood of leaks from that extra-high needed pressure. So from an automotive energy source perspective, the Alberta Tar Sands is an energy drain, not an energy source.	ACK
Roger Weise	April 17, 2013	Very few jobs will be created in the US and most of the refined oil will be shipped overseas.	PN 07
Roland Janzen	April 7, 2013	….article in Scientific American. It clearly spells out that the Return on Energy Invested (ROEI) for Tar Sand Oil is below the level required to support modern society.	REF
Rolf Peterson	April 3, 2013	Keystone XL will contribute dramatically to climate change. The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production.	CLIM 12
Rolf Peterson	April 3, 2013	While energy independence is a laudable and important goal, increasing the extraction rate and use of fossil fuels is the wrong direction to go.	PN 05
Rolf Peterson	April 3, 2013	In the state of Michigan, we have seen the devastating effects of a pipeline accident involving tar sands - years after the accident, the mess from this relatively small accident remains.	RISK 08
Rolf Peterson	April 3, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010.	RISK 26

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rolland Graham	April 15, 2013	Referring to the draft environmental review your department released last month for the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, it is a serious concern to me that there is inadequate consideration given to the environmental impacts of both the movement of the product through the pipeline, and also the refining and use of the petroleum products.	CU 08
Roller	April 18, 2013	Allowing a private foreign company with backing from this foreign country to take over private citizens land for there own profit is a violation of the 5th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States and is not in our national interest.	LEG 02
Roller	April 18, 2013	Allowing a foreign company to use this country as conduit to bring oil to refineries for the sole purpose of putting it on the World market is not in our national interest.	PN 07
Roller	April 18, 2013	"Critical Part of Keystone Report Done by Firms with Deep Oil Industry Ties" "Oil Sands Mining Uses Up Almost as Much Energy as It Produces" "The Most Influentia~ Climate Science Paper Today Remains Unknown to Most People" All from Inside Climate News	REF
Roller	April 18, 2013	"Koch Brothers Positioned to be Big Winners if Keystone XL Pipeline is Approved." Inside Climate News	REF
Roller	April 18, 2013	a spill at or near the Platte River will contaminate the water supply for Lincoln and Omaha because the river is hydraulic and therefore connected to the Aquifer.	WRS 09, WRG 01
Romaine Boerma	April 22, 2013	We must only invest in energy solutions that bring about balance with all concerned. We must take these steps now and in the direction we want to go. Fossil fuel is not the direction we are choosing. We need clean energy and we are holding ourselves back by clinging to old ideas that play havoc with our health, resources, and the beauty of our God given land.	PN 03
Ron Cady	April 22, 2013	The risk to our environment is too great and our country needs to focus of other alternatives and efficiencies.	PN 02
Ron Dutra	March 21, 2013	We should [not] be decreasing the use of dirty fossil fuels and all the many problems associated with them.	ACK
Ron Dutra	March 21, 2013	We should be increasing the use of clean energy technologies as well as increasing funding for research and development in those technologies.	ALT 01
Ron Georgalis	March 14, 2013	I am writing to express my alarm over the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline and my skepticism of the claims made by its corporate sponsor with regard to job creation and sustainability.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ron Lamb	April 14, 2013	I write in favor of renewable energy sources. I write in favor of natural gas and other relatively "clean" nonrenewable fuel sources,	PN 02
Ron Low	April 14, 2013	We need to invest ONLY in sustainable energy projects with low total carbon footprint.	PN 02
Ron Mckay	March 28, 2013	increasingly unstable climate caused by the burning of fossil fuels	ACK
Ron Saeger	April 22, 2013	Building the Keystone XL will directly impact the expansion of tar sands, and in turn speed up climate change. It is time to take positive action to limit climate change and the adverse impacts of tar sand oil on our continent and the planet.	CLIM 14
Ronald Clayton	March 14, 2013	More carbon emissions from more fossil fuels will only intensify the rate of global warming and major environmental disasters.	ACK
Ronald D'Aaddario	March 10, 2013	Due to the difficulty of extraction,… filtering, heating, and transport, processing tar sands oil from the mine to the car[results] in 40% to 70 % more greenhouse gas emissions than does an average barrel of oil.	CLIM 05
Ronald D'Aaddario	March 10, 2013	Installing [the Keystone XL] pipeline could be a game changer in the wrong direction. [If] built, most of our mitigation actions would be used to countermand the damage [done from] the pipeline instead of reducing our present C02 emissions.	CLIM 14
Ronald D'Addario	March 10, 2013	From what I have read from the IPCC and the U.S. National Academy of Science, our window of opportunity to mitigate the most serious consequences of climate change is a small one. Installing such a pipeline could be a game changer in the wrong direction. If built, most of our mitigation actions would be used to countermand the damage done by the pipeline instead of reducing our present C02 emissions.	CLIM 14
Ronald D'Addario	March 10, 2013	Due to the difficulty of extraction, filtering, heating, and transport, processing tar sands oil from the mine to the car results in 40% to 70% more greenhouse gas emissions than does an average barrel of oil.	PN 02
Ronald Dauner	April 13, 2013	certainly you must know that the worst consequence of pursuing this course will without a doubt be a worsening of global climate change.	CLIM 14
Ronald Grosslein	April 21, 2013	I'm writing to encourage the Department of State to consider climate effects of the proposed Keystone pipeline. What are the ramifications of millions of Bangladeshis rushing across their borders as sea level rises? What effects might we expect if the world opinion sees the US serving only its narrow short term interests, and ignoring the remarkable consensus of science that we are in deep trouble?	PN 05, CLIM 16
Ronald Hibbert	April 22, 2013	We cannot stand any more water contamination. with population growth and farmer and industry contamination our grandchildren are going to run out of decent water !!!	WRG 01
Ronald Kaminski	April 9, 2013	...an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ronald Kaminski	April 9, 2013	The Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality approved the new route that avoids the Sandhills and sensitive areas of our state, and the State Department just issued an environmental review confirming the minimal impact on the environment of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline.	ALT 06
Ronald Kenigson	April 22, 2013	The true price we will all wind up paying is not only in the cleanup of the devastating toxic pollution…	RISK 21
Ronald Or Judith Inskeep	March 7, 2013	We should be concentrating on conservation and alternative sources of energy.	ALT 02
Ronald Or Judith Inskeep	March 7, 2013	The tar sands are abrasive and would cause wear on the inside of the pipeline, leading to leaks	RISK 11
Ronald Or Judith Inskeep	March 7, 2013	The route is too close to water supplies	WRS 01, WRG 01
Ronald Or Judith Inskeep	March 30, 2013	What we need is RENEWABLE sources of energy, plus CONSERVATION	ALT 01
Ronald Or Judith Inskeep	March 30, 2013	This dirty oil should not be used, and extracting it is ruinous to the areas where it is found.	CU 01
Ronald Schlaff	April 17, 2013	In 1958 the concentration of CO2 in earth's atmosphere was about 315 ppm. It is now approaching 390 ppm. Because CO2 is the main factor in climate change driving the planetary heat gain, C02 must be limited. The Keystone Pipeline iwould not only be a purveyor of carbon dioxide equivalent to the emissions of 37 million vehicles, but is a symbol of our determination to either halt the destruction of our climate or sell the future of our planet to special interests	CLIM 11
Ronald Simon	March 28, 2013	It is necessary and right that America leads the world in making a dramatic transition to clean energy	ALT 01
Ronald Snyder	March 22, 2013	Keystone XL will create thousands of jobs here at home and serve as a long-term investment in communities where our energy manufacturers and refineries will be benefit from this vital supply of reliable energy.	PN 10
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	international companies owning right-of-ways dissecting the country and reducing natural resources, good land and water, we rely on.	ACK
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	significant increase of contributions to climate change that costs taxpayers more for each catastrophic storm occurrence	CLIM 12
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	The process to gain a barrel of dilbit produces significant increases of carbon emissions, and significant water pollution in Alberta.	CLIM 14
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	National security is affected by continued oil dependence for energy	PN 02
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	The race to expand exploitation of the Alberta tar-sands, should not be facilitated with establishing a precedent to legally exploit American resources and environment.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ronald_phelps	March 28, 2013	A 30,000 barrel spill in North Dakota on the Original Keystone pipeline, one of 14 reported during it's service, still requires some cleanup. This line is at lower pressures, and is a smaller diameter pipeline, than The Keystone XL design.	RISK 26, RISK 18
Ronna Johnson	April 5, 2013	We have to turn to safer, cleaner sources of renewable energy forces, pouring more funding and support into research and development and do all we can to move away from such dirty sources of energy as tar sands and coal.	PN 02, ALT 01
Ronni Varner	March 15, 2013	No way to clean the toxic chemicals from our drinking water. Our farmers will not be able to water crops, the tainted water will make them unfit for human consumption. The farm animals will not be able to drink it, either. It will mean slow starvation for the inhabitants of the planet	RISK 30, RISK 07, WRG 01
Ronni Varner	April 2, 2013	Granting approval for the Keystone Pipeline will be disastrous for the environment of the entire planet. This oil can never meet US standards for use in the USA, it must be shipped abroad. Wherever it is used, it will do irreparable harm to the earth's atmosphere. You cannot believe the results of the Canadian study - the hired "experts" are all from the oil company seeking approval. Isn't that a bit like having the fox guard the henhouse? There will not be a true evaluation from them.	PRO 01, CLIM 14
Ronnie Blackburn	April 5, 2013	We do NOT need the keystone pipeline and the inherent risks associated with it on a ecological as well as nation security level.	PN 01
Ronnie Bowlin	April 22, 2013	Please REJECT the Keystone XL pipeline through this current route over the last clean water acquifer.	ACK
Rosalie Richter	April 19, 2013	Recent, numerous and significant oil spills from the pipelines carrying the tar sands crude oil, reveal how vulnerable any pipeline will be to the gritty, corrosive, and highly toxic nature of bituminous tar sands oil. The spill are inevitable, given the corrosiveness of the oil and will threaten surface and ground water, air quality, farm land, wildlife, human health and homes.	RISK 11
Rosalie Richter	April 19, 2013	the company, O'Brian, that is contracted to clean future XL pipeline oil spills, has a terrible record of concealing the extent of spills and covering the evidence without removing all of the toxic material. Inside communications at O'brian, for example, revealed direction from management to mix the oil with dirt so the toxic oil is not in evidence.	RISK 13
Rosalie Richter	April 19, 2013	The jobs created, only 35 permanent jobs by the industry's own figures, pales in comparison to the jobs created for Americans if a comparable investment is made in renewable energy initiatives.	SO 05
Rosalind Bresnahan	April 9, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline is dangerous…potential spills…	RISK 21

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rosalyn Snyder	April 2, 2013	Promises from the Oil and Gas Industry have vastly overestimated the reliability of their safety procedures and underestimated the risks.The draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on the Keystone XL pipeline underestimates the pipeline's health and environmental risks.	RISK 14
Rosanne Couston	March 11, 2013	Before any decision is made, a thorough and transparent review of the Keystone XL pipeline is needed to ensure that our communities, wildlife habitat, waterways, and climate are protected.	LEG 04
Roscoe Edney	March 15, 2013	The same money spent on new technology and renewable energy will result in long term jobs, a cleaner environment and a real return on your investment.	SO 05
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	Keystone XL's polluting tar-sands oil will only exacerbate an already catastrophic climate situation, further decimating critically diminished biodiversity which cannot adapt quickly enough to survive a warming planet and resultantly volatile climate fluctuations. As such, the Keystone XL pipeline is also a disaster for threatened and endangered species which are facing extinction at an alarming rate.	ACK
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	the Keystone XL pipeline will encourage further development of Canada's tar sands -- with disastrous consequences for the environment. Extraction and refinement of tar-sands oil produces two to three times more greenhouse gases than conventional oil. It also represents a massive new source of fossil fuels that would be catastrophic for the climate.	CLIM 12
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	Global warming emissions from burning fossil fuels are endangering our health, our environment, and drastically altering our climate	CLIM 16
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	Development of the tar sands is leading to the destruction of millions of acres of boreal forest	CU 01
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	Development of the tar sands requires three barrels of fresh water for every barrel of oil produced in the process	CU 07
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	it will not ease U.S. gas prices nor reduce our nation's dependence on Middle Eastern oil imports...Keystone XL is in fact an EXPORT pipeline...Keystone will NOT further U.S. Energy security by lessening our nation's dependence on foreign oil, as advocates claim, but is instead intended for the transport of Canadian oil to American refineries for export to overseas markets. The majority of the fuel refined from the pipeline's heavy crude oil will NEVER reach U.S. drivers' tanks. This pipeline is not in our national interest.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	An existing pipeline called Keystone 1 has already leaked 14 times since it began operations in June 2010 -- including one spill that dumped 21,000 gallons of tar-sands crude. Other pipelines have also had massive spills in recent years, including one in 2010 that leaked 800,000 gallons of tar sands oil into the Kalamazoo River. This spill has yet to be cleaned up -- because of the propensity of the heavier tar-sands oil to sink, it is not clear that the oil from this spill can ever be cleaned up.	RISK 26
Rose Ann Witt	April 1, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will cross over a thousand water bodies, including the Yellowstone and Platte rivers. A spill into any of these waters would be a disaster.	WRS 01
Rose Gomez	April 22, 2013	Alternate energy sources are key for sustainability.	PN 02
Rose Huelsman	April 9, 2013	What scares me the most is the real possiblity of spills entering the aquifers on which human life, animal life, and crops depend. An equally grave concern iw the amount of water that is being taken out of the hydrologic cycle by tar sands removal. We are already facing world-wide water shortages which will only get worse.	RISK 07
Rose Marie Tresp	March 10, 2013	Using contractors for the company building the pipeline to write the report is just plain dshonest.	PRO 01
Rose Marie Wilson	April 5, 2013	What's more, a new Gallup pole revealed that the majority of the people, including Republicans, favor solar and wind energy over oil and gas. [http://www.gallup.com/poll/161519/americans-emphasis-solar-wind-natural-gas.aspx] Americans have made it clear that we want green, renewable energy sources, and we want to stop using dirty fossil fuels.	ALT 01
Rose Mary Johnson	March 29, 2013	The risks of a spill affecting the water supply in Nebraska are great	RISK 07
Rose Mary Johnson	March 29, 2013	TransCanada should provide a more thorough description of the fuel entering the pipe	RISK 12
Rose Mary Johnson	March 29, 2013	TransCanada has a history of insufficient spill cleanup	RISK 25
Rose Mary Johnson	March 29, 2013	Hiring of union employees will not benefit the local economy	SO 06
Rose Mary Sullivan	April 19, 2013	The idea of utilizing any of our water supply to acquire oil makes absolutely no sense to me.	CU 07
Rose Miksovsky	March 15, 2013	The SEIS's range of alternatives is inadequate as it fails to disclose other viable alternatives to the pipeline for the development of energy.	ALT 01
Rose Miksovsky	March 15, 2013	The SEIS is still deficient in key areas and fails to adequately disclose the impacts to water sources and supplies, particularly if a spill occurs.	RISK 07
Rose Miksovsky	March 15, 2013	The SEIS…. fails to adequately disclose the risks to people of the toxic substances involved in this project.	RISK 12
Rose Miksovsky	March 15, 2013	The SEIS…..fails to adequately disclose impacts to fish and wildlife and the impacts of the destruction of habitat.	WI 25

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rose Schneider RN BSN MPH	March 25, 2013	I am concerned about the health effects on the US population from this pipeline. The scientific journals have documented the harm done, especially to minority and indigenous populations from the increased use of carbon intensive oil.	RISK 30, CU 04
Rose Zuniga	March 26, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	CLIM 05
Rosemarie Kuhn	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Rosemary Slabaugh	April 13, 2013	The EIS for the Keystone pipeline was woefully inadequate as it did not address spill issues and effects such as the one in Arkensas last week.	RISK 13
Rosemary Thornton	April 22, 2013	We live north of the Niobrara River...We are concerned about all the rivers and streams in the route of the pipeline when a spill occurs. We have read widely about the pipeline and believe it to be the worst possible project for anyones country, no matter what the route.	RISK 07
Rosie Umstattd	April 9, 2013	Keystone will go through Native American reservations thus making their already pitifully poor lives and healthcare even worse.	EJ 01
Rosiland Dupont	April 15, 2013	this will not improve the US economy, it is the Canadian corporation that will be making money while we in the US must live through the inevitable spills and further pollution of land and water.	PN 05
Ross	April 22, 2013	This is not about making temporary jobs for Nebraskans and others, but about providing a way for big oil to transport dirty crude to refineries in the south. It is also not about energy independence because there is no requirement that the refined petroleum be sold in the US and most will be shipped overseas to bolster corporate profits.	PN 07
Ross Cannon	April 9, 2013	This tar sand sludge is really hard on the dang pipelines. its like running sandpaper through there. eventually the walls are degraded and then OMG leaks, gushers. its silly.	RISK 11
Ross K	March 1, 2013	Make no mistake, the keystone pipeline benefits no one in the longterm.	PN 08
Ross Mccluney	March 28, 2013	If they want to build the pipeline west to the Canadian coast, let them do it. The Canadians may think twice about that and realize the folly and stop.	ALT 05
Ross Mccluney	March 28, 2013	There has to be a better way to transition away from fossil fuels than investing in this dirty technology.	PN 02
Rossi Dudrick	March 6, 2013	inevitable leaks from this pipeline would pollute vital waterways including drinking water for Americans.	RISK 07
Rosy Jones	April 10, 2013	Consider the devastation any leakage in such a pipeline would cause to the environment.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rouwenna Lamm	March 29, 2013	In addition to the emissions from the energy needed to EXTRACT the tar sands, of course, burning the tar sands oil also emits MORE CO2, furthering climate change.	CLIM 12
Rouwenna Lamm	March 29, 2013	It takes a LOT of energy to extract tar sands. This produces 3-4 times more CO2 than the extraction of conventional oil.	CLIM 12
Rouwenna Lamm	March 29, 2013	By increasing the tar sands flowing into the U.S., we're encouraging the damaging practices of extracting the tar sands: clear cutting, using lots of energy from cleaner sources to mine a very dirty fuel out of the ground, and filling huge ponds with toxic slurry (which we know often leaks, causing contamination of the surrounding area).	CU 02
Rouwenna Lamm	March 29, 2013	The refining of this oil will decrease the air quality near the refineries. Emissions from oil refineries are linked to serious health issues such as heart and lung disease, asthma, cancer and decreased life expectancy. To make this worse, tar sands oil is higher in pollutants such as sulfur and nitrogen that form smog and heavy metals like lead, mercury and arsenic.	CU 04
Rouwenna Lamm	March 29, 2013	This pipeline will go over the Ogalala aquifer, which supplies drinking water for two million people and $20 billion in agriculture. If there were an oil spill that got into this key water supply, which would be disastrous. We all know oil spills happen.	WRG 01
RoxAnn Boettcher	April 22, 2013	Make [Transcanada] accountable for the safety of all of their current pipelines.	RISK 14
Roxann Parran	April 11, 2013	We are lucky that small spill happened now, to show us the dangers of doing this on a large scale. It is not worth the ecological impact. Some things even though they will make money and employ people are just wrong . This is one of those things.	ACK
Roxanne Staley	April 13, 2013	Solar, wave and wind power are the only sane way for our world to go forward.	PN 02
Roxanne Wach	April 22, 2013	[There is] no good means to clean up a spill and the chemically-polluted tar sand sludge is insidious. Its not good for Nebraska, not good for the environment, disastrous for the Ogallala aquifer and the farm land surround it……. I dont want this toxic scheme running through Nebraska. There is no way to restore a precious water supply…….. The people who lose? Nebraskans, the environment, the farmers and ranchers, the delicate wildlife, the precious aquifer and water supply.	RISK 08, RISK 07, WRG 01
Roxanne Zwier-swanson	April 10, 2013	We have seen with recent pipeline breaks the damage that can occur to the environment from a pipeline rupture. If approved, Keystone XL will transverse the Ogallala Aquifer which is the source of drinking and irrigation water for much of the great plains states. Contamination of this precious resource would devastate the health of that region and the economy of the entire United States. This becomes a national security issue. Who in their right mind would approve such a project?	WRG 01, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Roxie Newberry	April 16, 2013	I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL says that the pipeline would have a negligible impact on climate change. I strongly disagree, and the facts point to the truth that building the pipeline would be an environmental disaster to an already warming planet. A new report shows that the XL pipeline would send at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent each year into the atmosphere, further warming the Earth's climate. These emissions compare to emissions from 51 coal-fired power plants or tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars. Do not allow this pipeline to be built. It will hasten the disastrous course of global warming already will on the way due to fossil fuel emissions. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest	PN 05
Roy Baker	March 18, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would increase America’s energy security and strengthen our relationship with Canada. Canada will develop their oil reserves regardless of your decision about Keystone XL, and the oil will find its way to dirtier refineries in China via less efficient tankers.	PN 01
Roy Bigler	March 28, 2013	In light of ALL the recent and on-going oil leaks plaguing the world, PLEASE stop this criminal abuse of the environment!!	ACK
Roy Bigler	March 28, 2013	The number of jobs purported to be created by the XL is nominal, at best.	PN 05
Roy Ingham	March 14, 2013	What are the catastrophic consequences of burning tar sands oil. Global warming. The emissions from its combustion are greater than that of sweet crude. Much greater!	CLIM 12
Rs	April 21, 2013	Although the Keystone Pipeline may contribute only part of the earth's total increase of gasses affecting climate change, I believe it is essential that United States do all we can to decrease dependence on fossil fuels (especially those from tar sands). Therefore, I urge you to deny permission for the pipeline to cross the United States.	PN 05
Rudy Luehs	April 13, 2013	Why not just build an open air aqueduct for them[tar sands]?	ALT 10
Rui Liborio	March 30, 2013	If we don't convert to renewable energy now, you are letting greed and unaccountable power decide our future.	ALT 01
Rui Liborio	March 30, 2013	You only have to read the science literature just a little to know that Climate Change is the biggest threat to our national security since the cold war. Yes, it is even greater than the threat of terroism.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Russ Plaeger	April 21, 2013	There is evidence from recent spills of tar sands-derived oil, in rivers in the U.S., that the oil is heavier than other oils. That makes it more difficult and expensive to clean up because it sinks to the bottom of the water. The result can be increased impact to aquatic organisms, freshwater ecosystems and the people who depend on them for their livelihood and recreation.	RISK 14
Russ Souchek	April 22, 2013	I know that the water table rises to the surface in this area and so the pipeline then would be submerged. I am concerned that as the sand of the area is moved by the wind the pipeline at a four foot depth will become exposed.	SOIL 06
Russ Wilson	April 7, 2013	What happens if a leak occurs where this proposed pipeling crosses a main freeway? Or through a subdivision of homes? How will the Government apologize, and take care of the citizens empacted by that event?	RISK 20
Russell Jurkovich	April 12, 2013	Oil can only be transported so many ways, pipeline, ships, rail and trucks with ther own pros and cons.	ACK
Russell Ketch	April 2, 2013	if they'd just invest the money they plan to spend on construction, land leases, clean ups, security to prevent vandalism, etc., by investing it in renewable, clean, environmentally safe fuel sources	ALT 01
Russell Ketch	April 2, 2013	Does the insurance mandated by the governmnet to pay for remediation needed after a spill or leak occurs also pay for damages to the residents or businesses or farms or national or state parks for their loss of property value, damage to underground aquifers and the crops, animals, downstream communities who depend on that water until it's drinkable again? Is the insurance coverage prorated on the risks that the oil companies have already demonstrated is needed considering how much oil will be spilled in terms of pipeline capacity, flow rate, and length, times all the expenses a spill creates? Don't you think the companies would want to clean up their own mess?	LEG 06
Russell Mcglothlin	April 22, 2013	Notably, the SEIS inaccurately accounts for the total life cycle carbon emissions from the project. There are an estimated 240 gigatons of carbon stored in the tar sands, about half the carbon budget (500Gt) that scientists estimate we can use to stay under 2 degrees of warming.	CLIM 05
Russell Michaelson	April 10, 2013	If Canada wants to ship that oil to Asia let them pipe it to Vancouver, BC & let them pollute their land & Port.	ALT 05
Russell Michaelson	April 10, 2013	Oil will be tankered out of Gulf of Mexico (endangering that body of water) to highest bidder likely China /Asia & won't be for U S consumption.	PN 07
Russell Michaelson	April 10, 2013	This will only create about 2,000 American jobs that will last about a year.	SO 04
Russell Symonds	April 5, 2013	Let's create and support even more alternative clean sources of energy rather than continue to expand facilities for filthy fossil fuels such as the Keystone XL Pipeline.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Rusty Nelson	April 16, 2013	Please examine the report that accounts for the carbon footprint of the pipeline. It finds it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent/year, comparable to tailpipe emissions from 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants.	ACK
Ruth Afifi	March 6, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline will not benefit the U.S. except for some temporary jobs building it.	PN 05
Ruth Afifi	March 6, 2013	The Canadian tarsands synthetic crude will be exported to Asia, and the greenhouse gases from this exceptionally dirty fuel will exacerbate global warming.	PN 07, CLIM 14
Ruth Ann Prag Carter	April 11, 2013	But the creators of this draft tell us we don't need to worry about what tar sands will do to our climate	ACK
Ruth Ann Prag Carter	April 11, 2013	the creators of this draft…barely touch on the risks associated with tar sands oil spills.	RISK 21
Ruth Bosco	April 1, 2013	I would like to see instead [of the Keystone Pipeline], investment in green energy and alternative, non-food based fuels.	ALT 01
Ruth Bosco	April 1, 2013	… and we can not afford to burn up that much more fossil fuel, considering its impact on the ozone layer.	CLIM 14
Ruth Bosco	April 1, 2013	The Environmental impact is not worth the "gains," …	PN 05
Ruth Brotsky	March 3, 2013	This pipeline would be a huge detriment to farmers and ranchers in Nebraska plus everyone else that lives in Nebraska due to it's crossing of the aquafer.	ACK
Ruth Brotsky	March 3, 2013	I urge you to seriously look at this pipeline going through the Nebraska sandhills and aquafer. You have been sadly misinformed if you believe that this pipeline route has been re-routed around the aquafer and the sandhills. You need to do your own study of this pipeline and realize where it is going to be placed.	WRG 06
Ruth Calkins Calkins	March 20, 2013	I believe that natural gas, found in abundance here, is probably the best interim answer to our energy needs until we can harness renewables in a safe and inexpensive fashion.	PN 02
Ruth Carr	March 23, 2013	The process of producing oil from tar sands releases considerably more CO2 into the atmosphere than the processing of regular oil. Top scientists have warned about the toxic impact of tar sands production. … Our President's reputation as a courageous leader supporting alternative energy will be permanently damaged. The whole world, which looks for US leadership on the environment, and future generations experiencing climate change, will suffer if he takes the backward step of approving the Keystone pipeline	CLIM 12
Ruth Carr	March 23, 2013	The estimated number of jobs created is grossly overstated, and most of the jobs would be only temporary anyway. #3 Most Americans do not realize that the US would probably gain only about one-fifth of the oil coming through the pipeline. The free port of Pt Arthur would be busy with oil tankers from China, Latin America, and elsewhere shipping out the vast majority of the oil.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ruth Carr	March 23, 2013	Pipelines do leak. Any leakage of the pipeline carrying the dirty tar sands oil could severely damage the surrounding clean water and pristine grasslands of our country.	RISK 07
Ruth Chantry	April 22, 2013	Here in Nebraska, an immense resource in the Ogallala Aquifer will be compromised. We have seen in other places so to think it couldn't happen here is ridiculous. In an extreme drought year and headed towards the same this year -- possibly the worst drought in 80 years -- the idea of compromising our drinking water, as well as our landscape, our health & our land -- is so short-sighted as to be beyondcomprehension.	WRG 03, WRG 01
Ruth Charloff	April 11, 2013	The last thing we should be doing now is locking ourselves into greater carbon emissions.	CLIM 14
Ruth Cook	April 22, 2013	Supporters say it would mean jobs for our citizens, but it would mean jobs only in the short term in exchange for destruction in the long term.	PN 02
Ruth Davidson Hahn	April 22, 2013	The oil companies should build a refinery in Canada instead of having these pipes go through all of our states	ALT 08
Ruth Elaine Bitzel	April 17, 2013	So many of us citizens are against a pipeline that will not provide the U.S. with clean energy (or even dirty energy as it will be shipped from our shores), who is "for" this project. I guess there must be big money for the oil industry.	PN 05
Ruth Farthing	March 6, 2013	I am so sad when I see animals covered in oil like what happened with the BP oil spill.	ACK
Ruth Farthing	March 6, 2013	We need to learn lessons from oil spills and set our focus on Wind and Solar power.	ALT 01
Ruth Farthing	March 6, 2013	It is not something that can be cleaned up when it spills.	RISK 08
Ruth Gillan	April 22, 2013	Keep this pipeline away from most of the nations croplands. A chance of contamination is so great, Too many times of leaks!!!!! You know it, you see it, and you hear it!!! A great many jobs & generations of ongoing agriculture jobs could be destroyed. The future of many generations of U.S. citizens and their livelihoods is at stake, Dont let it happen.	SO 12, RISK 24
Ruth Hardinger	April 16, 2013	Renewable energy is much more a job creator because it is much more labor intensive.	SO 05
Ruth Hunt	April 4, 2013	The SEIS "is woefully inadequate in that it only seriously investigated the regional climate change impacts of the pipeline itself and not how the increased use of carbon-intensive oil would impact global climate change".	CLIM 12
Ruth Major	April 11, 2013	Lead the world in clean energy	PN 02
Ruth O'neal	March 11, 2013	Texan farmers did not want the pipeline running through their ranches.	ACK
Ruth O'neal	March 11, 2013	Keystone XL does not reduce our dependence on foreign oil but does enrich the Canadian coffers!!	PN 05
Ruth O'neal	March 11, 2013	There has been a huge overestimate of American jobs to be created by this dirty pipleline. Even the steel is imported	SO 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ruth Paine	March 6, 2013	The path planned for it goes through some of the best wind energy states. When subsidies for all sources of fuel energy are removed from the calculation, wind is the cheapest!	PN 02
Ruth Reischman Guinan	April 17, 2013	Once again I am begging you not to vote for the project which will only cause more climate change. Anyone who reads the newspaper or watches tv is aware of the terrible catastrophies that have occurred in the past few years. The US needs to send a strong message internationally that we are serious about combatting the effects of climate change. Voting for the pipeline will send just the opposite message as we continue to pollute the air and water.	CLIM 18
Ruth Rogers	March 19, 2013	THE TECHNOLOGY OF THE FOLLOWING ENERGY SOURCES IS BEING USED IN OTHER COUNTRIES -- WHO LAUGH BEHIND THE USA. WE -- THE USA -- CAN GO FULL SPEED AHEAD WITH WOODEN WIND TURBINES, WOODEN WINDMILLS, SOLAR PANELS FOR ELECTRIC ENERGY, SOLAR THERMAL ENERGY FOR HEATING AND COOLING, AND FLOAT AND BOAT WAVE ENERGY, WITH POSSIBLE USE OF THE -- NON-HARMFUL BIO-FUELS -- ALL THESE DONE AS PEOPLE AND EARTH FRIENDLY.	PN 02
Ruth Vacin	April 4, 2013	Do not add the Keystone XL pipeline for more potential pollution and desecration of animal and plant life, to say nothing of human habitation.	RISK 07
Ruth Wallen	April 22, 2013	Climate change is serious, with devastating economic as well as ecological consequences. …. Instead we can stimulate the economy by improving energy efficiency.	SO 05
Ruth Windham	April 15, 2013	Aside from the predictable spills from the pipeline, some of the long-term costs to our country from Keystone XL will be associated with dealing with the impact to the economy and to our people (and all people) of more severe weather from climate change. If those costs were to be estimated in dollars that might help us understand what an overwhelmingly negative impact this project could have compared to such small benefits.	SO 13
Ruth Zalph	March 28, 2013	Promises of water and earth and air not becomming polluted from the pipeline is an out and out lie. Remember all the past promises and the facts from Bophal, India to the Gulf oil spill.	ACK
Ruth Zalph	March 28, 2013	Scientists has shown that wind , solar, ocean power can provide clean energy from now on. It is a matter of WILL.	ALT 01
Ruthanne Gash	April 3, 2013	The spill in Mayflower, Arkansas is a prime example of the environmental impact of the tar sand spill. Arkansas prides itself on being the Natural State. There is nothing natural about the mess created by a broken tar sands pipeline.	RISK 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ryan Bunson	April 5, 2013	More and more evidence mounts that the oil industry has no way to clean up any type of spill that will occur with the Keystone XL pipeline as evidenced by what is still ongoing in Kalamazoo	RISK 29
Ryan Dillingham	April 16, 2013	As I understand it deforestation is also a major result of tar sand production. Deforestation has affected many different species and groups of species. Many species depend on large areas of forest for their survival. If this habitat is fragmented they are often challenged with either adapting or extirpation. Since adaptation typically takes a very long time these organisms are often extirpated from their home. The edge habitat produces by deforesting the forest changes the composition of the species found in that environment and this combination changes the function of those ecosystems. In many cases the resulting discontinuous habitat forces larger fauna into smaller habitats or into other individual's habitats. The result, if large enough, has been known to push certain groups of populations to diminishing numbers.	CU 02
Ryan Dillingham	April 16, 2013	In addition to historic spills I would also like to mention the fact that any time a natural, or anthropogenic ecosystem is disturbed this disturbance invites invasive species. Invasive species have become a major problem in the United States and we spend billions of dollars every year fighting these predators. It is nearly guaranteed that the production of this pipeline will propagate and encourage invasive species.	WI 05
Ryan Kruse	March 14, 2013	At a time where unemployment is decreasing, U.S. economy improving and global unrest stabilizing, we cannot afford the oil pumped down the Keystone XL pipeline to tie up U.S. Refineries and Storage, increasing our already high fuel prices. The Keystone XL pipeline shortcut would NOT bring the economic activity and energy security to the United because it’s profits over people	PN 04
Ryan Kruse	March 14, 2013	…. Keystone XL pipeline DOES NOT serve the national interest because the majority of the oil and fuel produced will be sold outside North America which will keep our prices we pay at the pump high and go higher due to less refining for our own supply and tie up storage.	PN 07, PN 04
Ryan Kruse	March 14, 2013	….construction of the pipeline could create tens of thousands of temporary jobs and only around 50 permanent jobs.	SO 04
Ryan Mcclure	April 22, 2013	it is foreign oil that will be placed on the world market (not even a guarantee for domestic use)...we need to work on converting to renewable energy completely. Blocking this from the world market will increase the cost and thus begin the process of looking for alternative sources of energy that are renewable.The taxes must also be increased on oil and gas in an effort to help pay for the negative externalities associated with their usage. These small steps must be used to artificially inflate the costs so that alternative sources of energy may become the norm.	PN 07, PN 03, SO 16

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ryan Tinney	March 17, 2013	Please, protecting our climate and environment are the most essential in the continuation for human progress.	PN 09
Ryan Tonniges	April 22, 2013	I therefore add my name to BOLD Nebraskas petition in hopes TransCanadas tar sands pipeline project is fully reviewed with environmental oversight free from abuses from TransCanada to our citizens and hopefully without avariciousness a properly made decision to preserve our infinite resources and not our finite resources.	LEG 04
S Allwein	April 17, 2013	Why not build a refinery on the Canadian .border ?	ALT 08
S. Brennan	April 12, 2013	We must begin now reducing carbon emissions if we want to slow the progress of the steady warming we have been experiencing	CLIM 14
S. Brennan	April 12, 2013	We have to put our money into renewable energy, not energy that is destroying our planet.	PN 03
S. Flank	April 22, 2013	As a member of the public, I was distressed to see the narrow range of alternatives addressed by the SEIS for this project...None of the alternatives in the SEIS examined alternative deployments of the equivalent amount of investment capital, and the comparative environmental impact if other energy resources (including efficiency and conversation) benefited from a similar investment...There are real alternatives to this pipeline, which would be more beneficial along almost any metric -- why aren't those alternatives examined by the SEIS?	ALT 01
S. J. Reineck	April 13, 2013	We do not want these pipelines criss-crossing our country, and putting our aquifers and residents at risk.	WRG 01
S. Jael Simpson	April 22, 2013	We should leave this beautiful aquifer alone!! I dont see how anyone can guarantee that a huge catastrophy will not occur with how many pipeliine busts we have seen in the last few years. Im sure there is a way to succeed to accomplish what you think is necessary in a better more ecofriendly and act with conservation in mind	ACK
S. Spacek	April 9, 2013	I call on you to revise your department's review and faithfully report the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate.	CLIM 14
S.R. Koogler	March 2, 2013	If sales of refined oil were restricted to US, there would be no incentive for pipeline.	PN 07
S.R. Koogler	March 2, 2013	The pipeline thus far has developed several leaks.	RISK 26
S.R. Koogler	March 2, 2013	Cost to US taxpayers from inevitable future leaks will be millions.	SO 10
S.R. Koogler	March 2, 2013	The only benefits will be to already-wealthy oil interests. Major costs and destructive results will fall on taxpayers.	SO 10
Sabine Clark	April 21, 2013	Unfortunately the pipeline approval process and the consequences has been buried in the news and so many do not understand or know the magnitude of climate change it would accelerate.	CLIM 14
Sabri Ipek	April 21, 2013	In addition to the damage it would do to our climate, extracting the tar sands oil is extremely harmful for the environment where it is done.	CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sabrina Joy Milbury	April 3, 2013	The time is now to truly put our mouths behind environmental protection, alternative energy sources and change.	PN 02
Sabrina King	April 22, 2013	Oil in the proposed Keystone XL pipeline is destined for export, and will not make the US more energy secure. Additionally, TransCanada already has a pipeline in place to carry tar sands oil to a US refinery inland (Keystone I goes to Illinois). The Keystone XL pipeline is therefore not in the national interest.	PN 01
Sabrina King	April 22, 2013	Job numbers are over inflated and misrepresented – TransCanada has reported the Keystone XL pipeline will create between 20,000 and over 100,000 jobs, but the DSEIS states it will create only 35 permanent jobs. Few local jobs will be created – only 10-15% of the total workforce would be hired locally. During Keystone 1 construction only 11% of the construction and inspection workforce in South Dakota was hired locally.	PN 05
Sabrina King	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan (DSEIS Appendix I) is inadequate and does not address the specific concerns of rural communities crossed by the pipeline.	RISK 05
Sabrina King	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS itself observes the lack of infrastructure needed in rural areas, including a lack of hospitals, fire departments, and security. Solutions to these issues are not addressed, and need to be before the pipeline is approved.	RISK 21
Sabrina King	April 22, 2013	Unanswered Questions 1: Who ultimately must deal with the costs associated with a spill or damage? Because the IRS does not consider diluted bitumen to be oil, companies shipping tar sands oil through pipelines like Keystone XL do not pay into the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, meaning taxpayers are directly responsible for the immediate costs of cleanup. 2: Experience from the Endbridge tarsands spill suggest that clean up tends to be incomplete, at times the contaminated oil is just buried, and it can take years for landowners to regain access. Can farmers and ranchers wait that long before ruining their livelihoods?	SO 15, RISK 03
Sadhana Brent	April 19, 2013	My suggestion. Close the tax loopholes and subsudies to oil companies and divert those funds into R&D for alternate solutions to powering our world. We do NOT HAVE TO CONTINUE to foul our food/water/air in order to make Exxon etc even more profitable.	CLIM 18
Sally & Dick Stapp-brigham	March 15, 2013	Read about ocean acidification. Think about the effects of burning fossil fuels increasing the CO2 absorbed into the world's oceans and the shellfish industries that are failing because of ocean acidification destroying the shells. It's real. Human activity - mostly burning fossil fuels - causes it, it getting worse.	CLIM 17

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sally Bianco	April 14, 2013	The areas affected are exponentially larger due to ancillary areas to store equipment, access routes, and other construction needs. The impacts to wildlife in pre-permit documents are based on existing data and not on real surveys of the project area.	WET 10
Sally Bianco	April 14, 2013	Mitigations specified in all documents that claim to reduce impacts to a 'less than significant' level are not adequate, nor are they monitored for enough time to ensure they do anything worthwhile.	WI 07
Sally Blakemore	April 2, 2013	It is for export only and will not help Americans in any way.	PN 07
Sally Chappell	March 21, 2013	Pipelines may be a cheap way to transport fossil energy, but they are dangerous and risky when you consider what is at stake[spills].	RISK 14
Sally Hawkins	March 28, 2013	We all know both Canadian and the US government is catering to the Chinese and it's past time to take responsibility for your people and look after them and the environment.	PN 07
Sally Howard	April 22, 2013	We can meet our energy needs with the alternatives - energy conservation, renewable energy, and less hazardous domestic energy sources.	PN 02
Sally Jensen	April 17, 2013	I am very concerned about the increase of CO2 levels in the atmosphere and the effect this is having on our enviornment, especially the ocean.	CLIM 14
Sally Jensen	April 17, 2013	I realize Canada is determined to extract this oil anyway, but we don't need to facilitate the process.	PN 05
Sally Lawson	March 10, 2013	This is a temporary measure that causes permanent damage. Better to invest in fuel efficiencies, fuel conservation and new technologies than to do this which produces so little for so few for so short a period of time. The real cost of this is a scandal. Energy companies have good PR and effective lobbyists, but they do NOT have a good record of cleaning up their destruction, let alone their reports on the true impact of their practices. Valdez, last time I was there a couple of years ago, still had oil everywhere. The oil failure in the Gulf of Mexico should never have happened, because BP should never have been given the ok to drill in the Gulf.	RISK 13, ALT 01, RISK 25
Sally Mitchell	April 5, 2013	t the Keystone Pipeline would be placed along the migration route of the highly endangered whooping cranes. Construction alone could damage their migration habitat; a spill could mean the end of the less than 300 whooping cranes in the only wild flock. The whooping cranes have made a slow but remarkable recovery from only around 20 remaining birds in the 1940s. Do we want to be the generation that allows this last natural flock to disappear forever?	TES 07
Sally Newell	March 11, 2013	How disappointing that this administration, which purported to be pro-environment, smart about the planet and transparent to the public during the campaign, ends up letting industry write the report on Keystone.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sally Picciotto	April 3, 2013	I am writing today as an environmental epidemiologist. The air pollution resulting from burning fossil fuels is known to cause cardiovascular and respiratory diseases and death, while also causing climate change--which itself poses serious threats to human health. With climate change, we will see increasingly severe weather events including hurricanes, tornadoes, tropical storms, heat waves, and blizzards, all of which can kill; furthermore, malaria and other tropical diseases will spread with their vectors.	CLIM 10
Sally Trathen	April 15, 2013	And the argument that Canada will build the pipeline to the West to their own seaport, if we don't, is a farce. If they could do that both politically and cost effectively, they would have done it. Canadians don't want the pipeline in their backdoor any more than we do.	ACK
Sally Trathen	April 15, 2013	If my information is correct none of the oil carried through the pipeline will end up in American homes or vehicles. We are just a conduit for Canada to sell there oil on the market.	PN 07
Salvatore	April 18, 2013	This land is crisscrossed by the Platte, Missouri and Niobrara Rivers. The Niobrara, designated one of the ten best rivers for recreation in these United States, possesses outstandingly remarkable values that Congress has designated must be protected and boasts a unique crossroads where many species of plants and animals coexist unlike anywhere else in the world. This Missouri River Basin through which the Keystone Pipeline will cross is a fertile basin of rich, unique soils and its heart is the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRS 10
Salvatore Reale	March 19, 2013	If we don't buy the oilshale from Canada, they will sell it to CHINA.	PN 07
Sam Alexander	March 8, 2013	There are several healthier more sustainable solutions that won't kill the caribou, as well as my and many other young peoples dreams.	ACK
Sam Alexander	March 8, 2013	This proposed idea would also cut off migration paths for many migration routes for the caribou, and other species that need to travel through the proposed area. chemicals can already be found in Woodland Buffalo national park.	WI 02
Sam Alexander	March 8, 2013	This endangers the future state of all the land that is near the oil producing areas, but also threatens rivers and waterways that run through the area.	WRS 01
Sam B Hopkins	April 21, 2013	I now add this additional suggestion for a compromise, in the case that tar sands oil production continues. Don't build the pipeline, and instead allow shipment of some tar sands product by rail. When poor EROI of tar sands is finally understood and we wish to stop using it, we shall not have wasted an investment in a pipeline that can neither be used for something else nor scrapped for the salvage value of the metal. The rail cars can, in contrast, be used, for other purposes or more easily converted into scrap metal.	ALT 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sam B Hopkins	April 21, 2013	When considering whether or not to exploit an energy resource it is not enough to only consider the economic cost/benefit. The energetic and greenhouse gas cost benefit should be considered as well. While exploitation of tar sands may be profitable from an economic standpoint, energy return on investment [EROI] analysis shows the resource does not compare to other fossil fuels in terms of the energy provided to society and has a lower return than many renewable resources like wind and energy efficient infrastructure. In addition, production of petroleum from tar sands emits approximately 15% more CO2 per barrel than traditional methods.	PN 02, CLIM 03, SO 13
Sam Bell	April 20, 2013	The history of pipelines has been and continues to be one of spills and leaks.	RISK 13
Sam Carman	April 22, 2013	Please consider the possible risks to the Ogalala Aquifer which not only supplies water to Nebraskans but also to many Iowans, and Kansans. The slight introduction of oil to this amazing natural resource could cause an unprecedented lack of potable drinking water to these states hence endangering nearly 3 million of your constituents health.	RISK 07
Sam Edelman	April 5, 2013	Keystone Pipeline is all risk and no reward, do not build it or pollute anymore.	PN 05
Sam Packard	April 22, 2013	KXL would give the oil industry the go ahead to a means of oil production that destroys huge amounts of habitat and produces extra amounts of carbon, etcetera.	PN 06
Sam Rede	April 22, 2013	The United States NEEDS to take the lead towards a clean energy future and invest in renewable clean energy instead of the polluting and unsustainable tar sands. Building this toxic pipeline would undo the progress weve made towards jump-starting a clean energy economy.	PN 03, ALT 01
Sam Rede	April 22, 2013	We need jobs but oil pipelines arent the only way to create them. Focusing on short term benefits while ignoring the long term environmental and social impact is a risky strategy and NOT in the Nations best interest. Keystone XL is an export pipeline. According to presentations to investors Gulf Coast refiners plan to refine the cheap Canadian crude supplied by the pipeline into diesel and other products for export to Europe and Latin America. Much of the fuel refined from the pipeline's heavy crude oil will never reach U.S. drivers' tanks	PN 05
Sam Rede	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL would allow more oil to be pumped from Canada which opens the way to expanding the tar sands	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sam Rede	April 22, 2013	[The KXL pipeline] poses a massive spill risk in the six states along the pipeline route including over the Ogallala Aquifer which provides up to 30% of our nations agricultural water. If the Keystone XL tar sands oil pipeline is permitted millions of gallons of the dirtiest oil in the world would be piped across America's heartland -– endangering drinking water and the aquifer that irrigates America's breadbasket.	RISK 07
Samantha Ashcraft	April 22, 2013	The KXL route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds, including the Ponca's Trail of Tears. Native tribes are concerned about health and cultural impacts of the pipeline, concerns that have not been adequately addressed by the State Department.	CR 02
Samantha Fleming	March 11, 2013	We must encourage the growth of clean, renewable resources of energy	PN 02
Sammie Rowse	April 22, 2013	If we can move a highway for a beetle why cant we move the pipeline for peoples lives? If they cant afford it they surely wont be able to afford to clean it up if it does leak. It will affect more people than just the ones who live here. The sand will blow out all around the pipeline in the hills and I wonder if the pressure from the water near the surface will also wash it out. We have so many springs and artesian wells here. Wouldnt it be better to put it where the under-ground water is farther down from the surface and the soil is more compact than sand.	SOIL 06, RISK 03, WRG 04
Samuel Chapman	March 4, 2013	The fact that there is potential for the toxic, destructive, and moronic exploitation of the Oil Sands to continue does not mean that the United States government has a responsibility to enable it, particularly after President Obama's State of the Union address.	ACK
Samuel Fishelson	April 22, 2013	Global warming is a disaster in grave need of a solution already. The Keystone XL Pipeline would result in a situation beyond hope.	CLIM 14
Samuel Holder	April 21, 2013	You do not take a chance with the destruction of most of the biosphere, for the sake of profit. I'm not saying that this is guaranteed to happen - we still have a chance. But the trade and production that will result from Keystone, like all other projects of its kind, will only increase the likelihood of this - the climax and full realization of the sixth mass extinction in our planet's history, already underway. All for the purpose of economic growth - not guaranteed to spread to the rest of the population, given the widening class divide between the working and the irresponsibly profiteering - and for a period of wealth that is just as vulnerable as any achievement of human history. Especially vulnerable to the reality of peak oil - which, I might add, is tied to the entire modern agricultural system, and thus the world's currently huge population.	PN 05, CLIM 14, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Samuel McClung	April 11, 2013	Consider this: because of past inaction--for whatever reason--we are strategically weakened with so much dependance on imported fuels. As uncertainty in other oil-exporting countries continues to grow, the 830,000 barrels of oil per day the pipeline would carry from Canada and America's upper plains states would strengthen U.S. energy security and stability and deepen our important trade partnership with Canada.	PN 01
Samuel McClung	April 11, 2013	construction of the pipeline could create tens of thousands of jobs and contribute billions of dollars to the U.S. economy in the form of salaries, materials, services, and other local economic activity.	SO 08
Samuel Smith & Elizabeth Smith	April 20, 2013	Bill McKibben, "Some Like it Hot!: The New York Review, May 9, 2013. McKibben's essay provides an introduction to the following three documents: Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis- editng by John D. Steinbruner, Paul C. Stern and Jo L. Husbands. National Research Council 9238pp) Turn Down the Heat:Why a 4 deg C Warmer world must be avoided. World Bank, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Reasearch and climate Analytics, 2012, November. 58 pp. The Collapse of Western Civilization: A View from the Future. Oreskes, Naomi and Conway, Eric. Daedalus. 2013, winter.	REF
Samuel Vance	April 15, 2013	The oil industry has a miserable record of creating disasters by their lack of proper planning , construction, inspection, and certification of their operations! There is absolutely no reason why we should trust them on any aspect of the Keystone pipeline!	RISK 14
Samuel Williams	March 14, 2013	The Draft Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement relating to construction of the Keystone XL pipeline is at odds with models constructed by competent environmental scientists. Additionally, there are reports of a conflict of interest by the authors of the report. Please research the subject further and obtain input from additional experts on the environment before finalizing this report.	PRO 01
SanchezA	April 18, 2013	Our lands have been taken repeatedly. And the water, we still have rights to that water. We have not been -- they have not talked to us. They have not --we have not consented anything. They have not asked us. There are how many tribes within this road, this map that I see where the water pipes -- the oil pipes are going, they have not consented with any of those tribes. And that still has to be done before this becomes legal.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandi Nichols	March 28, 2013	We will be sending dirty energy to China, only to have the pollution blow back at us within days.	ACK
Sandra And John Walker	March 11, 2013	I am very concerned that the XL pipeline is being billed as a way to get our country independent of foreign oil. That could not be further from the truth. The pipeline will help Trans Canada to get the dirty oil to the world market and as far as I know the US has been promised nothing - no share of that oil. An international corporation is being allowed to use an American right of eminent domain.	PN 07, LEG 02
Sandra Anderson	April 22, 2013	We do not want any more oil pipelines running through our country and are urging you to do the right thing that the majority want and that is to focus all your energy and resources on clean, green, sustainable energy.	PN 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	While the market analysis builds a case to suggest that alternative transportation of crude oil from WCSB and Bakken are not economically feasible, the alternatives assessment actually shows that transportation by rail is economically feasible and is booming….The Keystone Pipeline is expected to pipe 830,000 barrels per day, which could be absorbed by current and additional rail projects but without the environmental impacts and risks that oil pipelines can have.	ALT 04
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	While the SEIS analyzes many alternatives based on economical viewpoints and based on some comments received on the FEIS, the alternatives still do not address many of the concerns that our Tribes have about this Keystone Pipeline Project. No alternatives address design features of the pipeline that would further decrease or eliminate altogether potential oil spills. No alternatives address design features of the pipeline right of way that would completely contain oil from any leaks and spills. With the large number of oil pipeline spills/leaks each year in the US, it stands to reason that pipeline design and spill catchments need to be addressed. Alternatives that address design improvements that would eliminate or greatly reduce spills must be included.	ALT 10
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The Air Quality and Noise Resource sections of Affected Environment address federal and state air quality regulations, but does not examine tribal regulations. Because air quality will be impacted and transported across administrative boundaries, the SEIS must review any and all tribal air and noise quality regulations/standards and address how tribal air quality would be impacted later in Environmental Consequences section 4.12.	AQN 06
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Cultural resource inventories must include tribal members and their resource specialists in both field surveys and final determinations of NRHP eligibility. Moreover, the evaluation of properties of Religious and Cultural Significance never included our Tribe and our connection to the affected area.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Tribal consultation was insufficient. Consultation did not occur with our Tribe. Under NHP A Section 106 and pursuant to several executive orders, Dol consultation policies, and Presidential Memorandums, federal departments/agencies are required to consult with Indian Tribes in a government-to-government process if a tribe may be impacted by a proposed project. While Appendix E Record of Consultation lists a large number of Indian Tribes who were contacted about this project, but our Tribe was not contacted or consulted whatsoever. Our Tribe has historical and current cultural ties to areas that may be impacted by the Project and therefore should have been consulted in a government-to-government forum as required under NHP A and executive orders. Lack of consultation also prevented our Tribe from having an opportunity to be involved in any way with the tribal monitoring activities and the tribal monitoring plan.	CR 01
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Because our Tribe and many other Tribes were precluded from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in cultural resources inventories and fmal determinations, we are concerned about misclassifications of our prehistoric resources, which greatly reduces the number of NRHP eligible sites.	CR 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Furthermore, the lists of cultural resources under Table 3.11-2, Table 3.11-3, and Table 3.11 -4 seem incredibly few for the length of pipeline and this greatly concerns our Tribe not only of because of misclassified cultural resources, but also that cultural resource rich area seem to have been missed or unreported resources.	CR 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	SEIS at 3.11 -28. The PA is problematic because it establish an agreement and included and excluded Tribes from fair and reasonable participation in the NHPA process. A tribe's right to fair and appropriate participation in the identification and evaluation of historic properties exists under NHPA regardless of a PA. Our Tribe was never provided an opportunity to participate at any level in the NHP A process of this Project.	CR 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The SEIS does not fully address or disclose how tribal use of resources will be impacted.	CR 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The SEIS fails to consider tribal land uses under Section 3.9 of the SEIS. Our Tribal members use affected lands for cultural purposes. There are culturally significant sites in the affected area and sites that protected under state, federal and tribal laws that are likely to be impacted from the Keystone Pipeline.	CR 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The Cumulative Effects Analysis (CEA) uses a CEA matrix to illustrate subjective connected and cumulative impacts on certain subjective resource parameters. The determinations of those resource parameters that are included in the CEA matrices are incomplete and not fully representative of potential effects. CEA does not address past, present, future and connected oil releases on/in soil and water supplies that impact the all resources. The CEA does not accurately depict impacts from refinery expansions as may occur once Keystone Pipeline is in place. With the large number of oil releases from oil pipelines and other oil storage and transport facilities, this CEA must also address how Keystone Pipeline would add an increment of impacts from potential oil releases. The CEA fails to assess whether future actions would add an increment to the cumulative. The increments must be illustrated individually and shown how they add to the cumulative effect.	CU 09
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The construction and operation of the Keystone Pipeline will impact all resources parameters that are essential for the public, for wildlife and plants, and for tribal nations and those impacts are not fully evaluated nor disclosed. Connected actions are not fully evaluated and disclosed.	CU 13
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe is also concerned about the insufficient disclosure of environmental justice parameters of Native America people. Many areas along the proposed pipeline will disproportionately impact Native Americans, with much greater risk of adverse health and enviromnental impacts on adjacent tribal lands and/or culturally significant lands and sites.	EJ 01
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The FEIS and SEIS fail to consider major historic earthquake/seismic activity. The SEIS limits the data on seismic activity to the USGS's National Earthquake Information Center database. No effort was made to include seismic activity before 1973...Because major seismic activity can occur in the region, the SEIS must include the history of seismic activity on geologic time scales in the analysis. Currently, the omission of that data prevents our Tribe and the general public from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to review potential issues and risks of the Keystone Pipeline, and prevents an opportunity to challenge this NEP A document.	GEO 01
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Advanced design features must be included in the Alternatives section or required by the Department in order for the Project to proceed. An agreement between TransCanada and the Federal government that would delineate TransCanada's total responsibility in any oil releases from the Project must be included as part of this NEP A document and permit terms and conditions.	PD 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The oil imports vs. oil exports data do not support the contention that oil is being secured for domestic users nor that the US is weaningthemselves off of foreign supplies. SEIS at 1.4-15.	PN 04
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	It is clear from the Keystone Pipeline FEIS and SEIS that the risk to public health, public safety, and environmental necessities that sustain Indian nations and the American public would be extraordinary. Because of this, the Secretary of State cannot approve the Keystone Pipeline Presidential Permit even with the associated terms, conditions, and monitoring and mitigation. This Keystone Project places the burden of catastrophe on the public and the environmental resources upon which Indian nations and the American public require for their livelihoods.	PN 05
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	On one hand, the SEIS identifies that refined oil products from the Gulf Coast will not be exported because transportation costs are too high, but then on the other hand claims that regardless of domestic markets there will be a demand for refined oil products from Gulf Coast refineries. This would mean that even if domestic oil demand were truncated altogether, demand for additional oil would still exist. If the demand is not foreign demand and if it is not domestic, then where is that demand? The SEIS is unclear on this point and switches between demands from foreign vs. domestic to justify different components of the SEIS.	PN 13
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Predicting future markets based on a two-year interval snapshot not only is ripe with technical flaws, but it provides a misleading market baseline.	PN 13
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	While the market analysis estimates transportation costs of exporting oil products to foreign buyers from the Gulf Coast vs. West Coast under Table 1.4-2, the analysis fails to include any analysis of how much oil has been exported from the Gulf Coast historically and currently. If transportation costs of exporting oil from the Gulf Coast were sufficiently high to preclude selling and exporting to foreign buyers, then the SEIS must include an analysis of how much oil is actually exported. Without this type of information, the FEIS and SEIS preclude our Tribe and the public from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to review and challenge this NEP A document.	PN 13
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	The SEIS offers an extensive description of oil spill responses, which it claims under mitigation. Real and effective mitigation must first and foremost be mitigation that avoids potential releases altogether, and with the extensive dataset available on past releases, this Project must use existing pipeline release data in designing pipeline and associated facilities and equipment that will not be subject to oil releases.	RISK 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	A major flaw in the FEIS and SEIS is the failure and insufficiency of addressing potential environmental impacts from oil pipeline spills, leaks, breaches or other releases. The SEIS groups these different types of leaks or spills as "releases". Section 4.13 Potential Releases addresses the "potential releases associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project and connected actions and discusses potential mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize the potential impacts." SEIS at 4.13-1. While the SEIS provides about 30 pages of background on data sources, regulations, responses, and methodology background, it fails to provide scenarios from which assessments of environmental impacts would be based. With the large dataset that is available on oil pipeline spills in the United States, construction of oil release scenarios and conducting corresponding impact analyses must be conducted to provide our Tribe and the general public an opportunity for a real evaluation and challenge of the FEIS and SEIS. The SEIS must illustrate the high and low risk areas on maps so that the reader can readily understand the risk areas. Without this scenario type analysis, the SEIS fails the hard look test of NEP A and prevents our Tribe and the public from having a fair opportunity to tmderstand the potential impacts and hazards of the Keystone Pipeline.	RISK 07
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Further, the SEIS must include an analysis that evaluates multiple scenarios of potential oil release on all resources. This risk analysis has not been sufficiently conducted. Mitigation offered is insufficient. TransCanada must be held responsible for appropriate mitigation and in many cases in this SEIS it appears that the burden of environmental impacts is on American public, Federal and state agencies, and even tribal nations.	RISK 07, RISK 02
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe is also concerned about impacts on sensitive, threatened and endangered species (TES). These TES species are culturally significant and there is no description of that importance in the SEIS.	TES 14
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	Section 3.5.4.6 fails to provide a sufficient synopsis of native plants used for traditional purposes...This limited section fails to take a hard look at this resource parameter, and without a full assessment of those traditionally important plants the SEIS prevents our Tribe from an appropriate opportunity to review and comment on the NEPA document as provided for under NEPA and NHPA.	VEG 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	There is no subsection in Wildlife Resources or Fisheries Resources that addresses Native American traditional uses of fish and wildlife such as hunting, fishing and spiritual purposes. The SEIS provided no mention of bison in the areas potentially impacted by the Project...The SEIS justifies no assessment of impacts on bison by stating that "[f]ree-ranging bison no longer occur within the area that would be crossed by the proposed Project route". SEIS at 3.6-2.	WI 20
Sandra Barela, Ely Shoshone Tribe	April 22, 2013	In the Water Resources section, the SEIS fails to evaluate pristme waters, protected waters, or wild and scenic rivers or other protected designations. Instead, the SEIS evaluates Impaired or Contaminated Waterbodies and attempts to establish a misleading baseline condition for water resources by selectively including this water parameter while excluding other important water parameters. This skewed baseline assessment and exclusion of information prevents our Tribe from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to effectively review and comment on this NEPA document. Also, that exclusion fails to meet NEPA's requirement to take a hard look at all possible impacts.	WRS 11, WRS 10
Sandra Bielenberg	April 9, 2013	The length and enormity of the Keystone XL pipeline guarantees there will be more spills which will devastate the surrounding areas - homes, water supplies, habitats, farmland.	RISK 18
Sandra Blinn	March 11, 2013	An unintended consequence would be severe/terminalnillness for many of those workers--AND large increases in healthcare costs.	RISK 30
Sandra Botson	April 2, 2013	With Keystone XL, our crude imports from Canada could reach 4 million barrels per day by 2020, which will create jobs in the USA and help us with the costs of energy.	PN 10
Sandra Chalk	April 17, 2013	We don't need the dirty oil that will endanger the water table across the plains	ACK
Sandra Chalk	April 17, 2013	Say NO and put our energy into safe, renewable fuel - it can be done if America's great talents are behind the effort.	ALT 01
Sandra Dvorsky	April 2, 2013	This dangerous pipeline would put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk!!	RISK 07
Sandra Fairley	April 22, 2013	this pipeline crossing a portion of the shallow aquifer...our precious ground water is much too valuable to put it at risk.	WRG 01
Sandra Haddock	March 11, 2013	We must move forward on all fronts immediately moving all our systems toward sustainability. You must not fail us. You must not fail our children and grandchildren. This issue is vital to the very survival of the human race, and inevitably, all species on Earth. You must move us forward to efficiency. You must move us toward zero carbon emissions. ZERO ZERO ZERO	PN 02
Sandra Heater	April 4, 2013	It is essential to delve into the origin of this study to find whose vested interests are served	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Heater	April 5, 2013	We must find self renewing, clean sources of energy. A good place to start is stripping major oil and gas producers of their many tax benefits. Those revenues are better spent on research and development.	PN 02
Sandra Heater	April 5, 2013	One has only to look at Arkansas over the past days to realize the Keystone XL is a disaster waiting to happen	RISK 24
Sandra Jarvis	March 28, 2013	The pipeline will only create a small number (50) full time jobs and will not relieve energy needs in this country. The danger is too great to approve this project at the risk of our future and our children's future.	PN 05
Sandra McConnell	April 22, 2013	It will not decrease the price of gas at the pump, it will not create long term, good paying jobs.	PN 04
Sandra Moura	April 10, 2013	PLEASE do a more thorough review of ALL environmental impacts the tar sands pipeline could and will have in the near future.	ACK
Sandra Myers	March 31, 2013	no guarantee that oil drilled would remain in the western hemisphere benefiting us and ending dependency on middle eastern oil and countries from which we get it.	PN 05
Sandra Myers	March 31, 2013	few jobs would be permanently created	SO 02
Sandra O'brien	March 11, 2013	We need to invest in clean (no such thing as clean coal) renewable energy.	PN 02
Sandra O'flaherty	March 9, 2013	The administration's own top climate scientist Jim Hansen has said that further developing the Canadian Tar Sands is "game over" for the climate. There is no way the EIS for the KXL pipeline can legitimately say it will have no significant effect on climate and CO2 emissions.	CLIM 14
Sandra O'flaherty	March 9, 2013	Furthermore, the question of oil spilling from the KXL pipeline is a matter of when, not if. This is bad news for communities of people and wildlife in the corridor.	RISK 14
Sandra O'flaherty	March 9, 2013	Most alarmingly is how the pipeline could contaminate the already drought-threatened and overused Ogallala aquifer, on which much of the Midwest depends.	WRG 03, RISK 07
Sandra Porter	March 18, 2013	This amount of carbon would put us over the climate cliff	CLIM 05
Sandra Porter	March 18, 2013	This is not about energy independence for the United States, much of the resulting oil would be sold on the world market, giving the oil companies involved more profit.	PN 04
Sandra Porter	March 18, 2013	Saying that it would be extracted any way would make us - would make you Mr. President - complicit in keeping the U.S. and the world on a pathway to killing this beautiful planet.	PN 06
Sandra Porter	March 18, 2013	The first Environmental Impact Statement done for the Keystone XL pipeline was done by a company with strong business ties to TransCanada, making it void.	PRO 01
Sandra Porter	March 18, 2013	There would be a small number of temporary jobs, and very very few permanent jobs.	SO 04
Sandra Rudy	March 24, 2013	There are other sources of energy.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Rudy	March 24, 2013	The most important problem with the pipeline is the potential catastrophic damage to the aquifers in the states through which it will pass. We need good, clean water much more than we need oil.	WRG 01
Sandra S. Slaymaker	April 22, 2013	It is wrong to allow this country (Canada) access to the lands of Indigenous Nations.	ACK
Sandra S. Slaymaker	April 22, 2013	It is wrong to allow a foreign country to take our land by the use of eminent domain.	LEG 02
Sandra Safran	April 2, 2013	Why should we be jeopardizing our environment for a fossil fuel which is a fuel of the past. We need to move on to the future and invest in solar, WIND, geo-thermal and switchgrass fuels.	ALT 01
Sandra Shand	March 6, 2013	the Canadians themselves are not likely to develop their own tarsands and pipeline because of strong opposition in Canada to environmental destruction. So US support for this pipeline will release a further blow to efforts to protect the environment that would otherwise not likely happen.	PN 06
Sandra Speicher	March 20, 2013	we are destroying the migratory home of millions of birds and the permanent home to countless other animals [implied in Canada].	CU 01
Sandra Speicher	March 20, 2013	I do not believe that it is a forgone conclusion that if we (the US) doesn't assist in the transportation of the tar sands, someone else will. Many citizens of Canada have also expressed strong objections. This is why the oil industry is pursuing the US so aggressively.	PN 06
Sandra Speicher	March 20, 2013	Fourth, the number of jobs that will be created is not a great one…we can create more jobs by approving funding to repair our aging infrastructure or providing fiber optics to every community to make us more competitive	SO 05
Sandra Uribe	March 28, 2013	Let legitimate scientists study the process and its many pitfalls.It's time to make intelligent decisions that will benefit the many for generations to come.	ACK
Sandra Uribe	March 28, 2013	"there will be many jobs." So we should all accept the many risks so that the powerful may benefit on that one promise. There are other safer and healthier ways to create jobs.	PN 05
Sandra Woodall	April 4, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis	CLIM 05
Sandra Woodall	April 4, 2013	without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security	PN 01
Sandra Woodall	April 4, 2013	Families across America have already endured immense hardship as a result of the climate change-fueled droughts, storms, floods, and wildfires we've seen this past year. Now is the time to advance climate solutions, not develop the dirtiest oil on earth that will only make climate change even worse.	PN 03, CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandra Woodall	April 4, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 26, RISK 07
Sandra Woodall	April 4, 2013	this dangerous pipeline would also put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk.	WRG 01
Sandy Brown	April 22, 2013	It does not move us in the right direction toward cleaner energy sources so we can help minimize global warming, which is a necessary priority for our future.	PN 02
Sandy Brown	April 22, 2013	(1) it is not worth the risk to our environment and its precious natural resources, particularly our water, when a spill/leak/accident occurs, which we know will happen as nothing like this can be controlled indefinitely.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Sandy Chapman	April 22, 2013	I would encourage cleaner , safer renewable energy investments, and discourage the dirtier, finite, dangerous energy investments. I wholeheartedly oppose transporting Canadian oil sands through our country to be refined and sold on the open market. Renewable, cleaner and safer energy jobs would be plentiful.	SO 05
Sandy Fairley	April 13, 2013	After refining this oil it will be classified as grade 4 which the United States by emission laws can't use. China will be the biggest investor, they will sell it to North Korea and from recent news releases they are NOT our biggest fan! TransCanada will not disclose exactly what will be mixed with the tarsands so it will flow quickly through this pipeline. This should NOT be acceptable if they expect to go across our heartland!	RISK 12, LEG 10
Sandy Fairley	April 13, 2013	TransCanada plans to go through our property tearing up native prarie that has never been broken up in the past. … They would be tearing out established trees that are over 100 years old	VEG 03
Sandy Fairley	April 13, 2013	[TransCanada] also plan to go through spring water that has always flowed year around preventing our cattle from this water supply. … and digging through beaver habitat areas.	WRS 01
Sandy Forrest	April 10, 2013	It pollutes water and land. As we have seen in Arkansas we cannot trust these pipelines NOT to leak and accidents not to happen.	RISK 13
Sandy Fuchtman	April 17, 2013	Even though the proposed pipeline was re-routed around the sensitive Sandhills area, we strongly OPPOSE the pipeline crossing through the enviromentally sensitive Ogallala Aquifer.We are 4th generation Nebraska farmers living over the Ogallala Aquifer. We depend on the Aquifer for clean drinking water for people and animals, and for irrigation to grow crops to feed the world. When the pipeline leaks, it will be an enviromental and economic disaster for everyone.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sandy Fuchtman	April 22, 2013	We are 4th generation Nebr. farmers living over the Ogallala Aquifer. We depend on the Aquifer for clean drinking water for people & animals, and for irrigation to grow crops to feed the world. When the pipelline leaks, it will be an enviromental & economic disaster for everyone. Please think of the safety & wellbeing of generations to come, & consider keeping out only water source CLEAN and NOT contaminated by oil.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Sandy Keese	April 16, 2013	No effective method for cleanup? Then you shouldn't issue any permits.	RISK 08
Sandy Kennedy	April 12, 2013	I am not opposed entirely to the pipeline, just not crossing the Ogallala Auqifer. As I would hope you realize, this is a magnificent source to our agricultural world.	ALT 06
Sandy Podulka	April 22, 2013	Beyond the immediate effects and those in the regions directly around the pipeline over time, of course the critical issue is what the operation of the pipeline will do to climate change and to encourage our continued use of fossil fuel.	CLIM 14
Sandy Podulka	April 22, 2013	Delucchi, M.Z., and M.Z. Jacobson. 2011. “Providing all global energy with wind, water, and solar power, Part II: Reliability, System and Transmission Costs, and Policies.” Energy Policy, 39, 1170-1190, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2010.11.045.	REF
Sandy Podulka	April 22, 2013	Jacobson, M.Z., and M.A. Delucchi. 2010. “Providing all Global Energy with Wind, Water, and Solar Power, Part I: Technologies, Energy Resources, Quantities and Areas of Infrastructure, and Materials.” Energy Policy, 39, 1154-1169, doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2010.11.040.	REF
Sandy Podulka	April 22, 2013	Jacobson, Mark Z. and Mark A. Delucchi. November 2009. “A Path to Sustainable Energy by 2030.” Scientific American.	REF
Sanford Olson	April 19, 2013	Then there is the global risk of dependence on these fuels and their related planetary climate alterations. The risks are too great to do this.	CLIM 14
Sanjay Makhijani	March 19, 2013	It's just that simple. Please do not allow further destruction to our future as a Civilization. We cannot continue to rely on burning carbon for energy. Invest this money into a solution that is sustainable and safe. The stability of the our atmosphere is literally spiraling out of control in response to Human (in)action. Do not be short sighted, please.	PN 02
Santa Lucia Chapter Of The Sierra Club	April 8, 2013	The presumption that “production of WCSB and Bakken crude oil will proceed with or without the proposed Project,” based on the Market Analysis, results in the fundamental analytical failure of the Supplemental EIS, that this project will result in no increase in global warming emissions.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Santa Lucia Chapter Of The Sierra Club	April 8, 2013	Per Thomas, the No Project Alternative in the Keystone EIS must evaluate the elimination of 100 percent of the impacts of the extraction, transport, refining, and combustion of that portion of tar sands oil that is currently under the ground and would be extracted and transported via Keystone. NEPA requires analysis of the effects of the extraction, transport, refining and combustion of tar sands oil via the Keystone pipeline against the current environmental baseline condition – the oil left in the ground – not against speculative future demand scenarios based solely on current market conditions. The No Project Alternative may not dismiss the impacts of the expansion of Alberta tar sands oil field production by one million barrels of oil per day, the likely amount of additional production the Keystone XL project would facilitate.	PN 02
Santa Lucia Chapter Of The Sierra Club	April 8, 2013	In mistaking potential future economic and policy conditions for current environmental conditions, the EIS fails to reflect the legal principle expressed in Thomas v. Peterson, 753 F.2d 754 (9th Cir. 1985): “It is clear that the timber sales cannot proceed without the road, and the road would not be built but for the contemplated timber sales…..	PN 05
Santa Lucia Chapter Of The Sierra Club	April 8, 2013	s we write, a tar sands oil spill is decimating the town of Mayflower, Arkansas. It has been 32 months since tar sands oil spilled into the Kalamazoo River, with cleanup expenses, so far, totaling $762 million, after an original cleanup estimate of $5 million. The assumption of the EIS fails to incorporate the fact that the oil industry, having demonstrated in recent years that it is incapable of effective and timely response to conventional oil spills, has proven even less capable of responding to a spill of tar sands oil. The impacts resulting from this incapability must be evaluated in light of the evidence provided by the Mayflower and Kalamazoo spills, and the fact that a spill from the Keystone XL pipeline would potentially be ten times the size of the Mayflower spill.	RISK 14
Santa Lucia Chapter Of The Sierra Club	April 8, 2013	TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline, despite compliance with applicable laws and regulations and regardless of mitigation measures required by its permit, leaked twelve times in its first twelve months of operation	RISK 26
Sara Baker	April 22, 2013	I oppose the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline near the Ogallala Aquifer. My primary reason is quite simple: I drink water.	ACK
Sara Bhakti	April 4, 2013	It is a terrible idea and the purported jobs that would be created would be better created in clean, renewable energy, building a "smart grid' to deliver energy, and rebuild infrastructure.	SO 05
Sara Bhakti	April 9, 2013	It fails to assess the threat the Keystione XL pipeline poses to communities along the pipeline route and to the underlying ground water aquifers.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sara Bier	April 22, 2013	The continued development and extraction of the tar sands in Alberta is devastating to the environment in Alberta but also to the global environment in terms of the increased CO2 emissions which will result in climate change for everyone.	CLIM 05
Sara Bier	April 22, 2013	In terms of energy security, the dilbit that is being transported via the pipeline will be refined at refineries in the Gulf primarily for export so it will have no effect on energy security.	PN 01
Sara Bier	April 22, 2013	Also, spills along the pipeline of dilbit will have disastrous consequences on communities, surface and groundwater supplies, wildlife, etc	RISK 07
Sara Bier	April 22, 2013	The economic impacts of the pipeline are extremely temporary in terms of jobs. The final count according to the Supplemental EIS is 35 permanent jobs. The SEIS states that it will have negligible economic benefits	SO 04
Sara Darby	March 17, 2013	I am not convinced that the Keystone XL pipeline would benefit the United States. Many new jobs may be created to build this pipeline across the U.S. in the short term, but I am sure the number of jobs will be greatly reduced or disappear after the pipeline is built. I don't think the Keystons XL pipeline would benefit the American people much, as I feel that most or all of the oil would be exported overseas from Texas	PN 05
Sara Darby	March 17, 2013	I urge you to reject the proposed Keystone XL pipeline as it pertains to the United States. I believe strongly that if this pipeline is built across the U.S., that the potential for devastating environmental damage and endangering public health in the event of tar sands oil spills far outweighs any possible benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline as far as the United States is concerned.	RISK 14
Sara Darby	March 28, 2013	I am not convinced that the Keystone XL pipeline will benefit the American people as a whole. It may create jobs in the short term, but after it is built, I'm sure the jobs will be reduced or disappear. I believe strongly that if the Keystone XL pipeline is built, it will benefit the oil companies a great deal more than it will benefit the American people. I believe that in the event of one or more oil spills, the damage to wildlife, the environment, and public health would be severe or catastrophic. The potential risks outweigh any benefits that may result if Keystone XL is built in the United States.	PN 05
Sara Driscoll	March 29, 2013	It is not fair to the following generations to do this horrible piece of business. I believe you know in your heart that this would be a huge disaster and that the extraction of tar sands is the most damaging form of fossil fuel use to date.	ACK
Sara Fusilli	April 17, 2013	Please keep the soil from being permanently destroyed!	ACK
Sara Gilliam	April 22, 2013	Transcanadas bullying of family farmers and ranchers has been abhorent, and the corporation has show consistent disregard for not only environmental and climate change science but also human dignity.	LEG 02
Sara Neller	April 11, 2013	We need to move forward on renewable energy solutions. Now is the time. This is the moment!	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sara Ransom	April 2, 2013	Any way you look at it, the 1,700-mile Keystone XL pipeline from Canada to Texas (carrying dirty tar-sands oil) is bad news for wildlife, our climate and ultimately the future of the planet.	CLIM 14
Sara Ransom	April 2, 2013	The recent spill in Arkansas ALONE(!) is reason to recognize the danger to our environment. Consider this: the pipeline that leaked there carries one-TENTH as much oil as Keystone is slated to do (80,000 barrels a day instead of 900,000 barrels).	RISK 14
Sara Ross	March 27, 2013	This entire project, from the catastrophic extraction process to the risky transportation and refinement, as well as end use will have a disasterous effect on the already dangerously destablized climate.	CLIM 05
Sara Ross	March 27, 2013	Tar sands is one of the dirtiest fuels on earth. The extraction process pollute, poisons and desecrates miles of wild forests and biodiversity	CU 01
Sara Ross	March 27, 2013	the end product is destined for the world market, not for u.s. consumption for our energy needs.	PN 07
Sara Ross	March 27, 2013	This entire operation is only to serve the interests of the tar sands producers and shippers and a few Gulf Coast refiners who want to export the oil.	PN 07
Sara Ross	March 27, 2013	The tar sands oil is a highly corrosive and acidic blend of thick raw bitumen and volitile gas liquid condensate, clay sand and H2O. The current pipeline form Canada to Oklahoma has already spilled 12 times in it's first year of operation.	RISK 26, RISK 11
Sara Wyman	April 2, 2013	It would be well to calculate how much it would cost us to mitigate all the bad consequences of pouring more "greenhouse" chemicals into the environment.	CLIM 14
Sara Wyman	April 2, 2013	It is understandable--in our present economy--that some would focus on immediate (short-term) financial benefits from the pipeline. However, in the longer run, the big picture shows enormous costs in both human suffering and dollars if we proceed with this plan.	PN 05
Sara Wyman	April 2, 2013	Toxic seepage into our ever-scarcer clean water supply	RISK 07
Sarah Bailey	April 22, 2013	Of course we have seen the harmful effects of such spills on the surrounding environment and on public health. Perhaps the most disturbing piece to this is the fact that Transcanada cannot even provide a list of all the chemicals that are used in transport of this toxic bitumen. Thus, how do we even know what we are putting our people at risk for? How do we know exactly how a spill will affect the surrounding environment?	RISK 12
Sarah Bauman	April 22, 2013	The areas of ecological importance in Canada will be destroyed, caustic oil sludge will jepordize the land, the water, and the wild and human life. This would be a disaster.	CU 01
Sarah Bauman	April 22, 2013	the dilbit that would be transported is highly toxic, heavy, does not clean up, and the eventual oil from them will all be destined to foreign lands. Leaks in pipelines are major, and have been frequent occurrences these past few years. These are threats to the public, wildlife, the environment, and the economy.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sarah Bauman	April 22, 2013	All the steel used by Keystone is foreign manufactured, the latest estimate from the U.S. State Department is that only 35 jobs really will be created,	SO 11, SO 02
Sarah Bean	April 22, 2013	The process of tar sands extraction is a wildly inefficient and toxic	CU 01
Sarah Braik	April 16, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is planned to go over parts of the Ogallala Aquifer, which provides a huge portion of the midwest with its sole source of water in case of drought. If that aquifer is poisoned, entire states will be rendered virtually unlivable.	WRG 01
Sarah Braik	April 17, 2013	http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Cooking_the_Books_FINAL-SCREEN.pdf	REF
Sarah Byrd	April 6, 2013	If this oil were really for the U.S. there would be no need to build a pipeline for the oil from Canada to Texas. It would be more sensible to build a refinery nearer the source and move the finished product to where it was needed.	ALT 08
Sarah Donovan	April 15, 2013	From personal experience I know a lot can go wrong with a pipeline. I worked for Pacific Texas Pipeline, and leaks are possible. Leaking oil is difficult to clean up thoroughly. This is a problem for farmers near the pipeline.	RISK 14
Sarah Dougherty	April 2, 2013	Again, not only does tar sands oil create more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it will not increase U.S. energy security or lower gas prices.	PN 05
Sarah Dougherty	April 2, 2013	this pipeline would put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk	WRG 01, RISK 07
Sarah Dougherty	April 13, 2013	This pipeline is dangerous to our land and water supply… We can't keep on poisoning the land and the people that live on it so that we can continue to use a finite resource.	RISK 07
Sarah Drenth	April 22, 2013	We have a certified organic ranch. When the pipeline leaks (because ALL pipelines eventually leak), we would lose our organic certification on our ranch. Our certifiers have already notified us that we would lose our organic certificate when the pipeline leaks.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sarah Drenth	April 22, 2013	Grand Island Columbus Freemont Kearney Lincoln and Omaha would be affected as all water for those cities comes from the Ogallala Aquifer. If an engineer geologist or biologist would have taken the time to study the Sandhills and walked through the land they would have understood why the Keystone pipeline should not go through the Ogallala Aquifer which is beneath the Sandhills. There is a very high water table which includes many springs and artesian wells. Because of this high water table there are many wet areas and lakes. A leak in the Keystone pipeline could conceivably contaminate the entire Ogallala Aquifer in turn disrupting the agricultural economy of Nebraska. For these reasons the Keystone pipeline would likely destroy this area. Not only would it be harmful for the Sandhills but due to our high water table it would be difficult and costly to dig lay and bury the pipeline.	RISK 07
Sarah Drenth	April 22, 2013	We have a certified organic ranch. When the pipeline leaks (because ALL pipelines eventually leak) we would lose our organic certification on our ranch. Our certifiers have already notified us that we would lose our organic certificate when the pipeline leaks.	SO 12, RISK 24
Sarah Erdlen	April 22, 2013	I know they have pointed out that all reports have neglected that agriculture, particularly cattle-ranching, is our largest product here in Nebraska; no report takes that into account	SO 12
Sarah Fisk	March 17, 2013	While some steps have been taken, I respectfully submit that it has not been enough to slow down climate change enough to protect us from global environmental disaster.The science is clear. President Obama, if you do not stand up to the Koch brothers' on this one issue - when what exactly were you talking about when you said you would lead on climate? My dear President, this is one small bullet we can dodge in the battle of climate change. Please, act in the interests of all the people on the planet.	CLIM 18
Sarah Forsythe	March 28, 2013	We need to be honest and tell people they need to live differently with less energy. We need to change now to passive solar homes and appliances	ALT 02
Sarah Fuller	March 26, 2013	Our current carbon output far exceeds any initial scientific models, and Keystone XL and further tarsands development only ensures climatic disaster.	CLIM 14
Sarah H	March 8, 2013	The current amount of CO2 in the air is beyond any level that has been seen in the history of Earth, and the tar sands that this well would transport would help to further increase the level of CO2 in the air	CLIM 14
Sarah H	March 8, 2013	It (SEIS) blithely ignores that these pipelines all over the US have consistently suffered leaks and problems	RISK 13
Sarah Henry	April 22, 2013	http://watercenter.unl.edu/downloads/2011-Worst-case-Keystone-spills-report.pdf	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sarah Hernandez	April 17, 2013	What happened to evolving and creating GREEN JOBS??? WHERE IS THE SOLAR AND WIND AND HYDRO INVESTMENT?	SO 05
Sarah Jane	April 22, 2013	increase water and air pollution and further jeopardize the rights of downstream indigenous communities	RISK 06
Sarah Kalmanson	March 24, 2013	Please help the Indigenous People of Canada who are suffering from extremity and toxins and poisons in their water and lands	CU 05
Sarah Kelen	April 22, 2013	When the KXL pipeline is compromised to a greater or lesser extent, will it happen within the fragile Sandhills ecosystem? Will the Ogallala Aquifer be underneath it? How many irrigation wells will become unsafe?	SOIL 07, RISK 07, WRG 01
Sarah Lacy	March 18, 2013	We have the technology and the people who can go to work RIGHT NOW to strengthen your resolve to increase biofuels in the U.S.	PN 02
Sarah Larkin	March 24, 2013	America must work toward 100% wind and solar energy which will be affordable to all	PN 02
Sarah Lauer	March 24, 2013	I am concerned that this may affect our water quality years to come.	ACK
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	The “new” northern segment still crosses the sensitive Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer, a major supply of drinking water and irrigation. The pipeline still crosses the Yellowstone River which has already suffered one tar sands spill.	ACK
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	In Texas, TransCanada’s southern segment has already proven it is a threat to water as pipeline construction has polluted landowners’ natural springs with drilling mud, destroyed wetlands, and contaminated farm ponds with diesel fuel.	CU 14
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	TransCanada’s Keystone XL pipeline product is meant for export. 60% of the oil refined on the gulf coast is already destined for export.	PN 07
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	Tar sands crude is up to 70 times more viscous, 20 times more acidic, and up to 10 times more sulfuric than conventional crude adding to the fatigue and possible rupture of a pipeline.	RISK 11
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	The new Keystone XL pipeline will operate at pressures up to 1440 psi, almost double the pressure of conventional crude pipelines. Due to the quartz-like nature and friction of the material, the pipeline may heat up to as high as 158 degrees. Yet these pipelines are built to conventional crude pipeline specs and standards.	RISK 11
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	The industry considers its diluent formulas “proprietary” information and won’t share it with regulators. Incomplete MSDS sheets put first responders and the communities they serve at risk. This happened at the 2010 Kalamazoo spill in Michigan.	RISK 12
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	TransCanada has admitted that 700,000 gallons of tar sands crude could leak out of the Keystone XL pipeline without triggering its real time leak-detection system.	RISK 15
Sarah Mcfaddin	April 17, 2013	TransCanada’s Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation.	RISK 26
Sarah Mcgraw	April 6, 2013	the key findings stated that "WCSB crudes are more green house gas intensive than crudes they would displace in the US."	CLIM 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sarah Mcgraw	April 6, 2013	It also takes about two barrels of water to produce one barrell of this type of oil(Pembina Institute).	CU 07
Sarah Mcgraw	April 6, 2013	despite the 57 Project specific special conditions stated in the SEIS will try to ensure safe transport of the crude oil, they cannot say with complete certainty that leaks will not occur.	RISK 14
Sarah Mckee	April 2, 2013	This would indeed create jobs -- cleaning up the carnage.	RISK 06
Sarah Muehleck	April 13, 2013	We don't need energy independence from other countries; we need energy independence from oil. The solution is to invest money in the scientific pursuit of alternative energy sources.	ALT 01
Sarah Purcell	April 22, 2013	To say the pipeline is environmentally responsible is negligent and ignorant.	ACK
Sarah Purcell	April 22, 2013	Not to mention the environmental pollution and human health hazards that ensue from the very effort of extracting crude oil	CU 04
Sarah Purcell	April 22, 2013	Oil is a limited resource, and we need to be focusing our efforts on renewable, sustainable energy sources such as solar and wind power.	PN 02
Sarah Purcell	April 22, 2013	Every job this project purports to create can be lost in the event of an accident	SO 05
Sarah Supp	April 22, 2013	The proposed pipeline will pass through many areas that are ecologically unique and that provide important ecosystem services to US citizens, such as clean drinking water, arable land, and carbon sequestration	LU 01
Sarah Supp	April 22, 2013	Recent oil spills and unsatisfactory responses by oil companies have not shown that environmental losses from such disasters can be quickly or effectively mitigated	RISK 08
Sarah T. Brost	April 6, 2013	The pipeline may provide short-term benefit for advantaged sectors of society but will not support long-term, sustainable management of our communities, resources or environment.	PN 05
Sarah T. Brost	April 6, 2013	I am afraid that this development will result in the continued exploitation of oil resources, pollution of water and pristine wetland habitats and industrial deforestation in Canada.	PN 11
Sarah Williams	April 5, 2013	You already know that it is dirty and expensive - liquid coal, forced from the earth with water we cannot afford, water that will remain contaminated and unusable. Then we risk our farmland and homes to spills.Even in the absence of spills, we contaminate our air. And worst of all, we do not need this. We need to develop wind and solar, wave generated power, geothermal - we should be spending money on a smart grid and taking the path to a cleaner more natural environment.	PN 05, ALT 01, RISK 07
Sarajane Pickett	April 13, 2013	Based on the number of oil spills taking place, the oil companies have not yet reached the point in their technology developments of pumping practices to be able to transport oil safely over existing pipeline.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sattie Clark	April 11, 2013	As the mother of a child who suffers from air pollution related disease, I have to question the wisdom of the Keystone XL pipeline. Yes, it may have a positive effect on the economy, but it will simultaneously have a negative effect as it impacts human health and the environment. In the long term there is no question that the toll will be negative.	CLIM 10
Saundra Wolfe	March 21, 2013	In these times of increasing weather instability and severe weather events predicted by the models of climate change, continuing to spend limited federal resources on a pipeline that will further promote the use of dirty fuel and the release of even more carbon into our atmosphere on the pretense of creating a few hundred jobs for a few years is short sighted in the extreme. Not to mention the danger it poses to the agricultural land and communities it will pass through.	CLIM 18, CLIM 12, LU 01
Sawyer Lawson	April 12, 2013	Your statement completely disregarded the dire consequences of climate change. Opening up a major channel for the transportation of dirty bitumen means emitting huge amounts of carbon into our atmosphere. The atmosphere is already well above the safe limit of 350 ppm of carbon.	PN 06, CLIM 12
SchafferA	April 18, 2013	This issue extends beyond Nebraska. It's about the people, their health, their land, their water and their livelihoods. From Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, the well-being of the American people will be negatively affected if this project moves forward. The pipeline poses a significant threat to our nation's national security by polluting our land, our water and our food supply.	PN 08
SchafferA	April 18, 2013	As for the soil, as acknowledged in the SEIS in this handout that we all received when we walked in, the pipeline is not out of the Sandhills, it is only out of the NDEQ Sandhills. Figure 3.3.2-4 in the SEIS supports this, showing the Sandhills boundary extending to Keystone I, as it does in the USGS map that TransCanada submitted with their original application.	SOIL 07
SchafferA	April 18, 2013	This brings me to my first point about the pipeline route. It still crosses the Ogallala Aquifer. This issue with the route has always been about the water and it still is about the water. I truly cannot comprehend why anyone in their right mind would advocate placing a man-made pipeline less than a half an inch thick most certainly that will have man-made error filled full of undisclosed carcinogens over the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
SchreiberA	April 18, 2013	These past two EIS's the State Department did are scientific junk. And I'm saying this from the standpoint of a scientist and a geologist. They are junk. You do not hire contractors who work for the petroleum industry to write you an independent review because you don't get an independent review. You get a review that's guided for the petroleum industry and for TransCanada. The same thing can be said about the HDR review for DEQ, what a piece of junk. Not worth the paper it's written on.	PRO 01
SchreiberA	April 18, 2013	They totally ignore the fact that 10.8 miles of the Keystone XL's new route lies in the Ogallala Aquifer, buried under the surface of the Aquifer. Another 11.8 miles is at least partially submerged in the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRG 01
Schreur	April 18, 2013	Extracting tar sands oil has destroyed the boreal forests, uses tons of water, and threatened the health and livelihoods of indigenous people of Canada	ACK
Schreur	April 18, 2013	petcoke emissions are not included in assessments of the climate impact of tar sands extraction	CLIM 08
Schreur	April 18, 2013	The fossil fuel industry needs to be stopped and replaced by sustainable energy such as wind and solar	PN 02
Schreur	April 18, 2013	The dilbut coming through these pipes is so acidic and abrasive that it is expected that pipes will corrode and weaken at a faster rate than with conventional oil.	RISK 11
Schreur	April 18, 2013	These companies are even exempt from having to pay the taxes that would contribute to clean up of leaks	SO 15, RISK 03
Schroeder	April 18, 2013	There will be better and longer-term jobs building and maintaining renewable energy projects such as wind turbines and solar panels. Building and maintaining this infrastructure is just as good of a job and better for the environment and our air and water.	SO 05
Sclarone Brill Fspa	April 20, 2013	I believe that the negative environmental results are far greater. Please consider looking into what these results may do that may never be repaired and/or work horrendous results before installing this pipeline.	PN 05
Scott & Janice Roussel	April 17, 2013	The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is a project that will carry and emit at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year. This is a conservative figure, based on industry analysis of the carbon emissions associated with current tar sands production. This estimate includes the extraction, processing and pipeline transportation emissions as well as the combustion of all the products refined from the oil that will be delivered, including petcoke.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Scott & Janice Roussel	April 17, 2013	In a world constrained by the realities of climate change, the proper measure of any project's climate impact should not be based on the assumptions inherent in a business-as-usual scenario that guarantees climate disaster.	CLIM 12
Scott Andrews	April 15, 2013	I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability.	PRO 02
Scott Badenoch	March 20, 2013	Canada does not have another option to export the tar sands...if we say no to Keystone.	PN 06
Scott Badenoch	March 20, 2013	It creates very few permanent or temporary jobs	SO 04
Scott Christensen	April 22, 2013	We are risking the health of future generations of Nebraskans. And for what? So China can have Canadas oil? who will provide freash water and food to our nation when this pipeline bursts? Im sure Canada and China will not care.	PN 07
Scott Clemson	March 11, 2013	If the same largess were to be bestowed upon the solar industry, we could convert the whole country to clean renewable energy. There would still be PLENTY of money to be made, even by these same oil companies who now own patents to many advancements in the solar field (and other industries such as fuel efficiency), but are purposefully withholding these to allow them to continue with their present favored status and infra-structure as long as possible.	ALT 01
Scott Clemson	March 11, 2013	if the oil companies in collusion with the giant paper/lumber industry tried to do what is being done in Canada to extract tarsands oil here in th US, Americans would freak out ! Hundreds of square miles GONE, COMPLETELY, to depths of 300' as far as one can see ! Fortunately for these self-serving industries in Canada (and the politicians supported by these industries), very few people are around in the areas being destroyed, and these people, mostly Native Americans, trappers, hunters, and wilderness lovers, are largely marginalized in any decision making process. They will be left with devastation and pollution.	CU 02
Scott Hoffman	April 22, 2013	The new Keystone pipeline would threaten the greatest aquifer in our country. Subsequently that endangers the people of this large area the vast agricultural production it supports and the natural environment.	WRG 01
Scott Kemper	April 22, 2013	If the powers that be decide to build this pipeline and things go wrong, who will pay to clean up? Everything Ive seen or heard indicates TransCanada does everything it can to divert responsibility. I dont want the pipeline, but if it goes ahead, TransCanada should not be allowed to escape responsibility. Spills should be cleaned and the land and water should be restored to their pre-spill and and pre-pipeline condition. To show good faith, all existing spills should be cleaned and restored before a new pipeline is built. People say more spills happen with trains and trucks, but pipeline spills are bigger. Trucks can only spill a truckload. Spills from pipes can keep going, and going, and going.	RISK 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
SCOTT KITT	April 22, 2013	The Keystone Xl goes against everything we stand for in the United States of America. Property Rights, Eminent Domaine granted to a Foreign country, propery devaluation.	LEG 02
Scott L. Gardner	April 22, 2013	Protection of our non-renewal Ogalalla Aquifer is of primary concern, as are the rights of landowners in Nebraska and other states.	WRG 01
Scott Moen	March 11, 2013	America has a choice - adopt energy policies that favor life, a clean, healthy environment and widespread economic benefits or energy policies that favor death, a dirty, unhealthy environment and concentrated economic benefits. Investing in tar sands pipelines is an investment in death. Investing in clean, solar energy is an investment in life. Every 15 minutes, the earth gets as much energy from the sun as the earth uses from fossil fuels in a year. Only political will stands in the way of adopting clean, solar energy.	PN 02
Scott Putnam	April 21, 2013	acilitates carbon conversion from buried state to atmospheric state.	ACK
Scott Rayborne	March 15, 2013	NASA's leading climate scientist, Dr. James Hansen, said that tar sands development would mean "game over for the climate."It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuel on the planet.	ACK
Scott Rayborne	March 15, 2013	Rejection of the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is one of the most important and immediate executive steps that President Obama can take to address the climate crisis.	CLIM 18
Scott Rayborne	March 15, 2013	This pipeline will take the tar sands through America, not to America. It is likely an export pipeline, and will not lower gas prices or create very many permanent jobs.	PN 07
Scott Sparling	March 14, 2013	We must do our part to move the world's economies away from fossil fuels and towards renewable, clean energy alternatives.	ALT 01
Scott Spoolman	March 10, 2013	Consider this a golden opportunity to announce a major new goal of shifting to clean energy, developing wind, solar, and geothermal power	ALT 01
Scott Staskus	March 10, 2013	The pipeline is going to be the vessel by which the land locked tar sands of canada will be spread across the world. If XL is built the floodgates will be open, and the wilderness containing that petroleum will be uprooted. But more importantly, the effect on our air and soil will be irreversible…	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Scott Stellar	March 15, 2013	Forced into guardianship of all the life on earth we humans must act in accordance to the laws of nature (ignorance of which are no excuse)! Those laws have been established and refined over millions of years and clearly show that equilibrium of all living things survives. Like a balanced bicycle wheel that roles along effortlessly unless slightly out of balance creating a wobble until finally it crashes! Individual gain (as in corporate profit) over environmental well being (equilibrium) creates such a wobble and the scientific lookouts are crying out that the corrective stirring wheel has gotten to hard to handle! Let us not enable nature to show its indifference to us by wiping out our existence and then rebounding as it surely would, but instead adhere to its laws and abide by its commands! We must change our energy direction and clean up our mess! May our representatives from around the world sacrifice their self-interest for the greater good and lead we the people, kick and screaming if necessary, to equilibrium! Begin by stoping all future projects in carbon base fuels (like the keystone pipeline) and replace it with green sustainable energy and clean up the CO2 and other toxic waste. Do nothing that isn't recyclable, biodegradable or sustainable!!! Be this the bases upon which all endeavors are considered!	PN 02
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has harassed and threatened Nebraskans owning property along the proposed Keystone XL route with eminent domain if they refuse to sign a land easement. An easement is forever. Until the Keystone XL Pipeline controversy, I wasn’t aware that a foreign corporation could legally threaten Americans with eminent domain.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	Two legislated studies directly impacting Diluted Bitumen pipelines—were included in The Pipeline Safety Bill that passed by unanimous consent in both houses of Congress. One study examines the corrosiveness of diluted bitumen the other study focuses on a company's leak detection practices. The studies won't be completed until 2015. Why the rush before the studies are completed? Really?!Nebraska's own DEQ did not complete the "Risk Assessment" portion of their study before Gov. Heineman decided the route over the Ogallala Aquifer was fine after all, even though earlier he pleaded with the president and the secretary of state to not allow this to cross the aquifer, as did Sen. Johanns. The DEQ (Department of Environmental Quality) report was written by a firm hired by TransCanada and omitted crucial facts requested by Nebraska citizens, including analyses of negative economic impacts of a spill, corrosive soil in the pipeline path, sandy soil in the pipeline path and risks to water. Gas prices in the Midwest will rise AFTER the diluted bitumen is refined at Gulf facilities and shipped back to the Midwest…and much of the refined product from the tar sand oil will be exported It is all risk and no rewards.	PN 04, LEG 17, PRO 04
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	In 2012 the US exported more petro oil products, than it imported according the the US Energy Department. The reason given was that the US is now consuming 2 million LESS barrels of oil daily. The trend is expected to continue. WHY do we need a toxic slurry of heated tar sand bitumen pumped through the US to Gulf refineries where it will be sold to the highest bidder on the world market?	PN 13
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	Nebraskans have not been given accurate information from TransCanada regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline. …and the information received is continually changing when questioned and/or proven to be inaccurate. Getting the correct information from TransCanada regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline is akin to an 'Alice in Wonderland' adventure	PRO 06
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	A spill or spills will happen— it's not a matter of IF, but WHEN, and Nebraskans and the federal government will be stuck with any cleanup. What could possibly go wrong? Just ask the former residents in Kalamazoo, MI…or…Mayflower, Arkansas how its worked out for them. Truth be known there were 20+ leaks in the 20" Keystone Pipeline in its first year of operation in 2012. Same toxic cocktail of tar sands oil, benzene and other diluting carcinogens. A 36" pipeline carrying this heated, pressurized DilBit is a risk any sane or concerned person could put a price tag on. Imagine a spill, unseen, underground into the 2nd largest aquifer system in the western hemisphere with the projected 13 full-time employees and a system that is more dependent on passersby to report spills than from their own control panels.	RISK 24, RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	TransCanada uses the term 'crude oil' in their public discussions detailing the Keystone XL plans. Diluted Bitumen isn't even considered to be OIL by the IRS and another economic reason for their unwarranted and unnecessary pipeline through an ecosystem both fragile and valuable. The annual savings incentive for exemption alone for TransCanada is $23MILLION to the Oil Spill Liability & Trust Fund. TransCanada will be responsible for the first $315,000+ and off the hook for the rest.	SO 15
Scott Svoboda	April 22, 2013	Heated (150°) toxic tar sands oil thats pressurized shouldnt be allowed to run over a unique ecosystem and one if the largest aquifers in the western hemisphere.	WRG 01, RISK 14
Scott Theisen	April 9, 2013	Please don't trade short-term gain for long-term socioeconomic damage.	PN 05
Scott Warwick	April 17, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline will only provide scant temporary jobs and endanger our air, land and water…	SO 02
Scott Wylie	March 28, 2013	Once built, the cost of the multi-billion dollar project will encourage the continued use of it, until the tar sands mines decimate ever larger expanses of Canada's boreal forests.	CU 01
Scott Wylie	March 28, 2013	The fish in the Athabasca and other nearby waterways have already become too toxic to safely eat.	CU 02
Scott Wylie	March 28, 2013	It takes three barrels of water to process one barrel of tar sands oil, and that's just at the location of the mines. This polluted water is not purified, instead it's stored indefinitely in enormous unlined reservoirs (that can be seen from space) which are leaking toxins into the nearby swamps, streams and rivers such as the Athabasca, which weaves through native tribal lands and into Hudson Bay.	CU 07
Scott Wylie	March 28, 2013	The pipeline would cross over important aquifers which are sources of fresh water for parts of the Midwest, as well as many important rivers, streams, lakes and prime wildlife habitat. This pipeline if completed, will be used for a long time into the future, ensuring the long-term use of the most dirtiest form of oil sourcing.	WRS 01, WRG 01
Scott Zeigler	April 2, 2013	Oil is toxic.... Invest in renewable, sustainable alternative sources of energy.	ALT 01
Seabury Lyon	March 15, 2013	The State Department statements regarding the Keystone XL review are incomprehensible and an outrage against the concept of scientifically robust analysis -even American democracy itself. If I am to take reported comments and analysis seriously, there is a dramatically evident disconnect between what State Department looks at on one hand, and what any competent evaluator would look at to judge the long term safety, health, environmental and economic merits of the project…….. fact-based information upon which we rely to make our decisions as "informed citizens". We deserve and demand at least as much diligence and conscientiousness from our government.	LEG 04
Sean Kenney	April 11, 2013	We need better alternative energy projects and we need to be weaned off Oil and Fossil fuels as they are damaging to the environment and running out.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sean Mccutcheon	April 20, 2013	Fighting climate change should be a priority	ACK
Sean Phillips	April 11, 2013	reject the keystone pipeline to ensure our public health and safety!	ACK
Sean Quinn	March 15, 2013	The emissions created by the fuel in this pipeline will push us over the edge to a point of no return. The environment cannot bounce back from this.	CLIM 14
Sean Quinn	March 15, 2013	Pinholes have also been found in the portion already constructed	RISK 23
Sean Rooney	March 5, 2013	If we were to burn all of the carbon that's stored in Alberta's Tar Sands, which we might do over the course of 50 or 60 years, we'd doom our climate to an extent of warming that's largely impossible for our way of life to tolerate...The entire world will be put at risk if we burn tar sands oil.	CLIM 14, CLIM 05
Sean Williams	April 9, 2013	Building pipelines to import oil in this day and age is crazy. We could be running the country on 30-50% renewables by now if we had started 20 years ago.	PN 02, ALT 01
Sean Zigmund	April 17, 2013	It will continue to dramatically increase the amount of CO2 into the atmosphere and add to climate change.	CLIM 14
Seanna O'leary	March 17, 2013	the Oglala Aquifer is one of the main water supplies for our region. If it is contaminated by this pipeline (and I'm certain it will be at some point -- humans and human engineering is prone to mistakes no matter how well planned), then we will poison our water. We can run cars on things other than oil. We can make money on things other than oil. We cannot live without water. And there is no substitute for clean water. In the future, no doubt as worldwide pollution continues unchecked, it will be a more valuable commodity than oil. This pipeline is not a risk worth taking. I beg you not to jeopardize the lives of our children and future generations by opening the door to another BP disaster that poisons our biggest fresh water supply.	WRG 01
Sebastian Jackson	March 24, 2013	Which is why you would do well to consider these past cases in deliberating on Keystone XL. When the scientific community tells you that Keystone XL won't be "just another pipeline" and will cause terrible damage on the world's environment, and your impact assessment seems to be an outlier to that opinion, chances are good that it is the scientific community that knows what it is talking about.	RISK 24
Sebastian Smoot	March 10, 2013	The Keystone XL Environmental Impact Report was not prepared by any neutral government officials, but rather by a private company in the pay of the pipeline's owner. This is a conflict of interest and a breach of trust.	PRO 01
SedlacekR	April 18, 2013	pipelines continue to remain the safest means of delivering crude oil, energy products.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Senator Gathy Giessel	April 11, 2013	The Keystone XL project offers the safest, least intrusive, and most efficient method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region. However, the draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable. These alternatives would require significantly more land displacement and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions. The chance of a spill incident is also greater with these two alternatives. For all these reasons, pipelines carry nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported domestically.	ALT 07
Senator Gathy Giessel	April 11, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline project's positive contributions to U.S. energy security and the U.S. economy are estimated to be valued at over $20 billion. Throughout the life of the pipeline over 20,000 high-wage manufacturing and construction jobs will be created across the U.S., stimulating significant economic activity. Furthermore, access to a stable and affordable petroleum supply is essential to our national security and economic future. Domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada help to ensure a reliable energy supply that can be delivered over an extended period.	PN 10
Senator John C. Brenden	April 17, 2013	[The Project] would be another safe transportation avenue to get our Bakken oil transported out of Montana and North Dakota.	PN 05
Senator John C. Brenden	April 17, 2013	The last information that I have received is the U.S. uses 97% of the oil that it gets from Canada for domestic use.	PN 13
Senator Mae Beavers	April 11, 2013	Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods	ACK
Senator Mae Beavers	April 11, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. In the Southeast, the vast majority of our gasoline and diesel is delivered via one pipeline from the Gulf Coast refinery complex. With Keystone XL online, those same refineries would receive an extra 830,000 barrels a day of highly discounted oil, as it will be coming from Canada and the United States instead of the Middle East. When crude oil makes up 80 percent of the price of a gallon of gasoline, such an increase in supply can have a big impact, leading to lower prices for energy consumers across the Southeast.	PN 10
Senator Mae Beavers	April 11, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region. Alternative transport methods – namely rail and barge – will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions	PN 10, CLIM 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Senator Phil Berger; Senator Andrew Brock; Senator Buck Newton; Senator Bob Rucho	April 9, 2013	agriculture and agribusiness represents our State's number one industry, totaling $73 billion in annual revenue and accounting for almost 650,000 of the State's 3.8 mill ion-person workforce. Refined hydrocarbons from the Gulf Coast provide the energy and chemicals necessary for this sector to operate. Many of these industries are time sensitive and even a day or two without fuel to run farm equipment, natural gas to heat livestock houses and cure tobacco, and petrochemicals to fertilize crops can cost producers (and eventually consumers) millions of dollars.	PN 10
Senator Phil Berger; Senator Andrew Brock; Senator Buck Newton; Senator Bob Rucho	April 9, 2013	In addition to energy security, at a time when unemployment continues to remain high and state and local governments struggle to balance their budgets, the potential employment and revenue benefits from new pipeline construction that can connect Canada and our northern states to the rest of the country simply cannot be overlooked.	PN 10
Senator Timothy Solobay	April 11, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region. Alternative transport methods - namely rail and barge - will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions. Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods. For all these reasons, pipelines carry nearly two-thirds of the oil and petroleum products transported domestically.However, the draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude amongst Gulf refineries. Even with these less attractive alternatives, rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands.	ACK
Senator Timothy Solobay	April 11, 2013	By supporting domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security. Access to affordable, stable supplies of petroleum remains one of the most vital components for a growing economy.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Senator Timothy Solobay	April 11, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Senator William J. Larkin, Jr.	April 1, 2013	President Obama argues that the Alberta tar sands are likely to be developed anyway – as if we are powerless to do anything about that.	ACK
Senator William J. Larkin, Jr.	April 1, 2013	the hydrocarbons trapped in the tar sands are enough to add 120 p.p.m, to our current 393 p.p.m., and that the massive wildfires, and extreme droughts and storms that have plagued the planet in recent years are likely to become more extreme. Coastal cities are under particular threat, as are food supplies worldwide.	CLIM 16
Senator William J. Larkin, Jr.	April 1, 2013	Aside from the dangers to Greater Sage Grouse, migrating Whooping Cranes, and other endangered species, and the fact that the pipeline will traverse the Ogallala Aquifer and be sited near some wetlands – which the report mentions – is the fact that the pipeline will make Americans even more complicit in the exacerbation of global climate change than we already are.	CLIM 18
Senator William J. Larkin, Jr.	April 1, 2013	But as one of the largest emitters of greenhouse gases – per country and per capita – it is incumbent on us, as Americans, to lead the fight [against climate change] and to say no[to the pipeline].	CLIM 18
Senor Crews	April 22, 2013	it's NOT our oil! We don't control flow, availability, or price - the oil is carbon-intensive, using much energy to extract energy, therefore: - CO2 release per barrel is almost double - susceptible to market, and dependent on high prices over $90 to be worth it and, - no significant amount of jobs after construction completion	PN 07, CLIM 12, SO 02
Serendipitykatz	March 30, 2013	Please consider putting all the resources this pipeline would take into renewable energy that won't destroy wilderness.	ALT 01
Serendipitykatz	March 30, 2013	we need to be less dependent on middle eastern oil but we need to be less dependent on all oil.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Serenity Smile	March 20, 2013	Expansion of tar sands oil operations will destroy large areas of North American boreal forest [and] will threaten the homeland of Native Americans in Canada.	ACK
Serenity Smile	March 20, 2013	The pipeline will endanger valuable resources such as the Ogallala Aquifer and the Yellowstone, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers.	RISK 07
Seth Lehr	April 22, 2013	Much of the tar sands oil will be shipped abroad. It will produce only 35 permanent American jobs. Think about that: 35 permanent jobs for the carbon from 51 coal plants, to be shipped overseas. How can this possibly be in our interests?	PN 05
Seth Mccombs	April 8, 2013	Put money towards alternative fuels and energy. That's what this country and the world needs!	PN 02
Seth Pullen	April 5, 2013	TransCanadas should be required to pay into a cleanup fund	SO 15
Seth Yarden	April 22, 2013	There are so many other possible ways to obtain the energy sources we need for our everyday lives. Extracting oil from tar sands is one of the worst options, even in the short term.	ALT 01
Shakur Burton	April 13, 2013	No proper Regulation	LEG 11
Shakur Burton	April 13, 2013	No real permanent jobs; No real benefits, Will Not benefit our country in any way; Will not lower gas prices; Will be shipped to China, who will give us nothing in return;	PN 05
Shan Albert	March 14, 2013	The oil companies own report admits that only 35 jobs will be permanent.	SO 04
Shan Albert	March 28, 2013	And most importantly I don't want those pipelines running through our country -- there have been reports of those pipes leaking and the damage that could be done to our water and environment from that dirty fuel leaking into the ground is enormous and not worth the risk.	PN 05
Shanda Morand	March 19, 2013	Please consider the impact this pipeline will have on the land of this country in the instance of an accident. We've seen it too many times. Our countries land isn't replaceable and generations of the future will have to deal with implications of this decision. We're heading towards a time where we've got to find innovative solutions to energy demands. Let's place our resources and money towards rewarding people who can bring forward cleaner solutions.	RISK 06, PN 02
Shane Feyers	April 22, 2013	It is in the best interest of our country, continental biodiversity and global climate stability that we shift away from investments into oil. Albeit a difficult process over a long timeline, any new infrastructure or modifications such as this pipeline will damn our citizens to further faith in the current paradigm of non-renewable energy-based thought.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shane Feyers	April 22, 2013	It is our responsibility as educated world leaders to ensure that the innovation of jobs and economic growth now abides by the guidelines of social and environmental sustainability.	PN 02
Shannon Crane	April 17, 2013	The earths surface is ever moving, not static. The idea that we could safely contain such a toxic material as tar sands in long pipe is truly a "pipe dream." It is not safe, as the containment is bound to break and spill as we have seen so many times now.	RISK 07, GEO 01
Shannon Crane	April 19, 2013	The tactic used to condemn the land to acquire it for construction is a blatant act of neglect for the role of our American lands & waterways.	LEG 02
Shannon Crane	April 19, 2013	We have seen 6 reported pipeline spills within one month the past month, including the tar sands spill in Mayflower, AR. The toll of damages is being hidden from the American people in an effort too allow the oil industry to proceed unhindered. There are obvious risks & hidden future costs of health damage & satisfactory clean up to many who are paying attention.	RISK 30, RISK 24
Shannon Crane	April 19, 2013	The large volume of highly corrosive tar sands material cannot be safely contained while passing through the pipes crossing our waterways! The industry has a history of failing to inspect the pipelines they have built with enough regularity to prevent spills. It may not even be possible to prevent spills-- and running the pipe over (or under) the land surrounding our fresh water rivers is a huge mistake.	WRS 01, RISK 14
Shannon Healey	April 20, 2013	Let's give them a cleaner environment by investing in solar and wind power, NOT fossil fuels!	PN 02
Shanthi Gonzales	April 1, 2013	Just this weekend there was a spill in Arkansas and people had to be evacuated from their homes. The project is too risky and dangerous.	ACK
Sharla Bertram	March 10, 2013	THAT REPORT IS FRAUDULENT--PAID FOR BY TRANSCANADA! PLEASE STAND UP AND DEMAND AN HONEST ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACTS ON THE CLIMATE.	PRO 01
Sharlette Schwenninger	April 22, 2013	There is no reward for the residents of the U.S. We will not see any fuel from the pipeline - it will be exported to China and or India or any number of other country.	PN 07
Sharon	March 25, 2013	The security of the nation depends on protecting and conserving our natural resources, which run the risk of damage from pipeline leaks and savaging of the natural environment to extract the oil and build the line.	PN 05
Sharon	March 25, 2013	The number of jobs that would be generated are modest and of short duration, about 2 years according to Transcanada’s own documents.	SO 04
Sharon	April 22, 2013	It's past time to aggressively switch to renewable energy sources, whichever fit each region's specific climate and resources best, and significantly reduce our dependence upon an increasingly limited, difficult to access, expensive, and environmentally damaging resource that fossil fuels are.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sharon Carlino	April 11, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is clearly a project that has the potential for more hazards then it would benefits. Understanding the science related to the environmental and human hazards of tar sands and the disruption of our natural world with the construction of this pipeline, we MUST reject this project.	PN 05
Sharon Clifford	April 2, 2013	Please, don't give up our precious continent for a fuel that will be obsolete within our lifetimes.	CLIM 14
Sharon Clifford	April 2, 2013	The evidence is very clear that the extraction of oil from the tar sands of Canada will mean destruction that our planet can't tolerate.	CU 01
Sharon Cox	April 4, 2013	If Canada wants to continue let it be from their shore on the west coast not here in the U.S..	ALT 05
Sharon Cox	April 4, 2013	So far in the past week there has been 6 pipe line leaks..Causing huge damages to land, air, water and all life..Time to stop this madness now...Do not use this pipe line. Stop it now…	RISK 07
Sharon Hale	March 10, 2013	The State Department's revised environmental impact statement is outrageous as the State used one of TransCanada's own contractors to help them write the report. How convenient!	PRO 01
Sharon Johnson	April 18, 2013	The drilling, processing, piping and burning of tar sands oil is not a safe industry and the consequences-both environmental and economic are negative.	ACK
Sharon Kennedy	April 20, 2013	The Ogallala Aquifer is vital to our lives. If we allow oil to infiltrate the sand and eventually the water, it will have dire consequences on the people of this state. Since it is inevitable that a spill will one day happen, why would we want to take the chance.	WRG 01
Sharon Kolakowski	April 14, 2013	The pipeline is planned to go through farmland owed and farmed by a friend's family since 1876. They are opposed to this potentially hazardous toxic tar sand being piped through their land.	LU 01
Sharon Kolakowski	April 22, 2013	Sinks in water impossible to clean out of rivers and God forbid the Ogallala Aquifer.	RISK 08
Sharon Larson	April 15, 2013	TSO is impossible to remove from water- there is an aquifer that supplies water to several states right under where the pipeline will go.	WRG 01, RISK 08
Sharon Nolting	April 22, 2013	But more importantly even that that, the tar sands oil that will move through this pipeline is some of the dirtiest fossil fuel on the planet and would significantly contribute to climate change.	CLIM 05
Sharon Nolting	April 22, 2013	tar sands oil is some of the dirtiest fuel on the planet , producing consi derably more global warming emissions when burned than conventional oil.	CLIM 05
Sharon Nolting	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is a disaster waiting to happen, with the certainty that there will be accidents, spilling this toxic oil into our aquifers, land and communities.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sharon Osborne	April 3, 2013	Is our country so addicted to fossil fuel use that we will still support the "development" of an endgame industry--endgame for those affected by the pollution and accidents which we read about every day, and endgame for the planet, because of the carbon footprint and CO2 associated with the development of the XL pipeline.	PN 05
Sharon Paul	April 3, 2013	The proposed new pipeline would run through the heartland of America, with potential to contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers' and ranchers' ways of life.	RISK 06, LU 01
Sharon Rakunas	March 11, 2013	No only is it dirty, it uses up precious sources of water in extraction and also results in dirty polluted water that is forever unusable to the residents of the nation.	CU 07
Sharon Roberts	April 4, 2013	Building the Keystone XL pipeline can only lead to more environmental destruction along its route, damaging habitat, water supplies, and fouling our wildlife.	ACK
Sharon S. Condron	April 12, 2013	Our air and water don't need their pollutants and our oil companies have enough to do already.	ACK
Sharon S. Condron	April 12, 2013	Let the Canadians find their own way to sell their own oil through their own land with their own refinery and their own port.	ALT 05
Sharon S. Condron	April 12, 2013	The records of other "safe" pipelines is proof we don't need that.	RISK 14
Sharon Smith	April 9, 2013	The profits are not enough to justify what will happen to our country! Nor are they enough to justify what will happen to the people who live and work along the area of this pipeline.	PN 02
Sharon Smolinski	April 11, 2013	Do your job and do a proper and scientifically valid report on the far-reaching impacts that this export pipeline will have on our land, air, water, health and climate. Acknowledge the huge relevance of climate change impacts, and the severe danger to propery, water, ecosystems, species. (I can't believe I have to tell you this in a democratic administration.)	CLIM 12
Sharon Spriggs	April 8, 2013	The 3 spills that has happened within the last week or so should be reason enough to reject this pipeline. We are destroying our environment and our cities/towns with these spills.	RISK 13
Sharon Stoneback	March 11, 2013	the State Department agrees that the pipeline isn't necessary for our energy security.	PN 01
Sharon Stonecipher	April 22, 2013	If we ruin our land and water supply we may not have the technology to correct the damage I.e. the Ogallala Aquifer.	RISK 19
Sharon Toscano	March 17, 2013	I'd rather see effort be put into manufacturing more alternatives to gasoline and diesel based .transportation systems.	ALT 01
Sharon Victor	March 24, 2013	I am concerned about eminent-domain laws being used to obtain easements across private properties.	LEG 02
Sharon Victor	March 24, 2013	Most of the oil produced will be sold overseas, thus not helping us with "energy independence."	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sharon Victor	March 24, 2013	The Cornell report states the amount of jobs are overstated, most will be temporary, and the project will be more of an economic liability.	SO 02
Sharon Wheeler	April 3, 2013	Solar - wind- clean, renewable we can live with them for generations and generations.	ACK
Sharon Wilson	March 16, 2013	I can't find the beginning and ending dates of the comment period anywhere on the website	PRO 02
Sharon Zierott	March 30, 2013	I am hoping to get an answer. This is not a comment. Why is a company like Keystone allowed to start building this enormous pipeline without all their permits in place. The USA and the states weren't allowed to have a choice in this matter. We were forced my eminent domain. I really do want it explained to me. Please.	LEG 02
Sharri Harwick	April 6, 2013	Any such potential to negatively affect our water supply is not okay. People who need jobs would not be able to give up drinking water in return. Water is a necessity.	WRG 01
Sharron Thompson	April 4, 2013	If it can be clearly established that this project will NOT endanger the environment including wild life and birds, I would consider supporting the pipeline project. I would not support the project if it were found to be a threat to our environment. The two incidents that have already occurred pose considerable environmental threats. Cleaning up after an incident is not sufficient guarantee against the long term damage that is caused. So, is there a way to insure that the greatest care and protection can be insured? If not, please do not consider continuing this practice. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to express my concerns in the hopes that the panel will remember their responsibility to our children in caring for our environment.	RISK 14, PN 05
Sharyn Rothgarn	March 11, 2013	Recent developments have shown that, despite the treaty signed to reduce CO2 emissions, we will be OVER that level in just a couple of years and BEYOND what the foremost scientists in the world believe is safe! Allowing the Keystone XL pipeline will not only permit the continued use of fossil fuels with no end in sight,	CLIM 14
Sharyn Rothgarn	March 11, 2013	it will be built over CRUCIAL aquifers! What do we do once our largest sources of drinking water are contaminated?	WRG 01
Shauna Haines	April 21, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities r.ear refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04
Shauna Haines	April 21, 2013	Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could_end_as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 05
Shauna Haines	April 21, 2013	Contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, the pipeline could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 05, RISK 06
Shawn Grove	April 22, 2013	We do not need this pipeline otherwise we lose our wild animals forests. Which poses leaks from the pipeline and fires and impacts on human health.	RISK 30, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shawn Lewis	April 11, 2013	It would destroy wildlife habitat and accelerate climate change. Canada's tar sands contain twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history. If we exploit this resource, it will be game over for our climate.	CLIM 14
Shawn Lewis	April 11, 2013	The proposed pipeline bisects no fewer than six rivers as well as the crucial Ogallala aquifer. After the number of tar sands pipeline spills we have seen -- including 12 spills in the Keystone 1 pipeline's first year and the disastrous Kalamazoo spill a few years ago -- we can't risk another corrosive tar sands pipeline crossing these waters.	WRG 01, RISK 26
Shawn Newell	April 5, 2013	Please consider not only your children, but others in nations already affected by sea level rise, increasing heat and desertification and extreme weather.	CLIM 17
Shawn Newell	April 5, 2013	The US will benefit only through short-term construction jobs but a Canadian firm will benefit over the long-term with corporate profits.	PN 07
Shawn Newell	April 5, 2013	This oil will NOT be used to meet energy needs in America, but will be exported, exposing American coastlines and open ocean to additional risk of spills	PN 07
Shawn Newell	April 5, 2013	the risk of toxic oil spills along its route and terminus that threaten both human and natural communities as well as the land and water we all depend on, cleaning-up is not actually possible, we can only mop up what is on the surface, the effects last lifetimes	RISK 07
Shawn Newell	April 5, 2013	TransCanada has a poor record when it comes to safe, clean operations. In the first year of operation, their last pipeline had 12 spills	RISK 26
Shawna Raymond	March 28, 2013	Please don't let your legacy be the one who allowed the Keystone XL pipeline to tear through the United States. There is enough sequestered carbon in the site that, if released through digging, will be devastating for our climate. This decision will impact the whole world.	CLIM 14
Shawndra Hayes-budgen	April 2, 2013	This is about everyone else's health, living environment and the well-being of the delicate eco-systems that are poisoned when pipelines break, runoff spoils the soil and by-product pollutes the atmosphere because of oil and gas extraction. Not to mention any financial implications this has for families affected (lowered property values, health care costs, etc...) which, in turn, affect the stability of the whole country.	PN 05
Shawndy Linquist	April 4, 2013	It's time to focus on proven clean energy sources rather than environmentally harmful ways of the past.	ALT 01
Shawnna Fox	April 9, 2013	The 150,000 gallons of toxic crude spewed into an Arkansas suburb which forced homeowners to evacuate is nothing compared to what could happen with the volume of tar sands oil potentially going through the Keystone XL pipes.	RISK 18, RISK 13
Shayanna Kelly	March 27, 2013	Let's find alternative energy solutions instead of feeding the dangerous addiction of injecting our communities with the toxins of carbon-intensive fossil fuels	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shea B	March 19, 2013	I care about myself. I care about other people. I care about the environment. I care about animals. I care about our water, our air, our Earth. This Keystone XL Pipeline will be disastrous. It will destroy all the things I just wrote about. You must stop this ridiculous idea, that this Pipeline will be good. It will not. There are many, many citizens of the World that are completely opposed to this Pipeline. You must listen to these voices.	ACK
Sheela Alex	March 18, 2013	Pursuing the Keystone Pipeline is a seriously costly expenditure, especially to our air…	ACK
Sheela Alex	March 18, 2013	Pursuing the Keystone Pipeline is a seriously costly expenditure, especially… to our future.	ACK
Sheela Alex	March 18, 2013	Pursuing the Keystone Pipeline is a seriously costly expenditure, especially to our… climate	CLIM 14
Sheila & John Collins	April 22, 2013	[Mining tar sands] destroys millions of acres of boreal forest (a critical carbon sink)	CU 01
Sheila Beers	April 4, 2013	The people and the environment need electric cars to be mass produced so that this pipeline would not be necessary. The funds being spent on the oil industry and its damage should be going toward the manufacture of electric cars and rebates and other discounts for citizens who buy the cars. Another good place to start would be electric buses for transportation within and between cities and for use by the public school system.	PN 02
Sheila Brown	April 17, 2013	I believe the carbon emissions will impact the environment forever and that as Mr.Hansen said it will be "game over" for the planet.	CLIM 14
Sheila Brown	April 17, 2013	i know that past Impact statements have been deeply flawed because the scientists actually represented Trans Canada.	PRO 01
Sheila Davis	March 10, 2013	I have been fighting climate change for over 20 years. If tar sands are developed in Canada and the U.S. supports that development with this pipeline, you are saying to the world that the developed world doesn't give a damn about what happens to the climate. You're also saying that your Administration has been lying to the people of the United States - not the people who would never have voted for you in the first place; but to the very people who put their trust in you as an arbiter of change.	PN 02
Sheila Jensen	March 26, 2013	It is not clear to me just what benefits Nebraska would receive that would motivate our elected officials to put this critical area [Ogallala Aquifer] in peril. There have been too many catastrophic accidents linked to the oil industry to ever trust anything they say.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sheila Kelley	March 10, 2013	I have heard that the employment gains will only be temporary and that this oil is not destined for use in the US, ergo, I see no value in supporting a temporary fix which has the potential of having an inordinate environmental impact.	PN 05
Sheila Kilpatrick	March 28, 2013	This pipeline keeps us focused on dirty oil, rather than on clean, renewable energy and the risk to the environment is far too huge to risk. The time is now to move beyond the influence of big oil and you are the person to move our country forward.	ALT 01
Sheila Leadbetter	March 28, 2013	First and foremost, this oil is not to benefit the United States. The idea is to simply use our Country to move it to the ports in Texas to ship to overseas. We take the risk and for what? Jobs? If you want to produce more jobs, open a refinery on the border and use the oil where you do not have to ship long distances.	PN 07, ALT 08
Sheila Pryor	April 5, 2013	we are inexorably linked with Canada in regards to environment, as, we are also inexorably linked with those countires south of the USA boarder - we are one large North America - the destruction of the environment north or south, portends destruction of our whole continent, and it is destruction we are talking about	ACK
Sheila Rabun	April 15, 2013	Instead of pouring funds into the Keystone oil pipeline, risking spills and other harm to living creatures and the environment, we should be focusing resources on developing newer cleaner energy supplies.	PN 02
Sheila Wofsy	April 4, 2013	I am horrified to hear there have been two tar sands oil spills within a week or so, and a number of them before this, with birds, wildlife, neighborhoods and waterways fouled, and the state department still is not concerned about the risks.	RISK 14
Sheilah Rechtschaffer	April 9, 2013	The damage willl be irrepairable. Let's not go down this path to destruction of our most valuable asset. A balanced earth with a safe future for our children.	CLIM 14
Shelby Gerber	April 17, 2013	- Transcanada is a foreign corporation which means that the dependance for the US on foreign oil does not decrease - It will not make gas prices cheaper	PN 04
Shelby Gerber	April 17, 2013	- Untested pipelines with heated bitumen - Sludge full of highly toxic carcinogens (benzene) - No method of clean-up for bitumen	RISK 14
Shelby Gerber	April 17, 2013	- The route still goes over important water sources that many people drink from	WRG 06
Shellee Davis	March 6, 2013	"Recent assessment of the potential damage due to the Keystone XL Pipeline that says it is not likely to have a substantial impact on the tar sands or climate change. This is shocking after the pipeline failure that dumped 1.2 gallons of oil sands into 30 miles of of the Kalamazoo River in 2010 and the enormous expense and unprecedented difficulty of cleaning up that kind of oil."	RISK 13
Shellee Davis	March 6, 2013	TransCanada is currently under an audit for systematic violations of safety regulations.	RISK 25

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shelley Allan-cole	April 19, 2013	It is designed to carry tar sands bitumen to Texas to refine for shipping overseas, so it does not create energy independence here at home.	PN 04
Shelley Allan-cole	April 19, 2013	It will create only ~35 permanent jobs.	SO 04
Shelley Buonaiuto	March 11, 2013	Trans Canada has been disingenuous about the number of jobs that will be produced and is claiming that the tar sands oil will make us energy secure. This is not true. The jobs are temporary and the oil will be exported.	SO 04
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	The tar sands also contain many toxins, known carcinogens, which can leach into groundwater.	ACK
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	Even if the oil were to be used in the US, it would not be needed if a carbon fee were instituted. According to James Hanson, 10 times the energy that would be piped through the pipeline could be saved with the institution of a carbon fee and dividend.	CLIM 18
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	Our sovereign rights over our private property are not respected, when a foreign company is allowed to inflict eminent domain on U.S. Landowners, for private profit.	LEG 02
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	Many more jobs would be created in development of renewables. It has been estimated that development of solar could create more than 4 million jobs.	SO 05
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	We can do this quickly once we institute a carbon fee and dividend. Many major corporations are calling for a carbon fee, including Nike, Nestle and Starbucks. Exxon-Mobil, BP and Shell are calling for a carbon fee. Once this fee is in place, investors will be encouraged to invest in renewables.	SO 16
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	The pipeline is designed to pass over sensitive environmental areas, the Ogallala, Arbuckls-Simpson, Antlers and Carrizo-Wilcox Aquifers.	WRG 01
Shelley Buonaiuto	April 11, 2013	There is certain to be a spill contaminating at least one of these irreplaceable water sources, endangering drinking water as well as land and water crucial for farming in America's breadbasket.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Shelley Dahlgren	April 5, 2013	I bought an all electric car two years ago to get off fossil fuels, only I know this will not help because the gasoline I save will be sent abroad.	ACK
Shelley Hunt	April 22, 2013	the stuff will just be refined and shipped overseas to wherever the Oil Companies can get the highest price. American consumers won’t even get a break on gas.	PN 07
Shelley Jaye	April 16, 2013	Please just take a moment and think about what this resource is made of… tar plus sand. Sand held together by a tar that must be separated with a proprietary mixture of chemicals, heated with more fossil fuels and washed with precious clean water to be put in a pipe and forced to travel across a continent.	PN 05
Shelley Mills	April 11, 2013	We need to get over the oil/gas dependence.	ACK
Shelley Morris	April 9, 2013	We also have learned that Exon will not be responsible for tar sands because they aren't "oil." Really?	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shelley Schade	April 22, 2013	A few cents on a gallon of gas(which will not really happen long term) and jobs created(many temporary) and many from out of state. None of that is worth jeopardizing the Ogalalla auquifer.	PN 05
Shelley Stall	April 22, 2013	Even if this pipeline would bring a few temporary jobs to Nebraska, it could never be worth the damage a spill of bitumen would do to our water, our land and the health of our people.	PN 05
Shelley Whittington	March 18, 2013	I beg you to stop the mad control of the petrol companies! your grandchildren will know no wildlife if we continue to destroy this earth at the current rate! We are developing, logging, and farming to the point that there is no longer any viable wildlife areas...at least here in central Virginia!	ACK
Shelly Gifford	April 22, 2013	If [the KXL pipeline] allowed to continue the groundwater will be contaminated, and all rural people in Nebraska will be drinking contaminated water. They will develop cancer and other diseases. The food sold from Nebraska to other states will be contaminated.	RISK 24
Sheri Anderson	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline promises to be as dirty as any here-to-for and has the potential to cause immense climate and environmental impacts.	CLIM 14
Sheri Ertl	April 22, 2013	It may endanger our water supply and damage fragile ecosystems.	ACK
Sheri Roese	March 11, 2013	The "RISK vs. REWARD" of bringing tar sands across american lands, with no direct benefit to Americans other than the hope of 3900 temporary jobs is frankly not worth it.	PN 05
Sherilyn Lacount	April 16, 2013	Dear Mr. President-our environment and land is too precious. We have the same problem in Hawaii with the Rail project that will unearth ancient burials, trees & occupied homes. To build transportation for people whose homes we shouldn't have even built.	PN 05
Sherma Landess	April 2, 2013	We as a people should be breathing clean air and motivated to increase and support projects such as the Tres Amigas in New Mexico and the alternative energies.	ALT 01
Sherman	March 19, 2013	The State Department report was hugely disappointing for its lack of insight and balance. Sure, Keystone may be small in the larger scheme of things. Sure, it can be made more or less damaging at the margins. Sure, there are things that can be done to make things worse even if Keystone is, in fact, blocked. And we need more, a State Department that sides with the American people, the Canadian people, and the people of the world to fight the most powerful industries in the history of our economy, the fossil industries.	ACK
Sherman	March 19, 2013	Stopping Keystone will make it a little harder to develop dirty oil and degrade the climate we need for a better life.	CLIM 14
Sherri Bennett	April 13, 2013	More precious than your oil is our fresh water. Move your pipe line.	ACK
Sherri Tucker	April 22, 2013	It is a threat to the Ogalla Aquifer.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sherri Webber	April 2, 2013	THE PIPE USUALLY LASTS FOR FIFTY TO EIGHTY YEARS? AND IT "ONLY" HAPPENED BECAUSE OUR INFRASTRUCTURE IS SO BAD!? THAT'S WHAT THEY SAID! NOW, I DON'T SEE CONGRESS LETTING ANYONE REPAIR OUR TERRIBLE PIPES, ROADS, BRIDGES, ETC. NOW, SO WE SHOULD ADD MORE TOO THE MESS FIRST, BEFORE FIXING A ONE? I DON'T THINK SO, AND CERTAINLY NOT WHEN THIS WHOLE COUNTRY IS IN A DROUGHT, THE RIVERS ARE LOW, AND OUR WATER IS ALREADY THREATENED, WE SHOULD USE MILLIONS OF GALLONS OF IT FOR THESE WELLS, AND THEN "STORE" IT DANGEROUSLY, so it and the tar sands can BOTH leak and ruin what water we do have!? NOW, ISN'T THAT WHAT BROUGHT ANCIENT EMPIRES DOWN, NO WATER?! ITS NUTS AND SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED, EVER!	PN 05, RISK 14
Sherrill Futrell	April 5, 2013	The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to critically assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts	PN 05
Sherron	April 22, 2013	When we are trying to expand on our renewable energy resources and cleaning up our planet why would we ever consider approving something that is dirtier than anything we alread do.	CLIM 18, ALT 01
Sherron Norris	March 10, 2013	With all the oil spills we have had over the earth, the Gulf of Mexico, Alaska, the Yellowstone river to name just three, why, why, WHY would we want to ship this crude poison through the heartland of our country? The longer we rely on oil, theirs or ours, we will continue to rape the mother that gives us life instead of finding reliable clean alternatives. Please, please, PLEASE keep your promises to the people and not the big oil companies to protect our world.	ACK
Sherry Hutchison	March 9, 2013	Since renowned scientist James Hansen has said that if the pipeline is built, it's "game over for the planet," I cannot understand your stating that it wouldn't have a significant impact.	CLIM 13
Sherry Lewis	March 31, 2013	In a day when we are going "green," why are we building a pipeline for dirty oil?	ALT 01
Sherry Lewis	March 31, 2013	Put all the Keystone money to GREEN energy not diry tar sands.	ALT 01
Sherry Lewis	March 31, 2013	If Canada wants to take their tar sands and make money off it then let them build the refineries in their country.	ALT 08
Sherry Parsons	April 22, 2013	Not to mention the devastating impact on wildlife, ecosystems that are unique to Nebraska alone.	ACK
Sherry Parsons	April 22, 2013	Our WATER SUPPLY would be directly affected by any spills, and time and time again weve seen that the oil industry cannot guarantee that there wont be a spill. Its our water. If its fouled, it cant be made clean again	RISK 07
Sherry Shadday	April 13, 2013	See articles in the Salt Lake Tribune (Apr 12 2013) and Standard Examiner (Apr 11 2013) for more details.	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sherry Skramstad	April 9, 2013	Provide the opportunities for the growth of new industries and jobs by investing in, and developing, clean and renewable sources of energy	SO 05
Sherry Svec	April 10, 2013	The companies involved cannot be trusted - check out their safety records - abysmal and SURE TO POLLUTE.	RISK 13
Sherry Toelle	April 3, 2013	We cannot give a Canadian company the right of eminent domain in the US.	LEG 02
Sherry Toelle	April 3, 2013	If the pipeline breaks, who is responsible for clean-up and for the damage to the US Environment?	RISK 03
Sherrylee Felger	April 9, 2013	Not only is the American public TOTALLY unaware that the fossil fuel derived from the XL pipeline is not going to benefit the US, they have no idea that the US will have all the pollution and environmental destruction associated with refining it.	PN 05
Sherwin Racehorse	March 10, 2013	In Alberta providence, Canada, people and our earth are dying a slow death because of tar sands extraction. Please consider this issue in your decision and the fact that our land, air and water is contaminated--while, we support western thoughts of ecomonics over protection of our most important resources. Our children are depending on your decision to reject the Keystone XL. People on the southern half of the pipeline are losing their basic freedoms that are guarenteed in our constitution. Consider their lives.	RISK 07, CU 05
Sherwood Hake	April 17, 2013	EPA estimates that ADO (Alberta Death Ooze) has a "well-to-tank" carbon footprint 82% greater than oil. Canadian bitumen deposits could contain twice as much carbon dioxide as we've unleashed so far upon the biosphere in our entire history of using oil.	CLIM 05
Sherwood Hake	April 20, 2013	Some pipeline advocates are citing a recent IHS-CERA study that argues tar sand oil produces only 6 percent more carbon than conventional crude. This is an overly optimistic estimate from an industry-affiliated group that is not consistent with other findings. Tar sands must be mined with giant trucks and then heat is applied in order to separate the bitumen from the sands, thereby increasing the carbon footprint. A more reasonable estimate of 20-25% is found in a detailed analysis by Stanford Assistant Professor Adam Brandt. Moreover, a recent report notes that the overall impact may even be significantly worse than previously thought because tar sand companies are replacing boggy peat lands that absorb large amounts of carbon with dry forests when they are finished mining. We do not have determinative data yet to calculate the exact difference between tar sand oil and conventional crude, but there is little doubt that it is much higher than 6 percent.	CLIM 11
Sheryl A. Hanigan	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow the Keystone Pipeline expansion to cross through wetlands the Nebraska Sandhills or over the Ogallala Aquifer. These water resources are too precious and too important to risk losing.	WRG 01, WET 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shewell, Jarom	March 22, 2013	The fuel itself further perpetuates greenhouse gases, at a time when the US should be dramatically scaling down fossil fuels	PN 02
Shewell, Jarom	March 22, 2013	It's been suggested the majority of the fuel will be exported to Asia, serving no benefit to Americans and profiting only the large conglomerates fighting to impose this assault on the peoples of North American and the globe	PN 07
Shirley A. Condon	April 22, 2013	It poses a tremendous risk to the Ogallala Aquifer, the water supply of untold numbers of US citizens as well as crops, livestock, wildlife, and all living things. Though the Earths surface is largely water, only 1% of this water is suitable for drinking. Water is not a "renewable" substance; every molecule of water currently in existance is the same water present in the age of dinosaurs. We cant risk any of this precious resource getting permanently fouled by tar sands. Nothing made by human hands is perfect, and the KXL Pipeline is certain to corrode and leak eventually. Do we want future generations to wonder what we could have been thinking to let such a poisonous substance be pumped through our water supply?	WRG 01, RISK 07
Shirley Bickel	March 28, 2013	and hopefully will reject it in an effort to protect the environment, the health of the people in areas where it is being developed, the danger of further impact on the climate,	CLIM 14
Shirley Condon	April 16, 2013	The monitors for leak detection will be located in the Operations Control Center, not locally, but in Calgary, Alberta, and will be capable of detecting only leaks greater than 1 % (10,500 barrels per day!). In remote rural areas such as found in the Sandhills, a leak ofless than 10,500 bpd could continue for days unless it became visible at the surface and could be seen from the aerial inspections conducted approximately every 2-3 weeks, or until the shortage was detected.	RISK 15
Shirley Condon	April 16, 2013	TransCanada has told us that these "small" spills not detected by their monitors would be expected to be spotted by "passersby", as if folks out strolling in the vast Sandhills pastureland would happen upon such a leak.	RISK 15
Shirley Condon	April 16, 2013	We already saw this in the 60 foot geyser of oil erupting from a failed fitting in the first Keystone Pipeline in North Dakota in May of 2011. It was 30 minutes before the pipeline was shut down, and even then only because a local witness repeatedly reported it.	RISK 26
Shirley Condon	April 16, 2013	If you check a map you will see the majority of the large cities along the Ogalla Aquiferthat depend on this water source lie, east, downstream so to spek, of the pipeline route.	WRG 01
Shirley Condon	April 16, 2013	...the Platte River in Nebraska is a major source of water for our biggest cities; a spill at the river or one of its many channels would certainly affect many hundreds of thousands of people.	WRS 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	How will Canadian tar sands reduce US gas prices? Tar sands cannot be refined into gasoline, and its other products produced do not meet US standards for use here. TransCanada has said many times that the price per barrel of oil will increase with the addition of their tar sands. Their representative told me that the refined tar sands will be sold on the open market, so most likely will be exported.	PN 04
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	TransCanada has a reputation of mistreating Native tribes in their own country, polluting their rivers, disregarding sacred grounds, and ignoring the increasing cancer and illness rates near the tar sands operations. The State Department review did not address Native concerns here regarding health and cultural impacts on native lands, and the current route passes through a number of sacred tribal grounds protected by US Treaties, and includes the Ponca's Trail of Tears.	RISK 07
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	If TransCanada gets its "foot in the door" by approval of this permit, will they then have an easy path into our country for many more toxic pipelines, or even multiple pipelines along the current easements? The easement contracts TransCanada tried to coerce me to sign were ambiguous on this point, one contract stated "one pipeline", another "a pipeline", yet another "one pipeline" (with a space where something had apparently been deleted), and the final one stating "one or more pipelines". Worse yet, would this set a precedent for other (not as friendly) countries to gain permits to cross our borders?…What will prevent TransCanada from selling our easements or even the entire pipeline to another corporation or another country at some future date? They claim KXL will be the safest pipeline, but if they turn it over to another owner in 5 years it may not be properly maintained and we could end up with a mess like the Yellowstone River, Kalamazoo, or Mayflower, Arkansas spills…TransCanada plans to "abandon the pipeline in place" when they cease using it. They say that the landowner then takes full responsibility for any damages that occur in the future. If the easements are "permanent", how can TransCanada shirk its responsibility to maintain the pipeline permanently? If a major leak were to occur while the pipeline is in operation, could TransCanada then declare that they are abandoning the pipeline thus leaving the liability on the landowner	RISK 08
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	What are the components of the diluents added to the peanut butter-thick tar sands to allow it to be pumped through the pipeline? Thus far, TransCanada refuses to divulge the toxic substances, saying this is proprietary information. Even our own State Fire Marshall has been unable to obtain this information for our firefighters and first responders in case of a spill. Without this information, landowners will not know what contaminants to have their water tested for in order to detect hidden leaks. MSDS information is required by law.	RISK 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	What are the honest numbers of local or even US citizen jobs created by the KXL, and how long will the employment last? TransCanada has given a wide range of numbers of jobs, with no explanation as to why the first numbers were so inflated. The Perryman Group's analysis of the economic benefits, a report paid for by TransCanada for the first EIS, states that their report is based on "the 100-year life of the project". TransCanada says the project will take 2 years to complete and gives no clear estimate on the lifetime of the pipeline. Does the job number include only actual construction jobs, or does it include peripheral jobs -- an extra waitress or bartender at the local bar and grill, another housekeeper at the local motel, workers to repair damages to local roads during construction, etc? The steel for the pipeline has already been manufactured in another country and TransCanada employs many of their own workers in the construction. How may local jobs are currently held by workers from the first Keystone? There will be no additional refinery jobs, as the amount of tar sands delivered will be a small percentage of the amount currently processed.	SO 02
Shirley Condon	April 22, 2013	Will TransCanada pay into the Oil Spill and Liability Trust fund? Though TransCanada characterizes tar sands as crude oil, the tar sands will be carried as diluted bitumen to flow through the pipeline, and this "dilbit" is not considered oil by the IRS and is not thus taxed. The latest major pipeline spills in the US have pointed out this oversight in our laws.	SO 15
Shirley Cupani	April 22, 2013	The fact that Canada will not allow the pipeline to be built there tells you how bad the pipeline is. Why would you allow the garbage in our country? The profits go to a Canadian company. What benefit is there to the U.S.?	PN 05
Shirley Muney	April 20, 2013	the tar sand--I hesitate to call it oil--that it would transport would NOT deliver cheap oil to the U.S. It's destined for ports on the Gulf of Mexico, for ultimate shipment to oil-hungry countries around the globe, countries that may be willing to pay a huge price for this extremely dirty fuel.	PN 04
Shirley Muney	April 20, 2013	The promise of some temporary jobs during construction of the pipeline does not justify the risks and expense to this country.	PN 05
Shirley Muney	April 20, 2013	Aside from the HUGE environmental risks that the pipeline poses,	RISK 07
Shirley Napps	April 10, 2013	We also will not get the benefit (though dubious) of the extra oil coming from this project--it will be exported. We're fighting wars and spending our children's, grandchildren's, great-grandchildren's, and great-great-grandchildren's futures to make sure we have energy security built on foreign oil, while we allow Keystone XL oil to be shipped to other countries.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shirley Powell	April 4, 2013	We have already had three tar-sands spills - Michigan, Yellowstone and now Arkansas. The Michigan one was the first one and it has not been cleaned up three years later. We do not need that to ruin our land and water.	ACK
Shirley Powell	April 4, 2013	I'm sure you are aware that the reason they want the pipeline over the United States is that Canada will not allow them to run a pipeline either west or east. If their own country will not let them run a pipeline, why should we risk our water and land to it.	PN 07, ALT 05
Shirley Powell	April 5, 2013	By the way, the environmental impact study was written by the company that want to build the pipeline.	PRO 01
Shirley Shumake	March 30, 2013	The Canadian Government has already stopped the refining of tar sands oil there, so the China company that owns this mess is wanting to kill Texans to refine it on our Coast.	ACK
Shirley Shumake	March 30, 2013	Why on earth would we want to let a foreign Country build a pipeline across the middle of the United States that is causing water problems where it is already breaking in Canada?	ACK
Shirley Wallack	April 7, 2013	The environmental review os the Keystone XL pipeline is woefully inadequate. Surely we can do better than taking such a risk to our beautiful environment.	LEG 04
Shirley Ware-gully	April 5, 2013	I want to see our government create jobs and grow our economy using clean energy like solar and wind power.	ALT 01
Shirley Way	March 16, 2013	t is well documented that this project will contribute such volume of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere as to push climate change to the point of no return--where we will guarantee to cook the planet.	CLIM 14
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	the pipeline route goes through hundreds of sacred sites…we have laws requiring the protection of those sites, and those laws are being blatantly violated.	CR 02
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	[In bitumen extraction areas in Canada] the culture of hunting, fishing, and gathering has already been destroyed, replaced by logging, mining, and other paid work as the forests are no longer healthy enough to support traditional subsistence lifestyles.	CU 05
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The tar sands have caused serious health damage in every nearby community, with the cancer at Fort Chipewyan the most well known.	CU 05
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The granting of eminent domain and other privileges accorded Transcanada all require that this pipeline serve some need of the American people. The claim of jobs does not, or should not, meet any standard of necessity.	LEG 02
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	Our national priority should be an emergency mobilization to stop climate change – with any sacrifices necessary	PN 02
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	this pipeline, and other fossil fuel schemes…merely delays the implementation of alternative energy options.	PN 03
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The tar sands are in Canada, but they need this pipeline for full development.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	There is the claim that the tar sands will be developed anyway, with or without Keystone XL. This is false.	PN 06
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	When it reaches the Texas ports, it can and will be shipped to the highest bidder, anywhere in the world.	PN 07
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The State Department has accepted a report written by an oil industry consultant, and issued it as your own work.	PRO 01
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The pipeline will leake eventually there will be a leak into the aquifer, so the question is not if but when we will suffer serious damage to this important water supply and thus to America's agriculture.	RISK 07
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	Spill detection technology is weak, missing subtle cracks and also faults at joints - the most vulnerable places. Industry reports of spills routinely ignore the most common spill causes and report only the others. Far too many spills are only discovered when an ordinary citizen notices them. Responses are inadequate.	RISK 14
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	Temporary construction jobs will be available for the short term; very few long-term jobs will be added to maintain and monitor the pipeline.	SO 04
Shodo Spring	March 7, 2013	The change in route did not avoid the [Ogallala] aquifer, thus any spill risks contamination of the most important water supply in the Midwest.	WRG 06
Shoemaker, Lynn H	March 6, 2013	Opposition to any tar sands pipeline in Canada is fierce. Without major repression, I doubt if the east or west routes are feasible.	ALT 05
Shyla L. Jones, Mayor; Carolyn Schmoeckel, Clerk/Treasurer; William Crowder, Councilman; Bonnie Wiederrick, Councilperson; David Rummel, Councilman; Warren Abrahamson, Councilman	April 11, 2013	The project will create jobs that are in dire need in all states involved	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sid Sidney Madison	April 16, 2013	I can't believe you think that there is almost no impact on emissions. Think of the Earth as a patient. Get a second opinion!!!! We've got a fever that is getting worse and tar sands oil will add to the blanket that is making us warming.	CLIM 14
Sidnie	April 19, 2013	Why not use all the money it would take to build this toxic dangerous pipeline to look for alternative energy sources.	ALT 01
Siegel	April 18, 2013	I'm appalled that the Environmental Impact Statement from the U.S. State Department does not think there would be any significant impact on climate change.	ACK
Siegel	April 18, 2013	And I also wanted to say one thing, which is that in your report, a fact that's not stated about it, which is that it's well known -- it's well known that your outsourced EIS report is part of the decades-long trend in hiring private consultants to do government work. And I know your job at the state is to determine whether the pipeline is, quote, unquote, in the national interest. But from what I've read about the report and what I've read about the report, it sounds to me the way it was report is itself not in the national interest or because of the ability - - complete lack of oversight and asks whether or not - - whether there's any conflict of interest with the people who are doing the report. Normally when a State Department official, if they were to have any involvement or any financial interest with Keystone or if their spouse or partner did, they would be barred from working on it. But when the State Department outsources to private contractors, those employees are not subject to the conflict of interest rules. And so I think this report is extremely biased, whether it is acknowledged or not, even by the workers doing the report.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Siegel	April 18, 2013	I traveled here today from Iowa. And the reason I'm here is because the water hydrant from -- comes from the Jordan Aquifer which is the largest aquifer in the State of Iowa and the largest source of groundwater. It connects to the Dakota Aquifer which then decisively reaches across the western border to Nebraska and connects to the Ogallala Aquifer. So when the oil spills -- because it will -- it will penetrate into these other aquifers.	RISK 10
Sierra Club	March 27, 2013	The comment period substantially coincides with the public comment period for scoping comments for the Alberta Clipper Line 67 expansion project. Those comments are due on April 29th, competing directly with the comment epriod for the draft SEIS. The overlap unnecessarily impedes the ability of the intersted public to submit substantive vomments on both projects.	PRO 04
Sierra Club	March 27, 2013	The new information in the draft SEIS includes lengthy additions to the Market Analysis, Pipeline Risk Assessment and Environmental Consequence Analysis, Proposed Alternatives, and Climate Change Impact sections as well as documents to which our organizers currently lack access, but require in order to conduct a meaningful review. A longer comment period and access to all documents would allow for a meaningful review of the document.	PRO 04
Sierra Club, Delaware Chapter	April 18, 2013	Because the climate risks to Delaware and other coastal states are not detailed in the SEIS, the document is unable to advise the State Department on the true environmental impacts of the project.	CLIM 12
Sierra Club, Delaware Chapter	April 18, 2013	Delaware has made great strides to reduce our carbon emissions. The Keystone XL pipeline would quickly erase our effort.	CLIM 14
Sierra Club, Delaware Chapter	April 18, 2013	Section 4.14 of the SEIS details the impacts of climate change on the proposed project. The document does not discuss the impacts that the project will have on climate change, or the severity of the risks that the project would pose to Delaware or other coastal states.	CLIM 17
Sierra Club, Delaware Chapter	April 18, 2013	The greenhouse gases that would be emitte:d :ntc: the atmosphere with the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline would increase our local vulnerability to sea level rise.	CLIM 17
Sierra Dickey	March 4, 2013	We don't have the money or the carbon allowance to spend on this project.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sierra Dickey	April 13, 2013	re-design [Keystone's] path once again so that it may cross even fewer miles of the U.S…alter...the way the company deals with landowners by ceasing to use eminent domain land-grabs [and] disengage with the United States, and re-direct funds and efforts to constructing capable refining facilities on Canadian soil...In this way, TransCanada could extract, pipe, refine, and sell their product all within their own borders. This would also allow TransCanada to put their product on the global market	LEG 02, ALT 08
Sierra Dickey	April 13, 2013	Disagree with section 1.3 of the EIS. Supplying refineries is not a ligitimate purpose.The Gulf Coast areas are not in need of more oil to refine. There is not a need for TransCanada to provide product to refineries. The purpose and need of this project do not align with the National Interest Determination, or the current administrations foreign policy goals, notably “goals to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and to increase use of alternative and renewable energy sources”	PN 02
Sierra Dickey	April 13, 2013	The project is a threat to the Ogalla Aquifer because bitumen is heavier and more corrosive than other oils. A leak will affect the aquifer that provides 85% of water for Nebraska.	RISK 07
Sierra Dickey	April 13, 2013	If the soil of Nebraska is threatened in this way by erosion from construction and temperature alteration from proximity of the hot oil, something must be done. Given TransCanada’s record of poor community relations I am not comforted by the fact that their plan to soothe damaged soil in Nebraska is left at the vague phrase of “landowner compensation for demonstrated losses”	SOIL 02
Sierra Dickey	April 13, 2013	Forests will be cleared so that heavy vehicles may access the pipeline construction site. This vehicle traffic will be traversing a newly cleared tract of land, doubling the erosion of the soil that might take place from the singular acts of clearing or vehicle traffic.	VEG 02, SOIL 04
Sigrid Asmus	April 4, 2013	As you know, the material transported under pressure in these immense, 30-inch pipes is not just "oil" - it has been thinned with benzine. Benzine is so toxic that one drop is sufficient to make 75,000 gallons of water unfit to drink.	ACK
Sigrid Asmus	April 4, 2013	Our country does not deserve to put the Ogalalla Aquifer, or any other land or town at risk for the sake of a few jobs that will only keep a few thousand people busy for three or four years.	PN 05
Sigrid Asmus	April 8, 2013	When the State Department report is drafted in part by non-governmental persons with close ties to the oil producers, that's a major conflict of interest.	PRO 01
Sigrid Asmus	April 8, 2013	When thousands of gallons of toxic oil just like that from the tar sands get spilled in Arkansas, it is a sign that the infrastructure is not there -- either in the pipelines themselves, nor in those who manage them -- to prevent spills that present a terrifying danger to the water supply that supports the entire Midwest.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sigrid Cohn	March 20, 2013	Our people need jobs and that pipeline would put 100's of people to work and create tax revenue for the country, it only makes sense.	SO 08
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	Although Imperial Oil decided to abandon its plans to transport its 200-plus shipments of "megaloads" over U.S. Highway 12, efforts to transform U.S. Highway 12 into an industrial high-andwide corridor ...remains a real threat to the Tribe.	ACK
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS does not evaluate the Project's indirect impacts on climate change by supporting the extraction of oil from large sand deposits in Canada. Extraction of oil by this method contributes significantly to greenhouse gases that exacerbates climate change. Yet the United States' approval of the Project will result in continued development and operation of the Athabasca Tar Sands.	CLIM 13
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	The Project would injure Canadian First Nations communities and violate the United NationsDeclaration of the Rights of lndigenous Peoples.	CU 05
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	Section 1.9 of the DSEIS provides a list of permits, licenses, approvals, and consultation requirements for the Project. Yet the list does not acknowledge the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of lndigenous Peoples, or evaluate the Project's consistency with that international instrument.	LEG 01
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS does not adequately analyze the Project's impacts on road, rail and river transportation through the Nez Perce Reservation and Nez Perce aboriginal areas subject to rights reserved in its 1855 Treaty with the United States.	LEG 01
Silas C. Whitman	April 22, 2013	the Project's reliance on short-term jobs at the expense of injuring the environment and exacerbating climate changes does not serve the national interest.	PN 05, CLIM 14, SO 04
Silbernagel, Peter F.	April 18, 2013	I would encourage him to do so as quickly as possible as it is critical to improving the energy independence of our country, security and boosting our economy.	PN 10
Silbernagel, Peter F.	April 18, 2013	You are well aware the new jobs that will be created by this project and the billions of dollars in economic activity such a project will create. Additionally, you are well aware of the benefit to all of those communities along the pipeline corridor.	SO 10
Simone Vargas	April 5, 2013	We need to take pride in our world and our scientific community to create a sustainable energy that will not devastate our country. We need to be better that this.	ALT 01
Sioux Falls Scans	April 2, 2013	I would like share my support for this project because it will be built safely and provide thousands of jobs.	SO 02
Sira de la Fuente	March 30, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the pipeline ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives that the pipeline will decide the future of tar sands development	ACK
Sira de la Fuente	March 30, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the pipeline ignores the significant risk for toxic spills	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sira de la Fuente	March 30, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the pipeline ignores the significant risk for climate impacts	CLIM 12
Siri Beckman	April 13, 2013	The tar sands oil production sites produce twice as much sulfur dioxide as other oil producing sites.	CLIM 05
Siri Beckman	April 13, 2013	Tar sands production is destroying the boreal forest at an alarming rate. Logging of boreal forests releases methane gas which has a warming effect 20 times as potent as that of carbon dioxide. Besides harming wildlife habitat and native culture this deminishes natural wetlands while creating toxic lakes.	CLIM 06
Siri Beckman	April 13, 2013	Tar sands processing uses huge amounts of water, entire lakes in some cases. 90% of this fresh water ends up in vast tailing lakes big enough to be seen from space. These lakes are highly toxic killing anything that lands in them like water fowl for example.	CU 07
Sister Elaine DeRosiers	March 13, 2013	[purpose and need] with the development of (amazing) renewable energy technologies including solar mirrors that magnify the power of the sun, efficient wind turbines and jet fuel from algae.	PN 02
Sister Elizabeth Riebschlaeger, Ccvi	March 10, 2013	It is also a known fact that the man hired by Keystone as their lobbyist in Congress for approval of the Tar Sands Pipeline served as chair of Hilary Clinton's campaign for the presidential nomination in 2008.	ACK
Sister Elizabeth Riebschlaeger, Ccvi	March 10, 2013	ou must be familiar with NASA's Chief Environmental Scientist, Dr. James Hansen's public statement that "If these tar sands are allowed to be used as fuel around the world, we might as well throw in the towel on Global Warming". Nothing could be more clear. If you both support this Tar Sands Pipeline, you will be signing a death knell for our environment, and handing over to your children and grandchildren even more and greater environmental disasters.	ACK
Sister Elizabeth Riebschlaeger, Ccvi	March 10, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline designed to transport highly toxic tarry substances referred to as "oil", will cause the failure of all efforts to eliminate human impact on Global Warming made the last several years. Cities, states, public officials, individual citizens and environmental groups have worked to educate the public and have made decisions and choices that have made progress in lessen the impact of humans on our deteriorating climate. Even so, we have all witnessed the financial disasters that have been caused by natural disasters around the world, not the least of which was Hurricane Sandy on the East Coast of our own country. And there are more to come, even with our efforts.	CLIM 16
Sisters of Notre Dame	March 11, 2013	the XLPipeline has the potential to be disastrous for the health of the earth's atmosphere	CLIM 14
Sisters of Notre Dame	March 11, 2013	the XLPipeline has the potential to be disastrous for the health of the earth's atmosphere	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sisters of Notre Dame	March 11, 2013	the XL Pipeline has the potential to be disastrous for our nations' farmlands	LU 01
Sisters of Notre Dame	March 11, 2013	the XLPipeline has the potential to be disastrous for our nations' farmlands	RISK 06
Skeeter Leard	April 9, 2013	First count the rivers - there are around 30 - that the KXL would cross. Now go look at the footage from the Enbridge spill at Kalamazoo and this new spill at Mayflower. Imagine the Platte, the Arkansas in this condition. Imagine the financial implications.	WRS 09, RISK 13
Skip Wenz	April 15, 2013	The company that conducted the study of the pipeline for the State Department also works for the Canadian pipeline company. Therefore no disinterested, objective study has been done to establish whether or not the pipeline is harmful.	PRO 01
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Because of the demand to transport oil to coastal refineries, oil-by-rail projects are increasing dramatically in part because of limited options for transport via pi peline. The Keystone Pipeline is expected to pipe 830,000 barrels per day, which could be absorbed by current and additional rai l projects but without the environmental impacts and risks that oil pipelines can have.	ALT 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	For example, oil exports by rail from the Bakken reserves in North Dakota have quadrupled within a single year (2011-2012) and is expected to exceed 800,000 bpd of exported oil by rail just from Bakken reserves by the end of 2013.	ALT 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	While the market analysis builds a case to suggest that alternative transportation of crude oil from WCSB and Bakken are not economically feasible, the alternatives assessment actually shows that transportation by rail is economically feasible and is booming.	ALT 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Because air quality will be i mpacted and transported across administrative boundaries, the SEIS must review any and all tribal air and noise quality regulations/standards and address how tribal air quality would be impacted later in Environmental Consequences section 4.12	AQN 06
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	A tribe's right to fair and appropriate participation in the identification and evaluation of historic properties exists under NHPA regardless of a PA.	CR 01
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe has historical and current cultural ties to areas that may be impacted by the Project and therefore should have been consulted in a government-to-government torum as required under NHPA and executive orders	CR 01
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The PAis problematic because it establish an agreement and included and excluded Tribes from fair and reasonable participation in the NHPA process.	CR 01
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	While Appendix E Record of Consultation lists a large number of Indian Tribes who were contacted about this project, our Tribe was not contacted or consulted whatsoever.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	...the lists of cultural resources under Table 3.11-2, Table 3.11-3, and Table 3.11-4 seem incredibly few for the length of pipeline and this greatly concerns our Tribe not only of because of misclassified cultural resources, but also that cultural resource rich area seem to have been missed or unreported resources	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Because our Tribe and many other Tribes were precluded from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to participate in cultural resources i nventories and final determinations, we are concerned about misclassifications of our prehistoric resources, which greatly reduces the number of NRHP eligible sites.	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Cultural resource inventories must include tribal members and thei r resource specialists in both field surveys and final determinations of NRHP eligibility.	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Moreover, the evaluation of properties of Religious and Cultural Significance never incl uded our Tribe and our connection to the affected area.	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe was never provided an opportu nity to participate at any level in the NHPA process of this Project.	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Our Tribal members use affected lands for cultural purposes. There are culturally signjficant sites in the affected area and sites that protected under state, federal and tribal Jaws that are likely to be impacted from the Keystone Pipeline	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe was precluded from having any opportunity in the cultural resource assessments and final determinations of NRHP eligibility for historic and prehistoric sites, including lithic deposits, stone circles, and other prehistoric cultural resources important to our Tribe and other tribes. Cultural resource inventories often identifY prehistoric artifacts that third party consultants determine as "isolates"; whereas our Tribe upon review of those cultural resource data typically find that those determinations are incorrect and are actually part of a large prehistoric site and eligible under NRHP	CR 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The CEA does not accurately depict impacts from refinery expansions as may occur once Keystone Pipeline is in place. With the large number of oil releases from oil pipelines and other oil storage and transport facilities, this CEA must also address how Keystone Pipeline would add an increment of impacts from potential oil releases.	CU 09
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The CEA fails to assess whether future actions would add an increment to the cumulative. The increments must be illustrated individually and shown how they add to the cumulative effect.	CU 09
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The detenninations of those resou rce parameters that are included in the CEA matrices are incomplete and not fully representative of potential effects. CEA does not address past, present, future and connected oil releases on/in soil and water supplies that impact the all resources.	CU 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Our Tribe is also concemed about the insufficient disclosure of environmental justice parameters of Native America people. Many areas along the proposed pipeline will disproportionately impact Native Americans, with much greater risk of adverse health and environmental impacts on adjacent tribal lands and/or culturally significant lands and sites.	EJ 01
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Because major seismic activity can occur in the region, the SEIS must include the history of seismic activity on geologic time scales in the analysis.	GEO 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	No effort was made to include seismic activity before 1973. Geological data exists that would provide a time series of seismic events before 1973 and many centuries if not millennia into the past.	GEO 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The FEIS and SEIS fail to consider major historic earthquake/seismic activity	GEO 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Under NHPA Section 106 and pursuant to several executive orders, DI consultation policies, and Presidential Memorandums, federal departments/agencies are required to consult with Indian Tribes in a government- to-government process if a tribe may be impacted by a proposed project.	LEG 03
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The SEIS must illustrate the high and low risk areas on maps so that the reader can readily understand the risk areas.	LEG 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Without this scenario type analysis, the SEIS fails the hard look test of NEPA	LEG 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Without this type of information [how much oil is actually exported], the FEIS and SEIS preclude our Tribe and the public from having a fair and reasonable opportunity to review and challenge this NEPA document.	LEG 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Advanced design features must be included in the Alternatives section or required by the Department in order for the Project to proceed.	PD 05
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Because domestic oil exports have risen so sharply in the last decade, the concern that the Keystone Pipeline will greatly facilitate further oil exports rather than securing domestic oil for domestic users is a serious concern.	PN 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	If the demand is not foreind demand and if it is not domestic, then where is the demand? The SEIS is unclear on this point and swithches between demands from foreing vs. domestic to jsutify different compoents of the SEIS.	PN 12
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Predicting future markets based on a two-year interval snapshot not only is ripe with technical flaws, but it provides a misleading market baseline.	PN 12
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	If transportation costs of exporting oil from the Gulf Coast were sufficiently high to preclude seling and exporting to foreign buyers, then the SEIS must include an analysis of how much oil is actaully exported.	PN 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Later in the SEIS, the stance that exporting petroleum products from the Gulf Coast refineries would not be economicaly feasible is reversed. On one hand, the SEIS idenfities that refiend oil products from the Gulf Coast will not be exported because transportation costs are too high, but then on the other hand claims that regardless of domestic markets there will be a demand for refined oil products from Gulf Coast refineries.	PN 13
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	SEIS Figure 1.4.4-7 clearly illustrates drastic fluctuations of oil imports and exports over the last decade, and this analysis even predicts that oil imports will remain nearly the same for the next 30 years. The oil import v. oil export data do not support the contention that iol is being secured for domoestic users for that the US is weaning themselves off of foreign supplies.	PN 13
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	While the market analysis estimates transportation cost of exporting oil products to foreign buyers from the Gulf Coast vs. West Coast under Table 1.4-2, the analysis fails to include any analysis of houw much oil has been exported from the Gulf Coast historically and currently.	PN 13
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	While the SEIS provides about 30 pages of background on data sources, regulations, responses, and methodology background, it fails to provide scenarios from which assessments of environmental impacts would be based	RISK 02
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	An agreement between TransCanada and the Federal government that would delineate TransCanada's total responsibility in any oil releases from the Project must be included as part of this NEPA document and permit terms and conditions	RISK 03
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	No alternatives address design features of the pipeline that would further decrease or eliminate altogether potential oil spills. No alternatives address design features of the pipeline right of way that would completely contain oil from any leaks and spills. With the large number of oil pipeline spills/leaks each year in the US, it stands to reason that pipeline design and spill catchments need to be addressed. Alternatives that address design improvements that would eliminate or greatly reduce spills must be included.	RISK 14
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Real and effective mitigation must first and foremost be mitigation that avoids potential releases altogether, and with the extensive dataset available on past releases, this Project must use existing pipeline release data in designing pipeline and associated facilities and equipment that will not be subject to oil releases.	RISK 14
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	With the large dataset that is available on oil pipeline spills i n the United States, construction of oil release scenarios and conducting corresponding impact analyses must be conducted to provide our Tribe and the general public an opportunity for a real evaluation and challenge of the FEIS and SEIS.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Section 3.5.4.6 fails to provide a sufficient synopsis of native plants used for traditional purposes. The plants listed under this section are few, not even close to a complete list and description of those traditionally important plants.	VEG 08
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	This limited section fails to take a hard look at this resource parameter, and without a full assessment of those traditionally important plants the SEIS prevents our Tribe from an appropriate opportunity to review and comment on the NEPA document	VEG 08, LEG 04
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	The SEJ S provided no mention of bison in the areas potentially impacted by the Project. Bison are important animals to many tribes, including our Tribe historically and presently.	WI 20
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	There is no subsection in Wildlife Resources or Fisheries Resources that addresses Native American traditional uses of fish and wildlife such as hunting, fishing and spiritual purposes	WI 20
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	In the Water Resources section, the SEIS fails to evaluate pristine waters, protected waters, or wild and scenic rivers or other protected designations.	WRS 10
Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians	April 22, 2013	Instead, tbe SEIS evaluates "Impaired or Contaminated Waterbodies" and attempts to establish a misleading baseline condition for water resources by selectively including this water parameter while excluding other important water parameters.	WRS 11
Sky Nelson	March 11, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement is an inadequate basis on which to base approval of the pipeline because it does not consider the entire life cycle of the oil that will be transported from Alberta to Galveston. An analysis of this entire process, the life cycle of this material, must be done.Though the 3.19 million metric tons per year of CO2 to be emitted in operating the pipeline, annually, is not an insignificant amount, it is only a small part of the total emissions of the extraction, transportation, refining and burning process.	CLIM 05
Skye Taylor	April 22, 2013	What kind of lighting is going to be used ...? What kind of heating system will have to be put in place at how many places along the route?	LU 04
Sleonard	April 11, 2013	the reason they want to build the pipeline through the United States is because Canadians have rejected transport of the oil through their country	PN 06
Sleonard	April 11, 2013	Historically, the oil industry doesn’t have the greatest track record for having the ability to clean up the messes they have made.	RISK 14
Slholt	April 23, 2013	Keystone Pipeline Will Create Only 35 Permanent Jobs	SO 04
Smara	March 30, 2013	We/you should be protecting our land and putting our resources into wind, solar and biofuels like Envirolene.	ALT 01
Smarr, Janet	March 17, 2013	This tarsands oil is the dirtiest type of oil to produce and to use, a disaster for climate change	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Smarr, Janet	March 17, 2013	It will do this country no good; it will give us all the risks and destruction (climate and environment) while profiting a few private pockets	PN 08
Smarr, Janet	March 17, 2013	This oil is especially corrosive and therefore likely to eat through the piping; the company has already had many leaks, so we can be sure there will be more leaks.	RISK 23
Smith	April 18, 2013	And let us not forget a little girl who died May 23rd, 1887, at age one year, six months named White Buffalo Girl, daughter of Black Elk and Moon Hawk. Her grave, ironically, sits in the path of this poison pipeline. This gives the Trail of Tears a whole new meaning. We made a promise to watch over her grave in perpetuity and we must not break our promise to her.	CR 02
Smith	April 18, 2013	Although the proposed reroute is said to be away from the Ogallala Aquifer, we all know that this isn't true. The new route is projected to cross through the Verdigre watershed approximately 22 miles from my home. This area contains a rare fresh spring-fed trout stream called the Verdigre Creek. This spring flows freely year-round with crystal clear water.	WRS 01, WRG 01
Smith Sam	April 20, 2013	More than any other collection, these four documents comprehensively address the questions of how the proposed pipeline will affect the United States, the global community, the international financial system, world health, and the maintenance of the earth's ecosystems on which all life depends. The Four Documents Bill McKibben, "Some Like it Hot!" The New York Review, May 9, 2013. McKibben's essay provides an introduction to the following three documents. Climate and Social Stress: Implications for Security Analysis edited by John D. Steinbruner, Paul C. Stern, and Jo L. Husbands. National Research Council, 238pp., available at "http://nap.edu/catalog"nap.edu/catalog Turn Down the Heat: Why a 4 degree C Warmer World Must be Avoided a report for the World Bank by the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research and Climate Analytics, November 2012, 58 pp., available at "http://climatechange.worldbank.org"climatechange.worldbank.org The Collapse of Western Civilization: A View from the Future by Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway, Daedalus, Winter 2013	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
SmithM	April 18, 2013	the greatest risk posed by this pipeline is the perpetuation of an energy policy that will leave the entire world in dire straits--with globally rising temperatures posing a serious threat to the safety & security of the United States.	PN 02
Sobotka	April 18, 2013	a separate issue is eminent domain. the fact that American citizens have to appeal to the State Department through a hearing after suffering the bullying they have endured. It is inconceivable that people, citizens, have had little recourse and must go through all of this hassle and still may be subjected to the will of a corporation.	LEG 02
Sobotka	April 18, 2013	the jobs will go to workers who travel the country, most will not be from Nebraska.	SO 03
Sofia Smith Hale	April 17, 2013	Climate change is a direct threat to the well-being of my children	CLIM 14
Solarman	March 15, 2013	It's just a matter of time for another terrible oil/tar spill accident to happen and the pipeline which passes through environmentally sensitive areas as well as people's backyards is too risky.	RISK 07
Sonja Chan	April 4, 2013	... we need the water to be clean because there is no substitute for water.	ACK
Sonja Chan	April 4, 2013	We can get energy from other sustainable clean sources that will create jobs for our people and not contribute to the catastrophe of climate change.	ALT 01
Sonja Chan	April 4, 2013	We need the land to be clean and able to grow food	SOIL 01
Sonja Franz	March 8, 2013	represents a massive new source of fossil fuels that would be catastrophic for the climate.	CLIM 14
Sonja Franz	March 8, 2013	Development of the tar sands is leading to the destruction of millions of acres of boreal forest	CU 01
Sonja Stahlhut	April 5, 2013	The environmental impact report needs to be truthful, fully recognizing what the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would really do to the environment, what it would do to those birds and those forests,	ACK
Sonya Friesel	April 22, 2013	I oppose the routing of the TransCanada pipeline through the Nebraska Sandhills because I am concerned that a pipeline running through this area would recklessly endanger the Ogallala Aquifer and our water supply.	WRG 04
Sonya Newlyn	April 9, 2013	As the oil spill in Arkansas horribly demonstrates, the Keystone XL pipeline is a terrible plan for our environmental safety	RISK 13
Sophia Miyoshi	April 6, 2013	How about actually thinking of the beautiful planet that sustains us and work on projects that will cut down on waste, and be supportive of sustainable energy.	PN 02, ALT 01
Sophia Miyoshi	April 6, 2013	We cannot continue on this path (specifically towards building the XL pipeline) without taking in regards all of the communities such investments will be hurting directly and indirectly.	RISK 07
Sophia Shoen	April 17, 2013	We must go forward with development of alternative energy vehicles, and other sources of clean energy (solar, wind) to build a green economy.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sophie	April 22, 2013	The USA should be focusing on developing clean renewable energy rather than helping Canada export toxic crude oil across our land.	PN 03
Sophie	April 22, 2013	The citizens of this country deserve better than to be victimized by more pipeline spills.	RISK 06
Sophie Robinson	March 26, 2013	Take into consideration the overwhelming non partisan data that shows that if the Keystone XL pipeline is built, we will be put on a path to irreversible climate change that would seriously compromise the future of our children and grandchildren.	CLIM 14
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	Mining oil sands in Alberta and elsewhere is an energy-intensive undertaking that results in destruction of large areas of boreal forest, wetland, streams. Fragmentation and loss of this boreal habitat is already a critical issue for woodland caribou and other species and the large areas of surface mining for tar sands will dramatically increase the extent of this boreal habitat fragmentation.	CU 01
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	The potential effects of pipe failure and repair are especially problematic for outstanding waters such as the Platte River where the crossing will be approximately 2,000 feet long.	RISK 07
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	A complete survey of the pipeline right-of-way for all rare species has not been conducted and will be left to decision making at a later time.	TES 02
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	The pipeline would result in loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat and many natural communities, especially native grasslands, sagebrush steppe, and rainwater basin plains. The loss and fragmentation of these habitats and communities associated with the project will be permanent. It is not reasonable to argue that there is already a lot of fragmentation to these natural features in the pipeline location as a reason for permitting more.	VEG 02
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	A major threat to wetlands is the introduction of invasive species associated with soil disturbance. There is little attention given to this issue in the Draft SEIS.	WET 01
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	The Draft SEIS reports that there will be 262.2 acres of wetland impact (including open water), but also states that the wetland mapping and delineation for this project is likely to under-represent some wetland types. Those wetlands that are most likely under-represented are the depression wetlands of the Prairie Pothole Region, which are some of the most valuable and threatened wetlands in the U.S.	WET 02
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	The plan for how to repair or replace sections of pipeline that are damaged or faulty under rivers is unclear.	WRG 01
Sorenson & Kashanski	March 3, 2013	Rivers are dynamic and channels are constantly moving across valley bottoms and eroding new channels in response to storm events. The proposed pipeline mitigation appears completely inadequate to deal with this dynamic nature of rivers.	WRS 01, RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce	April 3, 2013	Alternative transport methods - namely rail and barge - will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions.	ALT 07
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce	April 3, 2013	Keystone XL is critical to improving American energy security and boostng our economy. In the Southeast, the vast majority of gasoline and diesel is delivered via one pipeli ny from refineries in the Gulf.Coast area.	PN 01
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce	April 3, 2013	Even with these less attractive alte natives, rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport.	PN 06
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce	April 3, 2013	As discussed in the draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude oil to markets in the Gulf Coast region.	PN 10
Spen281	April 6, 2013	It is a fossil fuel waste product and is too dangerous for our nation. Let's use this opportunity to focus on alternative energy solutions.	PN 02
Spencer Wade	April 18, 2013	The Keystone XL would carry 8 times as much crude as the pipeline that recently leaked in Arkansas, it would cross a number of vulnerable aquifers, and we have evidence of cracks in sections that have already been laid.	RISK 23, PD 06
SpottedeagleF	April 18, 2013	The Ihanktonwan people on April 4th formerly informed the Department of State that consultation process is flawed and that any consults must occur on Ihanktonwan homelands. The SEIS states that they have consulted the Yankton 159 times, which is a gross misrepresentation because consultation has not occurred once and the Department of State has broken their own federal laws regarding this process.	CR 01
SpottedeagleF	April 18, 2013	8,000 acres remain unsurveyed, which puts thousands and thousands of indigenous, cultural and sacred sites at risk. The Department of State imposed a fragmented, divisive process where tribes were forced to survey and compile documents that could not be shared, although all of these territories overlap. This is an egregious event to our people.	CR 02
SpottedeagleF	April 18, 2013	Documented linguistic evidence points out that our Siouan dialect survives in five provinces in Canada, we see no border, and 24 states in the US, thus firmly establishing our aboriginal rights to protect MAGPRA sites and ceremonial sites on the cultural landscape which also includes genesis sites within the XL corridor and beyond.	CR 02
SpottedeagleF	April 18, 2013	Another item is that we have been given an inferior status in the programmatic agreement that was drawn up. We are not signatories. The states, the federal agencies were deemed much more important than us and were given signatory status. We are only concurring parties. That is totally socially unjust and is not acceptable to us.	LEG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
SpottedeagleF	April 18, 2013	The SEIS seeks to destroy our relationship with our seven animal species that are endangered or threatened. In our culture they are deemed significant to our belief system, one of which is the Whooping Crane.This is adjacent to the KXL pipeline. Their existence has been minimalized and marginalized and they are certainly at risk.	TES 14
SpottedTailC	April 18, 2013	President Obama's consultation policies with Native American tribes is not working. Article 32 of the United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People states, the US shall consult and cooperate in good faith with indigenous peoples, concerned through their own representative institutions, in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development and utilization or exploitation of minerals, water, or other resources.	CR 01
SpottedTailC	April 18, 2013	The project will impact traditional cultural values, sacred sites within our treaty territories, pollution, greenhouse gases, water contamination and environmental and public health impact on Native Americans.	CR 02
SpragueM	April 18, 2013	The newer pipeline to the north and east of Nebraska had 14 leaks in 12 months. If this pipeline is approved and when it leaks chemicals into my water, it could be life threatening to me and thousands -- excuse me, and thousands of Americans with compromised immunities, as in the very young, those with health issues and the elderly.	RISK 07
Spurgeon	April 18, 2013	TransCanada has offered no plan for cleaning up spills in any waterway, let alon an aquifer.	RISK 05
Stacey Burns	April 18, 2013	Additionally, an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created.	ACK
Stacey Burns	April 18, 2013	Keystone XL will ensure American energy security and create jobs and economic opportunity in Nebraska.	PN 10
Stacey Smith	March 28, 2013	Tar Sands have harmed permanently the home land and way of life of First Nation people. The Keystone Pipeline is destroying wilderness, wildlife, farm land and rural life across the US. It is also destroying the home land and way of life for First Nation people in the US.	ACK
Stacey Smith	March 28, 2013	Already Tar Sands production have destroyed millions of acres of forest land in Canada, thus immediately increasing climate disruption	CLIM 06
Stacy W. Decker	April 22, 2013	we need energy, we need new energy, we need alternative energy. KXL is providing more of the same. We need something different.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stan C.	April 24, 2013	The pipeline will not benefit the American people since the refined fuel will largely be . sold to foreign markets. The number of permanent jobs the project would create are minuscule.	PN 07
Stan C.	April 24, 2013	The proposed Keystone XL Pipeline is a serious threat to our environment. To approve the pipeline is to allow the most viscous crude oil to be piped across our nation, endangering rivers and aquifers and risking an environmental disaster.	RISK 07
Stan Eckel	April 9, 2013	Rail shipments yes. The infrastructure is already in place for this and goods move over this transportation system every day with a lot less maintenance, and a lot more oversight that the pipelines. Pipelines are inherently dangerous especially with the bottom line management of the companies that are proposing this. Look at they're track record.	ALT 04
Stan Merriman	March 28, 2013	The damage to local health, air quality and quality of life already sustained by the local populace unsupportable.	ACK
Stan Merriman	March 28, 2013	no commitment to solving the climate crisis. This latter factor alone disqualifies the project for having any redeeming social or economic value.	PN 05
Stan Merriman	March 28, 2013	The intrusion on ranching and farming land illegitimate given the absence of public benefit for the pipeline.	PN 05
Stan Merriman	March 28, 2013	The only benefits are a small number of mostly temporary jobs to build the pipeline and profits mainly for a Canadian company with no commitment to solving the climate crisis.	PN 05
Stan Merriman	March 28, 2013	The environmental hazards with the TransCanada track record are self evident	RISK 25
Stan Miller	April 17, 2013	Most importantly, it will not provide the ongoing jobs which are promised.	PN 05
Stan Simpson	March 29, 2013	Please if you haved any brains at all please get the pipeline going as quick as possible not only for the jobs it will create but it will lower gas prices and these high rediculas prices are bankrupting the country	PN 10
Stan Simpson	March 29, 2013	the pipeline is a win win deal it creates jobs short term and long term, it should reduce gas prices, and it is alot safer to send oil through a pipeline than a train or truck.	PN 10
Stan Stanfield	April 22, 2013	And let's start concentrating our attention on alternatives. Not just the usual, of wind, solar, tidal and geothermal. But what are known ss free energy devices. That is the direction of the future. Let's start heading in that direction. Not back, to the ugly Era of Oil.	ALT 01
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	Executive Order 13337 authorizes the State Department to determine if the proposed pipeline is in the national interest. The pipele crossesd the Great Sioux Reservation as defined in the 1868 Laramie Treaty. Approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline would violate the Fort Laramie Treaty.	LEG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	Executive Order 13337 authorizes the State Department to determine if the proposed pipeline is in the national interest. The pipeline crosses the Great Sioux Reservation as defined in the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty. Approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline would violate the Fort Laramie Treaty. History has shown that it is not in the national interest to violate the Treaties with the Indian Nations. Under E.O. 13337, the State Department must deny the Keystone application.	LEG 01
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	The State Department must consult with the Standing Rock Tribal Historic Preservation Officer under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It must also consult with the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council under Executive Order 13175 on Government- to-Government Consultation. The DSEIS fails to demonstrate compliance with either consultation requirement.	LEG 03
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	The State Department must consult with the Standing Rock Tribal Historic Preservation Officer under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It must also consult with the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council under Executive Order 1317 5 on Government -to-Government Consultation. The Draft SEIS fails to demonstrate compliance with either consultation requirement.	LEG 03, LEG 01
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	The CEQ Draft NEP A Guidance on Consideration of the Effects of Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions requires the State Department to consider the greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project. The Draft SEIS fails to account for the adverse impact from greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the extraction of the tar sands crude, to be transported by the pipeline. This violates the CEQ Guidance, and directly and adversely affects the land and waters of the Standing Rock Reservation.	LEG 27
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	Standing Rock Sioux Tribe posess reserved water rights to the Missouri River and Grand River. The construction of the pipeline will degrade our water. Potential spills risk catastrophic environmental damage to our waters.	WRS 13
Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe	April 22, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline will cross the Missouri Rjver and the Grand River. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe possesses reserved water rights to these waters under Winters v. United States. The construction of the pipeline will degrade our water. Potential spills risk catastrophic environmental damage to our waters.	WRS 13
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	Appendix E of the DSEIS contains no substantive information regarding the extent of the Department's conversations with tribes. Although it purportedly details consultation history, this appendix is actually only a list of dates when the Department attempted to make contact with various tribes by phone, email or meeting.	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	Areas of religious and cultural significance to [the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe] exist in Saskatchewan and other Canadian provinces and we have concerns about these sites but have not been consulted on the pipeline's route or impacts on the Canadian side of the border. The Department's failure to analyze impacts to resources outside the US is a significant deficiency that needs to be corrected, particularly when the actual implications of the destruction of these resources are global.	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	Statements made throughout the DSEIS however, suggest that the Department is mistakenly under the impression that each Tribe's concerns are limited to the states immediately surrounding their respective reservation.	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	The 2011 PA includes t lhree types of parties: Signatories, Invited Signatories and Concurring Parties. Under the terms of the PA it is only the signatories that have the power to seek amendments or terminate the PA and it is only federal agencies, state agencies, SHPOs and TransCanada that are listed as signatory parties. [the PA] provides [consulting parties, such as the SRST-THPO] with no power to change the terms ofthe agreement or participate in a meaningful way because of their non-signatory status.	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	the Department waited until September 21, 2012, well after the scoping period had closed, to initiate Tribal consultation (Public Scoping Notice and DSEIS at 3.11-3). Even now, nearly a year later, it still remains unclear how the Department intends to integrate NEPA and Section 106 reviews	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	This disparity between the roles State agencies and Tribal Nations have available to them in the PA process is an environmental (in)justice issue. Although Tribal nations are disproportionately affected by the destruction of cultural resources, without signatory status to PA we are denied meaningful access to the very process set up to resolve effects.	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	While it is noted that some Tribal Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) studies (listed in Table 3.11-7, DSEIS 3.11-33) were conducted in connection with this proposed undertaking, [The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe THPO] has no information regarding which areas were covered by those studies, how they were conducted or what resources were identified as a result.	CR 01
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	[Standing Rock Sioux Tribe] expect to be involved in consultations regarding sites of significance to us all the way through the process. This means that in addition to being provided an opportunity to conducted field surveys as described above, we also need to receive the class Ill reports and other information pertaining to archeological surveys conducted	CR 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	First of all, SRST-THPO is uncomfortable with [the PA] approach as it enables the Department to issue a final decision regarding the permit before the identification phase of the process has been completed. Under this approach it is impossible to accord cultural resources full weight in the decision making when they have not yet even been fully identified.	CR 02
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	Significant portions of the proposed pipeline route remain unsurveyed and the Department has provided no real plan of action or timeline for addressing t his in consultation with tribes, repeatedly stating only that cultural resource surveys and tribal consultations are "ongoing".	CR 02
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	The low number of sites identified not only underscores the inability of archeologists to identify our sites and highlights the need for Tribes to be actively engaged in field investigations to identify our own sites but even from a purely archeological perspective, calls into question the adequacy of the surveys conducted.	CR 02
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	TransCanada proposes to run a crude oil pipeline directly through lands which are by definition of significance to [the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe]. These are our homelands and contain the landforms, burials, stone feature sites and other cultural resources central to our cu ltural and spiritual identity.	CR 02
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	We would like to point out that although SRST is in fact an applicable consulting party and is even listed as such in the DSEIS (3.11-32), we have not received any of the reports to date.	CR 02
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	SRST does however take issue with Montana SHPO's Recordation Standards and Evaluation Guidelines for Stone Circle Sites and therefore requests to be included in any discussions regarding the evaluation of these sites.	CR 03
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	It seems clear that if built, the pipeline would adversely impact the integrity of the [LCNHT] trail considering that the presence of a pipeline in an area where historically NO pipeline was present is not comparable to the natural description of the area particularly when the effects of a spill are taken into effect.	CR 06
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	limiting the analysis of communities and minority and low-income populations that could be affected by the proposed pipeline to those living within two miles on either side of the centerline of proposed pipeline is absurd and certainly flies in the face of CEQ 1997 guidance that in assessing cultural and aesthetic environmental impacts, the agency must consider impacts that uniquely affect geographically dislocated or dispersed minority or low-income populations or American Indian tribes.	EJ 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	[Please provide information to SRST regarding] In SD, unevaluated/potentially eligible sites for which SHPO/THPO Concurrence with the Departments finding is still Pending. Specifically: 39HN1078, 39HN1079, 39HN1080, 39HN1148, 39HN1151,39HN1152, C710J0001, 39MDOOO, 39PE0400, C710PE0011isted in Table 3.11-3 of Cultural Resources Identified in SD within the Project APE (beginning on p.3.11-16)	RFI
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	[Please provide information to SRST regarding] In Table 3.11-4 of Cultural Resources Identified in Nebraska within the Project APE (3.11-22) 25AP88,25AP89,25FM27,25HM24,25JF52,25KP151,25KP345,25SA86,25YK17,25YK26, 25YK28.	RFI
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	Table 3.11-2 of Cultural Resources Identified in Montana within the Project APE (beginning on page 3.11-9) indicates that several sites listed as undated stone cairns have been determined ineligible with SHPO/THPO concurrence. SRST-THPO has concerns regarding these determinations and is requesting more information on sites 24MC0480, 24VL1900, 24VL1905, 24VL1911, 24Vl1928.	RFI
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	There is also a discrepancy in the numbers presented; at the outset of this section the document states that 136 of the sites were previously identified and that out of the total number, 112 of them were archeological sites (3.11-16). Yet later in the section, the 112 archeological sites are described as newly recorded sites (3.11-19).	EDIT
Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Tribal Historic Preservation Office	May 1, 2013	The Department's conclusion that "there is no adverse effect to the LCNHT route since it is not possible to define an exact location or any physical trail remains where the expedition crossed the proposed Project route" is a direct contradiction to statements earlier in the paragraph that the proposed route crosses the LCNHT at two locations and that "The tangible elements of the LCNHT along the proposed Project corridor are defined by the rivers and river banks that the Lewis and Clark route followed, with the maintenance of the historic setting of this route along these river ways, comparable to the natural descriptions found in expedition journals, being integral to the resource" (3.11-14).	EDIT
Stanley and Jean Shavlik	April 3, 2013	…should X-L pipeline be allowed to cross our borders with canada, and possible lin ruptures, it would decimate our water supply (the oglala aquifer). The greatest underground water supply in the country!	WRG 01, RISK 07
Stanley Boydston	March 17, 2013	Dependance on oil is not an excuse for threatening the ground beneath our feet. Develop alternatives!	RISK 07
Stanley Fischer	April 9, 2013	It has little to do with U.S. energy security because, in reality, only a small portion will be used in the United States since oil companies can get a higher price for these fuels in Asia.	PN 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stanley Hecht	April 11, 2013	I am writing to ask that you block construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. What dismays me about the project, aside from the environmental risks in America and the liberation of tremendous quantities of CO2 in Canada, is that the oil extracted will be primarily sold on the international market. We in the US seem to be taking the risks so that Big Oil can profit.	PN 07
Stefanie Krantz	March 25, 2013	Also, Trans Canada has a record of leaks and safety incidents that does not lend confidence to their ability to contain the oil within the pipeline. ... Also, all pipelines leak, and a leak anywhere in any watershed could lead to ground water pollution, or surface water pollution	RISK 26, RISK 10
Stefanie Smith	March 11, 2013	If we spent as much on green energy as we did on dirty energy we'd be leading the world. This would be good for the economy, too. Perhaps we should be following the example set by Germany in it's renewable energy programs.	PN 02
Steff Watson	March 31, 2013	Given the sheer destruction occurring in Alberta and two recent oil spills in the United States, I strongly urge you to consider blocking the Keystone XL pipeline.	RISK 07
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	The SEIS ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will accelerate tar sands extraction and increase CO2 emissions, bringing climate change beyond its tipping point.	ACK
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Indigenous Sovereignty: The lack of comprehensive consultation with Native Nations and lack of meaningful participation with indigenous traditional societies, spiritual leaders and tribal grassroots on the protection of sacred areas, and cultural and historical resources is an environmental justice and treaty rights issue and is unacceptable. Human Rights: The report doesn’t address the human rights violations of the Dene, Cree and Métis that live downstream and other First Nations and local communities living in the regional areas of Alberta’s tar sands industrial complex.	CR 01
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Human Rights: The report doesn’t address the human rights violations of the Dene, Cree and Métis that live downstream and other First Nations and local communities living in the regional areas of Alberta’s tar sands industrial complex.	CU 05
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Land Rights: This report [the SEIS] does not address the rights of the farmers and ranchers who are being bullied and threatened with "eminent domain" by TransCanada - a foreign corporation - who began their intimidation and threats before a permit had been issued.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Energy Security: The people of the United States, nor Canada, will [not] be the end users of the tar sands oil. The pipeline has, from its inception been for the sole purpose of moving bitumen from tar sands extraction sites to refineries located on or near the Gulf of Mexico for shipment to foreign markets. The bulk of the refined oil will be loaded on tankers bound for China, South America, and Europe. Therefore, the people of the United States and Canada are going to suffer the environmental and human health risks of continuing and supporting a dirty and destructive fossil fuel economy.	PN 01
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Water Issues: This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles threatening drinking water for people, irrigation for farms and ranches with devastating tar sands spills. This new route still traverses the Ogallala Aquifer that supplies water to millions of people and for agriculture.	RISK 07
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	Pipeline Failures: TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation, and Enbridge, another pipeline operator, suffered a spill of more than one million gallons in the Kalamazoo River in 2010. In just one week, this year, from March 25th to the 31st there were three pipeline failures: 1)121,000 gallons in Alberta, 2) 15,000 in Minnesota, and 3) 550,000 in Arkansas.	RISK 26
Stefon Taylor	April 21, 2013	I oppose approving the Keystone XL pipeline permit for the following reasons: Jobs: The construction of the Keystone XL will create approximately 3,900 temporary and 35 full-time positions as cited in a U.S State Department report. In fact, and contrary to claims made by supporters of the pipeline, could end as many jobs as it creates with toxic spills in farmland or water resources.	SO 05, SO 04
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS should instead provide a robust analysis of renewable energy and energy efficiency alternatives including conservation and small-scale photovoltaic systems such as rooftop solar that are located locally where energy demand is highest (i.e., are "distributed").	ALT 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS fails to adequately justify its failure to study the [existing] Keystone CorridorAlternative routes. The DSEIS dismisses these alternatives on the basis of expense. But the DSEIS fails to provide specific evidence showing that this additional expense renders these proposed alternatives routes economically infeasible.	ALT 03
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	oil sands development also drives up demand for natural gas, displacing its use in electricity generation and making it more likely coal will be burned for such purposes. Therefore, with advancing extraction technologies and energy usage, the total carbon production for the oil sands accessed by the Project could be more than 230 gigat01mes. This carbon production must be, but is not, taken into account in the DSEIS as a climate impact and as a foreseeable and related cumulative impact.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The State Department also fails to address the carbon emissions associated with petroleum coke ("petcoke"), which is a byproduct of refining tar sands.	CLIM 08
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Where the State Department does address climate change, it relies on outdated information. For example, it refers to an lEA report calculating that even if warming remains within two degrees Celcius, tar sands production would increase from 1.6 million bbl/day in 2011 to 3.3 million bbl/day, leaving room for Keystone XL. However, the 3.3 million bbl/day figure is the same one lEA reported in 20 I 0, before the fracking boom drastically changed the oil market dynamics in North America, and increased production (leaving less room in the carbon emissions budget for projects like Keystone XL).	CLIM 13
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	During the years that IEN has been organizing on the KXL pipeline issue, talking to tribal leaders, tribal members and tribal cultural resources program staff, there have been consistency with issues of lack of capacity and not enough time allowed to, fully inventory the pipeline corridor. Along with this are concerns of failure to have full comprehensive consultation with the Tribes and meaningful participation of traditional societies, spiritual leaders, elders, and cultural knowledge keepers.	CR 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	It is an affront to the sovereignty of the affected First Nations that the State Department has yet to meet with their full tribal councils and other authorized representatives.	CR 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The lack of comprehensive consultation with Native Nations and lack of meaningful participation with indigenous traditional societies, spiritual leaders and tribal grassroots on the protection of sacred areas, and cultural and historical resources is an environmental justice and treaty right issue and is unacceptable.	CR 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the State Department- and President Obama- cannot fully comprehend and analyze Keystone XL's cultural resource impacts except by meeting and fully conferring with all the Indigenous Nations and commnnities potentially impacted by the Project. But those essential meetings have yet to occur.	CR 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	It is a fallacy- indeed, the height of arrogance- for the DSEIS to presume that the destruction of cultural heritage sites and artifacts could be mitigated by such measures as relocation to a museum, "protection of a similar resource nearby," "detailed documentation of the resource," or "interpretive exhibits." The cultural and spiritual value of these sites and artifacts is inextricably linked to their location on and in the earth.	CR 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The KXL pipeline corridor throughout the prairielands of the U.S. was once all indigenous territories used for millennia by many indigenous tribes. Despite what the draft SEIS reports, it is the opinion of many tribal cultural experts that a large percent of the pipeline corridor remains unexamined (to the standards of tribal experts) and may potentially contain important and critical cultural resources that would be disturbed in the construction of the KXL pipeline. A full comprehensive survey of the corridor and a reasonable timeline for the Tribes and indigenous cultural experts to review and evaluate all inventories is vital.	CR 02
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The State Department must require avoidance of all cultural resources, including sites rejected for National Register listing that nonetheless contain resources of significant spiritual and historic value to Indigenous Nations and communities.	CR 02
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Among the extraterritorial impacts that should have been- but were not- fully analyzed in the EIS are the impacts of bitumen tar sands mining in Canada. The DSEIS [analysis of impacts in Canada is] no better, offering less than four pages of information regarding the enviromnental effects of oil sands development in Alberta, much of it crammed into a cryptic and unintelligible list of cumulative statistics regarding these effects	CU 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	First, "the footprint of seriously disturbed lands associated with tar sands exploration and production far exceeds the FEIS' stated 232 square miles that 'have been disturbed by oil sands mining activity." Despite overwhelming evidence that the disturbed area is vastly larger, this same erroneous statistic is repeated in the DSEIS.	CU 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS repeats the FEIS' failure to even mention, much less analyze, the fact that tar sands mining releases massive amounts of sulfur dioxide and elemental sulfur into the surrounding environment, including both soil and water. The DSEIS completely fails to discuss the harmful effects of this sulfur, which "kills birds and other wildlife that contact these disturbed sites." [see separate reference]	CU 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	tailings ponds [associated with bitumen extraction] pose a significant risk to many species of birds, both migratory and local, and should be fully addressed in the SEIS 's analysis of environmental impacts.	CU 03
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS also implies that the impacts to birds from the Alberta tar sands tailing ponds are sufficiently mitigated As noted above, over 1600 mallards died in a tailings pond in 2008 despite highly vaunted "bird deterrents" that proved to be completely ineffectual. The DSEIS' conclusory one-sentence description of measures to reduce these continuing impacts Jacks "sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated." Robertson, 490 U.S. at 353; South Fork Band Council v. US. Department of Transportation, 588 F.3d 718, 727 (9th Cir. 2009).	CU 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The Natural Resources Defense Council has compiled a study [see separate reference] estimating [that] oil sands projects [in Alberta] will kill up to 166 million birds over the next 50-60 years.	CU 03
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	There is substantial documentation of the devastation of the environment, ecosystem, water, air, and more recently the health of the Native people living in the national sacrifice zone of the tar sands. Evidence of rare cancers linked to petroleum contamination is on the increase. The Alberta tar sands are far away, in another country, but the Obama administration could be making a decision that can directly affect the health and future of the Dene, Cree and Metis' First Nations people. The U.S. Department of State addresses human rights issues worldwide, however, in this report; it completely ignores its responsibility to apply U.S. policy on environmental justice and its commitment to address human rights.	CU 05
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Canadian pipeline expansions are not even included among the list of cumulative projects in the DSEIS...The DSEIS thus completely ignores, for example, whether the Project and the proposed Trans Mountain pipeline will have cumulative impacts. Will migratory wildlife be adversely affected by both projects? To what extent? Neither the DSEIS or the reviewing public can say. The DSEIS' omissions prevent meaningful public review and thereby violate NEPA.	CU 13
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS- implies that mining sites can be and are being reclaimed. DSEIS 4.15-113. This is simply incorrect. "Even if some mined areas are eventually restored with imported soils, soil geochemical segregation, as [Professor Curry] pointed out to the Provincial Legislature in 1976, cannot occur in northern Alberta within a human lifetime." [see separate reference]	CU 13
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS fails to analyze the impacts associated with the Gulf Coast Pipeline and thereby unlawfully chops up the Project into little pieces. The DSEIS claims that it need not analyze the impacts of the Gulf Coast Pipeline because the applicant indicated that it considers the Gulf Coast Pipeline to have independent utility and the Gulf Coast Pipeline supposedly was economically viable even if the ... application for the proposed Project is not approved. That is not the standard. Even assuming it is true that the Gulf Coast Pipeline would be built without Keystone, if Keystone would not be built without the Gulf Coast Pipeline, then the two projects are connected actions that must be analyzed in the same EIS.	CU 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Any key objective of environmental justice methodology must evaluate cumulative disproportionateimpacts to individuals, communities, and cultures not only through human health but also throughnatural resource quality, ecosystem health, socio-economic health and socio-cultural health. The cultural relationship between Indigenous peoples and our land is not only physical, but is also social, emotional, psychological and spiritual.	EJ 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	in violation of both NEPA and Executive Order 12898, the State Department gives...enviromnental justice and cultural resource impacts short shrift in the DSEIS	EJ 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Keystone XL would irreparably and disproportionately harm indigenous peoples and other underrepresented minority populations, while restricting its claimed economic benefits primarily to the corporate proponents of the Project and Canadian tar sands mining.	EJ 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	[By limiting the purpose to the delivery of crude oil, the DSEIS] violates NEP A National Parks & Conservation Association v. Bureau of Land Management ("NPCA v. ELM'), 606 F.3d 1058, 1070 (9th Cir. 2010).	LEG 01
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Federal agencies must consider the international impacts of their proposed actions. Hirt v. Richardson, 127 F.Supp.2d 833, 844 (W.D. Mich. 1999)… National Organization for Reform of Marijuana Laws v. United States Department of State, 452 F.Supp. 1226, 1232-33 (D.D.C. 1978)…Sierra Club v. Adams, 578 F.2d 389, 392 (D.C.Cir. 1978)…Wilderness Society v. Morton, 463 1261 (D.C.Cir. 1972).	LEG 04
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Instead of analyzing [impacts to unrecorded wells], the DSEIS puts the onus on well owners to request "baseline water quality testing" of their wells, and then only if their wells are "within 300 feet of the centerline of the approved route." DSEIS 4.3-4. The State Department cannot so lightly abdicate its NEP A duties, which require the agency, not those impacted by the Project, to take a hard look at the impacts in the first instance. 40 C.F.R. §1502.1; NPCA v. Babbitt, 241 F.3d at 733.	LEG 04
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS' required discussion of cumulative impacts is far too cursory. Such is inadequate under NEPA, which requires "quantified or detailed information." Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Service, 137 F.3d 1372, 1380 (9th Cir. 1998).	LEG 04
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the State Department entirely failed to consider the feasible and environmentally beneficial alternatives of adopting aggressive renewable energy and energy efficiency measures to obviate the claimed need for more crude oil...As EPA concluded in assigning the DSEIS a failing grade of "insufficient," this violates NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14; NPCA v. ELM, 606 F.3d at 1070; Friends of Yosemite Valley, 520 F.3d at 1038.	LEG 04, ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	NEPA applies perforce here, where the pollution indirectly caused by the Project in Canada would directly impact numerous migratory species that spend substantial portions of their lives in the United States, including the endangered whooping crane, endangered piping plover, and many other imperiled birds. Extraterritorial impacts must be- but were not adequately- analyzed in the EIS.	LEG 04, CU 03
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Instead of further tethering the country to oil, the State Department should investigate less harmful alternatives, such as adopting aggressive renewable energy and energy efficiency measures to obviate the claimed need for more crude oil.	PN 02
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS only examines approaches that address the putative market demand for heavy crude oil. By needlessly narrowing the Project's scope, the DSEIS unduly constrains the available options for meeting the nation's energy needs to those that are preemptively locked into fossil fuel dependence. In so doing, the State Department unreasonably restricts the range of alternatives considered, omitting feasible and much more environmentally beneficial renewable energy and energy efficiency alternatives.	PN 02
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the DSEIS' premise that tar sands in Alberta will be fully exploited presumes a world in which business continues as usual, with no major policy action taken to prevent climate change. This is possible, but it is far from certain, and would have catastrophic results.	PN 06
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the State Department assumes that the tar sands of Alberta will be fully exploited regardless of whether Keystone XL is built. This assumption is based on flawed reasoning in several notable respects. For example, the DSEIS brushes over the fact that other proposed pipelines face stiff opposition, and may never be constructed. In addition, as discussed elsewhere, the viability of rail transport depends on myriad factors, and is at best a distant second choice for industry.	PN 06
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	By building fossil fuel extraction infrastructure, the State Department is inducing greater dependence on fossil fuels by quantifiably lowering the market price of the oil sands heavy crude the pipeline will be transporting, while it is raising the relative cost of competing energy sources with more benign environmental impacts.	PN 12, PN 03
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	the 45-day public comment period is not enough time for the people of the land, who will be directly affected by this proposed pipeline to prepare comment. The public comments must demand more time, and require public hearings in all states that the proposed pipeline will cross- even 90 days isn’t enough time.	PRO 04
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Capriccioso, Rob, March 15, 2013, "Exaggerated Consultation Claims, Factual Errors in State Department's Keystone XL Environment Report Rankle Natives," Indian Country Today Media Network;	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Charpentier, Alex, et al., January 20, 2009, "Understanding the Canadian Oil Sands Industry's Greenhouse Gas Emissions," Environmental Research Letters 4 (2009);	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	February 14,2012 from Doug Chabino of Magellan Mistream Partners, L.P., to R.M Seely, the Director of the Southwest Region of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Pipeline Hazardous Materials and Safety Administration re: Longhorn Pipeline ReversalLMP Changes.	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Indigenous and Conservation Groups' October 9, 2011, Comments of North Coast Rivers Alliance ("NCRA ")and Indigenous Environmental Network ("lEN") on the Final Environmental Impact Statementfor the Keystone XL Project, submitted to the State Department;	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Oil Change International, April 2013, Cooking the Books: How the State Department Analysis Ignores the True Climate Impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Song, Lisa, December 20,2012, "Keystone XL Would Not Use Most Advanced Spill Protection Technology," InsideClimate News;	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Testimony of Robert R. Curry, Ph.D., RPG, Regarding Final Environmental Impact Statement for Keystone XL Pipeline Project, October 9, 2011, submitted with Conservation Groups' October 9, 2011, FEIS Comments;	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Wells, Jeff, et al., December 2008, Impact on Birds ofTar Sands Oil Development in Canada's Boreal Forest, Natural Resources Defense Council Report;	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	White, Patrick, October 26,2010, "Toxic Syncrude tailings pond kills hundreds more ducks," The Globe and Mail;	REF
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	to date there has been no modeling of the effects of dilbit, and its movement within, the Northern High Plains Aquifer System. The DSEIS itself...relies solely on infonnation from a nondilbit crude oil spill in Bemidji, Minnesota.This renders the DSEIS' groundwater impact analysis inadequate under NEPA.	RISK 02
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	while the DSEIS purports to analyze how spilled dilbit would behave in an aquifer...the State Department has simply not compiled the information required for a sufficient hydrologic analysis under NEPA. For example, the DSEIS fails to give the public any assurances-let alone demonstrate with evidentiary support- that the many trade-secret chemicals that would be used as diluents in the dilbit would not behave differently than claimed and cause significant health and environmental problems if released into an aquifer or surface waters.	RISK 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The State Department must prepare or fund a study that models the effects of dilbit, and its movement within, the Northern High Plains Aquifer System. See 40 C.F.R. §1502.22 (when "there is incomplete or unavailable information" that is "essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives and the overall costs of obtaining it are not exorbitant, the agency shall include the information in the [EIS]"); Foundation for North American Wild Sheep v. US. Department of Agriculture, 681 F.2d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 1982)...Oregon Natural Desert Association v. Singleton ("ONDA"), 47 F.Supp.2d 1182, 1194 (D.Or. 1998)…Oregon Environmental Council v. Kunzman, 614 F.Supp. 657, 663 (D.Or. 1985).	RISK 02, LEG 22
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS acknowledges that the risk of releases, spills, or leaks poses dangers to the enviromnent, but it fails consider multiple available and feasible mitigation measures.	RISK 05
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS also still fails to account for and analyze the impacts of an oil spill to the "thousands of unrecorded and unsealed wells in the rural areas through which the Project would pass."	RISK 07
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The leak detection system planned for the Project would detect leaks of "approximately 1.5 to 2 percent of the pipeline flow rate" "within 102 minutes." The Project will have a capacity of 29 million gallons per day. With a leak of 1.5 percent of the flow rate, more than 30,800 gallons of oil could flow into the environment in the first 102 minutes, before TransCanada even noticed, let alone began attempting to respond to, the problem.	RISK 15
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	Far better leak detection technology [than required for the Project] is available and in current use on other pipelines in the United States. For example, the Longhorn Pipeline in Texas includes exterior hydrocarbon-sensing cables, which can detect leaks as small as three gallons per day. Therefore, there are sensors available that are more than 48,000 times more sensitive than those planned for the Project. The DSEIS fails to even disclose that this technology is available, let alone explain why it has decided that it is not feasible.	RISK 19
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	More frequent foot and aerial inspections are also feasible and would further mitigate the risk of harm posed by leaks and spills by detecting problems earlier. Most of the Longhorn Pipeline is inspected weekly, and the 19-mile section overlying Austin's aquifer is inspected daily...The DSEIS fails to specifY how frequently the pipeline will be inspected, leaving readers to wonder about the safety of the surrounding environment, particularly the Ogallala aquifer.	RISK 23
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The DSEIS…fails to recognize and appropriately discuss…"how extensively interconnected are the rivers and aquifers of South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Texas."	WRG 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephan C. Volker	April 22, 2013	The new pipeline route...still traverses northern Holt Country, which has permeable soil and a high water table- precisely the characteristics that made the Sandhills too risky an area to cross. Therefore, any spill or release of oil or other chemicals would still pose grave risks to groundwater.	WRG 06
Stephan Hawkins	April 17, 2013	That oil isn't going to the USA, it's going to China.	PN 07
Stephanie Degenhardt	April 9, 2013	Alternative energy is where we need to go forward, unlike the Keystone XL which is taking us farther back.	ALT 01
Stephanie Degenhardt	April 9, 2013	The devastation to the environment, that only one accident could cost, far outweighs the impact of high gas prices.	RISK 07
Stephanie Heidemann	April 13, 2013	It's not safe, it's not right and I know we can have better.	PN 05
Stephanie Herron	April 10, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands, many of these areas are home to low income and already disenfranchised communities	EJ 02
Stephanie Jordan	April 2, 2013	If the water supply in America's Heartland is destroyed by toxic tar sands oil, the farms and ranches are also destroyed. No farms, no food. This is not only an environmental issue - it has the potential for a public health and food crisis.	RISK 06, LU 01
Stephanie Koenig	April 22, 2013	My understanding is that the estimate of jobs to be created by the pipeline is significantly over-inflated, but ev en if many jobs are created, this short-term benefit will be small compared to the irreversible damage to our climate and the great risks to the health and safety of the citizens of our heartland.	PN 05
Stephanie Koenig	April 22, 2013	There is the very legitimate concern about toxic spills in the heartland of our country. Despite assurances to the contrary by the industry, we know from experience that such spills keep happening.	RISK 14
Stephanie Lindemann	April 5, 2013	Saying no to Keystone is a crucial step toward a safe and prosperous future. Saying yes would light the fuse on a carbon bomb that will destroy our climate, with no serious benefits to the American people.	ACK
Stephanie Marshall	April 21, 2013	To help stem the bleeding without thought to our safety. This means for the XL Pipeline to face the truth about the impact of tar sands refining and piping into the refineries of the world. That truth is that it will add immeasurable harm to the attempts to limit CO2.	CLIM 14
Stephanie Mory	April 2, 2013	If this stuff ever gets into the water supply, you can never get it out and there goes your drinking water. People need to realize that we do not need oil but we certainly need fresh, clean drinking water. It is time America stopped being addicted to oil, coal and natural gas and embraced solar, wind, geothermal and tidal. There is no carbon in clean energy. Save the earth and slow down the use of carbon based fuels.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephanie Mueller	April 22, 2013	Please deny the pipeline, and instead work to educate our country about the considerable benefits to conservation--such as buying fuel efficient vehicles, and weatherizing homes and buildings.	PN 02
Stephanie Oelsligle Jordan	April 22, 2013	This pipeline is not only an environmental issue, but also a healthcare issue, and a food supply issue.	ACK
Stephanie Oelsligle Jordan	April 22, 2013	You must realize that when groundwater is damaged, farms and ranches are damaged. No farms and ranches, no food.	ACK
Stephanie Oliver	April 11, 2013	Why do we think it's a good idea to put lives, people's homes, and the environment at risk when we can invest in renewable sources of CLEAN energy such as wind and solar? Yes, wind and solar is not the 100% fix all but we need to take at least one step in the right direction. We are a nation that could lead the global climate change initiative and change the world.	ALT 01
Stephanie Sakasai	March 11, 2013	The evidence is clear and the information that has been generated in the last report you just received is not only misleading, it is a blatant lie that will cause earthquakes, water poisoning, species die off, more cancer , higher infant immortality than there already is.	ACK
Stephanie Seymour	March 6, 2013	This pipeline can and WILL have [a severe impact] on the environment, whether it be in its construction or its future use, or most likely, both.	PN 05
Stephanie Spahr	April 15, 2013	Common sense is the truth that the short-term gain of 35 permanent jobs is not worth the indignity of the following consequences: 4) the continued diminution and subordination of the general populace's long-term and short term welfare to an excessively powerful and negligent industry.	PN 05
Stephanie Spahr	April 15, 2013	Common sense is the truth that the short-term gain of 35 permanent jobs is not worth the indignity of the following consequences: 1) subjugating this nation's "BreadBasket", a national treasure and invaluable asset for sustaining and advancing our multifaceted growth and peace on the homeland, to the inevitable pollution and destruction of the fossil fuel industry be it the bursts or leaks of pipelines into our soils and water or the emissions into the air	PN 05
Stephanie Spahr	April 15, 2013	Common sense is the truth that the short-term gain of 35 permanent jobs is not worth the indignity of the following consequences: 2) the usurpation of valuable land from its sundry owners through eminent domain	PN 05
Stephanie Stout	March 10, 2013	We should be investing in renewable energy sources like windpower, NOT more oil.	PN 02
Stephanie Stout	April 20, 2013	We need more clean energy like wind-powered electricity and a transportation system that uses it including electric Light Rail Transit, intercity passenger rail (both conventional and High Speed, and mainline electrification for freight and passenger trains. We need to move away from oil as fast as practical.	PN 02
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	The risks posed to our precious water resources is unacceptable.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	I urge you to forge a new path to promote sustainability, justice, and alternatives to the status quo rather than support a plan that fosters environmental and climatic degradation and will certainly cause harm.	ACK
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	I have reviewed the environmental impact statement, and it leaves out the impact on the Canadian forests, on the native peoples in both Canada and the US that are potentially affected	CU 02
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	I have reviewed the environmental impact statement, and it leaves out the impact on the… impact on the air quality in Houston where the tar sands will be refined	CU 08
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	It does not create a complete picture of the detrimental environmental impact associated with the Keystone pipeline, from source to sink, nor does it effectively address the consequences of any potential spills.	RISK 07
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	The Keystone XL environmental impact statement does not demonstrate the ability of the pipeline to transport dilbit and oil crude without environmental damage.	RISK 14
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	The report mentions large spills may go undetected for some period of time due to a lack of sensitivity with SCADA and the magnitude of the leak, i.e. leaks can occur through pins the size of pin holes. This is a major point of concern. Another major concern is the likelihood of internal corrosion. The tar sand name itself implies that the material excavated contains sand-size particles. Sand size particles traveling through the pipeline will no doubt mechanically erode the pipeline, leading to small holes that could, undetected, lead to large spills.	RISK 15
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	Will the pipeline be able to handle the stress and strain associated with movement of the soils due to fluctuating moisture levels?	RISK 22
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	Keystone construction would not provide many long term jobs. Transcanada would need only 35 new US workers, and with 90% recruited from outside area of the proposed pipeline, citizens of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska would not see much benefit.	SO 03
Stephanie Thomas	April 4, 2013	If a leak were to occur, how would that impact the region that so depends on farming and water (especially in times of drought) for its livelihood?	SOIL 01, RISK 09
Stephen Anderson	March 17, 2013	Such efforts and expenditures would be better directed at developing a permanent energy fix, and centered at developing and refining clean energy, such as solar and wind.	ALT 01
Stephen Anderson	March 17, 2013	….provide terrorists greater advantage in successfully attacking the United States, and greatly increase the probability of a devastating toxic oil spill occurring.	RISK 04
Stephen Anderson	March 17, 2013	Due to the toxicity of the tar sand substance the prospects of a pipeline toxic spill is alarming; and includes the possibility of tainting and eliminating water supplies, permanently destroying food producing farm land, and wiping out wildlife habitat.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen & Monica Frytak	April 11, 2013	As a cancer specialist, I have seen the results of ignoring public health considerations when formulating public policy. We need to take long term health effects into consideration as part of the economic picture	CLIM 10
Stephen Amy	March 1, 2013	[Is] climate change…part of the criteria by which the Keystone XL Pipeline has been evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act[?]	CLIM 03
Stephen Amy	March 1, 2013	…Responsible scientists such as Dr. James Hansen have said that "unconventional" sources of gasoline must not be exploited if we are to have any hope of ensuring a livable climate.	CLIM 14
Stephen Amy	March 1, 2013	The Alberta Tar Sands and the Procedures they require in order to be processed into gasoline represent a very significant amount of carbon dioxide which, if utilized and released into the atmosphere, will further imperil the very future of civilization.	CLIM 14
Stephen Amy	March 1, 2013	Other assosciated problems [of the Keystone XL Pipeline include] … massive destruction of boreal forest in Canada and massve accumulation of toxic sludge as byproduct.	CU 01
Stephen Biggs	April 17, 2013	it is not at all clear that the oil will be extracted from the tar sands even if the Keystone XL is not approved.	PN 06
Stephen Bloomingdale	April 13, 2013	I also see that encouraging tar sand development takes the focus off highly important green energy development.	PN 03
Stephen Bradley	April 5, 2013	the carbon load released into the atmosphere from the extraction of the oil in the tar sands, and the burning of the oil, will significantly contribute to global warming.	CLIM 12
Stephen Bradley	April 5, 2013	An argument is made that this oil will be extracted, and if the United States does not use it, another nation will. The fact that another nation may choose to do the wrong thing does not mean that we should.	PN 08
Stephen Braun	April 22, 2013	he big selling point was to secure oil for the US. This is a joke. We are now exporting gasoline and soon oil. The XL pipeline will not create jobs, except for cleanup crews and the pipeline will enrich oil companies.	PN 01
Stephen Brooks	April 2, 2013	The Right Thing is to slow the production of CO2 and the Keystone Pipeline will irrefutable increase the introduction of CO2 into the atmosphere.	CLIM 14
Stephen C. Evans	April 9, 2013	The pipeline is aimed at passing through the sand hills area where the Ogalalla Reservoir water table comes up within a couple of feet of the surface. The pipeline could mean ecological disaster to most of Nebraska and pars of neighboring states.	WRG 01
Stephen Couche	March 10, 2013	A recent report also sighted that the EIS was written by a contractor to the company that is behind the Keystone XL pipeline, this is not ok, and I hope you call the people who allowed this to happen out and they hear about it and are reprimanded.	PRO 01
Stephen Duncan	April 4, 2013	[Keystone is] using eminent domain to take away Texas farmers land to build [the pipeline].	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen Eberting	March 1, 2013	Please stop the Keystone Pipeline in order to slow Global Warming.	CLIM 14
Stephen Gambill	April 22, 2013	The top climate scientists of this nation have stated in no uncertain terms that to allow the building and operation of the Keystone pipeline will mean that there will be no more chance to reverse global warming, and that will mean devastating consequences for America's and the world's environment, ultimately for all life on earth.	CLIM 14
Stephen Gambill	April 22, 2013	….the pitiful fiction of a report a company connected to TransCanada did for the State Department on the environmental impact of the Keystone pipeline. The conflict of interest there is blatant, and obvious to the thousands of American citizens involved in or following the developments of these considerations.	PRO 01
Stephen Grant	March 30, 2013	Because of the very high costs associated with rail shipment, I do not buy the argument that if the US does not build the pipeline, Canada will just move the oil by rail.	ALT 04
Stephen Grant	March 30, 2013	I believe construction of the Keystone pipeline from Canada's tar fields to Houston will contribute further to global warming and is a very bad idea.	CLIM 14
Stephen Julich	March 19, 2013	Thank you for providing a forum for public comments on this proposed project. We are all in the debt of the oil industry and its researchers for so many of the things we use every day that we all take for granted, from gasoline, to plastics, to synthetic clothing, to the pharmaceuticals that so often save lives, that it is important to be fair minded and consider every side of this issue. I have only one concern, really. If we rely on the expertise of those who know petroleum products to imagine, create, and improve those products, why then, when it comes to this pipeline, would we disregard the expertise of those whose sole focus is on the possible environmental impact of such a project? I am not talking of those who are hired by the oil industry to do research on environmental safety—a conflict of interest that I feel should disqualify them from the job—but of independent scientists and researchers who have dedicated their lives to environmental science in the way petroleum scientists have dedicated their lives to petroleum. It is these to whom we should be turning to determine if the XL is environmentally feasible. From what reading I have done, it seems the concensus is that it is not. Please consider the testimony of true experts in this case, and not merely to that of those on the payroll of the oil industry.	PRO 01
Stephen Julich	April 19, 2013	We need to find a way to live in harmony with the planet's natural rhythms, live cooperatively with other nations and communities, and stop thinking we can molest our Mother endlessly with impunity.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen Kalmar Ii	March 11, 2013	The pipeline will not ease our country's dependance on fossil fuels. It is another short sighted attempt to dig a ditch and pass on the clean-up to future generations,	PN 05
Stephen Marshall	March 25, 2013	All new money for energy should be directed toward renewable sources and sequestration of carbon. Plant trees. fund bio-char research.	ALT 01
Stephen Marshall	March 25, 2013	Obviously by blocking this project, we slow down the exploitation of carbon heavy tar sands, to the effect of slower profits for the investors, and possibly buying more time for policy makers to follow a more enlightened path away from climate radicalization	PN 06
Stephen Matic	April 24, 2013	The US can gain much more economic and political stability by progressing with innovative energy solutions.	PN 02
Stephen Montgomery	April 14, 2013	The State Department EIS of March 1, 2013 says that tar sands oil produces 5 percent to 19 percent more greenhouse gas emissions than other crude, depending on what oil was compared and who performed the calculations. The December 25, 2011 New York Times says that extracting, transporting and refining tar sands oil produces 15 percent to 80 percent more carbon emissions over its life cycle than average petroleum products.	ACK
Stephen Montgomery	April 14, 2013	Recovering tar sands oil turns virgin Alberta forests into vast open pits. Even with earnest restoration, which we suppose oil companies will pay for, all that will be left are even aged tree farms.	CU 01
Stephen Montgomery	April 14, 2013	The cost of renewable energy is decreasing. The Michigan Public Service Commission found that renewable energy plants produce electricity at a rate 30 percent cheaper than new coal. Unless there are new technologies to recover fossil fuel, costs can only increase as the most accessible fossil fuel is consumed. If Keystone XL Pipeline is not built, will investing in renewable energy be stimulated?	PN 03
Stephen Montgomery	April 14, 2013	The route of the Keystone XL Pipeline cuts across waterways and wildlife habitat for more than 20 imperiled species, including white whooping cranes and the massive, prehistoric pallid sturgeon. Leaking would threaten the Ogallala aquifer.	TES 15, TES 05, WRG 01
Stephen Mudrick	March 14, 2013	why did the EIS ignore the input from the scientific community with respect to the damage to the climate if all of this oil is mined and then consumed?	CLIM 05
Stephen Mudrick	April 11, 2013	Once the pipeline is operational, The rate of mining and processing of the tar sands oil will be increased, and damage to the global climate will be enhanced.	PN 06, CLIM 12
Stephen Paddock	April 4, 2013	it does nothing for our own domestic fuel needs and it endangers our water, our air, and our health.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen R Heisel	April 3, 2013	Forty-five minutes. That's how much time it took a ruptured pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas, on Friday to dump at least 84,000 gallons of tar sands crude into a residential neighborhood and force the evacuation of 22 homes. The evacuations weren't just because the oil is messy or inconvenient. Highly toxic and carcinogenic solvents like benzene are used to dilute tar sands crude to make it pumpable. During a spill, those toxics evaporate into the air. The Pegasus pipeline that spilled in Mayflower has only about one-tenth of the carrying capacity that the Keystone XL would. We don't know yet whether it contaminated nearby Lake Conway, an important source of drinking water, but the same pipeline crosses 13 miles of the Lake Maumelle watershed. If the spill had happened there, it would have contaminated the water supply for most of central Arkansas.	RISK 07
Stephen Reid	April 18, 2013	Moreover, tar sands oil produces three times more greenhouse gas emissions than crude oil, which would make our climate change problem worse. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that Keystone XL would increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven coal-fired power plants operating continuously.	CLIM 12
Stephen Reid	April 18, 2013	As proposed, the pipeline would cross five U.S. states (Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Texas), several major rivers (including the Missouri, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers), and aquifers that supply millions of Americans with drinking water and irrigated farmland. The construction and operation of the pipeline would bring substantial risks to the lives and livelihoods of those living along its route and near the refineries to which the tar sands oil would be directed.	RISK 07, CU 04, RISK 09
Stephen Reid	April 18, 2013	The dangers from tar sands oil were made vividly real last month when thousands of barrels of tar sands oil gushed out in Arkansas, forcing residents to flee their homes. A similar accident in North Dakota spilled 21,000 gallons of oil and in one year, Keystone I, which runs from Canada through Illinois, had 14 reported leaks.	RISK 10
Stephen Ritzel	April 4, 2013	One, the world's leading climate scientists warn that we can't burn enormously greenhouse-gas-intensive tar sands oil if we want to maintain a safe climate.	CLIM 12
Stephen Ritzel	April 4, 2013	Two, extracting oil from Canada's tar sands destroys boreal forest and wetlands where migratory birds breed. If Alberta Canada's tar sands oil fields are fully developed, an area of boreal rainforest the size of Florida will be eviscerated, leaving in its wake giant ponds of toxic wastewater. It's obvious why this would pose a massive threat to all wildlife species who reside there, including birds, wolves, woodland caribou and the iconic spirit bear.	CU 03, CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen Ritzel	April 4, 2013	And three, a spill along the Keystone XL pipeline's proposed route could threaten the water supplies of millions, endangered wildlife and human health.	RISK 07
Stephen Sachs	April 5, 2013	Moreover, the tar sands project causes significant dangerous water pollution, already causing an epidemic of rare cancers at a downstream community.	CU 02
Stephen Sanderson	April 20, 2013	Short-term, temporary U.S. jobs are not worth the risk of building a permanent fuel pipeline through our nation's heartland.	PN 05
Stephen Snyder	March 6, 2013	It's time to draw the line at opening up new sources of C02 pollution and end the building of the Keystone XL pipeline. Scientists from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration just reported this week that carbon dioxide levels have jumped by 2.67 parts per million since 2011 to total just under 395 parts per million. That’s the second highest rise in carbon emissions since record-keeping began in 1959. We have already gone beyond what many scientists see as the tipping point to stop catastrophic global climate change.	CLIM 05
Stephen Spieckerman	April 14, 2013	http://www.globalchange.gov/whats-new/agency-news/728-climate-change-indicators-in-the-united-states	REF
Stephen Spieckerman	April 14, 2013	Sanders, Robert, 6 June 2012, "Scientists uncover evidence of impending tipping point for life on Earth," (UC Berkeley News Center, http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2012/06/06/scientists-uncover-evidence-of-impending-tipping-point-for-earth/),	REF
Stephen Spieckerman	April 17, 2013	In case you haven't read the report, "Tar Sands Pipelines Safety Risks," a collaboration of the National Resources Defense Council, the National Wildlife Federation, the Pipeline Safety Trust, and the Sierra Club, I will quote some of the salient passages of the Executive Summary of that report, which you can read in its entirety at www.nrdc.org/energy/files/tarsandssafetyrisks.pdf	REF
Stephen Spieckerman	April 17, 2013	the report makes an even more important point: "Less well understood, however, is the increased risks and potential harm of transporting the raw form of tar sands oil…through pipelines to refineries in the United States." Dilbit is much more corrosive than conventional crude oil, and, therefore, conventional pipelines, such as those used in the United States, are ill equipped to carry the more corrosive mix.www.nrdc.org/energy/files/tarsandssafetyrisks.pdf	RISK 11
Stephen Spieckerman	April 18, 2013	Now, the International Energy Agency (IEA) has released the Clean Energy Progress Report that says that progress toward worldwide development of clean energy is too slow and that the target of keeping global temperatures from rising two (2) degrees Celsius may not be possible.	PN 02
Stephen Tencer	April 5, 2013	Don't let us invest in outdated technology in order to delay environmentally friendlier energy sources. Invest more in the better sources now and their prices will plummet, while our social costs will diminish.	PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen Tobias	April 9, 2013	I am writing to you as a disappointed donor to President Obama's 2008 and 2012 campaigns. Stopping this project is a powerful environmental action the President can take without Congress, and SHOULD take despite polls showing support-- because the public has been led to think the environmental impact will be low compared to the jobs the pipeline would provide. But your own department, on March 1, reported that there would be just 3900 construction jobs for 1 or 2 years, and negligible employment when construction is completed.	PN 05
Stephen Tobias	April 9, 2013	As James Hansen recently said: "The perspective of pipeline apologists is contrary to the laws of physics and basic economics, neither of which gives a damn about politics.... "The science on climate change has been in for a quarter of a century. There are no more mixed messages, just catastrophe after catastrophe. The president stands at a fork in the road: Rejecting the pipeline will show the world we are serious and determined to be on the right side of history. Approving it will signal we are too entrenched with business-as-usual to do what's right by the people, planet and future generations."	REF
Stephen Truslow	March 17, 2013	Tar Sands, mountain top removal for coal, and oil and gas fracking are last desperate attempts to keep the fossil fuel age going even though these are finite resources. We will need a crash course in renewables if we are to avoid the twin threats of resource depletion and climate warming.	PN 02
Stephen Wagoner	March 19, 2013	NASA's foremost climate scientist James Hansen has stated "It is game over for the environment" if the Keystone pipeline is built and utilized. What part of this statement is unclear? Are the American people so dimwitted that we would trade the habitability of this planet for continuing what has become our selfish and indulgent life style. Sadly, it seems the answer is YES.	CLIM 14
Stephen Wagoner	March 19, 2013	NASA's James Hansen says "It's game over for the environment" if the Keystone XL pipeline gets built and utilized. What part of his statement is still unclear? Are we as a people so dimwitted that we are willing to destroy the future habitability of this planet so that we can continue this selfish and indulgent life style? It seems that the answer is YES.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stephen Wagoner	March 19, 2013	Another very sad fact is that the State Department's environmental impact statement was written mainly by oil company consultants. Please tell me just what actual State Department employees were so busy with that this important task was passed off to consultants and lobbyists. Do actual living federal employees do any work for us anymore or is almost all work passed off to corporate interests? Hello – wake-up - it is time for change or most of us will be toast.	PRO 01
Stephen Webb	April 9, 2013	We need to spend our tax dollars on development and deployment of alternative energy sources, and even more aggressive goals for reducing energy consumption by homes, businesses, and vehicles. Higher taxes on fossil-fuel sources must be put in place to encourage this transition, as well as subsidies for developers of innovative, cleaner energy sources.	PN 02
Stephen White	March 17, 2013	The "end of oil" (great book by Paul Roberts) is not far off. How we make the transition to alternate energy is a choice politicians of integrity must make on our behalf. When we start moving in this direction is crucial. The time is NOW! Mr. President, please honor our hopes in voting for you. We understand the pressures on you, but it is time to transfer those pressures onto Big Oil and make them cooperate in the potentially smooth transition away from fossil fuels. With love and respect, Steve	REF
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) fails to: * account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining, and burning tar sands oil..	CLIM 05
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	Additionally, nearly three-quarters of a million acres of Boreal Forest in Canada will be clearcut so that the oil industry can get to the tar sands, forests that serve as a carbon sink for our atmosphere that is becoming increasingly choked with greenhouse gases.	CLIM 06
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	It [the Boreal Forest] is also forest land that is home part of the year to thousands of migratory bird species.	CU 03
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	TransCanada's oil production will not halt the global rise of gasoline prices. It will do nothing to end our dependence on foreign oil, as Canada is a foreign company. Much of the oil it produces might never be sold to Americans.	PN 04
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	...an accounting of the boreal forest destruction that will be hastened by this pipeline…	PN 11
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	...the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) fails to adequately address safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks, posed by tar sands.	RISK 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	...critical review of the spill risk given Keystone 1's track record…	RISK 26
Sterling Kinnell	April 7, 2013	The State Department rejected Keystone XL's previous permit applications because running an oil pipeline above the Ogallala Aquifer was not in the national interest. But running the Keystone XL oil pipeline over other areas of U.S. soil still poses serious threats to our clean water supply and safe land use.	WRG 01
Steskal	April 18, 2013	TransCanada has a reputation of being a bully, a liar, and they have also threatened the landowners with eminent domain even before there is a presidential permit for their pipeline. … TransCanada's tactics that they use to secure and easement from the landowners vary from letters, threats of eminent domain and Baptist preachers as land agents.	LEG 02
Steskal	April 18, 2013	This pipeline route still crosses the Sandhills and the aquifer. We do not want this pipeline to leak the tar stands into our water, as our families' livelihood depends upon our natural resource of the aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 07
SteskalB	April 18, 2013	This pipeline is not in our nation's best interests as it's shipped 1,100 miles to a tax free refinery. And when it is refined, it's grade four diesel fuel with high sulphur content and it's not allowed in the United States. It's -- it's too toxic.	PN 07
SteskalB	April 18, 2013	TransCanada admits that a SCADA detection leak -- will leak at a flow rate of 1. 5 to 2 percent undetected. At 830,000 barrels per day at two percent is 16,600 barrels per day leaking undetected in my water on my property.Not many of the leaks are detected by their high tech equipment.	RISK 15
Steve and Connie Ripp	April 22, 2013	TransCanada is not even required to have a spill containment plan in dealing with our water resourse.	RISK 05
Steve Arey	April 9, 2013	I believe that it would be more beneficial to put an oil refinery near where the oil is in Canada, than to pipe it to Texas.	ALT 08
Steve Backus	March 4, 2013	Please do not allow this project to take place. The USA does not need any part of this terrible project dividing our Country	ACK
Steve Breckheimer	April 11, 2013	It will create massive amounts of pollution both at the source and as it is refined and burned. We need to concentrate on improving our efficiency and reducing our need for oil and gas.	PN 02
Steve Bruce	April 22, 2013	We need to focus on 'clean' and let 'dirty' energy concepts disappear. We need to phase out and retrain dirty business. Do we know where this pipeline oil is destined ?	ALT 01
steve carrow	April 22, 2013	construction of the pipeline will not create tens of thousands of jobs as has been claimed. Recent reports cite the figure of 35 permanent jobs.	SO 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steve Chism	April 22, 2013	New data suggests that the current analyses of the impacts of tar sands underestimate the climate impacts of tar sands pollution by at least 13% because petroleum coke, the high-carbon byproduct of the refining process used as a cheap alternative to coal was not accounted for in its calculations.	ACK
Steve Chism	April 22, 2013	The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel. Keystone XL will open the floodgates to more tar sands production and even more greenhouse gas emissions.	CLIM 12
Steve Chism	April 22, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy that cannot be exported and will provide a secure energy future.	PN 03
Steve Cochran	April 9, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is fraught with great risk to our environment- listen to the scientists, not industry-tied analysis groups. The potential costs are beyond our ability to compensate	PN 05
Steve Cohen	March 4, 2013	The oil will go somewhere. It should go to the USA. win-win all around. The politics is making the administration look foolish and dishonest	ACK
Steve Coven	April 4, 2013	If you can not out right reject and prohibit this pipeline at least make any company involved in its construction or operation but in escrow up front the total dollar amount that a major catastrophic failure could possibly cost to clean up and restore. That money must then stay there as prepaid insurance as long as the pipeline is in operation. Only when corporations feel the economic pinch of their wantonly lax decisions will we get responsible planning from a corporation.	SO 16, RISK 03
Steve Eisenberg	April 15, 2013	risk of an oil spill due to the likelihood that the tar sands will cause a pipeline break and subsequent oil spill due to the corrosive properties of the tar sands.	RISK 11
Steve Fife-adams	March 25, 2013	I believe the decision we make on the Keystone XL pipeline will be a defining moment with regard to how our nation responds to the calamitous threat posed by human-induced climate change. It is possible to rationalize approval of the pipeline for short term benefit, but being overly concerned about the short term at the expense of long-term sustainability is what has gotten us to where we are today. This is the moment when the United States of America can turn the corner and begin to exhibit the moral leadership the world so badly needs to put the brakes on climate change.	CLIM 18
Steve Grover	April 11, 2013	and most importantly the climate change impact of this fuel.	ACK
Steve Grover	April 11, 2013	the unnecessary introduction of this dirty fuel into the world energy supply	ACK
Steve Grover	April 11, 2013	My objections are based on the issues surrounding transport and potential spills,	RISK 14
Steve Hampton	April 11, 2013	The pipeline is another key ingredient in the USA's energy independence.	PN 10
Steve Heinitz	March 11, 2013	The United States needs to take a leadership role in moving away from dirty fossil fuels. Our focus needs to be on energy conservation, renewable energy, (wind and solar) and then extracting fossil fuels from US lands in a safe and economic way.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steve Hollatz	April 2, 2013	We need to be moving toward sustainable energy sources. This is just a step in the wrong direction that will delay sustainability.	ALT 01
Steve Hollatz	April 2, 2013	A number of respected analysts say that this oil source will actually increase our energy costs and provide few benefits to the U.S. Although it will create some temporary jobs, the potential long term costs will be far greater than any possible benefit.	PN 04
Steve Hollister	April 22, 2013	It is unfortunate but universally well known that Governor Hiney is for sale to anyone domestic or foreign Compare the govs donor list to the list of those receiving LB 775 and other state grants contracts and favors.	ACK
Steve Hollister	April 22, 2013	The advent of deep-well irrigation from the Ogallala Aquifer turned the "Great American Desert" into the breadbasket of America, and the difference between an ample food supply for the entire Earth. The only way to ensure our national security is to jealously and ardently protect the main factor in our countrys food supply. That factor, of course, is the clean clear groundwater water of the Ogallala aquifer. This KXL foreign-owned and foreign-sourced pipeline can supply millions of dollars for election campaigns, but it Will, sooner or later, LEAK, in major and catastrophic ways, into our treasured aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 09
Steve Hummel	April 22, 2013	Do not allow the Keystone XL pipeline to be built. Support solar, wind, and other renewable forms of energy.	PN 02
Steve Janusz	March 8, 2013	For the health of our planet we must change our energy needs to renewable resources that do not further harm our planet.	PN 02
Steve Janusz	March 8, 2013	this pipeline has great potential to harm the land… it runs through	RISK 07
Steve Janusz	March 8, 2013	this pipeline has great potential to harm the... aquifer it runs through.	WRG 01
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	What is the area of the oil sands resource? How long will the extraction continue at current rates? And what is the impact on vegetation, wildlife, geology, water resources, wetlands, fisheries, land use and recreation, cultural resources, and native populations in Alberta if this area is progressively stripped?	ACK
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	I note that the GHG impact in the SEIS is subject to some uncertainty (Appendix W, p. 36). Why should we rely on those estimates? What is the worst case? The U.S. Government should insist on the release of the non-transparent data and proprietary data so we have the facts on this project, not just “expert judgment.” Why does Appendix W only evaluate GHG emissions for one product, gasoline?	CLIM 04
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	The SEIS needs to include an accurate picture of CO2 emissions from burning petcoke. According to Oil Change International, it emits 5 to 10% more CO2 than coal per energy unit (BTU).To further address the impact of the tar sands coke, the SEIS should also address pollutants other than CO2 that will be emitted (or possibly captured) in this country and in China, a probable market for the coke.	CLIM 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	..with respect to peat and its release of CO2, I do not see any analysis beyond the footprint of the mines and disturbance related to the mining/extraction industry. As the climate warms, CO2 will be released from all the peatland worldwide. What are the predicted releases worldwide and the contribution that the WCSD mining will make to the total release? How much ice melting in the Arctic will result from burning the tar sands and what is the GHG impact?	CLIM 12
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	In order to assess the environmental impact in Canada, the SEIS should provide a map locating these projects and explain the logistics to move the bitumen, synthetic crude (SCO), synbilt and dilbit to Hardisty, Alberta or other shipping points for transport.	CU 01
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	Independent study by an academic institution of SCO, synbit, and dilbit spills is needed. In addition, the study should examine other petroleum products because others may be transported, given the presence of refineries in Canada and the U.S.	RISK 28
Steve Knowlton	March 28, 2013	Volume II, section 4, the SEIS states (p. 4.3-9). This wording minimizes what could be serious. The troublesome words are “long” and “large.” They need to be defined. Some parameters of what is acceptable distance and impact should be included. How do the NHPAQ aquifers differ from the Sand Hill aquifer that the pipeline is avoiding? Given the volume of synthetic crude (SCO), synbit and dilbit that will flow through the pipeline, the consequences should be further defined.	WRG 01
Steve Larrick	April 22, 2013	The tarsands oil that DOES make it through the pipeline will be subject to toxic processing and burning that will contribute to catastrophic climate change for our fragile planet.	CLIM 14
Steve Larrick	April 22, 2013	We need to move, instead, to create jobs creating renewable wind, solar, geothermal and other cleaner sources of energy.	SO 05
Steve L'Heureux	April 22, 2013	Do not bring this pipeline through the Ogallala aquifer as this is a natural resource that cant be replaced!	WRG 01
Steve Malagodi	March 4, 2013	Do not approve the Keystone pipeline.	ACK
Steve Malagodi	March 4, 2013	To say that the pipeline will do no harm is absurd.	ACK
Steve Malagodi	March 4, 2013	Keystone XL is an incentive for development of the Alberta Tar Sands, and as such should be opposed by this administration which says it is committed to addressing climate change.	PN 06
Steve Marquardt	April 4, 2013	Now is the time to advance climate solutions, not develop the dirtiest oil on earth that will only make climate change even worse.	ALT 01
Steve Marquardt	April 4, 2013	The Keystone pipeline would be a threat to the environment, our climate, and American families. Tar sands oil create even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, so it would worsen the climate crisis, without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	PN 05
Steve Marquardt	April 4, 2013	This pipeline would also put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk.	WRG 01, RISK 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steve Mcbride	April 13, 2013	We need to put investment into safer alternative methods of energy.	PN 02
Steve Patton	March 11, 2013	For the short term gain selling the dirty oil to China or whomever for a burst of profits which will be used up in a flash, we also get the long term environmental damage,	PN 07
Steve Patton	March 11, 2013	It brings a small amount of skilled work for a short time, of little benefit in the bigger picture.	SO 04
Steve Piper	April 18, 2013	The study's have shown this is the best route, plan and economically the least expensive way to move the oil.	PN 10
Steve Puliti	April 15, 2013	America should focus more on solar, wind, and Hydroelectricity; all safer for the environment	PN 02
Steve Rogers	March 17, 2013	How can we justify this travesty? Only 35 jobs created? Only transported with risk across US soils, so that some of the dirtiest oil can be burned by our neighbors? Who benefits other than Big Oil? (once again, at the expense of the American people)	PN 05
Steve Shepard	April 19, 2013	The tar sands pipeline requires higher heat and pressure as this thick tarry “liquid” crosses the continent down to the Gulf. We have a disaster in Arkansas to ponder right now thanks to the difficulty of transporting this tar-sand substance. You should know that it is impossible to transport this substance even in the brand new pipeline without leaks and accidents and that alone is reason to reject it.	RISK 14
Steve Tnoffeet	April 18, 2013	Why should we run this [pipeline] over our rivers and through the Ogallala Aquifer?	RISK 07
Steve Tnoffeet	April 18, 2013	[talking about the tar sands flowing through the pipe] It is nearly impossible to clean up rivers [used Michigan as an example].	RISK 29
Steven Clark	April 17, 2013	As a nation we just need to develop non-oil based forms of energy. Put the money into research for new and better energy development that would go into the Keystone XL Pipeline.	ALT 01
Steven Cochran	March 11, 2013	The net energy gained by mining tar sands oil is at least 15% less than conventional oil sources	CLIM 05
Steven Cochran	March 11, 2013	Despite TransCanada’s assertion that more than half a million jobs will be created, you yourselves have concluded that only 42,100 temporary jobs will occur, and only 35 permanent jobs	SO 02
Steven Curtis	April 21, 2013	I ask you to consider the consequences of increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere [from using oil-based energy]. Physics tells us that CO2 absorbs and traps heat in the atmosphere. More CO2, more heating.	CLIM 12
Steven Esses	April 16, 2013	And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steven Federman	April 13, 2013	In addition to surface waters, the Keystone XL pipeline threatens vast underground water supplies that, once contaminated, cannot be cleaned. There's no "away" where toxic oil can go once it enters an aquifer. The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	WRG 01, RISK 08
Steven Gilbert	April 4, 2013	NEPA requires full analysis of primary, secondary, and cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are particularly important to fully address in light of climate change and the significant increase in carbon associated with burning tar sands oil. The inadequacy of the impact analysis and a clear look at alternatives to fuel production and transport leaves the NEPA process handicapped for its intent as a decision tool and subject to the criticism that it is written from the back forward (written to justify a preconceived decision).	LEG 04, CLIM 04
Steven Hanson	April 15, 2013	this private Canadian company will not guarantee that the majority of the oil traveling through this pipeline will be refined and remain in the US and/or North America. As a matter of fact, it is widely reported that the majority will be sold overseas.	PN 07
Steven Horneffer	March 14, 2013	I was dismayed to learn that the State Department allowed industry shills to write its study, and even more disappointed to learn that the extent of industry involvement was disguised.	PRO 01
Steven Katz	March 10, 2013	There are jobs to be created in the natural infrastructure realm as well as in clean energy.	SO 05
Steven Kimmelman	April 2, 2013	Beyond the effects on our climate, this pipeline would also put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk.	WRG 01
Steven Lowenthal	March 14, 2013	…. Who is writing your reports,	PRO 01
Steven Malahias	April 4, 2013	There are many environmental issues it will cause but also will probably need security which we cannot afford under the current budget crisis we are experiencing.	RISK 04
Steven Schafersman	March 11, 2013	With all the new natural gas and oil being produced by fracking, we don't need the tar sand petroleum. All of these new petroleum sources are unfortunately setting back the effort to switch to alternative energy sources. The new sources are lowering prices, making energy from petroleum too cheap, and delaying the move to alternatives	PN 03
Steven Serikaku	April 7, 2013	The Department of Defense recognizes global warming as one of the biggest threats to world security in the future. Why doesn't the State Department?	CLIM 18
Steven Skal	April 7, 2013	I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.	CLIM 18
Steven Skal	April 7, 2013	It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Steven Thiese	March 11, 2013	There are other, cleaner options that will boost the economy and add jobs. If you put as much time and effort into researching and supporting those options as you have debating the Keystone project, we'd be well ahead of the game.	SO 05
Steven Vogel	April 3, 2013	In addition, my Cree friends on the Reserves in Canada are pleading with their American neighbors to do everything we can to help stop the mass desecration of their sacred lands in Alberta by the exploitation of the tar sand deposits.	ACK
Steven Wagenseil	March 18, 2013	Please keep your eyes on the inevitable long-term impact of this project on the environment, both in the damage it will cause while under construction or in operation, and the damage that will result from burning more fossil fuels when we should be doing everything in our power -- and you have power, here -- to protect the environment and reduce greenhouse gases.	PN 05
Steven Yeager	March 19, 2013	to say nothing of the costs of increased Global Warming!!!!f you decide to pursue a different path, one that will not only help reduce global warming. Tar-Sands oil is more carbon intensive and therefore more polluting than the current oil we refine.	CLIM 05
Steven Yeager	March 19, 2013	Just because an industry exists and employs millions of citizens, does not make it indispensable to our economy. We have many industries - military industrial complex, health insurance, oil and others - that harm humans and our planet. Being a leader means being a visionary and choosing the right path into the future. Our economy can still remain strong as we transition into a greener, more peaceful world of justice and equality.	PN 05
Steven Yeager	March 19, 2013	The money spent...could stimulate more jobs AND more energy if spent in wind and solar technologies	SO 05
Stevie Mccormick	April 2, 2013	the Keystone XL pipeline is all risk and no reward.	PN 05
Stevie Mccormick	April 2, 2013	I live within sight of this pipeline, going through old growth forest. 110 ft wide easement was cut through 70 foot tall pine, oaks, dogwoods, sweetgum among other types of habitat that was home to all kinds of animals and people alike. To replant with mere grass is a travesty. It took generations to grow these trees, all cut down, loaded up and shipped off, or burned. I watched daily and took pictures of the process. I am disheartened as I now see the remains of dirt with no way of keeping it from washing into a torrential river of mud now that spring is here bringing rains. No replanting has been attempted.	VEG 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stewart Parsons	March 14, 2013	It is very disturbing to read in William Boardman's comments today that representatives of the oil industry or their paid consultants wrote much of the content of the Environmental Impact Statement regarding the Keystone XL pipeline which was issued on May 1, 2013. If these allegations are true it seriously undermines the integrety of the review process and our government.	PRO 01
Stewart Scholl	April 6, 2013	Please protect our planet for future generations by revising your environmental impact statement to reflect what we all know to be true: that the Keystone XL pipeline -- along with this existing Canadian oilsands pipeline -- is all risk and no reward.	PN 05
Stig Greve	April 21, 2013	There have been no less than 4 major oil spills in the US in the last 2 years, and every time a spill has happened the perpetrating oil company has shown they're completely incapable of cleaning up their own messes.	RISK 13
Stig Greve	April 21, 2013	We'll see no drop in the price of gasoline because of its presence, and most of the jobs it will create will be either temporary or low-paying.	SO 04
StoneK	April 18, 2013	The new route of the pipeline disturbs the Ponca's Trail of Tears and numerous other historical, as well as precontract sites, infringes on various treaties made by the U.S. government with certain tribes and threatens sacred water sources, among other things.	CR 02
StoneK	April 18, 2013	ranchers in this area are being told that if they do not agree with the permanent easements on their property for a pipeline, that they will be taken by eminent domain. To jeopardize livelihoods and to risk the breadbasket with a company's spill is not a proper use of eminent domain.	LEG 02
Stu Luttich	March 12, 2013	Although, the proposed re-routing of the TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline through Nebraska does avoid the Nebraska Sandhills, as geographically mapped and recognized by the United States Geological Survey, these areas are strictly confined to where the sandhill-type of topography and soil substrate is consistently and broadly extensive, and, does not include the more localized and less extensive areas that have either identical or similar types of sandy soil characteristics. The proposed Nebraska pipeline re-route does not avoid these localized areas.	ALT 06
Stu Luttich	March 12, 2013	I am requesting the President of the United States deny the permit to build and construct the Keystone XL Pipeline; since, to date, no objective evidence has been provided that proves the pipeline will serve the national interests.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stu Luttich	March 12, 2013	The statement that "…the impacts on aquifers from a "dilbit" release should be localized …" is disingenuous and not necessarily accurate. Furthermore, in the instance of the proposed TransCanada Ltd. Keystone XL Pipeline, TransCanada Ltd.'s Environmental Impact Statement acknowledges nearly 700 K gallons of dilbit – a relatively highly corrosive unrefined carbon-based crude oil – would be released before any sensors would automatically shut-down the pipeline. Seven hundred thousand gallons is not a small localized amount of oil!!	RISK 14
Stu Luttich	March 12, 2013	Yes, jobs will be created to construct, maintain and operate the pipeline; but, the overwhelming proportion of those jobs will be temporary construction jobs; and, once the construction of the pipeline is completed, those jobs will immediately evaporate. A far less significant proportion of jobs will remain for maintaining and operating the pipeline; but, even these relatively few jobs will not be absolutely secure.	SO 04
Stu Luttich	March 12, 2013	The proposed Nebraska Re-Route does not avoid fragile soils or ecosystems. Under the best of ideal conditions, aboriginal native tall and mixed grass prairie grassland and sod once broken requires more time to be fully restored than any of those living today have time left to live. Breaking aboriginal prairie sod is basically a one-time event, and, will require centuries, if not millennia, to be completely restored to the original unbroken condition. This fact was not even addressed, nor questioned, in any of the Environmental Impact Statements. TransCanada Ltd. simply stated their intentions to restore the land to as it once was; but, they will not, because they can not. The capability and understanding for doing so does not yet exist.	VEG 01
Stu Luttich	April 10, 2013	•Any routing and laying of any 36" diameter pipeline through virgin unbroken native prairie grassland will be a one time event within the lifetime of those living today and perhaps more than a few generations to follow. Native prairie grasslands and grassland sod once broken is never fully restored again to its aboriginal state. And, any breaking of the grasslands that are in the process of being restored only resets the clock back to zero in process that requires multi-decades, if not centuries, to achieve a reasonable approximate facsimile for being accomplished.	VEG 01
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	Neither TransCanada Ltd. nor any other company should be permitted to exercise the rights of eminent domain to acquire the use of another's private property until having proven beyond a shadow of a doubt how and why the pipeline or use of the pipeline will be of categorical importance in serving the public interest.	LEG 02
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	before TransCanada Ltd. is given final approval for constructing this pipeline, the U.S. American people should be provided with perfectly understood iron-clad legislative assurances for how not only the pipeline, but, the oil and bitumen flowing through that pipeline, will serve the U.S. American people at costs less than if the pipeline is not constructed.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	The U.S. American people deserve to be provided with perfectly clear and simple explanations for why this country should assume the risks associated with the pipeline only to improve the profitable fortunes of international private corporations.	PN 05
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	this proposed pipeline is complicit in contributing to causing significant changes in the Global Climate, without being obligated to pay any of the costs for having done so...neither the oil industry nor those who are complicit in aiding and abetting the industry are being required to pay one-cent to suppress or eliminate this addiction or defray the costs and compensations for the resulting damages and disasters.	RISK 03, CLIM 12
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	The claim that constructing the pipeline will create multi-thousands of jobs is completely facetious. During the relatively brief construction phase, yes, but after the construction is finished, jobs will be in the hundreds, and, even less,	SO 02
Stu Luttich	April 21, 2013	neither the current nor any of the earlier editions of the Environmental Impact Statements acknowledge how constructing this pipeline, or any other pipeline, through any of the few remaining tracts of unbroken native tallgrass prairie will permanently destroy the aboriginal ecological integrity of that prairie and prairie sod, and how the pipeline cannot be buried and constructed without doing so. Restoration and reclamation can be instituted; but, no amount of effort and expenditures of energy and resources will result in the prairie and prairie sod being fully returned to its aboriginal unbroken condition within the lifetime of those living today – and, perhaps, a few more generations to follow, if ever. We simply lack the tools and knowledge for doing so.	VEG 01
Stu Luttich	April 22, 2013	Yes, jobs will be created to construct, maintain and operate the pipeline; but, the overwhelming proportion of those jobs will be temporary construction jobs; and, once the construction of the pipeline is completed, those jobs will immediately evaporate. A far less significant proportion of jobs will remain for maintaining and operating the pipeline; but, even these relatively few jobs will not be absolutely secure.	SO 04
Stu Luttich	April 22, 2013	Native prairie grasslands and grassland sod once broken is never fully restored again to its aboriginal state.	VEG 11
Stuart Basden	March 31, 2013	To approve Keystone XL is to endanger the future of the American State itself.	ACK
Stuart Basden	March 31, 2013	I'm sure you know the 565Gt number regarding CO2 emissions that the International Energy Agency calculated.	CLIM 04
Stuart Basden	March 31, 2013	The argument that KXL would not increase climate emission is based on the assumption that the Alberta Tar Sands will be completely burnt, which is an assumption we cannot make.	CLIM 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stuart Basden	March 31, 2013	If we exploit the Tar Sands we commit ourselves to blowing way past the "dangerous" rise of 2ºC, and it will result in the death of tens of millions of Americans in the coming decades as the food production system falls apart due to climate instability.	CLIM 05
Stuart Basden	March 31, 2013	Given climate change is considered to be the biggest threat to national security by Admiral Locklear, it is prudent for America to reject any large infrastructure projects that would increase the problem.	CLIM 18
Stuart Holme	March 19, 2013	It is important to put substance behind the President's inspiring words about developing the energy sources of the future, rather than continuing to rely on the energy sources of the past. Also his words about doing something about global climate change. So, in the realm of actually doing something, let's bury this terrible Keystone XL pipeline that the President and his administration can't seem to get over.	CLIM 18
Stuart Kutchins	March 11, 2013	To review just a small part of the process—the building and operation of the pipeline—and declare that there is no impact on climate change is absurd. While the 3.19 million metric tons per year of CO2 projected to be emitted in operating the pipeline is not an insignificant amount, it is only a small part of the process. It is not the carbon emissions from construction and operation of the pipeline itself that will in the long run destroy large regions of our planet, but the extraction, transportation, refining and burning of the huge quantity of tar sands as fuel. An analysis of this entire process must be done to evaluate correctly the environmental impact of the pipeline.	CLIM 05
Stuart Kutchins	March 11, 2013	Who could believe the State Department is doing its job of protecting Americans if allows this smudge to be disseminated through the atmosphere, causing us to reach 450 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere, an irreversible tipping point for our climate? There is highly credible research demonstrating that the global average temperature will rise eleven degrees Fahrenheit, causing vastly increased pressure on Northern regions, even more violent weather patterns that will destroy U.S. homes and businesses along all the coasts, and massive poverty as a result of these changes.	CLIM 18
Stuart Kutchins	March 11, 2013	Please do not approve the Keystone XL project until an EIS is submitted that evaluates not just the pipe, but the entire project. The Keystone XL Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement is an inadequate basis on which to grant approval of the pipeline because it does not consider the impact of the material that will be transported from Alberta to Galveston. The pipeline is not a neutral entity—it is not being proposed for water or pork bellies, but for tar sands oil.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Stuart Luttich	April 10, 2013	Yes, jobs will be created to construct, maintain and operate the pipeline; but, the overwhelming proportion of those jobs will be temporary construction jobs; and , once the construction of the pipeline is completed, those jobs will immediately evaporate.	SO 04
Stuart Luttich	April 10, 2013	Native prairie grasslands and grassland sod once broken is never fully restored again to its aboriginal state.	VEG 01
Stuart N. Luttich	April 22, 2013	The proposed pipeline is being constructed from low-quality Chinese steel of lessened tensile strength (25% less); and therefore is more likely to corrode and develop leaks through the passage of time.	PD 06
Su Friedrich	April 17, 2013	If you have children or grandchildren, it's hard to imagine that you would approve something that would destroy their futures.	ACK
Suckow, Paul (CSD)	March 4, 2013	Nowhere have the nation’s railroads been included in the discussion. The IHS CERAWeek 2013 conference is launching as I write this, and some real momentum after over 30 years of preparation appears to be behind the transport of oil by rail. I would hope this alternative for Bakken crude appeared and was analyzed in the DSEIS I am going to be reading!	ALT 04
Sue Addison	March 11, 2013	Why should a Canadian company be able to declare imminent domain over the personal property of U.S. citizens and their families? Our laws need to change fast to protect our citizens.	LEG 02
Sue Anderson	April 5, 2013	Every pipeline is an accident waiting to happen. If you wouldn't want it in your back yard, it probably shouldn't be built.	ACK
Sue Ann Gardner	April 22, 2013	I became interested in this issue many months ago when I was made aware of the strong-arm tactics of TransCanada and their quick invocation of eminent domain against U.S. land owners who did not comply with their request to cross their property with the proposed pipeline. This is flagrant abuse of the purpose of that legal device, which is meant to be employed only in times of extreme situations. TransCanada's use of it is egregious and reprehensible as the only clear beneficiary of the pipeline is TransCanada itself. That the Nebraska administration and State Department would collude with this Canadian corporation in this manner is nothing less than an abuse of power. TransCanada should unfailingly accommodate land owners and site their pipeline only over the property of readily compliant land owners. Land owners should never be forced to comply with TransCanada's demands.	LEG 02
Sue Chavel	April 15, 2013	Costly leaks are inevitable with damaging environmental results.	RISK 07
Sue Edwards	April 12, 2013	we need to stop the build-up of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in our atmosphere.	ACK
Sue Edwards	April 12, 2013	Our nation needs to make a major investment now in clean renewable energy and energy efficiency measures.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sue Edwards	April 12, 2013	It is also clear that pipelines cannot function in perpetuity (or even in the short run) without leaks. We cannot afford to ruin precious aquifers such as the Ogallala.	WRG 01
Sue Frankewicz	April 21, 2013	I realize that Canada is a strategic ally but... their own people don't want the tar sands running through their provinces; why should we abet this destruction of the atmosphere that makes our lives possible on this planet?	ACK
Sue Gardner	April 8, 2013	he TransCanada pipeline construction project and subsequent monitoring would create very few permanent, or even temporary, jobs,	SO 04
Sue Geurkink	April 19, 2013	At any time there could be a break, how much property and water sources will it pollute before it is contained?...At the present time, oil is being shipped by rail and truck. At least if there is an accident, the destructive oil is limited.	RISK 07, ALT 07
Sue Kline	April 18, 2013	Therefore, the EIS should have taken into account the environmental consequences of the entire process of exploiting Tar Sands oil, including the removal of vast forests to reach the oil, the carbon emitted in the extraction and production process, which is 19 % greater than production of other oil sources, and the burning of that oil, which will greatly contribute to in an ocean too acidic to support life and, planetary temperatures inhospitable to human existence.	CLIM 12
Sue Kline	April 18, 2013	The pipeline would create few local or long-term jobs. In fact, in some parts of the country, such as the Midwest, it would undoubtedly lead to increased gas prices where existing pipelines for tar sands oil result in an abundance of oil that would, instead, be shipped to Texas and sold on the world market, mainly for the enrichment of a few multi-national corporations and wealthy individuals, should Keystone be built.	PN 05
Sue Kline	April 18, 2013	The assumption that Tar Sands oil could get to market by other routes or methods in the same amounts as the proposed pipeline would allow is not correct. Development of the Tar Sands is now constrained by the difficulty and expense of other types of transport for this caustic product. In addition, fierce opposition in Canada, and even east coast Amercian states, make pipelines going east or west from Alberta doubtful.	PN 06
Sue Kline	April 18, 2013	The pipeline would provide shipment for nearly 900,000 more barrels a day in addition to what is already being shipped by other means, making full exploitation of Tar Sands reserves financially feasible and inevitable. There is a consensus by analysts and executives in the oil industry that the Keystone XL would make the difference in allowing the tar sands to be fully developed.	PN 06
Sue Mchenry	April 10, 2013	Your new evaluation, if done in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, must show the reasonable and forseeable impacts…[form letter language…]	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Tarsands bitumen has no redeeming value CO2 emissions will exceed past fossil fuel emissions. CO2 emissions will accelerate climate tipping points. CO2 emissions will exacerbate flooding & drought. CO2 emissions will strengthen hurricanes and rains. CO2 emissions will decrease available potable water. CO2 emissions will increase heat-waves and wildfires. CO2 emissions will be “game over for the climate.”	CLIM 17
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Tarsands extraction has no redeeming value Extraction destroys the habitats of people and animals. Extraction destroys ecosystem, livelihood and culture. Extraction destroys the boreal forest carbon sink.	CU 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Tarsands processing has no redeeming value Processing leaves toxic water on the landscape. Processed toxic ponds attract migrating birds. Processed toxic waters seep and leak into rivers. Processed toxic water causes mutations in fish. Processed toxic water destroys food sources. Processed toxic water causes people to die of cancer.	FISH01, CU 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	The EIS was written by a conflict of interest, TransCanada personnall.	PRO 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	The environmental impact statement for the proposed KEYSTONE XL TARSANDS PIPELINE, was not written by any government official. The Environmental Resources Management (ERM) was paid an undiscolosed amount under contract to TransCanada to write the statement.	PRO 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	In the worst case secenior, which has never be studied, we will not any idea of the impact it will have on the Ogallaha Aquifer alone. I dont think anyone knows. We can not take the chance of destroying Nebraska and the Ogallaha Aguifer. It is our lively hood for all the natural resources in our state.	RISK 22
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Our sandy soil, which lies above the Ogallaha Aquifer will not stand any kind of toxic leak. Also the ground will never be replaced to the original state that TransCanada says it will. Once you break up the fragil sandhills, there is no return.	SOIL 05, RISK 07, WRG 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Nebraska has the most fragil land and sets over the largest part of the Ogallah Aquifer.	WRG 01
Sue Mitchell	April 22, 2013	Then we were hit with the other proposed route. It moved North of -- 20 some miles. That is where my husbands family has owned land for over 120 years. The land is the same. Sandhills that grow some of the best protein filled grass for our cattle. Also the water source goes through several springs that feed creeks, and ponds that water our livestock. The - Creek flows through our land and is the only source of water. The proposed route goes through the springs, that flows out of the ground to form the - Creek. What happens when that pipeline breaks and contaminates our water? We are 2 miles from the pipeline. Who is going to help clean up our water, or can it ever be cleaned up? How will our livestock and wildlife be protected. If the chemicals themself are seeping into these springs, the only way we will know that it is leaking is when our livestock and livestock become very sick.	WRG 01, RISK 08, WRS 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sue Perin	April 19, 2013	The pipeline would go over the top of the United States biggest and most important aquifer. I should not need to tell you how important clean water is as a natural resource and that even one "small" break in a pipeline could ruin that aquifer -- an aquifer that is not only important for drinking water but for crop production in the US.	WRG 01
Sue Thompson	April 21, 2013	The recent spills indicate there is no "plan" for such emergencies.	RISK 05
Sue Williams	April 5, 2013	When will the people we vote into office on their "promises" to develop renewable , alternative fuels be held accountable for their failure to uphold their promises. They lie to get elected, lie when they serve and lie when a tragedy like the Arkansas spill occurs. They protect the oil barons who fuel their campaigns with their dirty , oil stained money.	ACK
Summer Nelson	April 22, 2013	In addition to the ream of impacts that can be anticipated if we facilitate further tar sands exploitation and the associated global warming, there are the even more immediate impacts that tar sands development has on First Nations people and natural resources in Canada. That these impacts occur across the border is of no moment; because approval of this project would directly support tar sands development, the State Department must fully evaluate and disclose these impacts in its EIS. As well, the State Department must consider whether it is in our national interest to facilitate and support continued degradation of natural resources and subsistence food supplies, and persistent rare cancers and other diseases among First Nations people living downstream from tar sands operations, and the other devastating impacts associated with tar sands development.	CU 05
Summer Nelson	April 22, 2013	Another major concern is the potential for more oil spills like those we have seen recently, including that in Mayflower, Arkansas. That devastation is not something we need to risk much more of, especially in order to export primarily Canadian oil out of the U.S. The DSEIS has not adequately considered and disclosed the potential for oil spills, the likely number and frequency of spills that can be anticipated, and the associated impacts.	RISK 06
Summer Nelson	April 22, 2013	Please ensure that the final EIS fully analyzes and discloses all the impacts associated with this project from the limited jobs to be created in the U.S., to the risks of major oil spills, to the increases in global warming and the impact of tar sands development on our ability to meaningful address global warming, to the impacts of tar sands development on First Nations, to impacts on American Indian rights and concerns along the pipeline route.	SO 02, LEG 04
Sunergos	April 19, 2013	Sunergos' business is a clear example that importing oil form Canada creates jobs and economic growth in the US.	SO 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sunil G.m.	April 10, 2013	ON A EMERGENCY BASIS PLEASE REQUEST THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO REVIEW THIS PROJECT,AS WE HAVE SCARCE LIMITED DWINDLING QUANTITIES OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN OUR PLANET EARTH WHICH WILL BE REQUIRED BY THE PRESENT & THE FUTURE GENERATIONS…	PRO 05
Support Keystone XL Pipeline	March 8, 2013	The alternative, transporting unrefined oil directly to China by tanker is a process with nearly no environmental regulatory oversight.	ALT 07
Support Keystone XL Pipeline	March 8, 2013	As a UA member, the union members will benefit from having more jobs	SO 06
Susal Stebbins Collns	March 31, 2013	Developing and burning the Canadian tar sands oils would lead to catastrophic for climate change.	CLIM 12
Susan	March 6, 2013	… stop this project in favor of more positive steps to protect the atmosphere,slow climate change…	CLIM 12
Susan	March 11, 2013	Please stop the Keystone Pipeline application until further conclusive research is done regarding the potential hazards to wildlife, the environment and humans and can be reviewed by a board of neutral scientists. There is evidence that not nearly as many jobs will be created as initially projected by the oil/gas industry, there is no oil/gas supply shortage, and industry is trying to ram approval through the governing bodies prematurely.	SO 02, LEG 04
Susan	March 14, 2013	How nice to know that our State Department's IMPARTIAL AND OBJECTIVE analysis of the Keystone Pipeline was written by the oil industry.	PRO 01
Susan	April 22, 2013	Please let's stop expanding the pipeline and start investing in cleaner forms of energy, such as electricity, wind power, and solar power.	PN 02
Susan Almono Seaquist	April 15, 2013	PLEASE let's invest in renewable energy so we can lessen our dependence on fossil fuels more quickly.	PN 02
Susan Almono Seaquist	April 15, 2013	Let us NOT make huge investments into fossil fuel infrastructure since we will then have to justify the expense by continuing to use it.	PN 05
Susan Ascoli	April 20, 2013	The oil industry needs to back off and put their money into alternative energy sources, and STOP destroying land, water and wildlife!	PN 02
Susan Auerhan	April 7, 2013	The recent spill from the existing pipeline is clear evidence of how dangerous this project is to our environment.	RISK 07
Susan Black	April 3, 2013	If saftey and clean up expenses interfere with profitability that is an indication that the money would be better spent on clean energy.	PN 03
Susan Black	April 3, 2013	The argument that it would provide jobs is also false. An equal number of truckers would lose their jobs once the pipeline came on line.	SO 05
Susan Bozso	April 15, 2013	Over time, the moving sand simply erodes them away from the inside out, and then they leak with catastrophic results.	RISK 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Bradfield	April 15, 2013	I just have difficulty understanding why we have not put our resources to solar wind and water movement in the ocean like the Dutch did. We have so many miles of coastline that we could be generating a fair amount of energy with that technology.	PN 02
Susan Brown	April 6, 2013	The boreal forest is critical worldwide. North America is the beneficiary of the boreal forest running across Canada.	CU 01
Susan Bryan	March 10, 2013	I have seen a three-fold improvement in the collection of electrical energy from the sun on the last 30 years. Wind turbines have improved designs.	ALT 01
Susan Busker	April 22, 2013	I also do not agree with the use of Eminent Domain to benefit a private company. Eminent Domain should be used sparingly and then only for public projects such as roads and utilities.	LEG 02
Susan Busker	April 22, 2013	If we run out of water or poison our water supply, we will not survive. Please treat our water as the most valuable resource it is. It does not matter how many temporary jobs the pipeline MIGHT create if the water and soil are damaged. No one will want to live here.	PN 02
Susan Chapman	April 4, 2013	The U.S. study of the dangers of the northern segment Keystone XL piple is woefully inadequate as it does not take into serious consideration of the enormous negative impact on U.S. and Canadian wildlife nor on on the climate worldwide.	CLIM 12
Susan Christensen	April 20, 2013	the devastation to the Boreal Forest.	ACK
Susan Crampton	April 2, 2013	No/to a greenwashed environmental impact statement for Keystone XL. Yes/to government oversight with environmental responsibility and scientific accuracy.	ACK
Susan Degenaro	March 10, 2013	How can we get a true environmental impact report from someone hired by Trans Canada? It would help if employees of the State Department hadn't invested in the Keystone XL Pipeline project (Susan Rice & spouse).	PRO 01
Susan Di Giulio	March 11, 2013	This is a huge investment in a short term energy solution that commits us to burning more fossil fuel, faster, causing even more catstrophic envronmental degradation then we are already anticipating.	CLIM 14
Susan Di Giulio	March 11, 2013	THese funds nneed to be redirected to advancing renewable energy solutions, possibly into upgrading our power grid to make more wind power viable.	PN 02
Susan Dietsche	April 17, 2013	If Canada refuses to allow the pipeline to run across their country, why should we take the risk?	PN 08
Susan Douglas	April 4, 2013	Instead please put your support and authority behind the significant increase of non-fossil fuel energy sources, which need to be our focus for a healthy future.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Dubois	April 21, 2013	This comment is primarily about the climate change and green house gas (GHG) aspects of the Draft SEIS. Central to these analyses is the conclusion, in section 1.4 of the Draft SEIS, that "the proposed Project is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in the oil sands or in U.S. refining activities" (page 1.4-1) Section 1.4 presents the information on which this conclusion is based, and updates the discussion that led to a similar conclusion in the 2011 Final EIS. I will not attempt to evaluate the technical aspects of section 1.4, but will limit my comments to several more general things: (1) if the petroleum to be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline would be used at the same rate with or without the pipeline, why has so much effort been devoted to gaining approval for the pipeline rather than transporting the petroleum by rail? A very recent Reuters article (http://news.yahoo.com/analysis-oil-train-may-not-substitute-keystone-pipeline-062416624--finance.html) outlines reasons why the idea that rail transportation would be equivalent to the pipeline is not on solid ground. (2) Making additional petroleum available appears likely to decrease the cost of petroleum overall, or at least slow its rate of increase. A major factor that has undercut energy conservation efforts and less-polluting energy sources for decades is the argument that they are not economical when compared to continuing business as usual with fossil fuel. To the extent that the Canadian oil continues this pattern, it will further delay the shift to conservation measures and non-fossil-fuel energy sources. Even if one accepts the idea that the proposed Project is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in the oil sands or in U.S. refining activities, Appendix W concludes that the "[Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin] crudes, as likely transported through the proposed Project, are on average more GHG-intensive than the crudes they would displace in the United States" (App. W, p. 66). This would lead to increases GHG production. Appendix W does not discuss how the range of increases under different scenarios compares with GHG emissions from numbers of passenger vehicles or houses, in contrast to section 4.12 concerning construction and operation of the pipeline itself (page 4.12-12). Neither Appendix W nor section 4.12 appear to discuss how the projected emissions, whether product life-cycle or construction/operation of the pipeline itself, would affect atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Dubois	April 21, 2013	if the petroleum to be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline would be used at the same rate with or without the pipeline, why has so much effort been devoted to gaining approval for the pipeline rather than transporting the petroleum by rail? A very recent Reuters article (http://news.yahoo.com/analysis-oil-train-may-not-substitute-keystone-pipeline-062416624--finance.html) outlines reasons why the idea that rail transportation would be equivalent to the pipeline is not on solid ground.	ALT 04
Susan Dubois	April 21, 2013	if the petroleum to be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline would be used at the same rate with or without the pipeline, why has so much effort been devoted to gaining approval for the pipeline rather than transporting the petroleum by rail? Making additional petroleum available appears likely to decrease the cost of petroleum overall, or at least slow its rate of increase. A major factor that has undercut energy conservation efforts and less-polluting energy sources for decades is the argument that they are not economical when compared to continuing business as usual with fossil fuel. To the extent that the Canadian oil continues this pattern, it will further delay the shift to conservation measures and non-fossil-fuel energy sources. Even if one accepts the idea that the proposed Project is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in the oil sands or in U.S. refining activities, Appendix W concludes that the [Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin] crudes, as likely transported through the proposed Project, are on average more GHG-intensive than the crudes they would displace in the United States (App. W, p. 66). This would lead to increases GHG production. Appendix W does not discuss how the range of increases under different scenarios compares with GHG emissions from numbers of passenger vehicles or houses, in contrast to section 4.12 concerning construction and operation of the pipeline itself (page 4.12-12). Neither Appendix W nor section 4.12 appear to discuss how the projected emissions, whether product life-cycle or construction/operation of the pipeline itself, would affect atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations.	PN 03, CLIM 20, PN 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Dubois	April 21, 2013	This comment is primarily about the climate change and green house gas (GHG) aspects of the Draft SEIS. Central to these analyses is the conclusion, in section 1.4 of the Draft SEIS, that "the proposed Project is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in the oil sands or in U.S. refining activities" (page 1.4-1) Section 1.4 presents the information on which this conclusion is based, and updates the discussion that led to a similar conclusion in the 2011 Final EIS. I will not attempt to evaluate the technical aspects of section 1.4, but will limit my comments to several more general things: (1) if the petroleum to be transported by the Keystone XL pipeline would be used at the same rate with or without the pipeline, why has so much effort been devoted to gaining approval for the pipeline rather than transporting the petroleum by rail? A very recent Reuters article (http://news.yahoo.com/analysis-oil-train-may-not-substitute-keystone-pipeline-062416624--finance.html) outlines reasons why the idea that rail transportation would be equivalent to the pipeline is not on solid ground. (2) Making additional petroleum available appears likely to decrease the cost of petroleum overall, or at least slow its rate of increase. A major factor that has undercut energy conservation efforts and less-polluting energy sources for decades is the argument that they are not economical when compared to continuing business as usual with fossil fuel. To the extent that the Canadian oil continues this pattern, it will further delay the shift to conservation measures and non-fossil-fuel energy sources. Even if one accepts the idea that the proposed Project is unlikely to significantly affect the rate of extraction in the oil sands or in U.S. refining activities, Appendix W concludes that the "[Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin] crudes, as likely transported through the proposed Project, are on average more GHG-intensive than the crudes they would displace in the United States" (App. W, p. 66). This would lead to increases GHG production. Appendix W does not discuss how the range of increases under different scenarios compares with GHG emissions from numbers of passenger vehicles or houses, in contrast to section 4.12 concerning construction and operation of the pipeline itself (page 4.12-12). Neither Appendix W nor section 4.12 appear to discuss how the projected emissions, whether product life-cycle or construction/operation of the pipeline itself, would affect atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Dunavan	March 23, 2013	The land acquisition process os flawed. The pages devoted to mitigation and reclamation, the "57 special conditions" that TransCanada has agreed to, the Special conditions for the Sandhills of Nebraska, etc. need to be mentioned in the easement legal documents for them to be enforced. The current easements do not offer any protection of the landowner. There are no consequences for TransCanada if they do not comply with statements made in the EIS. Who should concerns be reported to? Letters to trans Canada requesting explanations have not been returned.	LEG 02
Susan Dunavan	March 23, 2013	The reclamation plan is flawed. Transcanada promised to restore the land in the right-of-way, but the EIS only states that the land would be reclaimed. The reclamation plan includes ony 7 of over a hundred varietes of plants found on the native prairie crossed by the easement. The list of plants native to Nebraska prairie is attached.	VEG 09
Susan Dunavan	March 23, 2013	The soil temperature studies are flawed. Please define "most root zones." The native prairie root zone is 8 feet or more past the pipeline.Further temperature studies should be conducted under the conditions which the pipeline would be built.	VEG 15
Susan Ebershoff-coles	April 15, 2013	And I still very much resent the taking of land belonging to American citizens to benefit a foreign company and and a foreign company even if it is Canada.	LEG 02
Susan Eckerly	April 22, 2013	NFIB believes construction of this 875-mile portion of the pipeline is important for reducing America’s reliance on foreign energy and helping to lower the cost of fuels small businesses use every day. In addition, the project has the potential to create thousands of jobs that will help create and support small businesses in communities where the jobs are created.	PN 10
Susan Ericson	April 5, 2013	PLEASE CONCENTRATE ON DEVELOPING ECOLOGICALLY SAFE, NONPOLLUTING ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF ENERGY.	ALT 01
Susan Fisher	April 22, 2013	The idea that an enormous aquifer and the US' largest swath of cropland would be imperilled for the sake of export profit is appalling;	PN 05
Susan Geldmeier	March 10, 2013	From what I have read, this pipeline will not create as many jobs as the Canadians are saying it will, and these jobs are primarily temporary...This also will not guarantee that the U.S. will be energy independent since most of the oil- once it is refined in the Gulf- will be shipped overseas. Shoring up our infrastructure is a much better way to create jobs which in turn will have a positive effect on our economy and won't endanger our climate.	SO 04, PN 01
Susan Germaine	April 16, 2013	This pipeline poses an unacceptable risk to water	ACK
Susan Germaine	April 16, 2013	The State Department confirmed that tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and the tar sands industry admits that Keystone XL will lead to more tar sands production. Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	EJ 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Granias	April 13, 2013	There is no win for us at all in this. It is all for Trans Canada. Their safety record stinks, we might have 200 jobs from it, and the oil will go on the foreign market. Why on earth would we even consider risking our water and environment?	PN 05
Susan Grau	March 15, 2013	Water tables are rising at unprecedented speed. To protect our coasts and allow time to create estuaries, we must NOT release this huge reserve of tar sands carbon. The Keystone XL pipeline will be catastrophic for our environment.	CLIM 17
Susan Hall	March 17, 2013	Tars sand is destructive, and the damage this project will create is irreparable.	CLIM 12
Susan Harney	April 9, 2013	The ramifications for climate change MUST be an integral part of this report. The ENTIRE carbon footprint for this type of oil must be included in the evaluation.	CLIM 12
Susan Hathaway	April 12, 2013	Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, and stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL.	ACK
Susan Hayes-tripp	April 4, 2013	The few temporary jobs which this will create is NOT worth transporting a fuel (which will not even be used in the U.S), BUT most of all, it is not worth the long term horrors that our environment will face.	PN 05
Susan Hayward	April 15, 2013	America doesn't need this oil, and it isn't going to stay here for our use anyway.	PN 07
Susan Hayward	April 15, 2013	It's going to drip and spill its way across our beautiful country, poisoning water supplies and devastating our cities and fields.	RISK 07
Susan Highfield	April 5, 2013	In the early '70s the Clean Air and Water Acts were passed and have done wonders in the last 40 years to protect our environment. Now is not the time to reverse those successes.	PN 05
Susan Howe	April 22, 2013	Please REJECT the pipeline going anywhere near the Oglalla Aquifer -- the Gulf disaster should make it abundantly clear that nothing of this kind is failsafe!	WRG 01
Susan I Josselyn	April 17, 2013	It is time to turn this country towards renewable sources of energy production.	PN 02
Susan Jerez	April 2, 2013	To allow a pipeline flowing with Tar Sands to cross the massive aquifer that waters our grain fields is inviting disaster. The inevitable spill will poison the water that gives life to our heartland. It cannot be cleaned up. You can't drink oil, and without the food grown in our Great Plains states, millions will go hungry, including Americans.	RISK 07, PN 05, WRG 01
Susan Kepner	March 16, 2013	There is description of alternative modes of transportation, most of which would have much less environmental impacts, but are supposed to be more expensive	ACK
Susan Kepner	March 16, 2013	f we consider National Interests , our wildlife, clean air and water, and preservation of farm lands to me have a higher, and longer term value. There is more to consider: quality of life in a cleaner, less polluted land that supports wildlife, farms, and a sense of preservation not destruction.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Kepner	March 16, 2013	Try as they may BIG OIL cannot EVER PROMISE that there will NOT be a damaging spill, leak, or fire.	RISK 14
Susan Kiplinger	April 15, 2013	It will not help the US become energy independent since the oil will go overseas.	PN 04
Susan Labandibar	March 29, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's catastrophic impacts on our climate …	CLIM 12
Susan Labandibar	March 29, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline ignores the pipeline's…significant risk for toxic spills.	RISK 07
Susan Lee	April 2, 2013	Beyond the effects on our climate, this dangerous pipeline puts the water supply of millions of Americans at risk.	WRG 01
Susan Lees	March 14, 2013	[The study] ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate	CLIM 12
Susan Lees	March 14, 2013	[The study] ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	PN 06
Susan Lees	March 14, 2013	I read last week that the State Department is once again farming out its analysis to oil industry contractors such as TransCanada, ExxonMobil and Koch Industries — the very corporations who have been massively funding climate denial for their own profit.	PRO 01
Susan Lees	March 14, 2013	The study ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills,	RISK 07
Susan Lindenberger	April 5, 2013	SEIS furthermore fails to consider the impacts not only of extracting and transporting this heavy crude, but the impacts of refining and then burning the resulting product.	CLIM 05
Susan Lindenberger	April 5, 2013	SEIS is similarly careless in failing to consider the terrible impact these tar sands have already had on Canadian environment. Further exploitation of this unsustainable product needs to stop -- Now.	CU 01
Susan Lindenberger	April 5, 2013	SEIS fails to ensure adequate clean-up by the perpetrators when the inevitable spill/leak occurs; the industry is careful to "cap" its liability, which means the clean-up is incomplete.	RISK 03
Susan Lindenberger	April 5, 2013	SEIS also fails to address the potential damage to the Agallala Aquifer, a water source depended on by people as well as the natural environment.	RISK 07
Susan Lonchar	April 3, 2013	I live by the Kalamazoo River in Michigan and know first hand the horrible environmental disaster a tar sands oil spill causes. Please stop this development now before it causes even more harm to our planet.	RISK 13
Susan Mach	March 15, 2013	I'm opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline because it doesn't push us in a clean direction and is a quick, short-term fix to what ails us, dependency on dirty fuels. Please don't allow the pipeline to go through. Other energies are out there for us to harness and create jobs from.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Martin	April 14, 2013	Protesters have taken, and POSTED, photos of cracks from shoddy welding in sections of the Keystone X pipeline--sections that were then installed WITHOUT REPAIR. Meaning, of course, that as soon as this corrosive toxic sludge starts flowing, it WILL be leaking from these holes. Hello?!	PD 06
Susan Mcdonough	April 2, 2013	If the Keystone XL pipeline is built, then it's a matter of WHEN it leaks, not IF it leaks	RISK 14
Susan Meles	March 11, 2013	In an effort to become "energy indepedent", the country has moved forward with some of the dirtiest extraction of natural resources ever. However, to then EXPORT this resource outside of the US is dispicable. This pipeline is a disgrace to President Obama's pledge of maximizing renewables and minimizing fossil fuel and its impact on the environment! We should stop this type of extraction and NEVER allow this to cross US soil, to then be exported around the world - the people and the climate of this country deserve better!	PN 07
Susan Michetti	April 13, 2013	IT IS UNACCEPTABLE THAT THE INDUSTRY HERE WAS ALLOWED TO WRITE PARTS OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT, WHICH INDICATES INDUSTRY HAS CAPTURED THE REGULATOR, WHICH INDICATES CORRUPTION.	PRO 01
Susan Morgan	April 4, 2013	If it spills at the Delta and stops the use of the Mississippi River then were will we be?	RISK 07
Susan Morgan	April 4, 2013	Our water supply and health of our environment are in danger	WRG 01
Susan Mullaney	April 15, 2013	The more we promote, advance and use clean energy, the less demand there will be for dirty energy, such as tar sands. Long-term investment in dirty energy disincentivizes current investment in clean energy. Please further bolster your administration's promotion and embrace of clean energy by blocking the Keystone XL Pipeline	PN 02
Susan Nancy Wight	March 15, 2013	Superior alternatives to Keystone XL and tar sands pipelines do exist to effectively meet our energy needs. Perhaps the time has come for ALL OF US to show our care and compassion for self, each other, all living beings, the earth home we share, and the earth home we will be leaving to next generations.	ALT 01
Susan Nancy Wight	March 15, 2013	Keystone XL and other tar sands pipelines are a pet project of big oil companies to meet their insatiable want for obscene corporate profits with stakes that are unimaginably and unacceptably high, i.e. rightful access to clean air, water and food for every human, animal and plant.	PN 08
Susan Nickell	April 17, 2013	…[DEIS] ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate	CLIM 12
Susan Nickell	April 17, 2013	the latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete	LEG 04
Susan Nickell	April 17, 2013	[DEIS] ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development	PN 06
Susan Nickell	April 17, 2013	It [DEIS] ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Oehler	April 11, 2013	If you think, even for one minute, that it is safe to have this pipeline in place, then please go live in Arkansas where there has recently been a pipeline of tarsands that broke and flooded out neighborhoods and wetlands. Live there for a month or two and see what it can do to our country. If you are unable to do that, then send one of your adult children and have them report back to you.	RISK 07
Susan Pantell	March 27, 2013	the cumulative impacts of mining and releasing tar sands fuels potentially has significant environmental and climate change impacts that can not be adequately mitigated.	CLIM 14
Susan Park	March 28, 2013	Plus we all know that this oil will be refined on the gulf coast and then shipped to foreign markets and the only thing the US citizens will get out of this is toxicity. Why should our health and the health of our planet be jeopardized just so some transnational corporations and fat cats can make even more profit, while the cleanup of the inevitable spill(s) will be on the taxpayers' dollar?	PN 07
Susan Pfretzschner	April 4, 2013	no economical benefits	SO 08
Susan Pope Reed	April 13, 2013	Tar sands oil is a new and ugly animal which the Arkansas spill has demonstrated. Do not support Canada's supply of this dirty, dirty stuff. Our planet's drinking water will forever be our most important resource and we must PROTECT our water or perish.	RISK 07
Susan Redlich	April 19, 2013	If the US were to increase its investment in renewable energy to even half of what it spends on oil and gas exploration and production, the US could achieve its goal of US energy independence sooner and our energy would be cleaner.	ALT 01
Susan Redlich	April 19, 2013	The Draft SEIS fails to consider the pipeline’s contribution toward the 565 Gigatons of carbon—the limit of additional carbon without causing a two-degree C increase in global warming.	CLIM 05
Susan Redlich	April 19, 2013	the Draft SEIS neglects to evaluate the ENTIRE amount of CO2 generated by KXL tar sands from "well to wheel" .	CLIM 05
Susan Redlich	April 19, 2013	Diluted bitumen is a toxic, viscous, corrosive substance with the consistency of gritty peanut butter that is moved at much higher pressures and temperatures than conventional oil. Strong evidence indicates tar sands oil threatens pipeline integrity.	RISK 11
Susan Redlich	April 19, 2013	The pipeline approval process should be put on hold until the U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) evaluates the risks of tar sands pipelines and ensures that adequate safety regulations for them are in place.	RISK 14
Susan Richardson	March 8, 2013	we need to put our imaginations, inventiveness, and resources into alternative sources of power.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Riggs	April 22, 2013	Please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. I am deeply concerned about its impact on climate change, public safety, and pollution all along its length. It has already caused small-scale disasters in several locations, including pollution where the tar sands oil is extracted.	PN 05
Susan Ringler	April 17, 2013	We urgently need to reduce carbon emissions and the President will send a powerful international message by rejecting Keystone XL	CLIM 18
Susan Rodriguez	April 9, 2013	Jobs don't mean anything if you can't live a healthy life.	PN 05
Susan Romero	April 11, 2013	Put the money that would be used to build this toward alternative energy- something that can last forever and not cost the health of the nation.	ALT 01
Susan Rosenzweig	March 11, 2013	It's outrageous that you used TransCanada's own contractors to help write the report! It's hard to believe you couldn't find other knowledgable but impartial specialists. Or at least include knowledgable environmentalists in your fact finding so that your report would be based on a broader picture of the issues.	PRO 01
Susan Rubin	April 20, 2013	If we are going to remain a powerful force for good in the world, the USA must lead the way in protecting people and animals from any more environmental destruction.	ACK
Susan Salzberg	April 15, 2013	THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE WILL PUSH THE BALANCE OF CLIMATE CHANGE TO THE POINT OF NO RETURN	CLIM 14
Susan Scanga	March 13, 2013	I am very concerned about Transcanada's request to use THINNER steel and pump the crude at HIGHER THAN NORMAL pressures.	PD 06
Susan Scanga	March 13, 2013	I am also very concerned about the obvious CONFLICT OF INTEREST between Transcanada and the agencies conducting the environmental review; the first contractor was replaced because of a "deeply flawed analysis." The new contractor was paid an undisclosed amount of money under contract with Transcanada to write the EIS--Gee, nothing like paying someone to say what you want them to say!	PRO 01
Susan Shaak	April 17, 2013	Why should the United States take all the risks so oil companies can make all the money? Furthermore tar sand/bitumin spills are exempted from the oil companies' responsibilities for clean-up.	PN 05
Susan Shaak	April 17, 2013	The pipeline is dangerous, dirty and destructive. Spills continue to occur with devastating effects.	RISK 10
Susan Shamel	April 5, 2013	We must begin to transform our energy systems to 21st century solutions. We should look to countries such as Germany, which are prospering from their transformations. The United States cannot tie itself to many more years of dirty fossil fuels with approval of the Keystone XL. Instead, we should send a strong message to the world that we are serious about climate change and reject infrastructure that locks us into archaic greenhouse-gas-forming energies.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Shamel	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline will create only two years of temporary jobs, and then approximately 35 permanent Canadian positions. Meanwhile, it will allow crude oil to reach the huger refineries in the Gulf to be processed, and exported at world market price. Rep. Ed Markey pointedly asked a TransCanada executive if the oil transported by the Keystone would be guaranteed for use in the US, and, as would be expected, the answer was no. Since the crude will have a large efficient exit out of the Midwest, it is expected to produce a rise in the cost of gas.	PN 05
Susan Shamel	April 5, 2013	Then there's the danger of leaks, and more leaks, and more leaks, destroying homes, farmland, and water. Can we really afford this?	RISK 07
Susan Silveira	April 18, 2013	The Keystone XL would carry 8 times as much crude as the pipeline that recently leaked in Arkansas, it would cross a number of vulnerable aquifers, and we have evidence of cracks in sections that have already been laid.	RISK 23
Susan Smith	April 11, 2013	Accidents happen too often and the reports gloss over inadequate care and maintenance of the procedures and pipes	RISK 14
Susan Spengler	March 28, 2013	Let's get moving on solar panels above every flat top shopping center store, windmills where there are heavy winds and power conservation by all, including the oil and gas industry.	ALT 01
Susan Stewart	April 13, 2013	I don't want to die from contaminated water. I now live within 10 miles of a fracking waste disposal well, who is going to bring me fresh water when my well gets contaminated? How come the oil companies are exempt from the safe drinking water act?	WRG 01, LEG 01
Susan Stuart	April 22, 2013	Climate change is one of the major looming threats to public health, affecting agriculture, vector borne diseases, ground level ozone, and extreme weather events. The U.S. government should be putting its resources into infrastructure that reduces dependency on fossil fuels while lowering greenhouse gases rather than supporting this environmental boondoggle.	PN 02, CLIM 16
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	I urge you to conduct a proper and thoroughly objective study. There is no doubt whatsoever that the study would conclude that, if implemented, the Keystone XL pipeline would endanger our climate irreparably and forever and would hasten global warming until our climate is no longer fit for human habitation.	CLIM 14
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	Previous studies show that tar sands pipelines are hazardous to the environment because: · Tar sands crude contains multiple corrosive chemicals, meaning capable of eating through metal. Therefore, no pipeline can safely contain it. Ruptures are certain and inevitable. (Keystone 1 ruptured twelve times during its first year of operation.)	RISK 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	Previous studies show that tar sands pipelines are hazardous to the environment because: · Poisonous chemicals are used to dilute the dilbit to transport it through the pipes, such as benzene which is carcinogenic, mercury and arsenic which are well known poisons, and toluene, known to cause premature births. Some of these chemicals are water soluble and will poison any water sources through which they pass.	RISK 12
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	Previous studies show that tar sands pipelines are hazardous to the environment because: · Pressures from shifting ground during drought, sodden ground from heavy rains, and other natural causes will cause stress fractures which are weak spots subject to rupture.	RISK 22
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	The chemicals escape into the air, and there is already evidence that communities along the paths of other tar sands pipelines have higher incidents of cancer, respiratory diseases, such as asthma and COPD, and other life-changing illnesses.	RISK 30
Susan T Cooper	April 18, 2013	Previous studies show that tar sands pipelines are hazardous to the environment because: · Ruptures would poison the soil for an indeterminate amount of time. Therefore, I am certain that any crops grown on such soil would be poisoned. It also seems obvious to me that any animals grazing on affected soil would also be poisoned.	SOIL 01, RISK 09
Susan Tritten	April 17, 2013	We as property owner are required to be very careful about how we use heating oil and leaks in our tanks. If I am required to carefully remove a 1000-gallon tank to be sure that it is not leaking very slowly so that I do not contaminate my own well and others in my neighborhood, the the oil companies should not be allowed to endanger ground water in a large territory with many, many more thousands of gallons of very dangerous oil. Water is precious and we cannot afford to risk a pollution of ground water that would be irreparable.	RISK 07
Susan Valiquette	April 4, 2013	It is up to us to legacy a safe environment for our children and grandchildren. We need to find alternatives to oil and stop the greed!	PN 05
Susan Vanderzee	April 9, 2013	We can put people to work and power our homes and businesses in sustainable ways through increased energy efficiency, locally sourced power, wind, solar and geothermal. These will create jobs, clean our air and help slow climate change.	SO 05, ALT 01
Susan Vanmeter	April 4, 2013	the damage from pipeline ruptures are disastrous, the Kalamazoo spill has not been cleaned in two years. and now Mayflower Arkansas... the tar sands oil cannot be cleaned up - water supplies, people and wildlife are in danger.	RISK 29

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Susan Vanschuyver	April 13, 2013	Let's be creative and create jobs in other areas like wind and solar power--alternative methods that will not spill and kill wildlife, dirty our environment, ruin the areas that the tar sands comes from, and so on.	ALT 01
Susan Williams	April 2, 2013	This isn't your usual light sweet crude or even close. No, this stuff is disastrous. Tar sands oil is especially acidic and especially abrasive, and it will chew up whatever pipeline you put it into. Guaranteed to leak, over and over again.	RISK 11
Susana Reyes	April 13, 2013	… we will all get sicker because of this pipeline.	RISK 30
Susanna Cummings	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, like many dreams of profit that mega corporations have, totally ignores science and commonsense. They want this so they think enough said. The government is expected to put out money to make it happen and bail them out when things go wrong - which they will. It is a stupid idea if you think about it. A 2,000 mile pipeline of extremely dirty oil. Oil which we do not have the knowledge to burn without raising CO2 levels a lot. Maybe someday in the future we will understand how but not now.	PN 05
Susanne Pinkham	April 2, 2013	The reason I want you to consider as the major factor in not approving the pipeline is the consequence of burning the oil that the pipeline will carry, and the effect all that carbon will have on the climate.	CLIM 10
Susie Baker	March 10, 2013	From everything I have read, it requires at least as much petroleum energy or more to remove the energy from tar sands than is gained. Where is the sense in promoting that behavior. Please Mr. Obama, stay as green as you can and do NOT bow to the pressure of Big Oil. WE cannot become oil independent, or less dependent, if we continue on as before. Take a stand and stay the course!	PN 02
Susy McMahan	April 22, 2013	We are moving too slow on clean energy. The plains of Nebraska needs windmills not pipelines. Nebraska surely has as much wind as Iowa and Minnesota who have plenty of windmills.	ALT 01
Suzan Eraslan	April 17, 2013	This is not the right move for energy independence.	PN 01
Suzanne And Gary Krill	March 11, 2013	Approval of the pipeline poses a dangerous threat to the land and water sources of our country.	RISK 07
Suzanne Curry	March 28, 2013	Please pursue avenues that invest in clean air technology, like wind and solar. We don't need to continue to use oil, it's just a bandaid on the situation and further reliance on this archair fuel even if it's coming from our own country.	ALT 01
Suzanne Fiederlein	March 17, 2013	Clear cutting the boreal forest, then strip mining the land, followed by the burning required to extract the petroleum from the tar sands creates tremendous environmental damage, including extensive pollution of the atmosphere with damaging green house gases.	CLIM 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Suzanne Fiederlein	March 17, 2013	I am very much opposed to its construction, not only for the potential environmental damage the pipeline itself might cause, but also because it primarily benefits the owners of the Canadian businesses involved in the tar sands petroleum extraction project and has little relative benefit to US business interests, let alone any benefit to the people of the United States. Furthermore, what limited economic benefit it may have is drastically offset by the environmental damage the tar sands petroleum extraction project will inflict on the tar sands area of Canada	PN 05, CU 02, PN 07
Suzanne Hassan	March 6, 2013	(From the State Department impact study) The spill of 1.2 million gallons of oilsands into 30 miles of the Kalamazoo River in 2010 tangibly demonstrates the expense ($800 million) and unprecedented difficulty in cleaning up this kind of oil. TransCanada, which would construct the Keystone XL pipeline, is currently under a sweeping audit for systematic violations of minimum safety regulations in the construction of its pipelines.	RISK 25
Suzanne Jones	April 4, 2013	I am not in favor of this pipeline, as it has the potential for devastating effects on the environment, not to mention that it is an extremely dirty extraction method.	CU 01
Suzanne Latko	April 19, 2013	I am against the KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE. It will lead to spills and unknown contaminants in our soil, lakes and drinking water. We do not need this pipeline across our country. It will do untold harm to our environment and people. Do not let the big oil power structure go ahead with this proposal.	PN 05
Suzanne Levine	April 15, 2013	Please remember that while installing the pipeline may bring a few thousand temporary jobs to Americans, and profits to oil refineries in Texas, much of the oil is going overseas and profiting Canadian companies, while the US takes the risk of aquifer and river contamination .	PN 07
Suzanne Luke	April 12, 2013	Spend more on solar, wind and wave energy technology, including teaching young people how to install and service these kinds of technology.	PN 02
Suzanne Michael	April 15, 2013	And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe. … We've had nine spills in the last week, how you can even consider allowing the Keystone pipelne just blows my mnid. Already we have thousands of miles of pipelines that are 50 years or older just waiting to burst because big oil wont b\cut into their bottom line to keep them checked or up tp date.	RISK 13
Suzanne Miller	March 18, 2013	[KXL] will not even be a help to our economy since the oil goes to the WORLD market, just like all oil.	PN 01
Suzanne Pentek	March 26, 2013	Looking at photos of what the Canadian companies have done to the once majestic boreal forests in order to extract oil demonstrates the greed surrounding this project.	ACK
Suzanne Pentek	March 26, 2013	The building of the pipeline will only provide temporary jobs, and will not bring down the price of domestic oil.	PN 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Suzanne Pentek	March 26, 2013	Multiple spills along the existing pipeline have already occurred. Research has indicated that more spills are inevitable if we allow this disastrous pipeline to be built across our sensitive heartland, threatening rivers, lakes, aquifers, habitats, animals, humans	RISK 26
Suzanne Singer	April 22, 2013	Please dont support the Keystone KL pipeline. … Lets put the US in the forefront of sustainable energy and not pollute our environment. When I was visiting a friend in Hamburg, Germany, and we drove up to the Black Sea, I saw fields upon fields on wind farms. Id love to see them across the United States!	PN 02
Suzanne Sundburg	April 13, 2013	No dangerous materials should be placed on indigenous peoples' lands without their free, prior and informed consent. Governments will protect the health of indigenous peoples who are affected by dangerous materials placed on their land.	ACK
Suzanne Sundburg	April 13, 2013	Claims of newer technology producing safer and more reliable pipelines do not hold up under scrutiny. Even brand-new pipelines leak. TransCanada's Keystone I Pipeline, which began carrying tar sands oil to our Midwest in 2010, has already leaked at least 14 times.	RISK 14
Suzanne Webster	April 17, 2013	Why must we be devastated by this procedure - and the oil is not even for our use	PN 07
Suzanne Webster	April 17, 2013	It is time to be realistic -- tar sands oil cannot be safely transported via pipeline!	RISK 10
Suzanne Yeaman	April 19, 2013	The corrosive tar sands oil is destructive to the pipes designed to carry it fro Canada to Texas.	RISK 11
Suzanne Yeaman	April 19, 2013	Leaks have plagued this project form the start. Pipe fitters working on this have made it clear that this is not a sound undertaking	RISK 23
Suzanne Zobel	March 29, 2013	Shockingly no one this side of the border seems to have picked up on the wastewater leak from the Canadian tar sand Suncor facility into the Athabasca River this past Monday, March 25th.	ACK
Suzanne Zobel	March 29, 2013	This is a FILTHY, ENVIRONMENTALLY DESTRUCTIVE, fuel which should be left in the ground to be pulled out in future millennia as a fuel of last resort.	CLIM 14
Suzanne Zobel	March 29, 2013	This pipeline will not solve our energy needs long term.	PN 01
Suzanne Zobel	March 29, 2013	This pipeline will not reduce prices at the pump.	PN 04
Suzanne Zobel	March 29, 2013	This pipeline will not improve our employment numbers long term.	SO 01
Suzette Jones	April 17, 2013	We must move away from fossil fuels to save our planet. Please stand by your pledges to support alternative energy sources and don't cave in to big oil interests.	ALT 01
Suzie Busko	April 22, 2013	There was a huge spill on the Kalamazoo River (Marshall Michigan) and first responders didnt even know what to do or how to clean up a tar sand oil spill….The Sand Hills and the Ogallala Aquifer are more important than Keystones bottom line.	RISK 07
Suzie Busko	April 22, 2013	The tar sands oil is exceptionally full of benzene and other known cancer causing agents.	RISK 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Svetlana Chervonaya	April 2, 2013	The gases from the oil and ... chemicals that naturally come from the Earth are dangerous to …wildlife.	CU 01
Svetlana Chervonaya	April 2, 2013	[The gases from the oil and…chemicals] get absorbed into soil and it is almost impossible and costly to get it out.	RISK 08
Svetlana Chervonaya	April 2, 2013	Adding chemicals to neutralize the effects [of oils and chemicals absorbed into the soil] is … unsafe.	RISK 08
Svetlana Chervonaya	April 2, 2013	The gases from the oil and ... chemicals that naturally come from the Earth are dangerous to human health.	RISK 30
Swati Jagdish Shah	April 5, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous and destructive for the future of our country for generations to come.	RISK 06
Swonerp/gmail	April 5, 2013	Technology is available to change the energy course of the US and running more pipelines for tar oils is not the answer.	ALT 01
Swonerp/gmail	April 5, 2013	With exports of gas expected to top 40% I can not accept the fact you believe ruining the future of our countries water and soil for export is our duty.	PN 05
Swordbrush	March 19, 2013	Perhaps the construction of the pipeline has been made less problematic by rerouting. But the use of that oil has not been.	ACK
Sydnee Goddard	March 10, 2013	The cost of all the damge caused by the storms, droughts, floods is only going to increase unless we take action against climate change. Tapping the tar sands is one more way to insure climate instabilty.	CLIM 17
Sydney Wallace	April 22, 2013	I also feel that the Environmental Impact Statement was incomplete as it does not take into account the effect developing the tar sands would have on climate change. Climate change is the most important and urgent problem facing humanity today as our very survival will be determined on our ability to confront and solve this issue.	CLIM 12
Sydney Wallace	April 22, 2013	As we have seen recently with the spill in Mayflower, Arkansas these pipelines can be a huge public safety hazard and as seen in the spill in the Kalamazoo River in 2010 very difficult to completely clean up. I understand the route of the Keystone XL crosses the Sandhills and Ogallala aquifer which provide drinking water to millions. Can we really risk these kinds of spills that threaten health and livelihood for short term gains such a temporary jobs which may or may not even go to American workers?	RISK 07
Sylvia Bongert	April 21, 2013	Due to the impact this project upon the landscape,Woodland Caribou and migrating birds I am against this pipeline.	WI 02
Sylvia Jones	March 11, 2013	Given the history of the oil and gas industry, it really bothers me that President Obama would take their word for the safety of the pipeline.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Sylvia Lambert	April 9, 2013	As is known by people affected, there has never been any complete cleanup of any spill or leak onto land, rivers, or ocean, all of which are accessible. A spill or leak into an aquifer is not accessible, so it would mean the end of potable water in any of the aquifers over which the Keystone XL would cross, thereby contaminating the needed water used for drinking, farming, livestock, and all other agriculture in a major portion of the United States.	RISK 07
Sylvia Zack	April 4, 2013	Let industry spend money and time on alternative fuels before it is too late.	ALT 01
T	March 19, 2013	No matter where the output flows, the input is a problem Diverts alternative energy development, our only viable future!	PN 03
T Carroll	April 15, 2013	SO MUCH OF THE WORLD IS WAITING FOR YOU TO FOLLOW THROUGH ON POSITIVE CLIMATE CHANGE ACTIONS. YOU ARE AND WILL BE THE LEADER NOT JUST FOR THE USA BUT FOR MANY OTHER COUNTRIES WHO RECOGNIZE CLIMATE CHANGE FOR THE MENACE AND DISASTER THAT IT IS NOW AND WILL BE EVEN MORE. PLEASE STOP THE DIRTY FOSSIL FUEL INITIATIVES, INCLUDING KEYSTONE.	ACK
T Carroll	April 15, 2013	THE MAJORITY OF CANADIANS (OVER 70%), NOT THE HARPER GOVERNMENT SUPPORTERS/LACKIES, WANT THE TAR SANDS INITIATIVES STOPPED; THEY WANT GOOD, FORWARD-THINKING CLIMATE CHANGE ACTIONS. THEY KNOW THEY NEED YOU TO HELP THEM ACHIEVE THAT, BECAUSE THEY WON'T GET IT FROM THE PRESENT HARPER GOVERNMENT.	ACK
T Carroll	April 15, 2013	10 OIL SPILLS HAVE HAPPENED IN JUST THE LAST 2 WEEKS - AND THOSE ARE THE ONES THAT ARE ACTUALLY KNOWN. HOW MANY MORE CAN THE ENVIRONMENT, WILDLIFE, AND COMMUNITIES STAND, BEFORE TOTALLY COLLAPSING?	RISK 14
T Hanselmann	April 2, 2013	Allowing more dirty oil into the country will inevitably delay the day the U.S. finally gets serious about alternative energy sources.	PN 03
T Hanselmann	April 2, 2013	Canada will surely try to get its dirty oil to our refineries by other means. A carbon tax is one, and perhaps the only one, very workable and fair solution. Please push for a carbon tax.	SO 16, PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
T Wulling	April 19, 2013	The criteria for National Interest Determination stated in ES.3.1 is not sufficient. I urge you to include in the determination the interests of the people of the United States and of the future of the United States. The determination is stated in SEIS section ES.3.1 (page ES-4) as, "The National Interest Determination (or NID) involves consideration of many factors, including energy security; environmental, cultural, and economic impacts; foreign policy; and compliance with relevant federal regulations." This determination does not specifically include the people of the United States or the future of the United States. It is not compatible with the purpose of the U.S. Constitution to "…promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." The "National Interest Determination" seems largely based on economic-related factors…	ACK
T Wulling	April 19, 2013	Section ES.5.5.2 (page ES-15) acknowledges GHG emissions would increase with approval of the Keystone XL pipeline: "WCSB crudes are more GHG-intensive than the other heavy crudes they would replace or displace in U.S. refineries, and emit an estimated 17% more GHGs on a life-cycle basis than the average barrel of crude oil refined in the United States in 2005." The Copenhagen Accord calls for decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. The Keystone XL SEIS differs by saying increases should be limited. Therefore, the Keystone XL pipeline must not be approved.	CLIM 14
T Wulling	April 19, 2013	The Keystone XL Supplemental Environment Impact Statement does not account for the United States' responsibility to REDUCE greenhouse gas emissions.	CLIM 18

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
T Wulling	April 19, 2013	The SEIS errs in discounting the greenhouse gas emissions caused by production from WCSB. In the Copenhagen Accord of 2009, the United States agreed that "deep cuts in global emissions are required according to science, and as documented by the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report with a view to reduce global emissions as to hold the increase in global temperature below 2 degrees Celsius, and take action to meet this objective consistent with science and on the basis of equity." The State Department would violate this agreement if it were to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, because the pipeline would (a) lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions by supplying U.S. refineries with more GHG-intensive crude and (b) thereby lead to additional increase in global temperature. Therefore, the Keystone XL pipeline must not be approved	CLIM 18
T Wulling	April 19, 2013	The determination is stated in SEIS section ES.3.1 (page ES-4) as, "The National Interest Determination (or NID) involves consideration of many factors, including energy security; environmental, cultural, and economic impacts; foreign policy; and compliance with relevant federal regulations." This determination does not specifically include the people of the United States or the future of the United States. It is not compatible with the purpose of the U.S. Constitution to "…promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."	LEG 01
T. Christon	April 2, 2013	MANY AMERICANS, ALL OVER THE COUNTRY, HAVE BEEN PLAGUED WITH HAZARDOUS OIL SPILLS! I URGE YOU TO REJECT THE LATEST, AND WORSE KEYSTONE XL TAR SANDS PIPELINE, IN LIGHT OF THE RECENT TOXIC RUPTURE IN ARKANSAS	RISK 13
T. Flesher	April 14, 2013	I have absolutely no doubt that the crude oil that will flow through it will not - in the end - benefit the energy needs of our country, but rather the needs of other countries.	PN 01
T. Flesher	April 14, 2013	It is simply disingenuous to suggest that there is little if any chance that the Keystone Pipeline will ever suffer a spill. To the contrary, it is more likely it WILL suffer a spill, and likely many spills over its lifetime.	RISK 14
T. Flesher	April 14, 2013	[There is an] unacceptable threat to the water supply along its proposed route.	WRG 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tahma Metz	April 15, 2013	· Some of these chemicals are water soluble and will poison any water sources through which they pass. · Tar sands is more difficult to clean up. It does not float on water and cannot be skimmed or vacuumed off. It sinks to the bottom of any body of water, and there is no technology existing to restore the affected lands and waters.	RISK 08
Tahma Metz	April 15, 2013	· Poisonous chemicals are used to dilute the dilbit to transport it through the pipes, such as benzene which is carcinogenic, mercury and arsenic which are well known poisons, and toluene, known to cause premature births. · Ruptures would poison the soil for an indeterminate amount of time. Therefore, I am certain that any crops grown on such soil would be poisoned. It also seems obvious to me that any animals grazing on affected soil would also be poisoned. · The chemicals escape into the air, and there is already evidence that communities along the paths of other tar sands pipelines have higher incidents of cancer, respiratory diseases, such as asthma and COPD, and other life-changing illnesses. · In these cases, first responders are not prepared to treat or rescue such eventualities, especially in smaller communities where fire departments are composed of volunteers.	RISK 12, RISK 10, RISK 30, SOIL 01
Tahma Metz	April 15, 2013	· Tar sands crude contains multiple corrosive chemicals, meaning capable of eating through metal. Therefore, no pipeline can safely contain it. Ruptures are certain and inevitable. (Keystone 1 ruptured twelve times during its first year of operation.) · Pressures from shifting ground during drought, sodden ground from heavy rains, and other natural causes will cause stress fractures which are weak spots subject to rupture. · Exceedingly high pressure per square inch add further stress to the pipeline metals, exacerbating stress fractures increasing the inevitability of rupture.	RISK 14, RISK 11, RISK 22

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Talin Lindsay	April 22, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline and other similar pipelines pose a very heavy national security risk. As we have seen with the spills in Arkansas, in Kalamazoo, the Gulf Coast, the Exxon-Valdez (shall I go on?) when these spills occur they ruin entire ecosystems to the point where nothing grows there. These sites are never effectively cleaned and the ecosystem of that area dies. Lifeless. These are all major security threats because if our environment dies, it cannot produce the things we eat. It contaminates the drinking water. If people don't have food to eat or water to drink, you can imagine the hell that will break loose and what a huge security risk we will have.	RISK 06, PN 08, RISK 24
Tamara Kellogg	April 23, 2013	climate change will cause more security risk than any trade agreements we engage in to get oil.	CLIM 18
Tamara Kellogg	April 23, 2013	The Canadian tar sands are NOT a clean source of fossil fuels: they are wreaking havoc in the beautiful Canadian wildlands already.	CU 01
Tamara Kellogg	April 23, 2013	Multiple reviews have shown the pipeline is prone to leakage and will create environmental damage along its route.	RISK 06
Tamara Mason	April 9, 2013	Rob Hopkins, "The Transitions Handbook"	REF
Tamhas Griffith	March 6, 2013	Big oil is over. Accept this and move the country toward more sustainable options. Solar energy has grown in its ability to convert at a higher percentage. Wind energy would create many jobs in the USA. All the parts needed to make the turbines are already manufactured in the USA! Both conscience and common sense determine that the KXL pipeline must be stopped.	ALT 01
Tammie Stenger-ramsey	March 10, 2013	More importantly, TransCanada executives admit that the tar sands will not be expanded without Keystone XL -- Canadian and First Nation opposition has blocked all proposed pipelines through Canada so far. If Keystone is blocked, so is expansion of the tar sands.	PN 06
Tammie Stenger-ramsey	March 10, 2013	Moreover, Keystone's tar sands are likely to be exports -- they will go through America, not to America. That means our communities get all the risks while Big Oil gets all the rewards.	PN 07
Tammy Daniels	March 24, 2013	Every pipe line leaks. Everyone!! How will you prevent this from happening if it happens on every pipeline???	RISK 14
Tammy Hansen Snell	April 22, 2013	It is time for the U.S. to move beyond petroleum products for the good of our economy, the good of our people, and the good of our entire planet. The U.S. should be striving to be the leader in alternative energies, and we wont lead as long as too many insist on clinging to the old ways. Stopping this pipeline is an important decision that could make an enormous historical difference in our ability to move forward as a nation and become the global source for new energy technology.	PN 03
Tammy Rosenthal	April 10, 2013	There needs to be more safety provisions for Keystone XL program.	RISK 21

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tammy Webb	April 3, 2013	I live in Arkansas and we are dealing with a major "leak" from an ExxonMobil tar sands pipeline. If ANY of you are interested in seeing WHY we shouldn't do this, come to Mayflower, AR! The risk involved is NOT worth it!	RISK 14
Tanderup	April 18, 2013	The proposed route will cross three sandy soil 2 types as identified by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. Most of the pipeline will pass through Thurman fine sand and Dager fine sand. There is a small strand of Boelus loamy fine sand. The soil survey of Antelope County Nebraska by Charles F. Mahnke, United States Soil Conservation Service, states that with these sands, soil blowing is a very severe hazard unless the surface is protected. Thurman and Doger sands have rapid permeability and low available water capacity. Boelus soils are rapid -- have rapid permeability in the surface layer and moderate permeability in the subsoil and underlying material. It blows easy in the wind, forming drifts. Liquids flow through it rapidly. It's a very fragile soil. Our land is - north and - east of the newly defined Sandhills. Other Sandhills maps included this area. We always knew we lived in the Sandhills. To prevent soil erosion and destruction, we utilize a variety of research-based conservation practices. In section 3.2.2.3, Nebraska State Department acknowledges, quote, in the northern section of Antelope County the soils are sandy loams that are frequently layered with very fine-grained ash layers that are susceptible to erosion by rain and wind, unquote. Any potential pipeline leaks will permeate this fragile soil into the water supply.	SOIL 03, RISK 07, SOIL 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tanderup	April 18, 2013	Water is one of our most precious resources. Our water comes from the Ogallala Aquifer. Our irrigation well is 120 foot deep and test pumped over 1, 500 gallons per minute when it was dug in the 1990s. Our house well is 90 foot deep and pumps from about 70 feet. Above the bottoms of these wells is gravel and fine sand, both very permeable. When leaks occur, it will not take long to contaminate this pure water supply. Section 3.3-5 of the SEIS states, quote, where present, the Ogallala Formation and associated alluvial aquifers are a primary source of groundwater for agricultural, domestic, commercial/industrial, and potable use along much of the proposed pipeline area in northern -- or southern South Dakota and Nebraska, end quote. We know the importance of keeping our water pure and clean. Nebraskans were promised that this pipeline would not be built in the Sandhills or over the Ogallala Aquifer. The route was moved a few miles in a newly defined nonSandhills region that contains very fragile soils. There is no question that the route still crosses the Ogallala Aquifer. It still only is 20 miles less of Sandhills than it was before. The Keystone XL Pipeline should not be built through our fragile soils or over our pure water resources.	WRG 04, RISK 07
Tania Munz	April 19, 2013	Since tar sands oil creates even more global warming pollution than traditional oil production, it would worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security.	CLIM 05
Tania Munz	April 19, 2013	TransCanada has tried to downplay the risks of an oil spill, but they said the same thing about their last pipeline, which spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. Since this pipeline would run through the heartland of America, a spill could contaminate important sources of drinking water, displace families from their homes, and jeopardize farmers and ranchers' way of life.	RISK 07, RISK 06, RISK 26
Tara Bloyd	April 11, 2013	The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across 3 states and 875 miles, threatening drinking water for people, farms, and ranches with a devastating tar sands spill.	RISK 07
Tara Bloyd	April 11, 2013	The pipeline's risk to water has not changed at all with the new route. It still crosses the Nebraska Sandhills and the Ogallala aquifer -- the reason that President Obama rejected the route the first time around.	RISK 07
Tara Bloyd	April 11, 2013	It threatens aquifers that we all rely on, and there's no easy way to clean toxic oil once it enters an aquifer.	WRG 01, RISK 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tara Escudero	March 1, 2013	Please examine your conscience and halt this project in order to make the way for a localized energy economy that employs many more people and makes many fewer sick or impacted by climate change.	ACK
Tara Escudero	March 1, 2013	This project will be an unnecessary risk to the many communities who fall in its path, as well as the global community being subjected to a large source of carbon emissions.	RISK 20, CLIM 12
Tara Parker-essig	April 19, 2013	NOT building the Keystone XL is the first step in saying NO to old bad habits and getting on a healthier safer and wiser track.	PN 08
Tara Seeley	April 21, 2013	the carbon released in the mining, transport, refining and final use of tar sands tips our already burdened climate past the point our globe can tolerate it the proposed pipeline puts large regions of water at risk--pipelines leak, as we have seen all too often in the last few weeks the profits will be Canadian profits the studies about job creation indicate that relatively few permanent jobs will result Our nation can innovate and invest in clean technologies that will meet our country's and other countries energy needs, creating solid long term jobs and a reduction of carbon emissions.	PN 02, CLIM 14, PN 07, SO 05
TarnickJ	April 18, 2013	This pathway of water leads directly to the Ogallala Aquifer which lies underneath me. Where is the environmental analysis and economic study when a spill would occur here?	RISK 07
TarnickJ	April 18, 2013	This study needs a proper environmental and economic impact of a spill. It has been stated that there will be only 35 permanent jobs on this proposed pipeline.	SO 02
TarnickJ	April 18, 2013	I live in Nebraska, where the proposed reroute will run through 320 acres of my family farm. Through this ground and along a stretch of 8 to 10 miles between the Loup and Platte Rivers, the proposed pipe will be sitting in the water table. Also working against the high water tables are sandy and alkali soils which eat away at stainless steel.	WRG 05
Tatiana Robinson	April 22, 2013	Do not allow certain politicians to convince you that Canadians are in favour of tar sands development. British Columbians are currently resisting attempts to ship this dirty oil through the northern landscape to our coast.	ACK
Tatiana Robinson	April 22, 2013	Many Canadians reject the notion that it is economically necessary to develop the tar sands, and fear grave environmental consequences will result if such plans are carried out.	PN 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Taylor Dalby	April 17, 2013	Unfortunately, however, North America is having a hard time getting the extracted material to market because of a lack of pipeline capacity. Current pipelines are at full capacity and railways are currently being used to move some of the excess, but holding tanks continue to pool with crude. This increase in supply reduces the price of North American crude. The U.S. and Canada already have a good infrastructure for moving oil via pipelines, we just need to increase capacity a bit to accomodate the increased production.Canadian crude is building up in Alberta without a close refinery with the capacity for refining heavy crudes, I think the U.S. is lucky that the industry was willing to move this crude to U.S. refineries on the Gulf to be prepared for market. Without additional pipeline capacity, this crude will likely be refined elsewhere.	PN 11
Taylor Teegarden	March 10, 2013	Bitumen is a toxic sludge that requires super-heated WATER or TOXIC CHEMICALS to render it elastic enough to flow through pipes.	ACK
Taylor Teegarden	March 10, 2013	Most of it is shipped to overseas markets, including China.	PN 07
Taylor Teegarden	March 10, 2013	the bitumen goes to a convenient Free Trade Zone in Texas, where it is refined to a pliable enough substance to be shipped out. The substance is shipped on the taxpayers' nickel because the corporations pay no taxes on the oil or its "refinement."	SO 14
Team Industrial Services	March 13, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline will help deliver secure and reliable energy to meet America's needs for decades.	PN 10
Team Industrial Services	March 13, 2013	The pipeline will generate economic opportunity and jobs along the route, and throughout the United States. Team Industrial Services has firsthand experience with the kind of economic opportunity Keystone XL will unleash by enabling continued development of North America's energy resources.	SO 08
Ted Bowen	March 15, 2013	Those that would block this are not looking out for the best interest of America. Override them, by-pass them in this process or what ever it takes. Look at the results of everything this man has had a hand in. It is easily seen that nothing he does is good for the long term of America.	PN 05
Ted Fondak	March 16, 2013	I beg of you all to consider alternatives: make incentives for Detroit to retool production lines to produce alternative energy sources; fund research into promising new sources of green energy; boost fuel efficiency standards even higher; create tax breaks for communities and individuals to employ environmentally friendly solutions; encourage reductions in consumption; inspire eco-friendly changes in citizen behavior	ALT 01
Ted Fondak	March 16, 2013	If approved, Keystone XL could, as our own government's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, potentially mean "game over" in our long-term fight to stop global warming.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Ted Gilmer	April 9, 2013	If we paved the right of way for the pipe line with solar panels, woud it not make more energy? An electreic Bike path from Calgary to Texas, that supplied energy to every town along the way. With no spills! Think of the hi tech jobs in the heart land.	ALT 01
Ted Mckinney	April 13, 2013	The carbon footprint of the Keystone proposal is an insult to our planet and to our intelligence.	CLIM 14
Ted Mckinney	April 13, 2013	And then there is the seldom mentioned fact that the refined product is destined for export, rather than domestic use.	PN 07
Ted Pratt	April 20, 2013	Since we are not getting any of the oil for our own use (except what spills on the ground), why should we even have the pipeline run through our country ?	PN 04
Ted Pratt	April 20, 2013	As for job creating,the only jobs it would create are the ones to build it. After that,our unemployment goes right back to where it is now and nothing really gets done.	SO 04
Ted Reese	April 2, 2013	Tar sands oil is among the most inefficient oil to extract devastating to areas in which it is mined.	CU 01
Ted Ringer	April 5, 2013	Our climatic future is bleak enough without adding this to the fire.	ACK
Ted Ringer	April 5, 2013	The danger… general environmental damage… is large.	ACK
Ted Ringer	April 5, 2013	The danger of spills... is large.	RISK 07
Ted Thieman	April 22, 2013	Allowing a foreign corporation the use of eminent domain, here in our United States, to transport the dirtiest oil on earth, even before a permit is issued, is just plain wrong	LEG 02
Teodoro Ayllon	April 13, 2013	A fundamental question here is, how are we to protect the aquifers so that we may drink water safely?	WRG 01, RISK 07
TeranR	April 18, 2013	this is going to be one of the safest pipelines built. With all the scrutiny that this job has taken from the get-go, this job is going to be watched during construction and down the road. And that's going to be -- that's going to benefit everybody.	PD 09
Teresa Audesirk	April 4, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes	ACK
Teresa Bacci	March 28, 2013	Mining the sands currently involves the use of huge amounts of water and chemical solvents to extract oil from bitumen, a viscous substance found in sand and clay. The extra energy required by the process of steam injection, strip mining removing large stretches of overlying soil and refining is a turbo-booster to CO2 emissions.	CLIM 07
Teresa Chegin	April 19, 2013	We need to spend our financial resources on clean energy and it will be cheaper in the long run to avoid environmental disaster. We need to stop the Keystone XL.	PN 02
Teresa Collins	April 4, 2013	Currently, there are several active spills being cleaned up in the US. We do not need to add another risky pipeline to our communities and environment.	ACK
Teresa Collins	April 4, 2013	Please choose to protect our health and choose to support renewable energy sources rather than support this damaging special business interest.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Teresa Collins	April 9, 2013	Current events regarding active oil spills in suburban and other areas underscore the destructive nature of continuing to focus on oil energy sources. Please choose to pursue less destructive, renewable energy sources instead.	ALT 01
Teresa Hargrove	April 11, 2013	Why should we spill oil all over our own ground so it can be shipped to China?	PN 07
Teresa Hargrove	April 11, 2013	I can't tell if the oil companies can't or just won't make pipelines safe, but whichever, it's obvious they are not and I don't think this one is worth the risk	RISK 14
Teresa Jaeger	April 11, 2013	We need to move past these nasty fossil fuels and to clean renewable energies. We should be leading on this and it's a national shame that we aren't.	PN 02
Teresa Nevins	April 13, 2013	This dirty plague will contaminate the soil	ACK
Teresa Nevins	April 13, 2013	This dirty plague will contaminate the… drinking water,	ACK
Teresa Nevins	April 13, 2013	This dirty plague will contaminate… the plants that grow in the soil,	RISK 07
Teresa Schmidt	April 22, 2013	We will NOT see any decrease in gas prices as the oil is to be exported.	PN 07
Terese Pierskalla	April 20, 2013	It's my understanding that most of the what will flow through the Keystone XL pipeline will be sold for overseas use. If that's the case why risk ruining more of our environment and potentially our health when the US won't even benefit from this oil (aside from the oil companies making more money, that is).	PN 07
Teri Franklin	March 17, 2013	Bringing in the oil by rail to Washington State and shipping it out of Grays Harbor through the Bowerman Basin National Wildlife Refuge is not acceptable either. This kind of actions need to stop. Storing the crude right nest to the wildlife refuge is bull. We are just getting cleaned up from the logging industry and now you want to put what is left of our fish runs in jeapordy. We have just spent millions studing the Chehalis Basin watershed and doing restoration and this is just plain stupid, I am sick of my tax dollars going to this type of development.	ACK
Teri Hlava	April 22, 2013	The jobs are short term, inflated, and largely non local to the common citizenry.	SO 03
Teri Nguyen	March 18, 2013	Some caribou in the tar sands region could disapear in as little as 30 years.	CU 01
Terri Armao	April 4, 2013	The review of Keystone Xl was done by a comapny hired by the very company hat wants to build the pipeline. The state department must think we are idiots or in a coma to believe the report. This smacks of corruption or lunacy.	PRO 01
Terri Blakley	April 15, 2013	We don't need more fossil fuel! We need to develop more earth-friendly green sources of energy! That is where the money needs to be spent	PN 02
Terri Harrington	April 11, 2013	I own farmland in Nebraska. My family homesteaded the farm in 1876...We do not want toxic tar sand piped through this farm. We don’t think anyone has a right to touch our land for any reason much less a foreign government. We do not want toxic tar sand refined in our country. We do not want our fields disturbed, our water poisoned and our children’s health and heritage jeopardized by a foreign country who destroys forests and creates toxic cesspools just so China can buy Canadian tar sand and pollute the earth.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Terri Harrington	April 11, 2013	I wholly agree with this article. Terri Harrington..landowner on the potential pipeline we protest…. "http://www.yorknewstimes.com/"this Smith's district to host final Keystone XL public hearing - York News-Times: Editorial…."I am guessing what he [State Rep Adrian Smith] hears is mostly from TransCanada, the foreign company that wants to slice Nebraska wide open to transport Canadian tar-sand oil, complete with toxins that kill, to the Gulf of Mexico so it can be refined and exported. If Smith was truly listening, he could hear the hundreds of Third District landowners who are desperate to have their congressman help save the Sandhills and the Ogallala Aquifer forever.	PN 05
Terri Harrington	April 11, 2013	There is no benefit to Nebraskans and there is no benefit to the people who live along the pipeline route. The small number of temporary jobs this toxic pipeline might create is nothing compared to the risk and consequence of some foreign country's oil spill.	RISK 13, PN 05, RISK 17
Terri Harrington	April 11, 2013	I wholly agree with this article. Terri Harrington..landowner on the potential pipeline we protest…. "http://www.yorknewstimes.com/"this Smith's district to host final Keystone XL public hearing - York News-Times: Editorial…"Surely the reporter knew Adrian Smith voted for the new Pipeline Safety Bill that was signed into law early in 2012. That bill requires two federal studies directly aimed at the tar-sand DilBit oil. One studies the corrosiveness of DilBit to see how it affects the pipe. The other studies the leak detection practices of pipeline companies. Both must be followed by a review period and regulatory process that won't be done for a couple years, yet Smith wants to bury the pipe now. I wouldn't call that basing his decision on science, would you?"	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Terri Harrington	April 11, 2013	I wholly agree with this article. Terri Harrington..landowner on the potential pipeline we protest…. "http://www.yorknewstimes.com/"this Smith's district to host final Keystone XL public hearing - York News-Times: Editorial…"Surely the reporter knew that Adrian sits on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee. This committee, back in 1980, declared tar-sand to be neither oil nor petroleum, so when an "anonymous company" recently asked the IRS to make a ruling on tax liabilities based on current law, the IRS had no choice but to rule the 36 million gallons of this toxic brew, gushing just a half inch away from Nebraska's Ogallala Aquifer every day, will not be subject to the eight cents per barrel Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund Tax…….drian has been informed that a spill in Nebraska similar to the one in Michigan could cost up to a billion dollars to repair and restore, and TransCanada is only liable for the first $350 million. After that, the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund is tapped, but remember, based on Adrian's committee, the Canadian oil going through the Keystone XL does not have to pay the $23 million a year tax to replenish the fund … only American oil has to pay.	SO 15, RISK 03
TERRI OBRIAN	April 22, 2013	Scare tactics or not, the risk to a major water supply is real. The inability to guarantee no accidents makes the risk too great. Once the water is polluted.. 'game over'. The documented effect of polluted water on humans and animals is disturbing.	RISK 30, RISK 07, WRG 01
Terri Sutton	March 14, 2013	Please be truthful about where the product(s) of this harmful transport system would go - NOT to the U.S. but to other countries that will pay higher prices for it.	PN 07
Terri Sutton	April 4, 2013	However, this is one money-backed initiative that will do irrevocable harm to our country and our water supply - WITHOUT DOING ANYTHING TO BRING THE END PRODUCT/S - AFTER REFINING - BECAUSE THE RESULTANT PRODUCTS WILL BE SOLD TO THE HIGHEST BIDDING COUNTRY (China, Inda, etc.) - NOT to American consumers!	PN 07
Terri Sutton	April 5, 2013	And all this for sludge that will not do a thing to lower the price of gas in this country but, rather, will likely see it increase as other countries outbid each other for the REFINED product that will result!	PN 05
Terri Sutton	April 5, 2013	any potential damage to the Keystone XL pipeline spells disaster for our country, its crops, and (worst of all) its WATER.	RISK 09
Terrie	April 4, 2013	Looking at the disaster in Mayflower, however, should help you understand that Keystone is a HUGE disaster waiting to happen.	ACK
Terrielynn Bach	April 1, 2013	Lets put our time, energy and money into developing CLEAN ENERGY [as opposed to oil-based energy]!	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Terry & Dave Johns - Bessey	April 15, 2013	The current Presidential Permit does not stipulate that the company is allowed to expand the project, and the State Department should conduct a new environmental assessment of the impacts of such an expansion on our communities, wildlife habitat, waterways, and climateTar sands results in more greenhouse gas pollution than conventional oil and has acidic and corrosive properties in pipelines that can lead to more frequent spills that are more difficult to clean up.	LEG 04
Terry & Elvira Burns	April 16, 2013	This massive pipeline project, a portion already under construction in Texas, is running rampant over private property rights in our State and disrupting agricultural lands throughout.	LEG 02
Terry Agee	March 27, 2013	Environmental organizations and communities living near the proposed path of the pipeline have raised significant concerns about the potential risks the proposed project presents to the health and safety of communities the pipeline will pass through.	RISK 07
Terry Agee	March 27, 2013	XL pipeline is a controversial project that would transport tar sands oil (which is more corrosive than crude oil) from Canada through America's heartland to Texas, creating air, water, and public health risks in its wake	RISK 11
Terry Barber	April 2, 2013	OIL SPILLS OVER THE LAST 30 YEARS HAVE NOT DECREASED BUT REMAINED RELATIVELY CONSTANT. THEY HAPPEN ROUTINELY,	RISK 14
Terry Coker	April 10, 2013	I am of the understanding that the Keystone pipeline will benefit the Chinese more than it would benefit the American people. It also appears that the Canadian people have a higher concern for their environment that our "American" representatives.	PN 09
Terry Donaldson	April 10, 2013	As for the prospect of an oil spill being easier to clean-up, the premier is dead wrong. The oil is heavier and sinks in aquatic systems (i.e., the Kalamazoo River), making it very difficult to remove. The premier acknowledged that some spills may occur but that these spills will essentially be the price of doing business. This argument is not only insulting but is indicative of the arrogance the premier has (with the tacit support of the Prime Minister who is ignoring Canadian law in the process) regarding this project and the environmental damage it will cause.	RISK 10
Terry Eaton	March 18, 2013	In fact for the USA, the expected benefits are negative. Any oil extracted and processed will be sent out of the country at the cost of increased environmental damage, and higher (not lower) gas prices.	PN 07
Terry Edeli	March 13, 2013	If we [US] are serious about stemming climate change, we certainly do not want to promote costly and carbon-intense extraction methods.	CLIM 14
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	An estimated 240 gigatons of carbon are stored in the tar sands, about half the carbon budget (500Gt) that scientists estimate we can use to stay under 2 degrees of warming;	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	Building the Keystone XL pipeline will set off additional tar sands development and spike greenhouse gas emissions. An estimated 240 gigatons of carbon are stored in the tar sands, about half the carbon budget (500Gt) that scientists estimate we can use to stay under 2 degrees of warming;	CLIM 05
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	KXL would be the equivalent of adding at least 4 million new cars to the road.	CLIM 11
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	Low-income communities will bear a disproportionate share of the contamination of air and water created by spills along the route of Keystone XL and refinery emissions from processing dirty tar sands oil.	EJ 01
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	Low-income communities will bear a disproportionate share of the contamination of air and water created by spills along the route of Keystone XL and refinery emissions from processing dirty tar sands oil.	EJ 01
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	The World Bank and the IMF have raised alarms against further investment in fossil fuels	PN 02
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	The Kalamazoo spill shows that tar sands spills are much more damaging than conventional crude spills. The Administration should evaluate the impact of tar sands spills along sensitive rivers and aquifers along Keystone XL's route.	RISK 10
Terry Hokenson	March 7, 2013	TransCanada is being investigated by Canadian regulators after they confirmed a whistleblower account of repeated violations of pipeline safety regulations by the company	RISK 25
Terry Johnson	March 25, 2013	We need to vote Yes on the Keystone project and man the jobs with union help, those that have had training to do the work safely and efficiently.	SO 06
Terry Johnson	April 20, 2013	This pipeline offers nothing to the US but environmental risk. It makes no sense to risk our breadbasket and water supply to get dirty oil China.	PN 07
Terry Laplante	April 10, 2013	These funds could be used to restore the degraded waterways across our nation. We can not risk another important waterway to be degraded. As this article points out, that in the year following Transcanada's announcement that it will build a safe pipeline they have had 12 oil spills from recently built pipelines. We can only trust them to do more of the same. Make them pay it forward or make them get out. We want our waterways restored and protected.	RISK 26, RISK 03, WRS 02
Terry Laplante	April 10, 2013	It is a given that approving the Keystone project with destroy the Ogallala Aquifer sooner or later.	WRG 01
Terry Miller	April 13, 2013	why do the need a pipe line why not build a refinery up in canada.	ALT 08
Terry Murcko	April 20, 2013	Renewable energy will produce ten jobs for every one which might come from oil. Even Americans who believe the nonsense that "no significant impacts" will result from the environmental atrocity of this pipeline, at least they all agree on the benefit of jobs.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Terry Osborn	March 31, 2013	I realize there are some transitory benefits to the economy of the state[Nebraska], based on what I have read, but I think the long and short term liabilities outweigh any benefits.	PN 05
Terry Osborn	March 31, 2013	No matter how much the company says it [Pipeline] will be safe, no ruptures or leaks etc., they can't really guarantee there won't be.	RISK 14
Terry Wiggins	March 12, 2013	The environmental impact statement recently released by the state department is misleading. First, it implies Keystone XL would have little effect on climate change. In fact, Keystone's impact counts for a great deal, because the effects are cumulative.	CLIM 13
Terry Wiggins	March 12, 2013	And second, it assumes that if the pipeline is not built, that the dilbit would be transported anyway, probably by rail. I believe that's a false assumption.	PN 06
TetherowJ	April 18, 2013	Allowing a multi-national corporation to threaten property rights via eminent domain is unconscionable.	LEG 02
TetherowJ	April 18, 2013	How can you approve a pipeline for a substance you aren't told the composition of?	PD 04
TetherowJ	April 18, 2013	If [a leak] happens in the aquifer, how will the added chemicals behave? YOU DON'T KNOW!	RISK 02
Tethrow	April 18, 2013	The fact that eminent domain is granted to a foreign nation makes me want to puke. E.D. was never intended for that use.	LEG 02
Thad Carlson	March 1, 2013	The carbon equivalent numbers you quote are all very questionable. There have been dozens of studies by independent experts that disagree with your findings.	CLIM 11
Thad Carlson	March 1, 2013	You sate "Spills associated with the proposed Project that enter the environment are expected to be rare and relatively small." …The issue of concern here is precisely that "we don't believe" when in fact these disasters are almost certain.	RISK 21
The Forest Management Trust	April 20, 2013	The extraction and burning of this oil has a disproportionately high rate of C02 production and is causing major downstream water quality impacts, particularly on First Nations people of the region.	CU 05, CLIM 14
The Keystone Pipeline Is A Disa Byers	April 19, 2013	The tar sands oil is also loaded with sludge and very corrosive compound sthat will tax the durability of the containing pipe. Expect oil spills!	RISK 11
The Light Center	March 27, 2013	[the pipeline] disrespects the rights of Native people.	ACK
The Light Center	March 27, 2013	the planned pipeline will endanger the… animals in the vicinity	ACK
The Light Center	March 27, 2013	the planned pipeline will endanger the land and lives of humans	RISK 07
The Rev. William J. Graham	April 17, 2013	All pipelines have some risk of spills, but this company has one of the worst track records in the business.	RISK 14
The Rev. William J. Graham	April 17, 2013	While it is true that construction of the pipeline would create a number of short term jobs, very few long term ones will be added. Information sent me (the validity of which I have no reason to question) predicts only 35 long term positions for my state of Nebraska.	SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
The Reverend Anne Slakey	April 9, 2013	I think the most responsible thing the US can do is to work on carbon capture and be ready to pay its costs. This willingness will address the issue of historic responsibility for carbon in the atmosphere, and can pave the way for all parties to work together to curb emissions. Keystone is not the way forward to a carbon free future. Please ensure that the US shows leadership on curbing carbon emissions, by opposing Keystone XL, by reducing emissions, by promoting carbon capture, and most of all, by working for international agreements to reduce carbon to 350 ppm.	CLIM 18
The Ven. Betsy Blake Bennett	April 22, 2013	As the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere increases, the amount of Arctic sea ice decreases, and as we continue to extract more fossil fuels from the earth, …….. The effects of climate change, including droughts, extreme weather events, rising sea levels, and melting permafrost all have ill effects on people, often on some of the poorest people in the world who can least stand these added stresses. ……. If we know what causes global warming and what we need to do to mitigate its effects and how very soon we need to stop burning fossil fuels, how can we even entertain the thought of building something to enable the release of the amount of carbon in the Alberta tar sands?	CLIM 14
Thea & Steve Merrill	March 28, 2013	The taxpayer money that's being pumped into these toxic, conventional energy sources would be better directed to investment in new, clean, sustainable sources of energy.	PN 03
Thea Orozco	April 16, 2013	[the proposed pipeline would] "* Disturb highly erodible soil along nearly half of the 875-mile U.S. segment — including 4,715 acres of "prime farmland soil." * Degrade streams and other surface water. * Encroach on the habitats of 13 federally protected species or species being considered for that designation, including the whooping crane and the greater sage grouse. * Be susceptible to potentially disastrous leaks and spill."	SOIL 03, SOIL 01, TES 13
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	I ask you to deny this application because … Tar sands oil...contributes in a major way to the devastating and probably irreversible effects of global warming with its resultant hardships on food and water sources to the poorest of the planet	CLIM 16
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	As of March 20, 2013, a poll shows that 62 percent of Americans “said private property should not be taken by eminent domain to build the Keystone pipeline” (Poll: Majority of Americans Want Congress Out of Keystone XL Pipeline Decision, Oppose "Eminent Domain," Worry About Water, Wildlife, Center for Biological Diversity).	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	Here, in the United States, a Canadian company is laying claim to our homes. TransCanada has 56 eminent domain actions filed against private landholders. Eminent domain is used for projects which will primarily benefit the public, but in this case the American public will not benefit. This pipeline will carry oil from Canada down through the U.S. to Port Arthur, Texas. TransCanada claims this will make our oil source more stable. But, a study by an independent research group reports that instead of giving our country a secure oil source, the majority of this oil will actually be shipped overseas to markets in Asia, not kept here in the U.S" (Keystone XL pipeline: Project not all it's cracked up to behttp://missoulian.com/news/opinion/mailbag/keystone-xl-pipeline-project-not-all-it-s-cracked-up/article_6947bffc-9d2f-11e2-b4c9-001a4bcf887a.html, April 4, 2013).	LEG 02
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	However, my overriding objection, which was my initial reaction on first hearing of this project, is the outrage I feel as an American citizen that a foreign corporation is allowed to invade our country by exercising eminent domain.	LEG 02
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	I ask you to deny this application because this project: Both in the construction and in the operation threatens countless precious species listed as either imperiled or endangered.	TES 01
Thelma Follett	April 4, 2013	I ask you to deny this application because this project:...Risks contaminating numerous water bodies	WRS 02
Theodora B. Crawford	April 1, 2013	Perhaps the recent pipeline spill in Arkansas will cause you to rethink the approval of the poison and potential destruction of our agricultural legacy until some real research can be accomplished.	ACK
Theodora B. Crawford	April 1, 2013	The report was blatantly disingenuous...Your willingness to sacrifice our future is appalling!	ACK
Theodora Bb	April 23, 2013	Further, the State Department has failed to consult with the federally-recognized Indian tribes that will be affected by this risky pipeline plan. Allowing only one (1) day for public comments of a significant and complex industrial development across multiple states, jurisdictions, and tribal lands is another failure to comply with NEPA requirements that requires fair treatment.	CR 01
Theodora Sobin	March 10, 2013	I am alarmed by the information that the State Department is using biased tar sands industry experts to write recommendations regarding the safety of the pipeline. It is especially important to consider the long-term effects the Keystone XL will have on our environment and our children. I expect more of the State Department.	PRO 01
Theodora Sobin	March 21, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline is a sham. It ignores the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills, ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate, and ignores the clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives who agree Keystone XL will make the difference in tar sands development.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Theodore Palmer	April 2, 2013	We all know that catastrophes happen even when everyone said they couldn't. Let's prevent this pipeline before it add to the long list of polluting events that "could never happen".	PN 08
Theresa Christopher	April 21, 2013	I don't have to go into the destruction that will be caused by this pipeline, since we are already experiencing the catastrophic spills from the sister pipeline	RISK 10
Theresa Kardos	April 2, 2013	I believe that approving this pipeline and enhancing fossil fuel production and distribution sends a confusing and ultimately wrong message from an administration that seemed to support renewable energy sources passionately.	ALT 01
Theresa Legler	March 18, 2013	Dear Mr. President, I am strongly against the Keystone Pine line. For not only the environmental impact it may cause to our planet. But the destructive path humans will make on cutting down and stepping on untouched ground. It makes sense to move forward in more ethical electricity alternatives.	PN 09
Theresa Lomomaco	April 2, 2013	The recent pipeline oil spill in AK worries me a great deal.	ACK
Theresa Lomomaco	April 2, 2013	I believe the project will accelerate global warming in that it perpetuates America's reliance on fossil fuels and it represents an enormous pollution risk.	CLIM 14
Theresa Lyngso	April 13, 2013	The future is green technology, lets put our minds and dollars into that.	PN 02
Theresa Markham	March 10, 2013	We have yet to see an oil company drive an effort like the Keystone Pipeline without cutting corners. They have proven time and time again that they place the bottom line above any other potential risks or outcomes, to the detriment of the environment, and the people making their living alongside oil drilling operations.	RISK 13
Theresa Reigadas	March 31, 2013	Oil giants always promise that there will be no spills, pipeline breaks, and transport accidents ; and they are always proven wrong by the occurrence of such events.	RISK 14
Theresa Rigney	April 22, 2013	Climate change is the largest issue of humanity. We need to move to clean renewable energy. This issue was not adequately addressed in the EIR. It is not a trade-off between the pollution of the pipeline versus transport via truck. The total projects environmental impact on climate, air quality, water quality, loss of land use from spills and impacts from production need to be considered. We need to start to limit the amount of CO2 being emitted into the atmosphere. Not allowing new sources is the first step. Regulating existing sources is the second.	PN 02
Therese Hill Peregrine	April 22, 2013	The processed oil and gas wont even be sold to Americans!	PN 07
Therese Hill Peregrine	April 22, 2013	Then theres the Oglala Aquifer! I shudder to think of the consequences if some of the tarsands oil would get into this system!	RISK 07
Therese Hill Peregrine	April 22, 2013	The sandhills region is a very fragile ecosystem, and would take literally hundreds of years to recover from the impact the pipeline would bring.	VEG 01, SOIL 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Therese Mackenzie	April 16, 2013	I request a reply that explains to me how mining carbon and methane will not adversely affect our atmosphere. If it carries at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants, how do you consider that no problem?	CLIM 11
Theresina Greenwell	April 22, 2013	I am totally opposed to Keystone XL pipeline being run through Nebraska and the rest of America to Texas. It is subject to leaks that would spoil land and water for thousands of people when there is already too much pollution ruining our earth and water systems. Canadians can testify to the damage it has fone to their land and livlihood. PLEASE do not permit this madness!	RISK 07
Thiessen, Todd	April 17, 2013	Keystone has to go thru and be approved. The permanent jobs, the job growth, the revenues and taxes to the various levels of government on payroll, corporations…..the benefits are enormous and endless.	PN 10
Thom Hale	April 22, 2013	Until the potential environmental impacts of this pipeline are assessed by an unaffiliated third party, we cannot trust the information therein. Because Cardno Entrix was contracted by Transcanada and uses data provided by Transcanada in their EIS, we must be skeptical of these findings.	PRO 01
Thom Shields	April 5, 2013	The clear cutting of thousands of acres of Canadian old growth forest will destroy habitat for all manner of wildlife and cause an increase in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere thereby contributing to climate change also known as global warming	CLIM 06
Thom Shields	April 5, 2013	The use of emanate domain intrudes on and destroys private property throughout the US on the pipeline trajectory	LEG 02
Thom Shields	April 5, 2013	It encourages reliance on fossil fuels when we should be finding alternative energy sources	PN 03
Thom Shields	April 5, 2013	There would be no reduction in gas and oil prices for US citizens as the oil would be sent to Asian markets	PN 04
Thom Shields	April 5, 2013	The pipeline could break and cause irreparable harm to the local environment including degradation of water, air and soil	RISK 07
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	[…]I have found the FEIS and SEIS for the proposed Keystone XL project lacking in key data and detail that preclude a proper evaluation of the Keystone XL's environmental impacts.	LEG 04
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Waterbody Crossings: The NDEQ acknowledges that the Nebraska Keystone route has 163 waterbody crossings, but the NDEQ's digital map file only contains the five largest.	LEG 17

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	The Report and the FEIS on which it relies cannot be considered suitable for public review until a complete open-source digital dataset has been made readily available at no cost.	PRO 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	While all parties, including PHMSA, FERC, and all state agencies, acknowledge that the pipeline's GIS data is public information, neither the DOS nor TransCanada will release this information.	PRO 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	It is disturbing that TransCanada has not been required to fully disclose details of the pipeline route to the public or to document adequate emergency spill response measures. The public review process requires more accurate and complete information than have been provided to date by TransCanada, the DOS, and all state agencies regulating the pipeline.	PRO 05, LEG 24, RISK 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Given the experience of the 2010 pipeline spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan, where cleanup costs are $1 billion and climbing, TransCanada's $200 million third party liability insurance is grossly inadequate.	RISK 03, LEG 08
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Of greatest concern are the insufficiency of both the GIS routing data and spill mitigation details in the report.	RISK 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	The FEIS and SEIS also fail to sufficiently addresses TransCanada's preparation for spill prevention and mitigation.	RISK 21
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	The gas and water well data contained in the FEIS has not been updated to reflect the revised Nebraska route.	WRG 05, GEO 03
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Conspicuously missing from the FEIS and SEIS are the location data for the pipeline's key landmarks, including milepost (MP) markers and waterbody crossings.	WRS 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Despite their absence, the MP markers are repeatedly referenced throughout both the project and DOS documents and are critical for all discussions of the pipeline route, potential environmental impacts, and surrounding points of interest.	WRS 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	In regards to the SEIS specifically, the GIS data contributed by the Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ) is inadequate for the following reasons: •Milepost Markers: The NDEQ report furnishes MP markers for even miles only, whereas the FEIS requires accuracy to the nearest tenth of a mile.	WRS 05
Thomas Bachand	April 5, 2013	Permitting should also be subject to EPA review. It would be negligent to repeat the Gulf Coast approval process, whereby USACE gave sweeping project-wide construction approval to TransCanada through a Nationwide Permit 12 and withheld waterbody crossing data until after granting their approval.	WRS 06
Thomas Blaney	April 5, 2013	Tar Sand Oil requires more energy to extract, transport and refine than it delivers!	PN 05
Thomas Bound	April 10, 2013	If Canada wants to export its tar sands oil, it is free to do so from its own ports, not ours.	ALT 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Brewer	March 21, 2013	The vast majority of jobs created by the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will be for the actual construction. These short-term jobs will disappear after it is complete, leaving few full-time jobs remaining.	SO 04
Thomas C. Gibbons	April 22, 2013	Any possibility, or lack thereof, involving alternate means of moving tar sands oil should be considered irrelevant to this study. If an alternate means of moving the tar sands oil is proposed, then there should be an environmental impact statement regarding that alternate proposal, which should also take into account the effects of the tar sands oil itself.	ACK
Thomas C. Gibbons	April 22, 2013	In reading through the impact statement, I noticed that it considered the effects of climate change on the pipeline and the environmental effects of just the operation of the pipeline. But it seemed to be silent on the effects of the normal burning of the stuff going through the pipeline.	CLIM 10
Thomas Cavalier	April 4, 2013	As a concerned citizen of the USA I would like to urge lawmakers and President Obama to allow for the completion of the Keystone pipeline. This pipeline would bring jobs to the affected area directly, and indirectly throughout the whole region. It would ultimately bring revenue and make us more independent from foreign oil nations who hate the USA. Studies have shown the environmental impact would be minimal, so to me , and many Americans this is a no-brainer. Allow for the Keystone pipeline to be completed.	PN 10
Thomas Dickerman	March 17, 2013	It is extremely dirty, contaminating large volumes of water in areas of pristine wilderness occupied by native americans.	ACK
Thomas Dickerman	March 17, 2013	we must quickly move from coal, oil and gas to renewable energy, which does not emit greenhouse gases.	ALT 01
Thomas Ellis	April 15, 2013	ALSO, I want to ask why no one is asking Canada to build a refinery in their country. If it's such a GREAT IDEA, I would think Canada would love to make the extra money by selling refined oil. Now that the Northwest Passage is open they could ship gasoline all over the world.	ALT 08
Thomas Ellis	April 15, 2013	TAR SANDS IS THE MOST DESTRUCTIVE FORM OF OIL. IT DOES NOT FLOAT, IT SINKS AND BECOMES A PERMANENT PART OF THE ENVIRONMENT.	RISK 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas H. Harbold	April 22, 2013	When considering whether or not to exploit an energy resource it is not enough to only consider the economic cost/benefit, the energetic and greenhouse gas cost benefit should be considered as well. While exploitation of tar sands may be profitable from an economic standpoint, energy return on investment analysis shows the resource does not compare to other fossil fuels in terms of the energy provided to society and has a lower return than many renewable resources like wind and energy efficient infrastructure. In addition, production of petroleum from tar sands emits approximately 15% more CO2 per barrel than traditional methods. In light of these facts, I believe the resources that some want to invest in tar sand production/infrastructure, including but not limited to the Keystone Pipeline, should instead be invested in things that will help to ensure a sustainable future, such as wind power or energy efficient infrastructure.	PN 02
Thomas Harbold	April 8, 2013	Tar sands "oil" - actually bitumen, which must be diluted with other toxic hydrocarbons to reduce its viscosity enough to be sent through pipes - is environmentally destructive in its extraction, dirty in its burning, and is a low-efficiency fuel, generating on 4-6 joules of energy for every joule used to extract it (compared to 15:1 for standard oil). Because it is basically a slurry, it must be pumped through pipelines at higher speed and pressure than liquid oil, and is corrosive, resulting in a greater chance of ruptures and spills. Because unlike oil, it does not float but sinks, it is much harder to clean up, and the chance of fouling water supplies - both above-ground and groundwater - is real and significant.	RISK 08, CLIM 12, RISK 11
Thomas Heidger	April 4, 2013	Keystone XL is another disaster waiting to happen. We've already had mishaps in Michigan and Arkansas and we don't need more in the central states. Stop this disaster before it happens by rejecting this pipeline.	ACK
Thomas Henderson	March 10, 2013	This pipeline, if it is approved and built, has the potential to foul thousands of square miles of until now clean, productive land. Much farmland would be made unusable.	LU 01
Thomas Keenan	March 14, 2013	….the fact that the planet continues to warm at a rate still surpassing the best scientific models, and considering the fact that there could very realistically be a major dying-off in the planets oceans with alarming changes in pH.	CLIM 17
Thomas Kuna-jacob	April 15, 2013	If you must allow fracking-natural gas as a bridge fuel, do that, but not both Keystone and fracking!. The biggest natural-gas pool in the US (as of geologic surveys done 60 years ago) is in NE Missouri.	PN 02
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	There is a clear consensus among financial analysts and oil executives that blocking the Keystone XL pipeline will have negative impact on further development of the Tar Sands in Canada	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	The net energy gained by mining tar sands oil is at least 15% less than conventional oil sources.	CLIM 05
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	The area potentially affected by a spill in the Keystone XL includes the Ogallala Aquifer. The regions overlying this aquifer are some of the most productive for ranching cattle and for growing corn, wheat and soybeans	RISK 07
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	This dense tar-like oil does not float, making cleanup of any spill near to impossible	RISK 08
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	The added chemicals [to the tar sands oil] are very toxic- they are known carcinogens and hormone disrupters	RISK 12
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	To be able to ship oil with the consistency of peanut butter, you have to add some very toxic chemicals like benzene just to get it to flow.	RISK 12
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	There have already been a number of spills in other pipelines carrying this type of oil	RISK 14
Thomas Liston	March 31, 2013	Despite TransCanada's assertion that more than half a million jobs will be created, the State Department concludes that only 42,100 temporary jobs will occur, and only 35 permanent jobs	SO 02
Thomas Manning	April 11, 2013	The Draft Environmental Review your department released last month for the northern segment of the "Keystone XL" tar sands pipeline was an inadequate whitewashing of its real dangers. Those dangers would be both immediate as pipeline leaks and spills, and long-term for its inevitable result of MORE - AND MORE DRASTIC - CLIMATE DISRUPTIONS FROM FOSSIL FUELS.	CLIM 14
Thomas Merten	April 22, 2013	There will be short term construction jobs but much/most of the oil will likely be exported…….. The time has come to move past dependence on dirty oil and seriously invest in conservation and alternative energy sources.	PN 03
Thomas Merten	April 22, 2013	Nebraskas most important resource is its water, specifically the Ogallala aquifer. If the Keystone XL pipeline is built, it WILL leak. Looking at recent history, horrible leaks have occurred fouling important waterways. Why risk terrible leaks for so little gain?	RISK 07
Thomas Moore	April 9, 2013	what is this I hear that because they call this diluted bitumen they do not have to pay into the spill fund? How ludicrous is that? Fix this situation. We are not some colony of the multinational corporations to be depleted and dumped.	LEG 08
Thomas Nass	April 2, 2013	Has anyone asked "What Emergency Measures" are in place for a possible Break, Sabotage or Rupture of this XL Pipe Line? How much product is contained in a linear foot of Pipe? How many Shut-Off Valves will be in place on the Pipeline? How far apart will they be? How long will it take for someone from "Operations" to get to the farthermost of these Valves for a Emergency manual Shut-off?	RISK 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Nass	April 9, 2013	Has anyone asked "What Emergency Measures" are in place for a possible Break, Sabotage or Rupture of this XL Pipe Line? How much product is contained in a linear foot of Pipe? How many Shut-Off Valves will be in place on the Pipeline? How far apart will they be? How long will it take for someone from "Operations" to get to the farthermost of these Valves for a Emergency manual Shut-off?	RISK 05
Thomas Nass	April 15, 2013	Has anyone asked "What Emergency Measures" -as should have been, but seem not to have been, in place in Arkansas, are in place for a possible Break, Sabotage or Rupture of this XL Pipe Line? How much product is contained in a linear foot of Pipe? How many Shut-Off Valves will be in place on the Pipeline? How far apart will they be? How long will it take for someone from "Operations" to get to the farthermost of these Valves for a Emergency manual Shut-off?	RISK 27
Thomas Perham	March 20, 2013	The possible benefits don't even come close to outweighing the risks.	PN 05
Thomas Perham	March 20, 2013	Despite what most people think, the pipeline will not reduce our reliance on foreign oil. TransCanada has already acknowledged that they will be exporting the majority of oil to foreign markets where it will sell for more money.	PN 07
Thomas Phillips	April 11, 2013	Tar sands oil causes more pipeline leaks than conventional oil. It is more viscous requiring higher pressures and temperatures, both of which increase the likelihood of major leaks. On top of that the oil companies have successfully classified it as something other than oil allowing these companies to avoid paying for cleanup. It's disgusting. I was for the KXl pipeline before the leak in Arkansas, but what I learned since has turned me against it.	RISK 21, RISK 11, SO 15
Thomas Powers	April 20, 2013	The Congress has cooked the books for their 'Big Oil and Gas Masters ' by a judicial ruling that the tarsand slurry is not oil thereby placing the cost of spill cleanups onto the backs of the citizen taxpayers of this country.	RISK 03, LEG 08, SO 15
Thomas Powers	April 20, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is a loaded gun aimed directly at the heart of Americas agriculture. Scientific studies have stated that spills are inevitable posing water pollution.	RISK 06
Thomas Rampton	April 19, 2013	How much better would it be to work on new energy sources, rather than continue with what's so dirty and dangerous? Let history record that we were innovative	PN 02
Thomas Ronan	March 18, 2013	The people who support this pipeline say we are taking away needed jobs. How many jobs will be created with this pipeline? Building it may create some jobs, but they aren't permenant jobs. Think of how many permenant jobs would be created by investing in clean energy. A lot more that by this pipeline, and they would be permenant jobs. This pipeline will just help us get closer to extinction due to climate change.	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Ronan	April 3, 2013	Politicians say this pipeline will create jobs, but why worry about a few pipeline jobs when you can create thousands of clean energy jobs.	SO 05
Thomas Ruhf	April 17, 2013	At the very least [Keystone XL] should be shelved till some credible evidence can be provided of real, effective safety measures in place by the oil corporations involved. Seems only fair enough to ask this on behalf of the American people.	RISK 14, PRO 04
Thomas Sherry	April 5, 2013	The environmental damage from the Keystone XL pipeline project means "games over" in terms of climate destabilization, and the incalculable environmental and economic devastation that scientific research indicates will result from our continued reliance on fossil fuels for energy supplies.	CLIM 14
Thomas Sherry	April 5, 2013	If we really want to create jobs, lets create jobs in renewable energy sources, energy-efficient public transportation, insulating homes and buildings, and generally creating more sustainable business and industrial processes.	PN 02
Thomas Sherry	April 5, 2013	The environmental damage from the Keystone XL pipeline project includes inevitable devastating pipeline leaks (let Canadian oil leak on Canadians, if it must leak at all!)	RISK 24
Thomas Sherwood	April 3, 2013	I am a proud member of the Laborers International Union of North America. I know that LIUNA supports this proposal in order to create jobs for its members, However, I believe that this is very short sighted thinking. We need jobs that will encourage clean, renewable energy, not projects that will ruin water, enviornment and climate for present and future generations.	SO 05
Thomas Spencer	April 10, 2013	"Dr. James Hansen reiterated the case against tar sands in the New York Times, pointing out that the deposits contain "twice the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by global oil use in our entire history." If we burn them on top of all the coal and oil and gas we're already using, "concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era" - a wildly different and likely unlivable earth. "	CLIM 05
Thomas Spencer	April 10, 2013	Most of [tar sands oil] will be refined into diesel and jet fuel and exported to Europe, China, and Latin America. The claim that the pipeline will reduce our reliance on OPEC is an outright lie. It will provide only a few thousand temporary construction jobs, and a few dozen maintenance/monitoring jobs.	PN 05
Thomas Spencer	April 10, 2013	There will be "several" spills/year. As an engineer, I can tell you that such a structure cannot be built to be spill proof, and there is a statistical certainty that it cannot operate flawlessly. It follows there is a statistical certainty of spills. Trans Canada itself "guessed" it would suffer a spill every seven years...but their own pipeline experience is a dozen spills in a year.	RISK 24, RISK 14, RISK 26
Thomas Spencer	April 10, 2013	"The Keystone XL pipeline is probably the single most environmentally destructive project in North America threatening millions of trees and thousands of miles of rivers, lakes and streams as it snakes its way across the nation's heartland."	VEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Thomas Thompson	March 29, 2013	Invest in more clean renewable energy you know that is the only sustainable way forward	ALT 01
Thomas Tilbrook	March 27, 2013	with the Keystone XL pipeline in addition to the massive shale oil deposits being found and developed in West Texas I can finally see the US becoming energy independent in the next 10 years.	PN 10
Thompson	April 18, 2013	A foreign corporation wants us in the midwest to subsidize the social and environmental costs of the project.	PN 07
Thompson	April 18, 2013	This pipeline will leak into our water. Even Transcanada admits it will leak…	RISK 07
ThompsonR	April 18, 2013	I have seen no provision in the Constitution that says these individual property rights are only yours until a big corporation who is politically connected wants to take them away from you.	LEG 02
Tiffany Holka	April 22, 2013	It will leak. Its a fact that eventually the pipe line will leak. Then what??? What will you do to clean our water?..... Also, I dont want to be showering and doing my laundry with aquafina!	RISK 07
Tim Durnell	April 13, 2013	With the Gulf disaster and recent oil pipeline spill we need to rethink giving the green light to big oil. The Keystone pipeline oil isn't even going to relieve our dependence on foreign oil.	PN 04
Tim Essebaggers	April 13, 2013	So, take your proposed pipeline and run it to the coast, through Canada and let them deal with it if it leaks and NOT the US.	ALT 05
Tim Essebaggers	April 13, 2013	And what irks me is that IF oil is spilled, companies are NOT responsible for 100% of the damage they cause. They make "efforts" to clean it up and don't get it all. They reimburse people for losses, including loss of business, habitat, personal losses etc. but they take years to do it and then "settle" for less than the entire cost and walk away. WE the people get stuck cleaning up the rest with tax payers dollars and/or making those who had looses, whole (or as whole as the USG feels that might be). And still, these huge companies walk away, not paying the whole bill.	RISK 03
Tim Frank	April 20, 2013	Civilization arose during a ten thousand year period when our planet has enjoyed the most temperate climate of the last 4 billion years. The delicate circumstances that have given rise to our well developed civilization are not wise to take for granted. The principle threat to our favorable climate is our own pollution, and in particular green house gas pollution. Given the value of the natural and economic assets threatened by global warming, it seams only reasonable to take steps to reduce the threat, and one of the most important steps is to stop using the most pollution intensive of energy sources. The tar sands are close to the top of this list. They should be left in the ground.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tim Hade	April 4, 2013	Other concerns, would be security, this pipeline will be a "target" for our enemies. Security needs to be addressed, especially in the sections that are going to run across the Ogallala Aquifer.	RISK 07
Tim Hade	April 4, 2013	If it is to go ahead, then this project needs to be heavily over-engineered in every aspect, with the spill in Arkansas, the company did not even shut flow down during flooding that put the pipeline in danger, even though other companies did so.	RISK 14
Tim Hade	April 4, 2013	There needs to be an "entity" that will be inspecting this pipeline, and which has control over emergency shut off of this pipeline, and which can run routine inspections up and down the entire length of it where it crosses American soil. I would suggest the Army Corps of engineers, and if there is some idea of creating jobs with this aspect, then the contractors need to be answerable to the COE.	RISK 23
Tim Hade	April 4, 2013	Heavy Crude is not even considered to be Crude oil, and as such, the companies involved in transporting it do not have to pay into the general clean-up fund maintained by our Government. Which is totally ludicrous, given the greater damage cauised and the much more time consuming and expensive clean-up required to clean up a Heavy Crude Spill.	SO 15, RISK 03
Tim Kaiser	April 4, 2013	I believe we need to consider what this process does to the Canadian province of Alberta. Between polluting pristine rivers and destroying the lifeline of native people, I find it completely unacceptable.	CU 01
Tim Kovach	April 22, 2013	SEIS claims Keystone XL is in the national interest, as it reduces dependence on oil from Middle Eastern sources. Yet, the very market analysis included in your report suggests that most of the tar sands oil that would travel through the pipeline is destined for export to other countries, particularly the emerging economies of East Asia. How exactly does facilitating the export of oil from Canada to China, in order to benefit a handful of tar sands companies, benefit the American people?	PN 07
Tim Kovach	April 22, 2013	In addition, the State Department apparently tried to hide the fact that the consultants who completed the SEIS have business dealings with TransCanada and may have a financial interest in seeing this pipeline come to fruition, as a result.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tim Kovach	April 22, 2013	[The SEIS] study grievously downplays the threat that Keystone XL spills pose to the inland waterways. We already know that TransCanada's original Keystone pipeline has leaked at least 20 times since it began operating in 2011. Any one of these spills would become vastly more severe if it occurred from the proposed XL pipeline. Tar sands oil does not float, like normal crude. Instead, it sinks and becomes mixed with sediment, making it nearly impossible to clean up properly in the case of a spill. Furthermore, every time water or wind disrupts that sunken bitumen, it can release into the water, creating ever newer ecological disasters. The EPA recently noted that more than 50% of America's waterways are in poor shape for human use. Keystone XL threatens to exacerbate this challenge further.	RISK 26, RISK 08
Tim Krantz	April 4, 2013	I am a Professor of Environmental Studies at the University of Redlands, I have 35 years of EIA experience, writing and peer reviewing hundreds of EIS/Rs. It piecemeals the project into its component pipeline segments, Sections of the pipeline have already been constructed--a clear violation of NEPA and due process of review and public comment PRIOR to project construction.	LEG 04
Tim Krantz	April 4, 2013	The SEIS for the Keystone Pipeline Project is woefully inadequate. It piecemeals the project into its component pipeline segments, while ignoring the broader impacts on the Canadian boreal forest resources altogether; and down-playing the real and highly significant adverse environmental impacts the project would have on global climate change.	LEG 04
Tim Limon	April 22, 2013	Once the Ogallala aquifer has been contaminated itll be a disaster of epic proportions.	WRG 01
Tim Maker	April 17, 2013	Construction of the pipeline would enable the extraction of huge amounts of the dirtiest oil at at a time when the International Energy Agency, in its 2012 World Energy Outlook, warns that we must leave two thirds of known oil reserves in the ground if we are to avert climate catastrophe.	CLIM 05
Tim Mckeever	March 1, 2013	This is the dirtiest most energy intensive extraction process and the result is the dirtiest burning, hardest to clean up crude on the planet.	ACK
Tim Mckeever	March 15, 2013	Greatest of all would be the impact on our world climate. Tar Sands are the most energy intensive oil to produce and the dirtiest oil, once refined, to burn. If our nation is at all serious about addressing climate change, at all serious about looking our for our future generations, KXL will be denied.	CLIM 18
Tim Mckeever	March 15, 2013	Property rights would have to be infringed for the good of private corporations.	LEG 02
Tim Mckeever	March 15, 2013	It would insure that we would have to deal with spills and water contamination	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tim Montesonti	March 11, 2013	If we were only to put as much money and effort into clean energy as we are into the tar sands pipeline we would actually be helping our climate. Drop the pipeline and spend on clean energy. Make it necessary for corporations to have to support clean energy because that's all there would be. If clean energy was their only way to make money they would be in the clean energy business.	ALT 01
Tim Morris	April 9, 2013	There are already nearly 40,000 kilometres of oil pipelines crisscrossing the massive aquifer, including 2,000 kilometres in Nebraska alone. Some 24 billion barrels of oil have been pumped out of the ground in the area over the past century, with no evidence of health problems or aquifer contamination.	WRG 01, RISK 08
Tim Olson	April 4, 2013	The tar sands are going to be extracted one way or another. While I would prefer that we were talking about approving a clean energy project of the magnitude of the Keystone project, that's not the reality right now. In pursuing our "all of the above" energy strategy, I believe it is in the best interest of our country to approve the Keystone XL project and to ensure that it is built by American worker to the highest standards possible.	PN 10, PN 06
Tim Rife	April 22, 2013	Find another route. The Sandhills are a natural treasure and the Ogallala aquifer too precious to taint so the oil better go around than through this region.	ALT 06
Tim Stephens	April 17, 2013	The pipeline will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide.	CLIM 11
Tim Suter	March 2, 2013	I suggest that Table E-4 in the Executive Summary be modified to include the expected GHG emissions of each scenario, and include a comment on the potential to reduce the Keystone XL GHG emissions with the mitigations listed in 4.12.4.2.	EDIT
Tim White	March 28, 2013	Permitting the continent's biggest new CO2 mass-production facility accelerates climate destruction full speed ahead.	CLIM 14
Timothty Johnson	April 2, 2013	Transporting Canadian tar sands to refineries in Texas and Lousiana for export to the world market is not in our best interest. Not only does this country absorb the toxic air pollution, it potentially is exposed to another one of the many spills that are inveitable, it adds to the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere.	PN 07
Timothy Burns	April 16, 2013	Now is the time to commit to moving away from carbon-based fuels. A good first step in that direction would be to stop the Keystone XL pipeline from being completed.	PN 02
Timothy D Hinkle	April 22, 2013	This late in the game, we absolutely cannot further kick the can down the road to future generations to deal with climate change.	CLIM 14
Tina Arnold	April 20, 2013	We must focus on other sources of energy--not dirty, dangerous tar sands.	PN 02
Tina Gauthier	March 28, 2013	I understand your wish to get away from foreign oil, but allowing the destruction of the environment on our own continent is no way to accomplish your goal. We need, desperately, to get away from OIL, all of it.	PN 05
Tina Mizhir	April 9, 2013	The oil is going to be exported not used here to reduce our cost so why should we take these risks?	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tina Morrow	March 20, 2013	If a spill happens, and it will, regardless of all the promises and assurances made, we would have polluted the water source for millions of citizens. Spills happen. It's the nature of the oil business. On average, there is at least one (1) spill per day in the US. Are you both willing to risk the health and water of millions of people?	RISK 14
Tina Wener	March 10, 2013	We need to invest in renewable energy and change the entire cost structure of energy towards renewables.	PN 02
Tino Sanchez	April 18, 2013	We cannot support such a risk as our waterways are not nearly as vast as the ocean and we can see how horrible oil spills have been to regional environments even in the ocean. One idea, unless we have a 100% guarantee such as automatic shut off switches at the first loss of pressure caused by a leak in the pipeline and a spillage reservoir built alongside the pipeline to minimize oil spills between the shut off switches, then how can we proceed and hope that there will be no spill!! We cannot…	WRS 01, RISK 14
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	The (DEIS) ignored the pipeline's significant risk for toxic spills	ACK
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	The (DEIS) ignored the pipeline's…..catastrophic impacts on our ….. Water resources	ACK
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	The (DEIS) ignored the pipeline's….. catastrophic impacts on our climate	CLIM 12
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	the worst thing to come from passing this project, according to a consensus among financial analysts and oil executives would be the trigger for major expansion to tar sand development leading to a sizeable increase in greenhouse gas emissions.	CLIM 13, CLIM 12
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	The report also ignored the government's chief climate scientist's assertion that Keystone XL will spell 'game over' for the climate!	CLIM 14
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	according to NRDC (National Resource Defense Council) Keystone XL hasn't even developed a method to address clean up procedures.	RISK 08
Tlaloc Tokdua	March 14, 2013	The environmental review also failed to take into account TransCanada's poor operating record	RISK 25
Toby Rhodes	April 5, 2013	I am appalled to think that in this age of worsening climate change we would still consider dirtying our nest even more with this pipeline. We have the possibility of many non-poluting forms of energy so why would you do this.	CLIM 14, ALT 01
Toby Stover	April 22, 2013	In a time of dangerous climate change, the Keystone XL pipeline would propel us into higher carbon emissions. Instead we should be rapidly scaling up clean energy and renewable fuels while scaling down fossil fuel extraction.	ALT 01
Todd Berchek	April 2, 2013	Have we learned nothing since Deep Water Horizon? How many more neighborhoods like the one in Arkansas need to be flooded with dirty oil before something changes? The fact of the matter is not if the keystone pipeline will fail, but when.	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Todd Devlin	April 2, 2013	They [TransCanada] have listened and responded to local concerns. They have addressed impacts to local infrastructure. They have been available to address concerns and answer questions. Some of those concerned impacts include roads and public safety. We have received funding for public safety infrastructure improvement. We have a good road haul agreement.	ACK
Todd Devlin	April 2, 2013	…we represent the overwhelming consensus of our citizens that believe the construction of the Keystone XL will be a huge asset for funding public services, national security, and certainty of supply. 100% of the landowners that the planned pipeline crosses have signed the easements to do so. The increase in our tax base will be 300% because of this project one project. This is a huge benefit to our local citizens and the public at large.	PN 10
Todd Downing	March 31, 2013	This oil will NOT go to the American market. The main termination for the line is an EXPORT refinery where the product will be sold on the open market. Mostly as diesel which is what this type of oil is most suited for. This is a patently BAD deal for America. We take ALL the risk and receive little of the benefit.	PN 07
Todd Downing	April 9, 2013	Even if [Keystone XL] was constructed well -which it is not as photo evidence shows sunlight shining throw the welds - the KXL is an incredibly BAD deal for the US. Americans are being asked to take ALL of the risks for nearly NONE of the rewards. The line leads directly to refineries that main outlet is an EXPORT terminal. Tar sands oil is best suited for diesel fuel which most American cars do not run on and besides - much higher prices can be had by selling to Europe. There are nearly ZERO jobs. Sure there are some short term constructions jobs, but even the State Dept admitted that the line is likely to result in only 35 permanent US jobs. KXL is bad for the environment and bad for the American people.	PN 05, PD 06, PN 07
Todd Gardenhire	April 15, 2013	The draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude amongsts Gulf refineries. Even with these less attractive alternatives, rejecting KXL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands.	ACK
Todd Gentry	March 19, 2013	Both Canada and the United States need to move onto other ways of energies and making money.	ALT 01
Todd Hildebrandt	April 15, 2013	There are too many lies and far too many dangers to go ahead with Keystone XL.	ACK
Todd Russell	April 2, 2013	We need to get away from energy sources that distribute harmful carbon into the atmosphere.	ALT 01
Todd Russell	April 2, 2013	It is a risky venture with little benefit.I believe that the harmful environmental effects of burning carbon fuels has been underestimated and the earth's surface and air temperatures will threaten our way of life.	CLIM 14, CLIM 12

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom and Cathie Genung	April 16, 2013	http://priceofoil.org/2013/04/16/cooking-the-books-the-true-climate-impact-of-keystone-xl/ Cooking the Books: The True Climate Impact of Keystone XL	REF
Tom and Cathy Genung	March 27, 2013	TransCanada states that they changed the route, but they did not change the route as much as they changed the map. According to TransCanada's own map that was submitted to the State Department, the area it is planning to traverse is still in the sandhille, meanwhile, the word 'aquifer' has been dropped out of the discussion entirely.	LEG 16
Tom and Cathy Genung	March 27, 2013	The public does not know what kinds of chemicals are in the tar sands. This means first responders cannot plan in advance in case of a leak or spill.	RISK 12
Tom and Cathy Genung	March 27, 2013	2% of tar sands oil could leak into the aquifer, undetected,and poison the drinking and irrigation water	RISK 15
Tom Balliet	April 20, 2013	Pipelines leak and contaminate soil and water. Soil can be cleaned. Water tables cannot.	RISK 08
Tom Brawley	April 15, 2013	We know if it makes it to the Gulf Coast refineries it will be exported to the worst comsumers in the world. If this resource is going to be used then build the refineries here and use it here. It could give our industires and huge econonic advantage as well. If we "have to" do something, then at least do something that will benefit our country and not just create another new source of profit for the Oil Companies by exporting the resource at our risk.	PN 05
Tom Budler	April 22, 2013	1) How can anyone do an enviromental study if they do not know what chemical is added to the Tar Sand in the pipeline?	RISK 12
Tom Budler	April 22, 2013	How can any EMT or hospital take care of anyone without this [chemical] knowledge?	RISK 12
Tom Cooney	March 19, 2013	The pipeline and the expanded use of “dirty” oil is dangerous. PA should be expanding its use of alternative energy, and building the jobs of the future in energy. We should also be continuing the expanded use of natural gas, if we resolve the water source protection issues. I understand that all energy sources are on the table for usage in the near future. But use of this form of oil is a big step backward.	PN 02
Tom Cristo	April 22, 2013	This pipeline it not the way for America to have a clean energy future.	ALT 01
Tom D'Ambrosio	March 3, 2013	Wouldn't it be cheaper/faster/easier to simply build a refinery in Canada (or anyplace between Alberta and the Gulf Coast?) So TransCanada (the owners of the resulting "oil") gets to export its oil and reap to profit, while we get higher gas prices, toxic waste ponds and a leaky pipeline bisecting the nation and endangering ground water (and it WILL leak, as the sandy sludge "sandblasts" the thin metal pipeline transporting it.)	ALT 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom D'Ambrosio	March 3, 2013	I find myself gravely concerned that what is to be pumped through this pipeline being referred to as "oil" as it is not. It is in fact an oily sludge called "bitumin" that must be extracted from the sand and converted into oil. Thick bitumin sludge does not flow like oil, so it must be mixed with water... and LOTS of it (a minimum ratio of 3:1) to liquify it to the point it can be "pumped" like oil. That's a horrendous waste of fresh water at a time when record heat means record drought. Upon arrival at its destination, much of the water must then be extracted before the refining process may begin. The waste water... now a muddy chemical sludge, is dumped into giant "tailing ponds" of toxic waste that seep into the ground water, poison the soil for centuries, and kill off local wildlife.	CU 07
Tom D'Ambrosio	March 3, 2013	American refineries will have to give up roughly 15% of their existing refining capacity to convert this sludge into diesel, diverting gasoline production intended for the U.S. market to diesel production for export. Less gasoline being produced means HIGHER prices, not lower.	PN 04
Tom D'Ambrosio	March 3, 2013	The solution to America's energy problems is not to further embed our dependence on fossil fuels from one of the worst sources of oil on the planet, for an energy supply that would last only a few years (not "100+" as claimed), wreak havoc with our environment, increase gas prices and not produce anything close to a significant number of jobs to justify such a costly project.	PN 08
Tom D'Ambrosio	March 3, 2013	Based on my own research, it is quite clear that the KXL would not only be a environmental catastrophe, but would not produce an abundance of jobs as many have claimed, and would in fact lead to higher gas prices (also in direct contradiction to stated claims) to go along with the aforementioned ecological disaster.	SO 02
Tom Ellis	March 16, 2013	Why are we about to build a pipeline to Texas when we could build a refinery MUCH CHEAPER in North Dakota?	ALT 08
Tom Fletcher	April 22, 2013	The pipeline should not go through the aquafer. If the pipeline is absolutely necessary it should be routed around or over our coveted and very critical main water supply.	ALT 06
Tom Graham	April 14, 2013	…promote renewable energy. Wind , solar offer safe options than extracting every last bit of oil from the earth. The government needs to lead here not be a bystander.	SO 05
Tom Hebert	March 3, 2013	I DO NOT support the building of the Keystone Pipeline.	ACK
Tom Hebert	March 3, 2013	Despite environmental issues, there are no guarantees that the oil will be refined for consumption in the United States, and would simply be put on the world market, further reducing any perceived positive impact its construction may have.	PN 04
Tom Hebert	March 3, 2013	The State Department report itself states that the economic advantages to the United States would be minimal and temporary.	SO 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom Heinz	March 15, 2013	I think the transport and processing of tar sands is environmentally disastrous and inefficient. It also has the potential for disastrous accidents paralleling the BP oil spill.	RISK 06, CLIM 12
Tom Lombardo	April 4, 2013	Oil from tar sands REQUIRES the destruction of the last untouched boreal forest on Earth. Not only will it commit us to more decades of burning oil, the deforestation involved will also release carbon into the atmosphere and further degrade what remains of wilderness.	CLIM 06
Tom Lynch	April 22, 2013	We need to insure the water supply in this country remains safe for our use.	WRG 01
Tom Mallard	April 2, 2013	We have to stop using gasoline and fossil diesel, say no to fossil-methane, aka "natural gas" because CH4 is 22-times more potent a greenhouse gas so pipe leakage makes using it worse than crude oil to burn because of the leakage, we have to drop CO2 down from the Pliocene levels, to 285-ppm is my take to have something to pass onto the children of today.	PN 02
Tom Mann	March 29, 2013	The decision about the pipeline should be based on long-term climate change dangers rather that short-term environmental impacts, …	CLIM 12
Tom Mann	March 29, 2013	The decision about the pipeline should be based on long-term climate change dangers rather that short-term environmental impacts, much less creating jobs.	PN 05
Tom Mate	April 13, 2013	Let's see, Prince William Sound, Alaska, the Gulf of Mexico, and now Mayflower, Arkansas, why do I need to explain the reasons to stop Keystone XL? Maybe because there is a "debate" over whether or not Keystone should be built while it is actually being built.	RISK 10, PN 05
Tom Matthews	April 21, 2013	Analyses in Section 4.13 suggest that crude oil releases that do reach surface waters are expected to be no greater than 1,214 feet from the release point; however, releases to a river will not float on water indefinitely and have the potential to be submerged introducing additional potential impacts and recovery challenges.	RISK 08
Tom Matthews	April 21, 2013	I believe these excerpts clearly highlight why this pipeline is a major threat to our valuable water resources. The remote northern parts of Phase IV of the Keystone XL Pipeline, identified in the report as being especially at risk, are located in the Missouri River basin. In 2008 the approximate economic value of crops and livestock produced in the Missouri River basin was 100 billion dollars (http://missouri.crces.org/).	SO 12
Tom Nass	March 26, 2013	Has anyone asked "What Emergency Measures" are in place for a possible Break, Sabotage or Rupture of this XL Pipe Line? How much product is contained in a linear foot of Pipe? How many Shut-Off Valves will be in place on the Pipeline? How far apart will they be? How long will it take for someone from "Operations" to get to the farthermost of these Valves for a Emergency manual Shut-off? The potential for a BP type Spill on the land, instead of in the water, is REAL.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom Noonen	March 17, 2013	If there were no other alternatives but this, then maybe I would understand the need to do something like this. But it isn't necessary...there are a lot of other options on the table that are worth exploring, developing and implementing...Invest in a NASA style mission to tackle the problem of energy storage so the power created by wind and solar energy can be used efficiently. Grow Hemp for biomass, and the hemp seed oil can help to end our dependence on drilling the earth for profit. Invest in pyrolysis plants.	PN 02
Tom Peacock	March 10, 2013	If we continue to advance the use of fossil fuel sources w/o putting a price on the effects of user emissions at he producer source we're simply giving the associated industries the same go on free goods without fully covering the cost effects of their use. The recently introduced Sanders/Boxer bill is the right direction to go.	PN 05
Tom Prunier	April 4, 2013	If we can't clean up the Michigan spill how will we clean up any XL spill	RISK 29
Tom Reeves	April 20, 2013	Most of the foreign crude oil imports coming into the U.S. are by sea and, therefore, are highly vulnerable to significant, long-term interruption during a time of national crisis. Some supply sources (e.g., the Gulf of Hormuz) are also highly vulnerable. Those imports are higher cost, because of the higher waterborne transportation cost, than the imports coming from Canada would be. It’s a 45-day tanker trip from Saudi Arabia to the U.S. Gulf of Mexico where most of the imports arrive. If the Gulf of Hormuz were blocked, crude oil supply from that part of the world could easily be disrupted – by mining the Strait of Hormuz or by sinking ONE ship in that Strait. Iran has increased its capability to block the strait, and has threatened to do so; Iran could thereby halt the supply of crude oil from that region by sinking one VLCC (Very Large Crude Carrier).	PN 01
Tom Reeves	April 20, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline: (1) will enhance the security of our nation’s crude oil supply, (2) could create more than 40,000 much U.S. jobs (U.S. State Department estimate), (3) should reduce the cost of gasoline at the pump for U.S. consumers, (4) by securing crude oil supply, encourage energy companies to build refineries inland in the Mid-West (most refineries are now located on U.S. shores where foreign imports are available), which would reduce (a) the cost of gasoline to Mid-U.S. markets (by eliminating transportation from refineries in the Gulf to Mid-Western markets) and (b) refinery exposure to the risk of severe weather (hurricanes) and enemy attack, and (5) would be a big “win” for U.S. consumers and U.S. national security.	PN 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom Reeves	April 20, 2013	We also believe the Keystone XL Project is in our nation's best interest in that the Keystone XL Pipeline, when it is completed, will assure security of energy supply in the event our nation should become involved in a national conflict. Without a secure supply of energy our nation and all its citizens would be placed at risk of serious harm. The Keystone XL Pipeline will enhance the security of our nation’s energy supply.	PN 10
Tom Ronan	April 15, 2013	Don't use jobs as an excuse because instead of this pipeline, we should invest in clean, green energy jobs which would far out do the jobs created by the pipeline	SO 05
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	I am categorically against the Keystone XL pipeline, or any other action that facilitates tar sands development and burning	ACK
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	There are many negative issues around the continued development of the Canadian oil sands. (…) from killing a vast forest, to treating our atmosphere like an open sewer.	ACK
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	They [tar sands development and burning] are the MOST energy intensive of fossil fuels, making their extraction and consumption detrimental to America.	ACK
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	While we have likely blown through 2C already, the tar sands ALONE represent 1/2 of the TOTAL carbon we can release before officially passing that dangerous threshold: "If the crude does stay underground, that will be a good thing for the climate. The tar sands are thought to contain as much as 240Gt of carbon, about half of what scientists say we can burn to stay below 2 degree Celsius of warming." Source for quotes: https://s3.amazonaws.com/s3.350.org/images/kxl-own-words-v2.pdf	CLIM 05
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	As Dr. James Hansen says they [tar sands development and burning] are "game over" for the climate. Dr. Hansen has been prescient so far in his climate work, and he continues to be with this warning.	CLIM 14
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	But the one issue that hurts us today, and our children tomorrow, is creating a new super-greenhouse gasoline for all of us to burn in our cars and trucks when we should be going the exact opposite direction.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom Scheel	March 4, 2013	Specifically, your report states "that approval or denial of the proposed Project is unlikely to have a substantial impact on the rate of development in the oil sands, or on the amount of heavy crude oil refined in the Gulf Coast area" However, the industry itself reports: ""“And conditions are not improving — pointing to an even weaker first quarter as Canadian prices continue to weaken. ‘If this persists it really points to (the first quarter) as being a really, really ugly quarter for heavy oil producers…’” “But for the growth to continue, all the proposed export pipeline capacity and more will need to be built, and soon, according to CIBC World Markets institutional equity research executive director Andrew Potter. ‘Even if you build every single pipe that’s on the table right now...you’re still short pipeline capacity,’ he noted.” Andrew Potter, Executive Director of Institution Equity Research, CIBC World Markets (among many other industry analysis which directly contradicts the State Department report)	PN 11
Tom Sciacca	April 9, 2013	Some part of already known hydrocarbon resources must be left in the ground to avoid climate change catastrophe. It makes sense to leave the most damaging portion of the hydrocarbon inventory, which includes coal and tar sands.	CLIM 14
Tom Scott Reno	March 15, 2013	From top to bottom of our country this corporation will send their pipeline over/under a lot of private property that will have to be confiscated in one way or another to allow this pipe - with all its mess - to pass through. Some property owners will be willing, others not - but by right of eminent domain it will take their land. This is deplorable.	LEG 02
Tom Scott Reno	March 15, 2013	The average American will reap no benefit from this deal, but the oil company executives - and some government officials certainly will. It will cause a big mess wherever it goes and as a tax-paying citizen. Shame on you if you give it pass, it is not right action. If the excuse is to provide jobs, let them find jobs in alternative energy development! Solar and wind development will do more good and provide more jobs. There is no excuse for this pipeline running through our land.	PN 05
Tom Sevick	April 7, 2013	The potential incremental damage to the environment is not worth the sacrifice to the people in this country who have struggled with difficult times since 2007 and who have no hope that the times will be getting better in the foreseeable future.	PN 05
Tom Strumolo	April 22, 2013	It hurts the US economy in favor of the Canadian and Chinese economies and helps the bottom line of the international fossil fuel companies that pay no US taxes.	PN 01
Tom Tetherow	April 9, 2013	Our water is WAY more precious than that damn tar sands oil	ACK
Tom Tetherow	April 9, 2013	If there is even the remotest chance of a leak, it's too big a risk	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tom Umrath	April 11, 2013	to strengthen the nation's energy security and build a robust, stable, and predictable energy infrastructure in North America.	PN 10
Tom Weitzel	April 22, 2013	The whole idea is flawed. It is not a matter of IF it will leak oil into the aquifer; it is WHEN!	ACK
Tom White	March 13, 2013	Canada's oil sands industry has always been carefully and responsibly developed with very comprehensive regulatory oversight: 1) The industry is aggressively pursuing continuous improvement in all aspects of environmental performance. 2) Oil sand sproducers are improving performance as measured by emissions. 3) Producers are required to support world-class environmental monitoring to ensure that overall air, water, and land impacts remain below highly protective environmental thresholds. 4) Oil sands producers are required to reclaim and restore land impacted by development to a standard equivalent to pre-disturbance.	ACK
Tom White	March 13, 2013	The pipeline will improve America's energy security by replacing oil imports from less friendly and less secure suppliers such as Venezuela and the Middle East	PN 01
Tom White	March 13, 2013	The pipeline will generate economic opportunity and jobs along the route and throughout the US.For example, Haws Corporation has provided goods and services to a major Canadian Petroleum Producer in recent years, and has generated over $100k worth of contracts.	SO 09
Tom Yager	April 22, 2013	Why would we allow Canada to build a pipeline across the U.S. to the ports in Southeast Texas, if the oil is not for U.S. consumption?	PN 07
Tomoko Murphy	April 13, 2013	we must improve the solar and wind energy production	PN 02
Toni Everly	March 16, 2013	Keystone XL pipeline is in the national interest..Keystone XL will create thousands of jobs here at home and serve as a long-term investment in communities where our energy manufacturers and refineries will be benefit from this vital supply of reliable energy.	PN 10
Toni Maira	April 16, 2013	THIS PROJECT IS ONLY ENRICHING CANADA AND THE EXPORT COUNTRIES THE OIL IS GOING TO. THERE IS NO MAJOR AMOUNT OF JOBS GENERATED FROM THIS INSTALLATION AND ONCE THE PROJECT IS COMPLETE, THERE WILL BE ONLY A HANDFUL OF MAINTANENCE CREWS….	SO 02, PN 07
Toni Nordan	March 11, 2013	The media does not report that this is Canadian oil which goes to the international market. The U.S. will not benefit from this oil.	PN 07
Toni Nordan	March 11, 2013	Also the number of jobs created is vastly over-rated.	SO 02
Toni Semple	April 5, 2013	The Pacific rim gets yet more air pollution. How does this help America?	ACK
Toni Semple	April 5, 2013	Why set up so many mid- and western states as a conduit for Canadians to sell dirty oil to China? Canada risks nothing and we risk everything.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Toni Semple	April 5, 2013	The jobs touted for construction of this pipeline are TEMPORARY--not the kind needed to help pull us out of economic doldrums. And how many will actually go to U.S. citizens rather than Canadians?	SO 09, SO 04
Tonia Moya	March 10, 2013	In terms of economic value - the potential cost of disaster relief, for example for coastal cities, as a result of the rising of sea and emission levels, not to mention the cost of human life and environmental damage, would far exceed the profits made by a few from the proposed XL pipeline.	PN 05, CLIM 17
Tony G Robinson	March 16, 2013	Selfish big oil prefers to risk fresh water reserves from Alberta to the Texas gulf instead of building the refinery in Alberta where it belongs.	ALT 08
Tony G Robinson	March 16, 2013	Tar sands bitumen must be piped under heat and pressure using very toxic emulsifiers. Those toxins prevent wqorkers from stopping a pipeline spill until they dissipate. That can take days.	RISK 11
Tony Hoang	March 31, 2013	Enough of these projects that continue to ruin our planet, lets think sustainable, lets think of projects that do not hurt people, keep your promise to us President Obama, clean energy is where our future is as a nation. Let's show the rest of the world that our country has the capacity to care about our entire nation and it's people and it's environment.	PN 02
Tony Jordan	April 13, 2013	Developement of the Keystone XL project is just so wrong on every level from the destruction of the Boreal forest of Canada, that will wipe out habitat for dozens of endangered species to the inreased carbon polution extraction will produce.	ACK
Tony Jordan	April 13, 2013	The extraordinary potential for another major spill like the ones that have already occured recently in other Keystone pipelines currently in operation would be catastrophic to the aquifers through which it must pass regardless of what route it takes	RISK 07
Tony Martin	March 30, 2013	I find it hard to believe anyone could think the development of tar sands would be an answer to our energy crisis.	PN 04
Tony Povilitis; Dusti Becker	April 2, 2013	The United States currently has no comprehensive program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to levels consistent with climate security. This means that the XL pipeline will contribute to damage to the human environment and the biosphere in ways unlikely to be offset by other actions or events, contrary to the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act and to principles of responsible government.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tony Povilitis; Dusti Becker	April 2, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline, if approved by the State Department, would emit substantial greenhouse gases during its construction and operation. The pipeline will transport high carbon fossil fuels, thereby facilitating their production and burning. The claim that Keystone XL would not have a significant impact on climate because these fossil fuels will be transported through other means and ultimately burned in any case erroneously presupposes environmental and political approval of these alternatives.	CLIM 13
Tony Povilitis; Dusti Becker	April 2, 2013	This pipeline would become one of numerous projects approved or sanctioned by the U.S. government that contribute to greenhouse gas emissions and collectively to climate change. ...the cumulative effect of these projects is very significant, and will, unless offset by a comprehensive national program to abate greenhouse gas emissions, increase the risk of catastrophic climate change.	CLIM 14
Tony Robert Blankers	April 17, 2013	Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.	CU 04
Tori Yoder	March 21, 2013	Now is the time to be working to MOVE PAST OUR OIL DEPENDANCE by REJECTING the old ways of continual extraction of finite resources and EMBRACING sustainable energy solutions such as wind, hydro, and geothermal energy.	ALT 01
Tori Yoder	March 21, 2013	I do not trust reports written by people who have worked for companies such as ExonnMobil, Chevron, Shell Oil, and Koch Industries. Phony science should not be the deciding factor on this decision.	PRO 01
Tori Yoder	March 21, 2013	Mining the tar sands in Canada will have disastrous effects on our environment: oil leaks, the destruction of natural habitat, and increased greenhouse gases.	RISK 07, CLIM 14
Tory Ewing	April 22, 2013	After the example of all the hundreds of oil spills (large and small) from the Alaska pipeline we cant take the chance of an oil spill polluting the Ogalalla Aquifer under Nebraska.	RISK 14
Tostanoski, Deedee	March 6, 2013	I assume that Keystone has done everything in their power to anticipate and prevent spills; however, the question remains – what is the impact when a spill DOES occur, as it will, and how will that impact be mitigated by Keystone?	RISK 08
Toussaint Liberator	April 15, 2013	In addition to the environmental havoc that will be wreaked by this approval, there are homes and people of the Native American reservations of minnesota, north and south dakota, montana, and so forth whose homes, whose lands lie directly in the path of the pipeline.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
'tr' Rose	March 21, 2013	Right now, there are three VIABLE PATENTS in our U.S. Patent Office by Howard Johnson that have been HIDDEN THERE for a long, long while! We ALREADY have the necessary AC/DC technology to make this happen very, very quickly. Another side benefit of this form of energy is that it would eliminate ALL MASSIVE POWER OUTAGES due to our new INCLEMENT CLIMATE because EACH SYSTEM IS TOTALLY INDEPENTDENT of each other!	ACK
'tr' Rose	March 26, 2013	Why not use the American People's VERY OWN, FAR LESS POLLUTANT Natural Gas for both HOME & AUTOMOBILE and ultimately CONVERT to the [explicit] NEAR FREE, 100% NON-POLLUTANT Magnetically Driven Electrical Energy?????	PN 02
Tracey Miller	April 22, 2013	Please do not allow the pipeline to built along its current planned route. Our water resource is too valuable and no matter how responsible this company may be the next company 50 years down the road may not care about Nebraska.	ACK
Tracey Schuster	April 4, 2013	There is nothing safe about the handling of this dangerous material and the industry has a horrible past and recent record of being able to prevent disasters and clean up from them.	RISK 14
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	Even with these less attractive alternatives [rail and barge], rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport.	ACK
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	Alternative transport methods - namely rail and barge- will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions.	ALT 07
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	Furthermore, the likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods.	ALT 07
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands.	PN 06
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	By supporting domestic production and oil imports from out ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security.	PN 10
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy.	PN 10
Traci Boyd	April 2, 2013	These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Tracie Anderson	April 12, 2013	Please keep your climate promises and reject the Keystone XL pipeline.	CLIM 14
Tracie Anderson	April 12, 2013	I believe that the few jobs created by this project are temporary but the damage done to our environment is permanent.	PN 05
Tracy Johnson	April 22, 2013	Should there be a spill, and no doubt there will be, how will these small cemetaries be protected	LU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tracy Johnson	April 22, 2013	Without the protective equipment that the clean-up workers have. Will houses needs to be demolished because of the toxic fumes that will linger in the air and come in the houses, plant themselves in carpet and furniture, settle in the dishes and glasses and pots and pans, adhere to the painted walls, and stick on the clothes?	RISK 07
Tracy Johnson	April 22, 2013	There are countless smaller cities and towns all along the purposed route that get their water from wells. How is TransCanada going to protect this water?	WRG 01
Tracy Ouellette	April 5, 2013	We need our government to show the leadership that protects our health and natural resources far into the future. We need our leaders to help lead us away from fossil fuels, and this is the first step. We need our leaders to think beyond the easy short term profits to the long term health of our economy and environment.	PN 05
Tracy Tiffany	March 10, 2013	We aren't getting cheaper fuel prices by buying our petroleum at home. The oil companies in the U.S. have a vertical monopoly on production no matter what the price of crude. I worked on an environmental impact assessment years ago for the Audubon Society in Battle Creek, MI. What I realized then is that we need to protect the oil from depletion as much as we need to protect wildlife. We don't have to rush to use it up. It isn't going anywhere, it isn't going to go extinct. Let it be.	ACK
Tracy Wiebeck	March 18, 2013	we wouldn't use the oil in this country, it would all go to overseas markets.	PN 07
Tradition Hardware	April 21, 2013	The massive electrical usage of the pumping stations of Keystone XL pipeline has been discussed very little in the media and not at all at the State Department Hearing in Nebraska on April 18. This energy expenditure must surely be considered in the equations used to determine if the development of the tarsands, from the strip mining to extract them, to the final time they are refined in China so they are of use, actually uses more energy than the tarsands themselves provide…In Montana alone there would be a 756% increase in the state's electrical usage from the 474.7 million kWh yearly use of the 6 pumping stations that have a combined 17 pumps with a combined 110,500 horsepower. (source:Attachment 3-Draft Keystone XL Pipeline Rate Impact Study and Response to Public Comments). This represents the power usage of only one state on the XL route…Farming in Nebraska depends on irrigation. Center pivot irrigation relies heavily upon electricity. I question whether enough power exists in our current electrical grid to supply the pipeline's enomous appetite for electricity. Many farmers are already on "standby", where they can only irrigate from 11:00PM until 7:00AM the following morning, therefore conserving electricity to provide power for air conditioning during the peak demand hours of the hot afternoons and early evenings.	PD 08, CLIM 02, PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Trainham, James	March 4, 2013	I am writing to support approving the Keystone XL pipeline. Such approval is in the best interest of the United States and the countries of North America.	ACK
Trainham, James	March 4, 2013	I will add on further comment related to the "dirty oil" issue: Venezuelan oil is very heavy crude and the Canadian Tar Sands once diluted to enable it to flow in a pipeline will have very similar carbon content. U.S. refineries on the Gulf Coast are set up to handle these heavy crudes and the by products are asphalt and petroleum coke (used in steel mfg.).	ACK
Trainham, James	March 4, 2013	So the U.S. should take advantage of the jobs created and continue to work on renewable substitutes.	ALT 01
Trainham, James	March 4, 2013	With all the political turmoil in the Middle East and the unfriendly relationship the U.S. has with Venezuela, energy security is an important reason to give approval.	PN 10
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-25 - 34 Line: Section DEIS Text: Except for agreeing that Keya Paha County has a meaningfully greater low income population, the DSEIS and SER do not agree on any other component of the EJ analysis. Comment: The SER used the FEIS methodology which analyzed all census blocks within, or partially within, a 4 mile-wide corridor centered over the CL using 2 evaluation criteria - 50% and meaningfully greater - and analyzed for minority and low-income populations within the census blocks. The same criteria and analysis were performed at the county level. The DSEIS used census block groups and only analyzed for those groups. The DSEIS does not include the analysis for counties. It also included areas outside the 4 mile-wide corridor. This inconsistent approach potentially skews the analysis.	EJ 06
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 1.8-7 Line: 7 DEIS Text: 11. The Supplemental EIS should provide an analysis of the Pelly Amendment … Comment: Comment: Pelly Amendment issues are not specifically addressed in the DSEIS.	LEG 01
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-18 Line: 2 DSEIS Text: …surface water features could serve as potable water sources, and spilled material could threaten water supplies for the local population Transcanada comment:This scenario is unlikely to occur and should acknowledge that the ERP prioritizes protection of surface water potable water sources and, therefore, would mitigate any potential impact. It should contain a reference to Section 4.13.5.2, Spill Response.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-18; Line: 16-19; DSEIS Text: The proposed Project would temporarily impact approximately 408 acres of habitat and permanently impact approximately 221 acres of habitat in South Dakota, and would temporarily impact approximately 727 acres and permanently impact approximately 372 acres of habitat in Nebraska (1,768 acres total). Transcanada comment: The referenced underlined number of acres of habitat and impacts is not consistent with the BA (BA page 3.0-42, Table 3.1-5).	TES 01
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-36; Line: 3; DSEIS Text: Currently, there is insufficient information … Transcanada comment: Comment: Describe why there is insufficient information at present and be more precise about WAPA/RUS prospective NEPA duty	TES 01
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.8-33; Line: 21; DSEIS Text: In Nebraska, NGPC recommends HDD methods for any stream crossings occupied by these minnows, as open-cut crossings typically cause effects from increased turbidity and suspended sediment (such as avoidance and gill irritation). Transcanada comment: Keystone has initiated discussions with NGPC regarding crossing methods for streams containing threatened or endangered species, and will continue coordination with the NGPC following the completion of field surveys at streams potentially containing these species. Keystone recommends that this be left as an option to use the open cut dry crossing or HDD methods to accommodate site-specific conditions that may be present at the time of construction because both methods are protective of the species and their habitat.	TES 06
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-15; Line: 35-37; DSEIS Text: Down-shield lights if HDD occurs at night during the spring and fall whooping crane migrations, in areas that provide suitable habitat. Transcanada comment: Consistent with the BA, section 3.1.3.4, page 3.0-24, and also other sections of the DSEIS that address listed species, there should be a statement that: [T]he proposed Project could affect, but is not likely to adversely affect whooping cranes.	TES 07
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-54; Line: 18-32; DSEIS Text: Incremental loss or alteration of black-tailed prairie dog colonies through prior project construction and operation in addition to similar effects from the proposed Project could lead to cumulative impacts on the black-footed ferret and the mountain plover in Montana and South Dakota. However, the black-tailed prairie dog colonies that would be crossed by the proposed Project were determined to be too small to support black-footed ferrets. Short, medium, or long-term loss or alteration of native grassland and sagebrush habitats through the spread of invasive plants in Montana and South Dakota from previous projects in addition to similar impacts from the proposed Project could contribute to cumulative habitat impacts for federal candidate-for listing birds, including the greater sage-grouse and Sprague's pipit. Transcanada comment: Not mentioned in FEIS or the BA.	TES 10

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.8-21; Line: 12; DSEIS Text: Avoid working at night in Tripp County, if possible, because the American Burying Beetle is attracted to light at night. If working at night cannot be avoided, only use lighting between September 1st and June 1st Transcanada comment: There will be certain operations during construction that need to be completed the day they are started (i.e., testing of the pipeline, HDD operations, etc.) and therefore Keystone will need the ability to work at night in selected locations until the work is completed. In addition, security considerations require lighting at certain facilities such as contractor yards, camps, pipe yards through the night. Any impacts associated with these facilities on ABB will be addressed in the USFWS Biological Opinion.	TES 13
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-56; Line: 11; DSEIS Text: there are potential impacts to the ABB associated with the concurrent construction of the GCP Transcanada comment:Why is this included? Whooping crane discussion also brought in	TES 13
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-19; Line: 14; DSEIS Text: During operations, lights associated with aboveground facilities may attract American burying beetles, particularly if the lights emit wave lengths in the ultraviolet spectrum. Facilities associated with the pipeline would generally not be lighted, although a single light would be used above pump station doors for employee safety. One pump station in Holt County, Nebraska occurs in habitat within the known or suspected range of the American burying beetle. This is not expected to cause a substantial issue with regard to American burying beetle attraction. Transcanada comment: As described in the Biological Assessment, Keystone has made the commitment to use sodium vapor lighting and / or down shielding at pump stations located in American Burying Beetle habitat. Facilities in ABB habitat will use a single light above pump station doors as well as a single low output light at the main entrance gate for public safety. At all pump stations, station access gates and equipment shelters incorporate a single photocell controlled light which provides for safe access by operating personnel during hours of darkness.	TES 13
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-23; Line: 6th bullet; DSEIS Text:Restore wet meadow habitat using a seed mix approved by the NRCS and USFWS. Transcanada comment: An appropriate seed mix for wet meadow habitat was approved by the NRCS, USFWS, NGPC, UNL, and Keystone at the USFWS Nebraska Field Office in Grand Island, Nebraska on September 22, 2011. No further coordination is required.	VEG 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.8-23; Line: 7th bullet; DSEIS Text: Keystone will monitor restoration of construction-related impacts to wet meadow habitats identified as suitable for the western prairie fringed orchid consistent with USACE guidelines which indicate monitoring for a 5-year period for successful re-establishment of wetland vegetation Transcanada comment: Keystone will monitor restoration of construction-related impacts to wet meadow habitats identified as suitable for the western prairie fringed orchid consistent with USACE NWP requirements. The USACE guidelines do not specify a time period for monitoring reclamation.	WET 03
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-12; Line: 15-18; DSEIS Text:In an effort to avoid and minimize impacts to sensitive wetlands that may provide important habitat resources for federally listed species, the USFWS recommends that HDD be considered during the permitting process when crossing streams and wetland habitats containing high diversity and unique aquatic species assemblages (USFWS 2012b). Comment: Keystone will acquire permits from the USACE to cross wetlands. During the course of that permitting, the USACE will coordinate with appropriate agencies before issuing permits. Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements.	WET 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.4-1; 4.4-2; Line: 33-41; 1-6; 7- 15: DSEIS Text: Wetlands within the proposed Project area were mapped using a combination of wetland data from various TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP (Keystone) sources, including the 2011 Final EIS, the TransCanada Keystone XL Pipeline Project: Supplemental Environmental Report for the Nebraska Reroute (exp Energy Services Inc. 2012a), the TransCanada Keystone Pipeline Project: Environmental Report (exp Energy Services Inc. 2012b), and additional 2012 field data gathered by Keystone during the development of this Supplemental EIS document. Wetland impacts described in previous Project reports relied primarily on field data, aerial photo interpretation, and National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data (USFWS 2012a). For the purpose of the DSEIS, wetland data presented in the above sources were supplemented by two additional national wetland datasets: National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD [Fry 2011]), and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Gap Analysis Program (GAP) (USGS 2011). In addition, a desktop analysis of 2010 National Aerial Imagery Program (NAIP) orthoimagery (NAIP 2010 and 2011), National Hydrography Data (USGS 2012), and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil data (UGSG 2012) was used to check the quality of the wetland data from the above sources. Potential wetland impacts for the DSEIS were analyzed by assessing the area of wetland overlapped by the proposed Project area. Field and desktop analysis data provided by Keystone were given priority, followed by wetland coverage in the NWI, NLCD, and GAP datasets, respectively. Data from these four sources were analyzed using Arc Info GIS software whereby wetland data were mapped in the following order of priority: Keystone wetland data (field data and desktop data), NWI wetlands, NLCD wetland communities, and GAP wetland communities. When more than one dataset provided wetland coverage for a given location, overlapping acreages were clipped (removed) to avoid double-counting. No further edits to the wetland boundaries and acreages resulting from the combined datasets were made. Comment: Wetland types in the proposed Project area (Table 3.4.1-1) were identified by completing field surveys and reviewing aerial photography. Wetlands and waters of the U.S. were delineated using either field surveys or desktop analysis in accordance with direction provided by the appropriate USACE districts. Wetland data were collected for routine on-site delineations (USACE 1987) where required, following Great Plains regional guidance (USACE 2008b) for the Steele City Segment, and Atlantic and Gulf Coast Plain regional guidance (USACE 2008a) for the Gulf Coast Segment, and Houston Lateral. Section 3.4.1, page 3.4-2 Keystone's review used survey results for findings and nonfindings to identify and eliminate desktop identified features along the pipeline route. Field surveys used USACE Corp of Engineer standards to identify the presence or absence of wetlands.	WET 10
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-5; DSEIS Text: Comment: Comment: This page suggests, especially the chart, that conversion from one type of wetland to another is a permanent wetland impact. This is not the case.	WET 11

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Comment: Throughout the executive summary facts do not align with the main body of the DSEIS. For instance, page ES-16 states construction would start in 2015, this is incorrect. Please cross-check Executive Summary with the text of the main document.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 1.3-2, Line: 12 DEIS Text: Add: The Secretary of State has … Comment: Add: "been delegated"1.3-2	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 1.4-7, Line: 13 DEIS Text: Add: … significant changes to petroleum … Comment: Add: delete: "significant"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 1.4-65, Line: 26 DEIS Text: Add: This is because there is an active flow of gasoline, and other clean products, from the Gulf Coast into the Midwest, mainly via the Explorer pipeline. As a consequence, Midwest product prices are derived from Gulf Coast prices, both of which are in turn driven by international (rather than U.S. inland) crude oil prices. Enabling (additional volumes of) WCSB crudes to flow to the Gulf Coast would not change this dynamic. Comment: Add: Approval of the project will provide USGC refiners access to the less expensive Canadian heavy crude (quality comparable to the declining Mexican and Venezuelan heavy crude). This in effect will force imported heavy crude to delink from international benchmark crude price to compete with Canadian crude, which is WTI based priced, at the USGC. Competition in a free market will result in better prices for the consumer.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Section 2.1 The language from the FEIS relative to route refinements is missing and should be inserted. Comment: Keystone would make minor adjustments to the proposed pipeline alignment during final design based on additional information obtained from field surveys or landowners. These minor route variations (micro-alignments) could be implemented to address specific landowner concerns, void certain features (such as structures, wells, or irrigation systems), minimize impacts to environmental resources, or facilitate construction in such areas as steep terrain or waterbody crossings..	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-8, last para DEIS Text: In addition, a construction worker camp could be required in northern Nebraska to avoid occupying all of the limited available rental units and hotel rooms during construction. Comment: A construction work camp will be required in Nebraska. Even if all of limited rental units and hotel rooms were available during construction, there would not be enough units to accommodate the entire construction workforce.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-19, Line:19 DEIS Text: Keystone would use down-lighting at the pump stations wherever possible to minimize impacts to wildlife Comment: Keystone did not make a commitment to use this mitigative measure at all pump stations. As pointed out in the Biological Assessment, Keystone has made the commitment to use sodium vapor lighting and/or down shielding at pump stations within American burying beetle habitat.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-28, Table 2.1-11 DEIS Text: Construction Camp Permits and Regulations Comment: County Ingress/Egress permits (non environmental road permits) are required for the camps.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-29, Fig. 2.1.5-1 DEIS Text: As shown in Figure 2.1.5-1, a total of eight temporary construction camps would be established. It is currently anticipated that four construction camps would be needed in Montana (McCone, Valley [2], and Fallon counties), three camps would be required in South Dakota (Tripp, Harding, and Meade counties), and one camp would be required in Nebraska (Holt county) (see Appendix H, 2012 Biological Assessment). Comment: A total of eight temporary construction camps would be established. It is currently anticipated that four construction camps would be needed in Montana (McCone, Valley [2], and Fallon counties), three camps would be required in South Dakota (Tripp, Harding, and Meade counties), and one camp would be required in Nebraska (Holt county) (see Appendix H, 2012 Biological Assessment). Figure 2.1.5-1 shows the anticipated location of 6 of the 8 camps. The final number and size of camps…..	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-31, Fig. 2nd para under Use of Camps DEIS Text: Based on the current construction schedule, the camps would operate in standby mode during the winter (from December through March or April). Comment: Depending upon the final construction schedule, the camps would either be operated in standby mode for the winter, be decommissioned and removed, or be relocated to another spread.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-35, Line: 21 DEIS Text: The pipeline would be constructed of high-strength, X70 steel pipe that would be mill-inspected by an authorized owner's inspector and mill-tested to American Petroleum Institute (API) 5L (API 5L2) specification requirements. Comment: Change Material Grade to X70M. Pipe is manufactured to API5L 44th edition.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-36, Table 2.1-12 DEIS Text: Pipe Design Parameters Comment: Change Material Grade from “Grade X70” to “Grade X70M”. Change the "Nominal 80-foot (double-joint)" to “Maximum 80-foot”.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-36, Table 2.1-12 DEIS Text: Field production welding processes Mechanized?gas metal; arc welding; manual-shielded metal arc welding. Comment: Should be "gas metal arc welding" (no semi-colon).	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-38, Line: 38 DEIS Text: …..any necessary acquisition of property-in-fee have been completed, construction would begin. Comment: after "begin" add "for the segment under construction."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.2-40 to 2.2-62 DEIS Text: Based on the analysis described above, the Department has identified the following as reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project for inclusion and evaluation in the Supplemental EIS. A preferred alternative will not be put forth in the Draft Supplemental EIS but will be identified if appropriate in the Final Supplemental EIS or the Record of Decision. Comment: Consider whether Keystone's initial Proposed Alternative (August 2012) including the Nebraska Reroute, should be listed as an alternative carried forward for inclusion and evaluation in the DSEIS.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-50, 3rd bullet DEIS Text:Pipeline markers would be installed at all fences. Comment: Warning signs are placed at all fences, not pipeline markers.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.2-50 Line:Table 2.2-10 DEIS Text: *comment at the end of the table: For the purpose of this screening it is assumed that this Alternative could be collocated with the existing Keystone Pipeline. The permanent Corridor (50 feet) would occupy 25 feet of the existing Keystone Pipeline ROW; Comment: The Keystone XL Pipeline permanent easement would abut the Keystone ROW and only the temporary easement would overlap the existing Keystone ROW.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-58, Table 2.1-17 DEIS Text: Waterbodies Crossed by the Horizontal Directional Drill Method Comment: Ash Creek Bluff (MP 431.2) should be listed as HDD.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-60, Line: 13 DEIS Text: The operation ROW would be 30 feet in all three states, Comment: The permanent ROW will be 50 feet in all three states.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 2.1-65, Line: 17 DEIS Text: In addition, a fully redundant backup OCC would be constructed, operated, and maintained, also in Canada Comment: In addition, a fully redundant backup OCC has been constructed and is being operated and maintained in Canada	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:2.1-67, Line: 20 DEIS Text: This would include a redundant fully functional backup system available for service at all times Comment: This would include a redundant fully functional backup OCC available for service at all times	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.2-7, Line: 3 DEIS Text: … sustained winds of 111 miles per hour with gusts of nearly double that … Comment: Confirm/correct the sustained and peak wind speeds.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.3-26, Line:14 DEIS Text:Surface water features classified as either open water or riverine are addressed in the Wetlands portion of this document, Sections 3.4 and 4.4. Additionally, waterbodies that are present within 10 miles downstream of waterbody crossings along the proposed route are documented, as well as surface drinking water supplies within 1 mile of the proposed pipeline right-ofway (ROW). Comment:FEIS, Section 3.3.1.2, page 3.3-14. "Stream and river crossings are described below by state. Additionally, reservoirs and larger lakes that are present within 10 miles downstream of these crossings are listed in Appendix E. Levees, water control structures, and flood protection structures along the proposed route are also presented in Appendix E." Department of State Environmental Report Response to Comments 09/12/2012; ER Section 3.4.1, Page 61, Last Paragraph Comment: "This section describes numbers of “waterbodies” within 10 miles downstream of crossing associated with the Project. In Appendix B, (Construction, Mitigation, and Reclamation Plan) the criteria listed for identifying waterbodies are largely directed towards categorizing linear water features such as streams and rivers. There is mention of other waterbodies, but not specific criteria." Response: "Waterbodies within 10 miles of the Project was a metric developed to assess potential downstream users and impacts during review of the Keystone Mainline Project. Appendix B, the CMRP, has nothing to do with this metric, so there is no comparison of criteria between the two. Keystone uses NHD data, USGS topographic maps, NWI maps, and, if possible, existing public imagery to identify visible lakes, ponds, reservoirs, or other waterbody features that could be impacted by a potential release into a stream crossed by the project. There is no size or other criteria, just an examination of potential waterbodies downstream of the Project that could be impacted in the event of a release."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.3-38, Line:20 DEIS Text: …detailed consult'n with USFWS & NRCS should be considered during the permitting phases when planning stream crossings Comment: This consultation has already occurred. No further consultation required.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-1, Line:39 DEIS Text: [USEPA] 2001 Comment: Comment: Is there a more recent reference for wetlands and, perhaps, a USACE publication?	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-2, Line:9 DEIS Text:based on vegetation or Comment: Replace "or" with "and/or"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-2, Line:10 DEIS Text: These wetlands are composed of Comment: Delete and replace with "These types of wetlands are characterized by"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-2, Line:15 DEIS Text: Surface water dominated wetland types Comment: Add: ", including both riverine and open water wetlands,"	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-2, Line:42 DEIS Text: "may represent a successional stage leading to a forested wetland or they may be relatively stable communities. Scrubshrub wetlands …" Comment: Add: Delete language. Sentence should read "Scrub-shrub wetlands are often associated with …	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-8 Comment: There are references to "endangered wetlands" which is not a recognized term and should not be used (this is also used when discussing crane habitat).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-9, Line:38 DEIS Text:…for the discharge of fill material … Comment: Insert: "dredged and" before "fill material"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-10, Line:32 DEIS Text:Individual states administer clean water regulations that have been delegated to them from USEPA pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA. Comment: Delete and replace with "Under Section 401 of the CWA, USEPA has delegated authority to the states to administer clean water regulations."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-10, Line:36 DEIS Text:… is only summarized to the state level. Comment: Add footnote at the end of this sentence. Footnote to read: "Under CWA §401, any applicant for a Federal license or permit which may discharge into navigable waters must provide the permitting authority with a certification from the state indicating that discharges will comply with the relevant sections of the CWA (Sections 301, 302, 306, and 307)."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-11, Line:36 DEIS Text:…are managed by Section 404 of the CWA … Comment: Delete "by" and replace with "under"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.4-12, Line:41 DEIS Text:Certification (managed by states, see below) Comment: Delete "managed by" and replace with "delegated to the"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.6-1,Table 3.6-1 DEIS Text:Total length of the Project is 876.2 miles Comment: Length differs from mileage totals provided in the Table 2.1-1 of the Sept. 7 2012 Environmental Report; total length is 875.39 miles	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.7-9, Line:Table 16 DEIS Text:All other perennial stream crossings in Montana would use one of the open-cut crossing methods, also described in Section 2.1.9. Comment: The MFSA certificate requires that perennial streams in MT be crossed by either dam and pump or dry flume. Flowing open-cut method not allowed on perennial streams in Montana	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-5, Table 3.8-1 DEIS Text:Table 3.8-1 Summary of federally Protected and Candidate Species Included in the 2012 BA and their State Status Comment: The Red Wolf is evaluated and eliminated in the BA.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-7, Line:9 DEIS Text:… in Montana are well established Comment: Typo: should read "… in Montana is well established"	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-11, Line: 8-10 DEIS Text:In Montana, the Yellowstone River crossing of the proposed pipeline route in Dawson County has historically supported, and currently supports, breeding populations of interior least terns (AECOM 2008b, AECOM 2009a). Comment: In Montana, the Yellowstone River crossing of the proposed pipeline route in Dawson County has historically supported, or currently supports, breeding populations of interior least terns (AECOM 2008b, AECOM 2009a).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-11, Line: 17-19 DEIS Text:This species was not observed along the Cheyenne River during 2008 and 2011 surveys, but the 2011 surveys were conducted when there was flooding and habitat was not visible. Therefore, surveys should be repeated along this proposed river crossing. Comment: Three years of surveys with one year of abnormal conditions does not provide a basis for requiring further surveys	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-14, Line: 14 DEIS Text:… during spring and fall migration. Comment:See Comment at page 3.8-36, sections 3.8.7.2 and 3.8.7.3	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-20, Line: 6-10 DEIS Text:The northern portion of the proposed Project route in Nebraska avoids the Sand hills. Pedestrian botanical surveys of the proposed Project route in 2012 also did not locate any suitable habitat for the species. Based on the lack of suitable habit for this species in the proposed Project area, and the fact that the Project area is outside of the known range for this species, the blowout penstemon is not expected to occur in the Project area. Comment:As discussed in the BA (1.4.5) the Nebraska re-route avoids habitat for this species.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-28, Line: Line 2 DEIS Text:River Otter Comment:Discussion should be expanded to include the survey in ER Table 3.6.1.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-28, Line: Line 22 DEIS Text:The proposed Project route crosses swift fox range in Phillips, Valley, Dawson, prairie, and Fallon counties in Montana (Kahn et al. 1997), and suitable habitat in Fallon and McCone counties in Montana. Comment:Per the BA, surveys were conducted for the swift Fox.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-29, Line: 13 DEIS Text: Five active bald eagle nests were documented during raptor nest surveys for the proposed Project during April 2010. Comment:Aerial surveys were conducted in 2011 and 2012. See Table 3.6-1 of ER	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-29, Line: 29 DEIS Text: Two of the three recognized subspecies could occur within the proposed Project area: the American peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus anatum) and the Arctic peregrine falcon (Falco peregrinus tundrius). Comment: Aerial surveys were conducted, none were found.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.8-32, Line: 7 DEIS Text: The river otter is described above in Section 3.8.5.2, South Dakota State Protected Species. This species could occur in rivers throughout the proposed Project area Comment:Discussion should be expanded to include the survey in ER Table 3.6.1.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.8-36 Comment:Discuss whether 3.8.7.2 and 3.8.7.3 are within whooping crane migratory corridor	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.9-1, Line:23 DEIS Text:four pump stations 22-25 each occupy 12 to 15 acres Comment:Pump station sites range in size from 5 to 15 acres as stated in Section 2.1.4.1 of the DSEIS.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.10-2, Line:2 DEIS Text:There are 28 of these counties: six in Montana, 10 in South Dakota….. Comment:KXL only crosses 9 counties in South Dakota. The route does not cross Gregory County, nor are any ancillary facilities located in that county. Revise the total county count to 27.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.10-3, Table 3.10-1 DEIS Text:South Dakota/10/…….Gregory Comment:Should be: "South Dakota/9/…..Tripp" Strike Gregory County	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:3.10-9, Line:21 DEIS Text: "…and Prairie in Montana; Butte, Perkins, Meade, Pennington, Lyman, and Gregory in South….." Comment: "…and Prairie in Montana; Butte, Perkins, Meade, Pennington, and Lyman in South….." Remove Gregory County.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-13, Line: Table 3.10-8 DEIS Text: South Dakota/……Gregory Comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-15, Table 3.10-9 DEIS Text: South Dakota/……Gregory Comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-15, Table 3.10-9 DEIS Text: Unemployment rates for some Nebraska counties vary greatly as opposed to the SER info Comment: exp used US Census Bureau: Nebraska State & County Quick Facts DOS used US Census Bureau, American Fact Finder	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-17, Table 3.10-10 DEIS Text: South Dakota Economic Corridor/….Gregory Comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-26, Line: 24 DEIS Text: (see Table 3.10-1) plus Carter County, Montana, and Ziebach County, South Dakota. These two….. Comment: Should also include Gregory County, SD as an adjacent county	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-32, Table 3.10-14 DEIS Text: Gregory County Comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.10-39, Table 3.10-18 DEIS Text: Gregory Comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-1, Line: 19 DEIS Text: For the purposes of the proposed Project, field studies to identify cultural resources assess archaeological resources (sites) Comment: For the purposes of the proposed Project, field studies were conducted to identify cultural resources, assess archaeological resources (sites)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-1, Line: 23 DEIS Text: paleontological resources as being one in the same Comment: paleontological resources as being one and the same	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-6, Line: 3rd bullet DEIS Text: In 2009 and 2010 prior to each addendum report field survey program Comment: file searches were conducted every year (2009-2012)	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-8 DEIS Text: paragraph preceding table 3.11-2 Comment: all numbers will need to be updated once the missing sites from Table 3.11-2 are included. Sites missing from Table 3.11-2: 24PH1785 (DOS Supplemental, p. 95; Addendum 6); 24PH1787 (DOS Supplemental, p. 95; Addendum 6); 24RV0132 (DOS Supplemental, p. 96; Addendum 6); 24SH1222 (DOS Supplemental, p. 96; Addendum 6); C512VA001 (DOS Supplemental, p. 96; Addendum 6); 24PH4219 (Addendum 1); 24PH4266 (Addendum 2); 24PH4146 (main report); 24PH4315 (Addendum 3); 24PH4145 (main report); 24PH4314 (Addendum 3); 24PH4144 (main report); 24PH4316 (Addendum 3); 24PH4220 (Addendum 1); 24PH4221 (Addendum 1); 24PH4159 (main report); 24PH4268 (Addendum 2); 24PH4160 (main report); 24PH4353 (Addendum 5); 24PH4354 (Addendum 5); 24PH4355 (Addendum 5); 24PH4340 (Addendum 5); 24PH4337 (Addendum 5); 24PH4345 (Addendum 5); 24PH4347 (Addendum 5); 24PH4348 (Addendum 5); 24PH4338 (Addendum 5); 24PH4346 (Addendum 5); 24PH4341 (Addendum 5); 24PH4349 (Addendum 5); 24PH4350 (Addendum 5); 24PH4351 (Addendum 5); 24PH4352 (Addendum 5); 24PH4342 (Addendum 5); 24PH4343 (Addendum 5); 24PH4344 (Addendum 5); 24VL1895 (main report); C55VA002 (main report); 24VL1927 (Addendum 1); C63VA003 (main report); 24VL1896 (main report); 24VL1934 (Addendum 2); 24VL1935 (Addendum 2); 24VL1922 (Addendum 1); 24VL1932 (Addendum 2); 24VL1908 (main report); 24VL1931 (Addendum 2); 24VL1923 (Addendum 1); 24VL1924 (Addendum 1); 24VL1930 (Addendum 2); 24VL1897 (main report); 24VL1899 (main report); 24VL1898 (main report); C55VA009 (main report); 24VL1904 (main report); 24VL1921 (Addendum 1); 24VL1893 (main report); 24VL1925 (Addendum 1); 24VL1926 (Addendum 1); 24VL1273 (Addendum 1); 24VL1894 (main report); C002VA007 (Addendum 3); 24VL1891 (main report); 24VL1960 (Addendum 5); 24VL1961 (Addendum 5); 24VL1962 (Addendum 5); 24VL1964 (Addendum 5); 24VL1966 (Addendum 5); 24VL1967 (Addendum 5); 24VL1963 (Addendum 5); 24VL1959 (Addendum 5); 24MC0468 (Addendum 1); 24MC0482 (Addendum 3); C57DA002 (main report); C57DA003 (main report); C001DA001 (Addendum 3); C57DA005 (main report); C107DA005 (Addendum 5); 58PR003 (main report); C58FA005 (main report); 24FA0752 (main report); C104FA001 (Addendum 5); C57FA004 (main report); C57FA003 (main report); 24FA0750 (main report); 24FA0762 (Addendum 5); C104FA003 (Addendum 5); 24VL1937 (Addendum 2); 24VL1939 (Addendum 2); C104PH001 (Addendum 5); 24PH4339 (Addendum 5); 24VL1895 (Addendum 2); 24VL1918 (main report); C69VA001 (main report); C82MC001 (Addendum 1); 24MC0469 (Addendum 1); 24MC0257 (Addendum 1); 24MC0477 (Addendum 2); 24MC0478 (Addendum 2); C82DA002 (Addendum 1); 24DW0525 (Addendum 1); 24PE0721 (main report); C001FA004 (Addendum 4); 24VL1941 (Addendum 2); C001DA002 (Addendum 3); C210MC001 (Addendum 2)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-8, Table 3.11-2 Comment: There are asterisks after two site numbers in Table 3.11-2 with no explanation.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-8, Table 3.11-2 Comment: Edits to the table are attached. [Reviewer see next comment submission]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-8, Table 3.11-2 Comment: [edits to Table 3.11-2]	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-12 and 3.11-13 Comment: Discussion of numbers of sites/resources will need to be updated once Table 3.11-2 is revised.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-5, 2nd bullet Comment: file searches were conducted every year (2009-2012)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-16, paragraph preceding Table 3.11-3 Comment: all numbers will need to be updated once the missing sites from Table 3.11-3 are included.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-16, Table 3.11-3 Comment: Sites missing from Table 3.11-3: 39HN1175 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39MD0895 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39HK0159 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39LM0545 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), PE00000020 (Addendum 1), 39PE0475 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39HK0158 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39MD0893 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), MD00000339 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39HK0157 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7), 39HU2003 (Addendum 7), 39HN1163 (Addendum 5), and 39LM2007 (DOS Supplemental, p. 98; Addendum 7).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-16, Table 3.11-3 Comment: There is an asterisk after one site number in Table 3.11-3 with no explanation.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-16, Table 3.11-3 Comment: Edits to the table are attached.[Reviewer see next comment submission]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-16, Table 3.11-3 Comment: [edits to Table 3.11-3]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-19 and 3.11-20 Comment: Discussion of numbers of sites/resources will need to be updated once Table 3.11-3 is revised.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-22, paragraph preceding Table 3.11-4 Comment: all numbers will need to be updated once the missing sites from Table 3.11-4 are included.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-22, Table 3.11-4 Comment: Sites missing from Table 3.11-4: 25KP347 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT57 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT58 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT59 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT60 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT61 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP76 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP77 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP80 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP81 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP82 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP85 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP86 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP87 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP91 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25AP92 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO57 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO58 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO59 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO62 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO66 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25BO68 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25NC149 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25NC150 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25NC151 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25NC152 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25NC153 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK28 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK29 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK30 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK31 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK32 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK33 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25MK34 (DOS Supplemental, Appendix K; Addendum 10), 25HT56 (Addendum 9), 25HT55 (Addendum 7), 25WH7 (Addendum 7), 25YK32 (Addendum 7), and 25YK29 (Addendum 3).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-22, Table 3.11-4 Comment: [Reviewer next comment submission for table edits]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-22, Table 3.11-4 Comment: [edits to Table 3.11-4]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-26 Comment: Discussion of numbers of sites/resources will need to be updated once Table 3.11-4 is revised.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-26 and 3.11-27, North Dakota subheading Comment: This section is incorrect. A survey was conducted and a report has been submitted (with SHPO concurrence provided to DOS on May 21, 2012). The report is titled A Class I and Class III Cultural Resources Survey of the Proposed Knife River Rail Siding Improvement for the Keystone XL Project, Bowman County, North Dakota. This is also discussed in the DOS Supplemental document (p. 99).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-34 Comment: Unanticipated discovery plans should not be required for North Dakota and Kansas.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.11-34, Line: 35 DEIS Text: "is stipulations" Comment: "is a stipulation"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.12-7, Line: 3.12.2.2 DSEIS Text:Regulatory Requirements Comment: Comment: Much of this NSR/PSD discussion seems excessive given that the non-road engines and timeframe for use are excluded and, therefore, PSD and NSR review is not triggered.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.12-7, Line: 15 DSEIS Text: …of industrial GHG emitted in the United States Comment: make GHG plural, "GHGs"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-1, Line: 23 DSEIS Text: A comparison of the crude oil that is transported . . . Comment: Add reference to Penspen 2013 (attached).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-2, Line: 15 DSEIS Text: In addition, Canadian heavy crude is also usually sour (i.e., has a higher sulfur content) . . . . Comment: The crude oils expected to be shipped on the Project are not typically "sour" even using the broad definition in the DSEIS. Sulfur content is poorly correlated with H2S concentration and, therefore, is not predictive of inhalation hazard. The crude oils expected to be shipped on the Project all have H2S concentrations less than 2.0%. See the attached table.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-2, Line: 22 DSEIS Text: Specific Gravity: determines whether the unweathered oil will sink or float…. Comment: Specific gravity is a measure of the density of a substance compared to the density of water. The term "unweathered" should be deleted from the sentence. Also, the document does not consistently use API gravity. See e.g. Table 3.13-1.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-2, Line: 3-4 DSEIS Text: Light crude is a mixture . . . Comment: This may mislead the reader to conclude that heavy oil cannot flow through a pipeline without processing or treatment. In fact, many heavy crudes are transported without processing or treatment. Viscosity should not be the relevant issue, since it is controlled by tariff specification. Rather, the emphasis between heavy and light should focus on density relative to water (e.g., API gravity)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-2, Line: 33 DSEIS Text: Pour point: an indicator of the temperature… Comment: Pour point is not an indicator, it is the lowest temperature at which a liquid becomes semi-solid and loses it's ability to flow.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-3, Table 3.13-1 DSEIS Text: Synthetic crude oil and diluted bitumen types (imperial oil and husky) Comment: Table 3.13-5 has a number of problems. Please see the substitute Table attached.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-4, Line: 7 DSEIS Text: Raw bitumen is solid under ambient conditions… Comment: Raw bitumen is very viscous but is not necessarily solid. It is more accurately a semi-solid to solid depending on ambient temperatures.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-4, Line: 3-4 Comment: Sentence identifying the high boiling point of the Canadian oil sand bitumen has little meaning and, if included, should be a range of values. Suggest rewording to: "Like other bitumens, Canadian oil sand bitumen is composed primarily of high molecular weight hydrocarbons, commonly referred to as ashphaltines."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-7, Line: 13 DSEIS Text: SCO can produce flammable or explosive vapors when above it's 68°F (20°C) flashpoint. Comment: The referenced ignition and flashpoint are applicable to a single dilbit and SCO and are not representative of the range of these product types. Different SCO types will have varying flashpoints ranging from -40oF to 347oF. Dilbit and SCO are capable of ignition at low temperatures. These statements are equally applicable to all crude oils. The paragraph should be revised to read: "Like all crude oils, dilbit and SCOs are capable of ignition and can produce explosive vapors. Crude oils are flammable products; however, for an ignition to occur, produced vapors from the oil must be between the lower and upper flammability limits. . . . "	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-7, Line: 16 DSEIS Text: Given the liquid nature of dilbit, . . . Comment: Given the liquid nature of crude oil	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-7, Line: 17-18 DSEIS Text: Within a pipeline, oxygen conditions are typically too low and an ignition source is not present, so an explosion within a closed pipeline is unlikely. Comment: There is no oxygen in the pipeline, thus no potential for explosion.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-7, Line: 21 DSEIS Text: "Naphthenic acids can create corrosion problems." Comment: Qualify sentence. "Under extreme temperatures found at refineries, naphthenic acids can create corrosion problems. "The inhibitory role of naphthenic acids is understated. Insert summary sentence that is clear to lay reader: "Research indicates that naphthenic acids are not corrosive at pipeline temperatures and may protect the pipeline from corrosion (Messer et al. 2004, Been and Wolodko 2011, Penspen Integrity 2013)."	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-8, Line: 32 DSEIS Text: Sulfur is mostly bound . . . Comment: Elemental sulfur is chemically bound to crude oil hydrocarbons which account for the majority of sulfur content in a crude oil. (Dettmen, 2012). The concentration of H2S is low and does not represent a threat to pipeline steel walls. See Table 3.13-1 attached.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-10, Line: 13 Comment: Add to bulleted list: "1) High resolution in-line inspection tools" since the use of these tools has resulted in substantial reductions in corrosion.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-11, Line: 1 DSEIS Text: Definition of Cathodic Protection Comment: Cathodic protection: this counters the effect of electrolytic corrosion by the application of direct current in such a way that the structure to be protected is made to act as the cathode of an electrolyte cell, reducing or eliminating the external corrosion rate if the external coating is damaged. The proposed pipeline would employ cathodic protection.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-12, Line: 18 DSEIS Text: Sentence "This is consistent with the limited observance…" Comment:Unclear. Clarify to indicate that Alberta data support the fact that internal corrosion is limited.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-12, Line: 31 DSEIS Text: 31 focused peer reviewed study of potential corrosivity/erosoivity of oil sands derived crude has not yet been conducted Comment: Consideration should be given to the Penspen Integrity 2013 study evaluating the corrosivity of diluted bitumen (Attached). [Reviewer, this report is the "08-Final-Penspen Report.pdf" page that is included in the Transcanada submitted saved on the Holland server noted above]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-12, Line: 36-37 DSEIS Text: …constituents that potentially contribute to corrosion inside a pipeline include sediment and water that can enter the pipeline with the oil being transported. Comment: This discussion should recognize that there will be FERC-approved tariff specifications in place that limit the amount of sediment and water that can enter the pipeline. Canadian dilbit and SCO have lower sediment and water concentrations as compared to most conventional crude oils. (Penspen Integrity, 2013).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-14, 2nd para under Manufacturing Comment: Split the paragraph. The first paragraph would address the circumstances addressed in the PHMSA low yield strength advisory. The second paragraph should recognize that Keystone must comply with the requirements set forth in the Advisory.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-14, Line: 35 DSEIS Text: "minimum specified yield strength" Comment: "specified minimum yield strength"	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-15, 1st full para Comment: Split paragraph. Describe mechanical stress. Separate paragraph should discuss the mitigation for this issue including PHSMA Special Conditions related to pre-commissioning quality inspection and detection of defects.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-18, Line: 14-15 DSEIS Text: This means that the minimum volume for a large spill (1000 bbl. As defined above) exists in roughly every 800-foot section of 36-inch-diameter pipe, not considering response measures to stop the leak or the presence of design features such as mainline valves to mitigate the volume released. Comment: This paragraph does not convey meaningful information and should be eliminated. It does not reflect actual potential spill volumes as reflected in the PHMSA database and could mislead a reader into believing that catastrophic spill volumes are common and could occur at any location. The discussion fails to take into account the numerous measures in place to prevent and minimize spill volumes. It further fails take into account pipeline elevation and the potential for restricted drain down volumes.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-20, Line: 13 DSEIS Text: . . . Higher levels of inspection . . . Comment: Add "and repair criteria."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-20, Line: 30 DSEIS Text: reference to finding that health effects of SCO are no different from conventional crudes. Comment: This invites the inference that the health effects of dilbit are different. There is no basis for that inference; there is no evidence that dilbit is different from other crudes, therefore, the health effects are anticipated to be comparable.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-21, Line: 5 DSEIS Text: In particular, a human health risk could result from the inhalation of any H2S… Comment: Not true, the concentration of H2S would have to be above certain threshold concentrations to cause human health impacts, not just "any" H2S. Sentence should be revised to state that human health risk could arise from inhalation of elevated levels of H2S.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 3.13-21, Line: 28-29 DSEIS Text: 28-29 These activities are provided in Keystone's Draft Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan (Appendix I). Comment: No, these measures are included in the ERP (Appendix I)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.1-3, Line: 4 DSEIS Text: At other river and stream crossings, the proposed pipeline would be buried under at least 5 feet of cover for at least 15 feet on either side of the bank-full width. Comment: The CMRP specifies "stream channel " instead of "full bank width". There is no justification for requiring burial of the pipeline 15 feet on either side of full bank width	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.16-1, Line:20 DSEIS Text: "…Appendix Y, pipeline construction in Sand Hills native rangelands." Comment: Keystone has rerouted its pipeline outside of the Sand Hills-defined region to the satisfaction of the NDEQ and Governor of Nebraska. Keystone has incorporated measures for construction in fragile soils into the revised CMRP. This appendix is no longer applicable, please see the CMRP Fragile Soils section.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-3, Line: 14 DSEIS Text: To accommodate potential discoveries of contaminated soils, contaminated soil discovery procedures would be developed in consultation with relevant agencies and these procedures would be added to the CMRP. In the event that the proposed Project encounters contaminated or potentially contaminated soils, based on obvious odor or discoloration, work in the area of the discovery would halt and equipment would be moved from the immediate area. Containment berms would be installed, as necessary, to prevent migration of runoff from the excavated material. The state agency responsible for site assessment and remediation would be contacted and a plan of action would be developed in consultation with that agency and the landowner. Testing of the potentially contaminated soil may be necessary. Depending upon the level of contamination found and based on approvals from the appropriate agency(ies), affected soil may be replaced in the trench, remediate in situ, or removed for off-site disposal. Comment: In the event of a discovery of contaminated soils, Keystone will comply with all applicable federal and state requirements.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-4, Line: 7 DSEIS Text: In non-forested agricultural proposed Project areas, the top 12 inches of topsoil would be removed and segregated during excavation activities. Comment: Keystone has consulted with the NRCS in all states regarding soil salvage depths. As the CMRP (Section 4.3) and Con/Rec descriptions indicate, topsoil salvage depths in agricultural lands will be 8 to 12 inches depending on the amount of topsoil that is actually present. Salvaging soil too deeply when the actual productive horizon(s) are shallow can mix productive and unproductive horizons, resulting in less agricultural production.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-6, 4th Paragraph DSEIS Text: Description of modifying or stopping work during wet weather to prevent soil rutting and mixing topsoil and subsoil. Comment: The language in this paragraph presents the appearance that numerous methods will be required to prevent the mixture of topsoil and subsoil during wet weather. Note that rutting which results in mixing topsoil and subsoil is only a potential problem if topsoil has not been salvaged and stored out of the working area. Keystone will salvage topsoil from all areas where equipment will be operating (e.g., the working side of the ROW, contractor yards, etc.). Consequently, mixing topsoil and subsoil through rutting will not occur.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2.7, Line: 16 DSEIS Text: Where shelterbelts would be disrupted, the ROW would be revegetated and seeded, and wind fences would be installed across the ROW in areas where trees and/or shrubs have been removed. Comment: Keystone's Con/Rec descriptions provide only that Keystone would install wind fences where Keystone determines that measure to be appropriate (see Appendix R, Shelterbelt Con/Rec, note 1).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-10, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: Site-specific soil erosion and revegetation plan for MT should be prepared for agency approval prior to start of construction and ripping of soils on MT range and pasture lands should be performed if requested. Comment: The MDEQ has not required a general site-specific erosion control and revegetation plan in Montana. Site-specific plans are required at specific stream crossings. Keystone has prepared these plans. Appendix I of the MDEQ Environmental Specifications is specified as a Rehabilitation Plan, Erosion Control, Reclamation, and Revegetation Plan. Appendix I states that erosion control, reclamation, and revegetation procedures to be followed are detailed in the Montana Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and plans approved by the County Weed Control Boards for Keystone XL Pipeline Project construction activities. Keystone has prepared the SWPPP and submitted seed mixes to the counties for review consistent with MDEQ Environmental Specifications.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-11, Line: 8 DSEIS Text: … fencing of ROW may be advisable Comment: Keystone has indicated in several project documents that fencing may be completed if required but that fencing can be a serious impediment to landowners. If livestock appear to be negatively affecting revegetation success, Keystone will work with landowners to address the problem.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.2-11, Line: 15 DSEIS Text: Additionally, based on comments received from NRCS, it is recommended that Keystone employ a method of assessment of soil productivity such as yield comparison between ROW and non-ROW areas. Comment: This commitment for crop yield monitoring is only appropriate in areas where problem soils have been identified with the NRCS. Reclamation can be effectively monitored in most areas without employing this measure.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-1, Line: 30-36 DSEIS Text: The number and type of stream crossings and stream crossing methods have changed due to changes in the proposed Project route as well as updated field survey information provided by Keystone. The stream crossing assessment was comprised of a desktop analysis based on National Hydrologic Dataset (NHD) information and supplemented by Keystone field survey descriptions; Based on the limitations of the data used in the desktop analysis, the intermittent and ephemeral stream categories were combined and assessed as intermittent streams. Comment: Department of State Environmental Report 12; ER Section 3.4.1, page 61, last paragraph Requested Information: Please provide details regarding the criteria used for identifying these "waterbodies", especially non-flowing bodies of water (ponds, lakes, reservoirs, etc.). Is it based on size, designated use, and other criteria? Response: Appendix H-1 of the DOS ER filed on September 7, 2012, provides the number and type of streams found on the reroutes. The FEIS provides the information on the number and type of streams found on the FEIS portion of the route. In both cases, the information is a combination of field surveys and NHD data. However, since the FEIS was completed, Keystone completed additional field surveys that delineated streams not found on the NHD database, mostly ephemeral drainages. This resulted in an increase in the number of crossings reported. Keystone does not cross any lakes or reservoirs. There is no database that permits desktop identification of “ponds” other that review of aerial imagery. If we encounter a man-made pond on a landowner’s property during field surveys, we identify it as such on the alignment sheets and cross it using an appropriate method, including draining the pond with the landowner’s consent. Added information: Field review is a iterative process which both confirms the presence of desktop surveyed features as well as showing through USACE standards the lack of presence of a feature.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-4, Line: 26+ DSEIS Text: T26+ Keystone would conduct baseline water quality testing for domestic and livestock water wells within 300 feet of the centerline of the approved route, upon the request of individual landowners who provide access to perform the testing. Comment: This condition was agreed to for Nebraska landowners. There is no similar requirement in the MFSA or SDPUC Certificates. Specify this is for NE. Montana and South Dakota have state-specific requirements for water well testing. Implementation of this measure throughout the project would increase the numbers of tie-ins and the duration of construction disturbance. The unintended consequences resulting from this would include extended disruption to landowners, extended and increased use of public roadways and increased potential for erosion and sedimentation along the ROW.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-9, Line: 30 DSEIS Text: ... and information from many other petroleum releases ... Comment: Provide cross-reference to place in DSEIS where "many other petroleum releases" are discussed	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-11, Line: 35 DSEIS Text: …unregistered well is found Keystone would provide the landowner with technical assistance to register the well Comment:This condition was agreed to for Nebraska landowners. There is no similar requirement in the MFSA or SDPUC Certificates.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-13, Stream Crossing.. First Paragraph DSEIS Text: Trenches through water bodies that are dry or contain non-moving water at the time of crossing would not be left open for more than 24 hours, except in extenuating circumstances, to reduce sediment discharge from a sudden storm event resulting in runoff. Comment: This condition was agreed to for Nebraska landowners. There is no similar requirement in the MFSA or SDPUC Certificates. Implementation of this measure throughout the project would increase the numbers of tie-ins and the duration of construction disturbance. The unintended consequences resulting from this would include extended disruption to landowners, extended and increased use of public roadways and increased potential for erosion and sedimentation along the ROW.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-14, Line: 11 DSEIS Text: For waterbody crossings where HDD would be used, disturbance to the channel bed and banks would be avoided. Comment:The sentence should include: "except where equipment access is needed and for accessing the river to use water for hydrostatic testing and for HDD mud makeup"	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-14, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: These agencies could require measures to limit unnecessary impacts such as requiring all the non-HDD crossings to be constructed during dry conditions. Comment:Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements. This is an unreasonable measure to implement across the entire project. Crossing methods are resource based, not based on perceived water quality impacts for the short duration of an open cut crossing.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-17, Line:17 DSEIS Text: In an effort to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive waterbodies, detailed consultation with the USFWS and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) would be done during the permitting phases when planning stream crossings in already depleted and drought prone watersheds. Comment: Additional consultation with USFWS and NRCS is not required, beyond what has already occurred. Keystone will consult with the applicable permitting authority in developing the appropriate crossing methods for waterbodies.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-17, Line:37 DSEIS Text: They go on the say that … Comment: Typo: should read, "They go on to say that …"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-18, Last paragraph of section DSEIS Text: Discharged water would be tested for water quality prior to release in the environment to ensure it meets applicable water quality standards imposed by the discharge permits for the permitted discharge locations. Where hydrostatic test water does not meet standards for discharge proper, treatment or disposal is required. Comment: permits generally require testing during discharge. This appears to be a misstatement.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-21, Line: 12 DSEIS Text: … would determine the need for any … Comment: Comment: Revise text to reflect that Nebraska has made its route decision. Elsewhere, the DSEIS is inconclusive with regard to whether the independent consultants' analysis would be completed or considered. Need to reconcile inconsistent treatment of the consultants' analysis.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-22;4.3-23, Line: 28-45;1-3 DSEIS Text: For any waterbody crossings that utilize HDD or any other bore method, it is recommended that the bore entrance and exit points be located entirely outside of the channel migration zone (CMZ), and that the pipeline be constructed sufficiently below the maximum design scour depth for the entire CMZ width to prevent unexpected pipeline exposure during channel migration events. In addition, other permanent features such as access roads or construction pads should also be placed outside the areal extent of the 100-year CMZ. Many of the rivers in the proposed Project ROW are unstable with high sediment supply systems with dynamic active channel(s), depositional bars and active bank margins. Some of the larger rivers crossed by the proposed Project, such as the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in Montana; or the Platte River, Loup River, and Prairie Creek in Nebraska, are all drainage systems capable of substantial lateral channel migration, bank retreat, and subsequent reactivation of historic floodplains and channels during the life of the proposed Project. All states affected by the proposed Project are prone to ice jams on their major rivers, which often cause substantial backwatering and lateral scour. CMZs are defined by the corridor that each river is expected to occupy over a given timeframe and are based on physical geomorphic parameters and local geologic control. As an example, CMZs for the Yellowstone River in Montana have been mapped (Yellowstone River Conservation District Council 2009) as part of an effort by state and federal agencies to provide additional information for minimizing impacts to major surface water and natural resources, including avoidance of poor development decisions and subsequent damage or loss of infrastructure and property. Comment: Keystone has completed the HDD design for the Yellowstone River that accommodates the 100-year CMZ, and the entry and exit locations are outside of that CMZ. 100-year CMZ information does not exist for the remaining rivers. For the stream crossings other than the Yellowstone River where 100-year CMZ data does not exist, Keystone referenced available sources including 100-year flood data, conducted additional scour analysis, performed a lateral migration analysis and reviewed historic aerials based on the design life of the pipeline (50 years).	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.3-23, Line: 4-9 DSEIS Text: Culvert design and construction should be done to ensure unimpeded fish and aquatic organism passage during the lifetime of the proposed Project for all road-stream crossings over fish-bearing streams. There are many recent and reliable engineering manuals that provide methods for designing and constructing fish friendly road-stream crossings. These methods should be followed when road-stream crossings on fish bearing streams are required and should be incorporated into the CMRP (Appendix G). Comment: The methods provided in the CMRP are adequate and consistent with industry best practices for crossing fish bearing streams. Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.4-2, Line: 5 DSEIS Text: …soil data (UGSG 2012) … Comment: "Typo: "UGSG" should be "USGS"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.4-2, Line: 7 DSEIS Text: …assessing the area of wetland … Comment: "wetland" should be "wetlands "	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-3, Line: 18 DSEIS Text: …to provide a high-end estimate … Comment: Add: "conservative and" before "high-end estimate"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-3, Line: 21 DSEIS Text: …as a high-end estimate. Comment: Add: "conservative and" before "high-end estimate"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-3, Line: 40 DSEIS Text:…wetlands acres that would be … Comment: delete "would" and replace with "might"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-11 and 4.4-13, 5th bullet and last bullet; and 1st bullet on p. 4.4-13 DSEIS Text: Develop compensation for impacts to forested wetlands impacted by the construction ROW through the USACE Clean Water Act Section 404 and 401 permitting program. Keystone would mitigate for impacts to non-jurisdictional, as well as jurisdictional forested wetlands; Comment: Comment: Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-12, Line: 35-40 DSEIS Text: In addition to these additional mitigation measures offered by the Department and other participating federal, state, and local agencies, supplementary list of recommendations has been generated through the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement development process. Where appropriate and applicable, a plan to compensate for permanent wetland losses and to prevent temporary to permanent wetland degradation would be developed to include the following: Comment: The USACE has primacy in issuing permits for wetland crossings. Appropriate mitigation measures and any compensatory mitigation will be addressed in the USACE permit process. Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.4-13, Line: Section 4.4.4 DSEIS Text:Recommended Mitigation Measures Comment: Keystone will manage both "dry" and "standard" wetland crossings using the BMPs outlined in the CMRP. These BMPs were developed using current USACE NWP requirements. Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-3, Line: 19 DSEIS Text: A total of 50 individual noxious weed species may occur along the proposed pipeline corridor. Comment: Table 3.5-5 does not include the results of Keystone's field surveys and the locations of noxious weeds. The results of the field survey are found in Table 3.5.2 (page 71) of the Sept. 7 2012 Environmental Report.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-3, Table 4.5-1 DSEIS Text: Mileage totals for Montana (286.2), South Dakota (315.2), Nebraska (274.0) Comment: The mileage totals provided in the DSEIS differ from mileage totals provided in the Table 2.1-1 of the Sept. 7 2012 Environmental Report; MT (285.65), SD (315.30), NE (274.44)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-13, Line: 36 DSEIS Text:Where appropriate, Keystone would retain a local rangeland expert to coordinate area-specific seed mixes. Comment: Keystone has already retained a rangeland expert that has developed the con/rec units and reclamation measures.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-16, Line: 3 DSEIS Text: Test topsoils and subsoils for compaction at regular intervals on rangelands and pastures where requested by landowners, land management agencies or permitting agencies; and Comment: The Montana DEQ suggested measure is only applicable to Montana. The suggested measure is not included in Keystone's CMRP. The CMRP provides for measures to test for compaction in active agricultural and residential areas only. (CMRP sect 4.11.1; page 29)	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-16, Line: 20 DSEIS Text: In Nebraska, herbicides applied prior to or during construction would be non-residual. Comment: The CMRP commits to: All herbicides applied prior to construction shall be non-residual or shall have a significant residual effect no longer than 30 days. (sect 2.13; page 7). No mention of Nebraska specific requirement in the CMRP	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-17, Line: 4 DSEIS Text: Do not over-prepare revegetation seed beds; instead, leave them intentionally heterogeneous and irregular. Comment: This potential mitigation measure in the FEIS was developed for the Sandhills ecoregion (FEIS Sect. 3.5.5.5; Page 3.5-40) and is no longer applicable to this project (see Sandy Prairie con/rec in Appendix R of this DSEIS). Keystone will prepare an adequate seed bed consistent with NRCS standard recommendations for grass seeding.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-17, Line: 8 DSEIS Text:Reseed disturbed areas with seed sources from local populations of Native American traditional use plants in areas used to harvest these resources; and Comment: This potential mitigation measure was recommended only for Montana in the FEIS and was not included in Keystone's MFSA Certificate. (FEIS Sect 3.5.5.2; page 3.5-38). There is unlikely to be consensus on where these areas occur, which species are of importance, and most importantly, enough viable seed to successfully revegetate the disturbance.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.5-17, Line: 10 DSEIS Text: Use hydro-seeding during extended drought conditions. Comment: Keystone may use hydro-seeding in specific instances where conventional seeding would be ineffective. Typical areas for hydro-seeding include very steep slopes. Hydro-seeding provides relatively little soil moisture, however, if water associated with hydro-seeding resulted in seed germination during an extended drought it is likely that the seedlings would die. It is preferable for seed to lay dormant until soil moisture and temperature conditions are conducive to germination rather than to force germination during unfavorable conditions.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6, Line: 4.6-3 DSEIS Text: Table 4.6-1 Comment: The Cornwell Ranch Conservation Easements were established after the Project obtained the pipeline easement.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6-4, Line: 2nd paragraph DSEIS Text: The pipeline ROW would be maintained free of trees and shrubs, resulting in long-term alteration of wildlife habitat structure and value Comment: Only the permanent easement within forested areas would be maintained free of trees. Shrubs would be allowed to grow within the permanent and temporary ROW. In particular, sagebrush would be seeded in several areas to encourage its establishment.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6-6, Line: 24 DSEIS Text: The primary big game species occurring in the proposed Project area include white-tailed deer (Odocoileus virginianus), elk (Cervus Canadensis), mule deer (Odocoileus hemionis), bighorn sheep (Ovis Canadensis), and pronghorn antelope (Antilocapra Americana). Gray wolf (Canis lupus) may also be present in Montana and mountain lion (Puma concolor) may also be present in Montana and South Dakota. Comment: Gray Wolf, Mountain Lion, Bighorn Sheep are not contained within the FEIS or ER as Big Game Species. The addition of these species does not change the evaluation of impacts to Big Game species found in the FEIS and the DSEIS.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6-12, Line: 7th Bullet DSEIS Text: Coordinate the suitability of fertilizers and pH modifiers in native rangelands to minimize the potential spread of non-native and invasive species with agricultural agents/rangeland experts and manage accordingly. Comment: This potential mitigation measure is inconsistent with the mitigation measure contained in the CMRP. The CMRP states: If site-specific conditions warrant and if agreed to by the landowner, the Contractor shall apply amendments (fertilizer and soil pH modifier materials and formulations) commonly used for agricultural soils in the area and in accordance with written recommendations from the local soil conservation authority, land management agencies, or landowner. Amendments shall be incorporated into the normal plow layer as soon as possible after application. (CMRP sect 4.11.3; page 30). Keystone consulted with rangelands experts and the NRCS in developing the measures contained in the CMRP and con/rec units.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6-12, 8th Bullet DSEIS Text: Coordinate with landowners to discourage intensive grazing in the restored forested areas along the construction ROW during the first five growing seasons. Comment: The recommended measure is only applicable in Nebraska. The CMRP states: Keystone shall work with landowners to discourage intense livestock grazing of the construction right-of-way during the first growing season by utilization of temporary fencing or deferred grazing, or increased grazing rotation frequency. (CMRP sect 4.11.4; page 32).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.6-12, 11th Bullet DSEIS Text: Develop a Migratory Bird Conservation Plan in consultation with USFWS to comply with the MBTA and implement provisions of Executive Order 13186 by providing benefits to migratory birds and their habitats within the states where the proposed Project would be constructed, operated, and maintained. Comment: The SEIS should address the Special Purpose permit or alternative migratory bird authorization that is under consideration by USFWS.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-3, Line:18 DSEIS Text:In accordance with the CMRP (Appendix G) and based on field survey results, site-specific crossing plans would be developed for each waterbody that would be crossed by the proposed pipeline. Comment: The CMRP only commits to site-specific crossing plans as needed. (CMRP sect 7.1; page 54-55): Keystone will complete site-specific crossing plans for certain waterbody crossings if required by the applicable regulatory agencies during federal or state permitting processes. At most waterbody crossings, Keystone's standard crossing approach is adequate for permitting purposes, there is no value in preparing sitespecific crossing plans if the regulator permitting the crossing does not require it.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-6, Last three lines of third paragraph DSEIS Text: Therefore, the non-flowing open-cut and flowing open-cut crossing methods may not meet the Section 401 requirements of the MDEQ for Nationwide Permits. For Standard Permits, separate Section 401 verification from the MDEQ would be required. Comment: Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements. Keystone will use dry crossing methods in streams containing water in Montana as required in its MFSA Certificate.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-8, Line: 37 DSEIS Text: …appropriate construction windows would be determined for each crossing….majority of fish spawn April thru July Comment: Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements. Construction windows are not required by regulatory agencies for non-listed species. As the DSEIS recognizes, in-stream trenching and backfill work periods are very short, thus minimizing potential effects of suspended sediments on eggs and fish. Implementation of this measure throughout the project would increase the numbers of tie-ins and the duration of construction disturbance. The unintended consequences resulting from this would include extended disruption to landowners, extended and increased use of public roadways and increased potential for erosion and sedimentation along the ROW.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-11, Line: 8 DSEIS Text: 8 Keystone proposes to equip the hydrostatic test water intake structure (often a large box-type structure) with 500 mesh (0.001 inch, 0.025 millimeter, 25 microns) screens to prevent the entrainment of fish and macroinvertebrates. Comment: It is not feasible to draw water through a 0.001 mesh screen. Keystone will use 0.1-inch mesh wire screen.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-11, Line: 34 DSEIS Text: In addition, water samples would be taken prior to discharge of the water, as required by state and federal permits Comment:Testing is accomplished during discharge in accordance with permits, not prior to discharge.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-13, Line: 9 DSEIS Text: Given this, it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed pipeline could also elevate stream temperatures. Studies along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (BLM 2002) indicate that groundwater temperatures are elevated by the heat from the pipeline (the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System is also a heated pipeline that is buried in several river drainages). Comment: The parenthetical suggests that Keystone XL would be a "heated" pipeline; it is not a heated system. Any heat effect is generated by friction of the oil moving through the pipeline. TAPS is not an applicable comparison given the differences in the flow rates and the fact that TAPS traverses permafrost, not typical temperate soils/streams. The impacts of temperature changes are more noticeable in soils/streams for the restricted temperature range found in arctic climates.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-13, Line: 39 DSEIS Text: Construction at open-cut river crossings should be planned to take advantage of non-spawning time frames (August through March), thus reducing impacts during this critical life stage. Comment: Keystone will comply with existing state and federal permit requirements. These requirements do not mandate stream crossing construction windows for non-listed species. As the DSEIS recognizes, in-stream trenching and backfill durations are very short, thus minimizing potential effects of suspended sediments on eggs and fish when best management practices described in the CMRP are employed. Construction on most spreads would kick off in the May/June time frame and stream crossings would be initiated within a few days after kick-off and advance at a pace and overall duration commensurate with mainline construction. However, this recommended additional mitigation measure would restrict the available construction window for open cut stream crossings to a 2 to 3 month period after August 1st. To ensure installation of all streams after August 1st would require the addition of some 1,000 or more skilled workers overall during the peak construction period (thus increasing demand for camp accommodations on those spreads with camps). The resulting increased congestion on the ROW, more activity going on at numerous simultaneous work fronts along the ROW, and inefficiencies due the stream crossing skips and move-around would all increase the risk of safety and environmental incidents. This would also potentially increase other environmental impacts by extending the duration of construction disturbance due to delayed final clean up and reclamation (in some areas to the next spring) thus extending disruption to landowners, extending and increasing the intensity of use of public roadways, and increasing the potential for erosion and sedimentation along the ROW.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.7-14, Line: 1 DSEIS Text: To reduce the potential impacts of hydrostatic water withdrawal on eggs and drifting macroinvertebrates in sensitive surface water sources, water withdrawal should be avoided during any low-flow periods that coincide with the spawning and egg development timing window. This can be achieved through timing of water withdrawal or the selection of an alternative water source. Comment: Keystone will comply with any restrictions on water withdrawal in the required withdrawal permits.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-2, Line: 35 DSEIS Text: The northern long-eared bat (Myotis septentrionalis) is also discussed in this section Comment: The discussion should be consistent with the BA; this species is not included in the BA.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-5, Line: 3-8 DSEIS Text: Although the USFWS has indicated that black-footed ferrets have not been observed in the proposed Project area in South Dakota, and this area is no longer required to meet USFWS guidelines under Section 7 of ESA, the SDGFP has requested an estimate of the number of prairie dog habitat acres that would be lost to pipeline construction and operation and that additional surveys be conducted to determine the presence of black footed ferrets in this habitat before any construction activity occurs. Comment: Keystone has not been required by the FWS to conduct surveys in South Dakota for the black-footed ferret. The August 2011 FEIS summarizes the reasons why: "In Nebraska and South Dakota, black-footed ferret surveys are no longer recommended in prairie dog colonies. All prairie dog towns within the proposed Project route are considered unsuitable for the reintroduction of the black-footed ferret, and there are no currently existing black-footed ferret populations crossed by the proposed Project route (Tacha and Carlson, pers comm. 2011)." The lack of a requirement to survey for black-footed ferrets is further substantiated in the DSEIS, first bullet, page 4.8-5.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-5, Line: 37-38 DSEIS Text: No prairie dog towns would be crossed or impacted by the proposed Project. Comment:The DSEIS is inconsistent with the BA. See Section 3.1.1.2, page 3.0-3.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-9, Line: 2nd bullet DSEIS Text: Develop a conservation plan with MFWP, SDGFP, USFWS, and BLM to address impacts to greater sage-grouse…. Comment: A conservation plan has been developed and agreed to with MFWP, SDGFP, USFWS, and BLM through agency review and consultation of the plans presented in Appendices O and P as well as compensatory mitigation that has been defined for impacts to sage-grouse habitat in Montana and South Dakota.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-9, Line: 3rd Bullet DSEIS Text: Follow all protection and mitigation efforts as identified by USFWS and SDGFP including: a) identify all greater sage-grouse leks within the buffer distances from the construction ROW set forth for the greater sage-grouse by USFWS; and b) avoid or restrict construction activities as specified by USFWS within buffer zones, between March 1 and June. Comment:Add "15" after "June" at the end of the sentence.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-9, DSEIS Text:..and other important habitat between approximate mileposts 95-98 and 100-121. Comment: The MFWP, MDEQ, and BLM defined “important habitat” as sagebrush habitat between Mileposts 96.5 and 123 in a meeting with Keystone on January 31, 2013 in Helena, Montana.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-10, Line: 5th bullet DSEIS Text:..Monitor and report on establishment of sagebrush in restored areas, unless otherwise requested by the landowner…. Comment:In the MFSA Environmental Specification, the landowner commitment was pertinent to seeding sagebrush, not monitoring sagebrush.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-10, Line: 6th bullet DSEIS Text:Criteria were established with MDEQ, MFWP, and BLM in a meeting with Keystone on January 31, 2013 in Helena, Montana.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-11, Line: 2nd Bullet DSEIS Text: Develop a research fund, in consultation with SDGFP, and managed by a third party to evaluate the effects of pipeline construction on greater sage-grouse. Transcanada comment: Keystone has not been required to develop an additional research fund to evaluate the effects of pipeline construction on sage grouse leks. Keystone's meeting with the FWS and SDGFP indicated that the mitigation funds could be used for research purposes as well as conservation..	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-13, Line: 3-5 DSEIS Text: Surveys would be repeated at these river crossings prior to construction to ensure that no nests have been built within 0.25 mile of the proposed ROW or any areas that would be affected by construction activities. Transcanada comment: The survey corridor was 0.25 of the centerline (BA, Table 3.2-2).	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-13, Line: 15-17 DSEIS Text: Indirect impacts to piping plovers from temporary water reductions during hydrostatic testing would be negligible since the volume of water needed would be withdrawn at a rate less than 10 percent of the baseline daily flow and returned to its source within a 30-day period. Transcanada comment: This restriction is only for the Platte River basin, please see the BA, page 3.0-66.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-14, Line:1-7 DSEIS Text:In Montana, the proposed Project route would cross and may contribute to fragmentation of an estimated 164.4 miles of highquality native grasslands, and outside of the habitat north of the Missouri River there are approximately 87 miles of native, mixed-grass prairie that could serve as suitable habitat depending on grazing regimes and adjacent human activity. In South Dakota, the proposed Project route would cross and may contribute to fragmentation of an estimated 103.6 miles of high quality native grasslands in 17 locations in South Dakota. In Nebraska, Sprague's pipits are considered uncommon migrants Transcanada comment: Miles are 44 and 87 in the BA, with a total of 119 miles in the BA section 3.2.2.2, page 94.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-14, Line:4th Bullet DSEIS Text: Develop a Migratory Bird Conservation Plan in consultation with USFWS to comply with the MBTA and implement provisions of Executive Order 13186 by providing benefits to migratory birds and their habitats within the states where the proposed Project would be constructed, operated, and maintained. Transcanada comment: The SEIS should address the Special Purpose permit or alternative migratory bird authorization that is under consideration by USFWS.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-14, Line:9-12 DSEIS Text: The proposed Project may cause grassland habitat loss, alteration, and fragmentation; loss of eggs or young during construction; and facilitated raptor predation from power poles from associated power lines. To reduce impacts to native grasslands and wildlife, the following measures identified in the proposed Project CMRP (Appendix G) would be implemented: Transcanada comment: All of these measures are in the BA but are not in the CMRP.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-15, Line: 14 DSEIS Text: Temporary water withdrawals to support hydrostatic testing are not expected to result in impacts to the whooping crane since the volume of water needed would be withdrawn at a rate of less than 10 percent of the baseline daily flow and returned to its source within a 30-day period. Transcanada comment: This restriction is only for the Platte River basin, please see the BA, page 3.0-66.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-15, Line: 12 DSEIS Text: In other areas along the proposed Project route, revegetation (particularly within riparian zones and in wetland habitats) would reduce habitat impacts. Temporary water withdrawals to support hydrostatic testing are not expected to result in impacts to the whooping crane since the volume of water needed would be withdrawn at a rate less than 10 percent of the baseline daily flow and returned to its source within a 30-day period. Transcanada comment: This restriction is only for the Platte River basin, please see the BA, page 3.0-66.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-15, Line: 1st Bullet DSEIS Text: During spring and fall whooping crane migration periods (March 15–May 31, and September 1–November 31, respectively), Environmental Monitors would complete a survey of any wetland or riverine habitat areas potentially used by whooping cranes in the morning (prior to sunrise) and afternoon (after 4:00 pm), before starting equipment. These surveys would follow the Whooping Crane Survey Protocol previously developed by the USFWS and NGPC (USFWS 2012). Transcanada comment: This recommended mitigation measure is inconsistent with the mitigation measure found in the BA page 3.0-23.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-15, Line: 2nd Bullet DSEIS Text: Cease work if whooping cranes are spotted and contact the USFWS and appropriate state agency representative in Montana, South Dakota, or Nebraska for further instruction. Work could proceed if whooping cranes leave the area. The compliance manager would record the whooping crane sighting, bird departure time, and work start time would all be recorded on a survey form. Transcanada comment: New commitment, this is not in the BA or FEIS. BA section 3.1.3.4, page 3.0-23	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-24, 25, Line: 36+ DSEIS Text: To avoid impacts to mountain plovers, the following measures would be implemented: [Bullets follow] Transcanada comment: These mitigation measures are inconsistent with those found in the BA, page 3.0-69, and do not correspond to USFWS recommendations provided to Keystone	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.8-27, Line: 1st bullet DSEIS Text: Conduct river otter surveys prior to proposed Project construction along the Bad River, White River, and Cheyenne River in South Dakota and along the Niobrara River, Loup River, North Branch Elkhorn River, South Fork Elkhorn River, Cedar River and Platte River in Nebraska (if suitable den habitat occurs near the river crossings and if construction would occur during the denning period). Transcanada comment: The Project no longer crosses the Cedar River, North Branch or South Branch of the Elkhorn River. The Project does cross the main stem of the Elkhorn River.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.9-7, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: Keystone would take reasonable steps to identify organic farms along the proposed Project route. Where Keystone is made aware of the presence of certified organic farms along the proposed Project route prior to construction, Keystone would work with those organic farm operations to ensure that pipeline construction does not impair the farm's organic status. If the proposed Project would cross an organic farm, Keystone would work with the landowner to take reasonable steps to avoid mixing organic soil and non-organic soil. Transcanada comment: Comment: This condition was agreed to for Nebraska landowners. There is no similar requirement in the MFSA or SD PUC Certificates.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.10-22, Line: 8 DSEIS Text: In South Dakota the combination of a sales or use tax on all materials, equipment, and services, plus the contractors' excise tax on amounts received by contractors for work done in the state, would generate an estimated $45.6 million for state government over two years of construction on the proposed Project. Transcanada comment: Comment: Possible typo, correct sales/use tax estimate should be $46.5 million instead of $45.6 million. The value of $46.5 million was provided by Keystone via DOS DR 8 (Dec 3rd, 2012 timeframe).	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.10-26, Table 4.10-11, footnote a DSEIS Text: Property tax estimates in the table for Montana and South Dakota use an estimate of the total valuation of the proposed Project provided by Keystone. Transcanada comment: No values for total valuation are provided in Table 4.10-11, only resultant property tax estimates for first full year of operation are noted. Consequently, the estimate calculation for Montana and South Dakota is not transparent.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Table 4.11-3 Transcanada comment: Table 4.11-3 missing sites: 25BD236, 25BD237, 25HT63, 25JF53, 25JF507, 25JF59, 25KP349, 25KP350, 25KP351, 25MK35, 25MK36, 25MK37, 25NC153, 25PK31, 25PK41, 25PK42, 25PK43, 25SA91, 25SA92, 25SA93, 25SA94, 25AP74 (AP00-084), AP00-000, AP00, 300, BO00-000, BO03-008, BD00-235, BD00236, KP00-105, PK00-220, C502NA021FS, C502NA0022FS, C502NA024, C502NA025FS, C601KP001FS, C601BD004FS, C601BD006FS, C601HT002FS, C601HT003FS, C601NA002FS, C601MR007FS, C601MR008FS, C601PK002FS, C601YK001FS, C601YK002FS, C601JF002FS, and C601JF007FS.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Line: Table 4.11-3 [Table 4.11-3 mark-ups]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-5, paragraph 2 Transcanada Response: numbers need to be updated when Section 3.11 is revised.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-5, full section Transcanada Response: numbers in this section will need to be updated once Table 4.11-1 is revised.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-6 through 4.11-9, Table 4.11-1 Transcanada Response: Table 4.11-1 – missing sites: C002VA007, C001DA001, 24DW0552, C58FA003, 24VL1937, 24VL1939, C001DA003, C210FA001, 24RV0132, and 24SH1222.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-6 through 4.11-9, Table 4.11-1 [Table 4.11-1 mark-ups]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-9 Transcanada comment: numbers in this section will need to be updated once Table 4.11-2 is revised.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Table 4.11-2 Transcanada comment: Table 4.11-2 - missing sites: 39MD0895, 39MD0834, MD00000339, 39HU2003, and 39LM2007.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-10 and 4.11-11, Table 4.11-2 [Table 4.11-2 mark-ups]	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.11-15, Section 4.11.5.4 Transcanada comment: This section needs to be updated with data from the ND report.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.12-19, 6th Bullet DSEIS Text: Offer selection preference for contractors who use energy efficient and low-emission equipment in their equipment/construction fleet during the construction bidding process. Transcanada comment: Keystone already has completed its pipeline contractor selection process. Keystone makes its selections only from pre-qualified, reputable, experienced contractors. The use of energy efficient/low emission equipment is not a criterion in the selection; however, given the significant size and importance of the Project, Keystone expects that contractors will use efficient construction equipment of recent manufacture. The current generation of construction equipment operates on cleaner diesel fuel. In addition, it is Keystone's expectation that its contractors maintain their equipment to manufacturers' specifications.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.12-20, Line: 10+ DSEIS Text: During proposed Project construction, the following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize noise impact on individuals, sensitive areas, and livestock [bullets follow]: Transcanada comment: Keystone will comply with all state and local regulations concerning noise control. Keystone is also identifying noise sensitive receptors that are in close proximity to HDD locations to develop site-specific measures to abate noise impacts to landowners. Keystone confers with landowners along the construction ROW prior to construction to identify any noise related concerns they may have and to develop mutually agreeable solutions. Retrofitting construction equipment across the industry to accommodate a single project is not feasible or practicable given the short duration of impact. For all pump station operations, Keystone will identify all noise sensitive receptors within 1 mile of each pump station. Ambient noise measurements will be taken at these receptors prior to operations to determine the incremental noise impact pump station operations may have. If landowners require that Keystone address an incremental noise increase, measures will be developed specific to the site. Keystone pump stations are not housed in insulated buildings and berms are not constructed around each pump station for noise design. Pump station engineering design does not allow for installation of insulated buildings or berms around the pump stations for the noise mitigation purposes. Keystone would observe the USEPA noise standard of 55 dBA Ln for each pump station and site specific noise mitigation is based on that criteria.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-2, Line: 11-12 DSEIS Text: Most spills ranging in magnitude from small to medium (up to 1,000 barrels [bbl.]) would occur on construction sites or at operations and maintenance facilities. Transcanada comment: Delete "Most" - small to medium spills can occur anywhere on the pipeline system including the pipeline itself.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-2, Line: 16 DSEIS Text: For medium to large spills (greater than 1,000 bbl.), especially those that reach water resources, the response time between initiation of the spill event and arrival of the response contractors would influence potential magnitude of impacts to environmental resources. Transcanada comment: This sentence, within the context of the paragraph, suggests that response to medium and large spills would be slower, however, Keystone's response -- regardless of spill size -- will be quick. It is correct that response time will effect the magnitude of impacts.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-3, Second set of bullets DSEIS Text: The total volume of a spill is a combination of the following: Transcanada comment: add "elevation profile" to list	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-3, Line: 15-17 DSEIS Text:After the leak is detected and isolated, the volume of liquid in the pipeline between the isolation valves (valves that stop the flow of pipeline contents) could be released unless otherwise controlled. Transcanada comment: It is correct that oil between closed valves can still be released, however, not the entire volume of oil between the valves would be released, due to the elevation profile of the pipeline, without regard to the application of any other control measure. Revise to read "After the leak is detected and isolated, the volume of liquid in the pipeline between the isolation valves (valves that stop the flow of pipeline contents) could be released. The actual volume released is dependent on a number of factors, including primarily pipeline elevation."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-3, Line: 28-30 DSEIS Text: Until sensors detect a deviation in pressure below the monitoring threshold (which activates pipeline shutdown), oil can escape from the pipeline and create a spill. Transcanada comment: This sentence is not correct. Revise the sentence to state the following: When pressure, flow and temperature sensors, in combination with software, detect a deviation that exceeds a threshold, an alarm is sounded. The control room enters into a 10 minute investigation window. If the investigation is indeterminate at the end of the window or a potential leak is confirmed, the control room will shut down the pipeline. It is during this detection, investigation and subsequent shutdown time that oil can escape from the pipeline and create a spill.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-3, Line: 33-35 DSEIS Text: ..however, if the valves do not close properly, outflow could continue…ineffective valves adds to the spill. Transcanada comment: While this is theoretically possible, it does not reflect reasonably anticipated events. Keystone will take steps to install valves that close properly.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-8, Line: 27-30 DSEIS Text: In Canada, where the proposed Project originates, there are three agencies with responsibility for regulating pipelines Transcanada comment: Not correct, there are multiple regulatory authorities including, for example, the British Columbia Oil and Gas Commission, etc.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-8 DSEIS Text:Inconsistent references to barrels and gallons.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-17, Line:30 DSEIS Text: The PHMSA data indicate that large spills are associated with severe damage to or complete failure of a major pipeline component (e.g. rupture in the pipe material…) Transcanada comment:This example should include third party strike.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-18, Line:13 and 18 Transcanada comment:Add caveat that reference is to "unconfined" shallow groundwater resource.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-18, Line:25 DSEIS Text: Reference to "longer term disruption." Transcanada comment: The duration of impacts does not appear to account for clean up, since impacts from a small spill to drinking water resources, wetlands, and particularly to oiling of vegetation or wildlife also would be short term. The duration of small spill impacts would last days to weeks, particularly after accounting for clean up.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-18, Line:29 DSEIS Text: A slow subsurface release would infiltrate down into soil Transcanada comment: change "would" to "could"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-18, Line:37-38 DSEIS Text: …a plume of chemicals could form and migrate away from the release site Transcanada comment: As in other places in this section, this discussion does not take into account spill response measures on mitigating potential impacts. Petroleum hydrocarbons are unlikely to have time to dissolve in groundwater and form a plume that can migrate due to the fact that Keystone will conduct a prompt response that would remove the free product.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-19, Line: 13 DSEIS Text: . . . Also from response actions . . . Transcanada comment: Clarify by inserting "surface disturbance associated with" after "also from" and before "response actions."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-19, Line: 16 DSEIS Text:In a large spill, very little of the oil released (relative to the size of the spill) would be contained in the immediate vicinity of the release point. The majority of the volume would migrate away from the release site. Transcanada comment: Not correct. Even in a large spill, the oil can be contained in the immediate vicinity depending on terrain, and other environmental conditions as recognized in the last sentence of the paragraph. If the oil was spilled directly into water, then these sentences would be correct.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-19, Line: 18 DSEIS Text: The distribution of the oil would be influenced by terrain, location, soil type, weather, soil cover, and the response of operators to the release as described above. Transcanada comment: Land based v. water based spill should be added to this list of factors influencing migration of the oil.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-19, Line: 29-30 DSEIS Text: The size or extent of a spill could be affected by the terrain or topography of the release site, release location Transcanada comment:Land based v. water based spill should be added to this list of factors influencing migration of the oil.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-19, Line: 37-38 DSEIS Text: The pool of oil on the groundwater surface could continuously supply the dissolved-constituent plume Transcanada comment: Does not account for clean-up. It takes time for soluble compounds in the oil to dissolve into the water. Because the source would be entirely or mostly removed, the source of oil for groundwater contamination would be significantly diminished.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-20, Line: 6 DSEIS Text: Once the spill reaches the surface, the oil would flow following the topographic gradient Transcanada comment:Revise sentence to read: "Oil on the soil surface would flow following the topographic contours, pooling in low-lying areas."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-20, Line: 16-18 DSEIS Text: In flowing water systems, sinking oil could be transported downstream without obvious surface oiling of stream banks. Sinking oil can be deposited in river or stream bottoms and become a continual source of oil as changing water flows release the deposited oil. Transcanada comment:The crude oils transported by the pipeline all have API gravities that indicate the oil would initially float on the surface and likely would oil stream banks. If oil does remain on the water surface for a sufficient time, without being cleaned up, there is the potential for some oil to sink. There are really two types of sunken oil - that which is like a tar ball and that which is a light weight crude emulsion. The tar ball type would be persistent but would not actively disperse free oil. The light weight crude emulsion is not as persistent and could release free oil. Sunken oil can be detected, notwithstanding the lack of visual clues at the surface. In addition, there are many procedures for the containment and clean up of sunken and submerged oil.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-20, Line: 35-37 DSEIS Text: …the more soluble components of oil (e.g., benzene, toluene, xylenes, among others) would dissolve in the water Transcanada comment: change "would" to "could"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-20, Line: 38 DSEIS Text:These dissolved plumes could continue to lengthen and spread until all of the oil's soluble components dissolve into the surrounding water. Transcanada comment: It is unlikely that all soluble components would dissolve into the surrounding water regardless of duration. Most compounds have relatively low solubilities and would preferentially remain in any residual oil, where they would be broken down by natural attenuation processes.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-21, Line: 1 DSEIS Text:…the oil could become heavier and sink to the bottom sediments where the oil would further degrade Transcanada comment:change "would" to "could".	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-21, Line: 10 DSEIS Text:Smaller drainage channels generally flow into larger channels… Transcanada comment: Not generally. This scenario could occur but it is only one of many potential scenarios.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-21, Line: 27 DSEIS Text: In remote areas, spills may not be discovered immediately… Transcanada comment:Add "small" in front of "spills." Also edit: and a "small, slow" release may not be detected "immediately" by leak detection systems.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-21, Line:32-33 DSEIS Text:Unusually Sensitive Areas Transcanada comment: wetlands, flowing streams and rivers are not included in the defined term "Unusually Sensitive Areas."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-22, Line:34 DSEIS Text:Dilbit is comparable to a heavy, sour crude oil… Transcanada comment: Dilbit can be comparable to light to heavy crudes.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-22, Line: 34-36 DSEIS Text: The viscosity of the oil . . . . Transcanada comment: This temperature is not the result of the product's viscosity nor is it intended to make the product less viscous; rather the temperature of the product results from friction created by the pumping action of the system.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-23, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: …where it may be trapped and remain for extended periods of time. Transcanada comment: Insert "Clean up is expected to remove the majority of the released oil" before the sentence beginning with "This buried oil . . ."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-24, Line: 12 DSEIS Text: Inside the pipeline, the oxygen level is generally too low, making an explosion unlikely Transcanada comment: There is no oxygen in the pipeline, thus no potential for explosion.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-24, Line: 18 DSEIS Text: Explosions at a pump station could potentially occur due to a fire unrelated to the pipeline such as at generator fuel tanks or local storage tanks. The fire, if uncontrolled for a prolonged duration, could affect the integrity of a pipeline, causing a leak and fuel for a pipeline fire and potentially an explosion Transcanada comment:An uncontrolled fire of long duration is unlikely to affect the integrity of the pipeline sufficiently to cause a leak, fire or explosion. In addition the ERP further mitigates any potential impacts from a fire unrelated to the pipeline.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-25, Line: 12 DSEIS Text: …however, localized toxicity could occur from virtually any size of crude oil spill Transcanada comment: This hypothesis does not take into account spill response and clean up.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-25, Line: 21 DSEIS Text:Based on the combination of toxicity, solubility, and bioavailability, benzene was determined to dominate toxicity associated with potential crude oil spills Transcanada comment: However, benzene in crude oil is in very low concentrations.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-25, Line: 27 DSEIS Text: Because the diluted bitumen crude oils have a significant amount of lighter hydrocarbons added, they tend to have higher benzene concentrations than many other heavy oils Transcanada comment: Benzene in dilbits is low in concentration (0.15%, See Appendix Q) and significantly lower than light crudes.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-26, second full paragraph DSEIS Text: Dilbit released into the aquatic environment could…. Transcanada comment: This paragraph is equally applicable to all crude oils, not just dilbit.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-27, Line:26 DSEIS Text: including populated areas, drinking water protections areas, and Unusually Sensitive Areas. Transcanada comment: drinking water protection areas are included within Unusually Sensitive Areas. Please see the attached table for a mileage summary of HCAs along the project route.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-28, Line:3-14 DSEIS Text:PHMSA identifies certain surface and groundwater resources as drinking water Unusually Sensitive Areas… Transcanada comment: The discussion of Groundwater Unusually Sensitive Areas should accurately reflect 49 CFR 195.6 and should include a discussion of aquifer sensitivity, i.e ., aquifers classified as 1 and 2A	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-30, Line: 18-19 DSEIS Text: It was also assumed that a small and medium plume . . . . Transcanada comment: The scenario of a small leak going undetected for six weeks is highly unlikely to occur. In order to meet the requirement of 26 over flights per year, there would not be two consecutive 3 week intervals without an over flight. Moreover, there are numerous additional methods of detecting a small leak including ground patrol and landowner reporting	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-30, Line: Table 4.13-4 Transcanada comment: The dissolved phase benzene plume length is based on total spill volume and assumes no clean up. In reality, the clean up would remove most, if not all, product, thereby removing source oil.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-30, Line: 35-36 (excluding table) DSEIS Text:The following are two examples of persistent plumes: • Former Nebraska Ordinance Plant Mead, Saunders County, Nebraska; and • Former Cornhusker Army Ammunition Plant (CHAAP), Hall County, Nebraska Transcanada comment: These spills are not representative of impacts from crude oil spills. This discussion combines the discussion of crude oil plume lengths and plume lengths of persistent compounds is confusing. Recommend starting a separate subsection for "Contaminants other than those found in crude oil . . ." .	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-32, Line: Table 4.13-5 Transcanada comment: Table heading of "Potential Impact" is confusing. Suggest changing heading to "Potential for Occurrence" of the impact. Also, the footnotes refer to gallons; should be barrels.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-32, Line: 13-14 (excluding table) DSEIS Text: Spill impact buffers for the proposed pipeline route do not cross any populated area HCAs. However, for completeness, the potential impacts of a spill to this type of HCA are discussed below Transcanada comment: How does it make it more complete by discussing a situation that does not exist on the KXL system?	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-33, Line: 14 DSEIS Text: If oil were to be spilled into surface water or groundwater supplies that serve as human drinking water sources, use of these sources would be prohibited, and the sources would be monitored under state regulatory processes until the levels return to safe drinking water levels Transcanada comment: This argument makes the assumption that a spill would result in contamination of drinking water. If State regulatory authorities suspected that water quality standards were exceeded, use of water sources would be prohibited until it was determined that drinking water quality was acceptable.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-36, Line: 22-24 DSEIS Text: …cross the more sensitive highly erodible by wind and highly erodible by water soil types, respectively. Transcanada comment: The text should clarify that erodible soils were selected because of potential impacts that could occur from surface disturbance during clean up and reclamation, not from the oil spill itself.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-37, Line: 7-10 DSEIS Text: Spill clean up could affect the soils . . . Transcanada comment: Spill clean up could affect the soils, e.g., erodible soils . . .	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-37, Line: 15 - 19 DSEIS Text: …required to meet applicable residential cleanup levels… Transcanada comment: Delete the word "residential" from first sentence; clean up is to applicable levels. Specify that the levels identified in the second sentence are "residential" levels.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-41, Line: 19 DSEIS Text: .. . Readily disperse in the environment. . . Transcanada comment: . . Do not readily disperse in the environment, do not bioaccumulate, and therefore, . . .	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-43, Line: 34-36 DSEIS Text: .…if the species or community is a key recreational or commercial resource, biological impacts… Transcanada comment: There is no context to address whether this hypothetical scenario is likely to occur on the Project. It would appear that there is a very low likelihood of this occurring on the Project. Recommend deleting sentence.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-44, Line: Table 4.13-11 Transcanada comment: Suggest the table should be limited to NRHP eligible sites, not all cultural resource sites.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-45, Line: 2-3 DSEIS Text: Most crude oils move across surface waters at a rate of 100 to 300 meters per hour Transcanada comment: To clarify, this rate of spread pertains to standing water with no discernible flow and excludes environmental influences such as wind.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-49, Second bullet DSEIS Text: South Dakota -- One public water supply well (associated with the Colome SWPA)… Transcanada comment:The pipeline route does not traverse the Colume SWPA and the distance from the public well is greater than 1 mile. By being outside the SWPA, the pipeline is beyond the 20 year "time-of-transit" zone.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-49, All bullets Transcanada comment: This discussion implies that a 1 mile buffer is needed to protect SWPAs, however, SWPAs by definition already have a protective buffer. SWPAs have time-of-transit buffers; therefore, being outside the SWPA indicates that Keystone is already beyond the 20 year time of transit and the SWPA is considered protected.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-50, Line: 23-25 DSEIS Text: …the analysis indicates the need for rapid notification of managers of municipal water intakes downstream… Transcanada comment: The text implies that Keystone has not addressed "the need for rapid notification of managers of municipal water intakes downstream…" when in fact, it is an integral part of the ERP. Please add sentence following this statement, stating " Keystone's Emergency Response Plan contains notification procedures to ensure that these water managers are immediately notified (See Section 4.13.5.2)."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-50, Line: 30 DSEIS Text: ….reduce the concentration of benzene in surface water quickly. Transcanada comment: Use of EPA models (ADIOS2) indicates that benzene concentrations would significantly decrease to nominal levels within the first 18 hours of a spill.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-53, Line: 25-27 DSEIS Text: …both physical removal by response teams and natural attenuation. Natural attenuation could… Transcanada comment: Replace "natural attenuation" with the term "weathering." The fate processes described in the text are most appropriately termed "weathering", whereas "natural attenuation" typically refers to biological and chemical degradation of petroleum hydrocarbons.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-53, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: Longer-term water quality degradation could be… Transcanada comment: Most impacts to water quality (e.g., exceeding drinking water standards and aquatic toxicity) would be short-term (i.e., days to weeks), even for large spills. "Longer-term water quality degradation" does not specify duration. Residual oil that may remain after cleanup could represent a source of localized, low-level contamination, but focused clean up efforts would ensure that residual oil would not likely adversely affect municipal potable water supplies .	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-60, Line: 25 DSEIS Text: …could result in much of the oil being submerged in the water column Transcanada comment: "Much" is subjective. Should restate to "could result in oil becoming submerged in the water column"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-60, Line: 18-41 DSEIS Text: The Department examined . . . Transcanada comment: There is no data to suggest that dilbit is different from other heavy crudes. Revise sentence to state " . . . Evaluate the impacts of other components of heavy crudes, including dilbit. . . . All references in these two paragraphs should replace dilbit with heavy crude.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-60, Line: 30 DSEIS Text: … water environment would require … Transcanada comment: Insert: after "require" add "to a certain extent"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-60, Line: 32 DSEIS Text: will present new Transcanada comment: Delete: replace with "has the potential to present additional"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-62, Line: 10-11 DSEIS Text: Some spilled crude oil could sink through the water into underlying sediments and remain there for years Transcanada comment: Section 4.13.4 in general starts to discuss the effects spill response measures have on mitigating impacts by oil; however, this statement again ignores the impacts of oil removal during response.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-62, Line: 18-19 DSEIS Text: Discussion of catastrophic effects Transcanada comment: Does not recognize that ERP would address both response actions and clean up of oil contaminated wildlife.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-62, Line: 26 Transcanada comment: Consider new paragraph break starting at "Spills to aquatic environments would trigger . . ."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-62, Line: 27-28 DSEIS Text: Spills to aquatic environments would trigger regulator involvement and assessment to implement remedial action. However, response and remediation efforts in a wetland have the potential for appreciable adverse effects from construction/cleanup equipment. Transcanada comment: A spill to any environment that results in regulatory notification would trigger regulator involvement. Additionally, the Net Environmental Benefit Analysis (NEBA) process would be used to ensure response efforts result in net environmental benefit.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-68, Line: 6-7 (excluding table) DSEIS Text: PHMSA regulations require approval for an ERP for the proposed Project at least 6 months prior to beginning pipeline operation Transcanada comment: The ERP does need to be approved by PHMSA but not 6 months prior to going into service.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-69, Line: 18-19 DSEIS Text: The Keystone Oil Control Center is contacted first to engage Keystone's internal response units… Transcanada comment: Revise the sentence to read: "The Keystone Oil control center is contacted first to ensure the pipeline is shut down if it is not already and then to activate an emergency response by both internal and external responders."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-71, Line: 29 DSEIS Text: …personnel as they arrive on site. Transcanada comment: Insert after "personnel as they arrive on site.": "The Incident Command System is a nationally recognized response framework for responding to various emergencies, allowing communication between responders, and a scaled response."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-73, Line: 11 DSEIS Text: The Emergency Site Manager would conduct an initial assessment … Transcanada comment:Change Emergency Site Manager to Incident Commander	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-73, Line: 23 DSEIS Text: The Emergency Site Manager would request additional resources … Transcanada comment: Change Emergency Site Manager to Incident Commander	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-74, Line: 11 DSEIS Text: Care should be exercised… Transcanada comment: The NEBA process will be used to ensure response measures result in net environmental benefit. Additionally, all response efforts need to be approved by regulatory agencies.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.13-79, Line: 38 DSEIS Text: should address a submerged oil as Transcanada comment: Typo: delete the "a" so it reads "should address submerged oil as"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.14-1, Line: 9 DSEIS Text: …development of the oil sands Transcanada comment: Add the word "Canadian" before "oil sands"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.14-3, Line:13 DSEIS Text: …precautionary approach by using … Transcanada comment: Insert the words "conservative and" before "precautionary approach"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.14-5, Line:13 DSEIS Text: …a number of implications included increase in … Transcanada comment: Delete "included" and replace with "including"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-1, Line:1 DSEIS Text:A cumulative effects assessment (CEA) considers … Transcanada comment: Cumulative impacts do not necessarily continue to occur long after construction is completed. Cumulative impacts can encompass, for example, the impacts of three timber sales in a watershed or cumulative visual impacts from, for example, 3 proposed prescribed burns. The visual impacts will not continue to occur long after construction.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-1, Line: 40 DSEIS Text: …increased tax revenue, … Transcanada comment: Add: after "tax revenues," insert "other permanent beneficial impacts include lessening the United States' reliance on other countries' oil"	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-17, Line: 28 DSEIS Text: …types of facilities was previously described … Transcanada comment: Delete "was" and replace with "were"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-18, Line: 7-9 DSEIS Text: 82% of GC would be within 300 feet of existing p/lns utilities or road ROWs Transcanada comment: Re-check.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-18, Line: 17 DSEIS Text: …and permanent wetland impacts would be approximately 217 acres. Transcanada comment: Gulf-Coast Project will not impact this many acres.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-26, Table 4.15-4 DSEIS Text: DSEIS lists one cumulative potential impact concerning access to Mineral/Fossil Fuel Resources, and a direct impact to paleontological resources during construction and indirect impact to possible geologic hazards during construction. Transcanada comment: The DSEIS does make allowance for these impacts.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-36, Table 11-14 DSEIS Text:In floodplain areas adjacent to waterbodies, the contours would be restored to as close to previously existing contours as practical and the disturbed area would be revegetate during construction of the ROW in accordance with the CMRP. Transcanada comment: FEIS, Section 3.14.3.14; page 3.14-25: The majority of pipeline construction activity would generally pass by a specific location within a 30- day period before final grading, seeding, and mulching takes place, thereby resulting in minor short-term contributions to cumulative air quality impacts.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-40, Line: 23 DSEIS Text: not necessarily represent Transcanada comment: Delete the word "necessarily"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-40, Line: 37-39 DSEIS Text: Permanent wetland losses due to operational ancillary facilities are estimated to be 0.82 acres in Montana, 1.2 acres in South Dakota, and no acres in Nebraska (see Wetland to Upland Conversion in Table 4.4-2). Transcanada comment: As commented on pages 4.4-1 and 2 these numbers are reflective on database reviews that are not considering survey review of the potential wetlands and waterbodies through along the project using USACE standards for identification and classification.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-42, Line: 43 DSEIS Text: expected to affect 8 acres Transcanada comment: Check for accuracy and consistency	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-44, Line: 10 DSEIS Text: Permanent impacts to only 47.3 acres of forested areas spaced across Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska (includes forested upland and wetland acres) would occur within the 30-foot-wide permanent easements centered on the pipeline. Transcanada comment: There is no regulatory requirement to use a 30-foot-wide permanent easement in forested areas in MT, SD, NE. 30-foot permanent footprint for access roads, but not ROW.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-44, Line: 24 DSEIS Text: Although native grasslands would be reseeded with native seed, short grass prairie and mixed-grass prairie areas could take up to 100 years to become re-established due to poor soil conditions and low moisture levels. Transcanada comment: Section 4.5.4 (page 4.5-11) of the DSEIS states: Although native grasslands would be reseeded with native seed, construction effects on previously untilled native prairies could be long term, as destruction of the prairie sod during trenching may require more than 100 years for recovery. Short grass prairie and mixed-grass prairie areas may take 5 to 8 or more years to re-establish due to poor soil conditions and low moisture levels. Review for consistency in the description of re-establish estimates	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page:4.15-56, Line: 18 DSEIS Text: project are also considered … Transcanada comment: Add: ", but not believed to be significant because the Gulf Coast Project is not within migratory corridor."	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-76, Line: 31 DSEIS Text: from the original capacity of 275,000 to … Transcanada comment: Table 4.15-18 lists Motiva capacity at 300,000 bpd	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-80, Line:24 DSEIS Text: Since a portion of the petroleum coke produced from upgrading Transcanada comment: Not a complete sentence	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-80, Line: 31 DSEIS Text: … and as water cut of the produced reservoir fluids increases. Transcanada comment:Phrase garbled	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.15-107, Line:30 DSEIS Text:… although the latter can be in part act … Transcanada comment: Delete: "be"	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.16-1 Line: 5th Bullet DSEIS Text:.Keystone would implement the measures designed to avoid or reduce impacts described in its application for a Presidential Permit and supplemental filings with the U.S. Department of State (Department); the additional measures identified in Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences, of this Supplemental EIS; the methods described in the Project Construction, Mitigation, and Reclamation Plan presented in Appendix G; and the construction methods described in Appendix Y, Pipeline Construction in Sand Hills Native Rangelands. Transcanada comment: Appendix Y, Pipeline Construction in Sand Hills Native Rangelands should have no bearing on KXL now that the Nebraska re-route avoids the NDEQ defined Sand Hills. The CMRP Rev 4 is included in the DSEIS in Appendix G, and includes revised language pertaining to fragile soils procedures which supersede Appendix Y, Pipeline Construction in Sand Hills Native Rangelands.	EDIT

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.16-4, Line: Table 4.16-1 DSEIS Text:Combustion of fossil fuels such as crude oil is a major source of global greenhouse gas emissions, which contribute to human-caused climate change. Transcanada comment: This statement is included in the Operation Impacts to Air Quality and GHG. This clearly refers only to potential effects of the oil after it leaves the project's purview.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 4.16-5, Line:Table 4.16-1 DSEIS Text: The proposed Project's lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions (and their effects on global climate change) are discussed under Air Quality, above Transcanada comment: This statement is included in the Operation Impacts to Climate Change. See above comment.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 5.1-1 Line: Table 3 DSEIS Text: for that or other reasons. Transcanada comment: Delete phrase. No explanation of what this refers to.	EDIT
TransCanada	April 22, 2013	Page: 5.2-29 Line:2 DSEIS Text: The 2011 Steele City Alternative route would follow the same route as the proposed Project except that Gregory County, South Dakota…… Transcanada comment: KXL does not cross or have facilities in Gregory County SD	EDIT
Travis Gallagher	March 7, 2013	the [monetary] effort to build Keystone XL could go a long way to develop…safer energies like wind and solar.	ALT 01
Travis Gallagher	March 7, 2013	When did 'demand' constitute a good reason for giving someone something that will harm their children? Once informed, they would rather have energy that does not entail such risks.	PN 02
Travis Gallagher	March 7, 2013	[The reasoning that] the Keystone XL pipeline would not lead to more greenhouse gas emissions because the oil sands would be developed and transported to markets by other means if the pipeline is blocked…ignores the high long-term risks of continued fossil fuel use.	PN 06, CLIM 12
Travis Leeper	April 2, 2013	We need not focus on more energy production, but how to do more with less input of energy.	ALT 02
Travis Wernet	April 2, 2013	The proposed Keystone XL pipeline do not, in my view appear to be viable for the ecology of the planet, nor do these ideas/practices appear to offer workable alternatives to the living inhabitants of the planet-wide ecosystems of the earth.	ACK
Travis Wernet	April 2, 2013	We need sustainable and viable practices for maintaining and establishing creative and innovative approaches to our fuel and water concerns, and the current proposals do not meet these critical criteria.	ALT 01
Trent Clifton	April 17, 2013	We should be focusing on renewable, clean sources of energy. This pipeline will not only create more pollution, more danger, and more damage to our world, it will also severely hinder progress towards clean, renewable energy.	ALT 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Treva Walsh	April 4, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar sands development.	ACK
Treva Walsh	April 4, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of putting 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes.	ACK
Trevor Glenn Colm	March 19, 2013	It goes without saying there are potentially disastrous environmental implications of allowing this pipeline to be installed. We risk a similar event as the BP gulf coast disaster.	RISK 07
Trevor Glenn Colm	March 19, 2013	We have almost no need for fossil fuel use as a primary energy source. It is the most harmful fuel to the environment. We can create millions of new jobs by investing in green energy as well as virtually eliminating the risk of disaster and the negative effects on the environment.	SO 05
Trevor Herron	April 22, 2013	It is my understanding the oil will be transported down south in order to refine it and sell it abroad. Why not just refine it up north and sell it to American?	ALT 08
Tricia Mckenna	April 9, 2013	The peanut butter consistency of the tar sands make cleanup a brutal procedure, and after two breaks in much smaller pipelines I have my doubts whether the bituminous sands can be completely cleaned up. The path of the pipeline is going through the breadbasket of the US and the world. This pipeline is too dangerous for the possible reward.	RISK 08
Tricia Mckenna	April 9, 2013	Mr. Secretary this proposed pipeline does very little for the people of the United States. I understand the oil supply will be exhausted within 10 years. Granted there will be some jobs created on the short term, but many more could be created if you tackled the infrastructure and the antiquated power grids not currently suited to buy and sell solar power from homeowners.	SO 05, PN 08
Trinidad Madrigal	April 19, 2013	Keystone XL will lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions and worsen global warming. Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions when we should be rapidly investing in renewable energy. TransCanada has a poor safety record and tar sands spills are significantly more damaging to the environment than conventional crude spills	PN 02
Trisanne Terrinoni	April 15, 2013	An oil spill is like a bullet shot from a gun. We can not call it back. Our planet can not afford another "accident"	RISK 10
Trish Tolbert/david Hill	April 7, 2013	Some analysts predict that opening this market will ensure that the current world society will have no chance of reducing these gases and mitigating the current negative effects of climate change on this planet.	CLIM 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Trish Tolbert/david Hill	April 7, 2013	Spills are going to occur and precious water resources (especially in this drought-prone part of the US) will be damaged.	RISK 07
Trish Weber	March 20, 2013	The [SEIS] Market Analysis erroneously concludes that tar sands oil could be economically transported by rail to Gulf Coast refineries instead of pipeline if the Keystone XL pipeline is not built. This analysis used as basis an incremental cost increase between pipeline and rail an inaccurate and unsupported figure of $5/barrel.	ALT 04
Trish Weber	March 20, 2013	The Market Analysis cited the Reasonable Alternatives Section of the SEIS as the source of the $5/barrel figure used in the breakeven analysis. This information is not found anywhere in the Reasonable Alternative Section...Thus the SEIS itself is internally inconsistent.	ALT 09
Trish Weber	March 20, 2013	The only real world data available concerning rail transportation costs of shipping diluted bitumen to the Gulf Coast indicates that the cost differential is on the order of $23/barrel. This greatly alters the breakeven analysis of the viability of tar sands development without Keystone XL pipeline, and is why industry trade group in Alberta, national, and international market experts have affirmed that Keystone XL pipeline is critical to the expansion of the tar sands production.	PN 06
Trish Weber	March 20, 2013	http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-03-07/keystone-pipeline-decision-may-influence-oil-sands-development	REF
Tristan Peter-contesse	April 7, 2013	A series of "No Action" alternatives taken on the various oil transport infrastructure projects currently under consideration, for example, could significantly affect the ability to move crude from the Bakken shale formation, and (in combination with other pressures to shift away from greenhouse gas-intensive forms of energy) lead to significant innovation and expansion of renewable and less carbon-intensive forms of energy. Please include a thorough analysis of this alternative in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.	ALT 09
Tristan Peter-contesse	April 7, 2013	Any meaningful analysis of the newly-proposed pipeline MUST be considered in context of the Gulf Coast portion of the route into which it will feed. Please perform a detailed and exhaustive assessment of the cumulative impacts of the proposed new pipeline infrastructure in its entirety - particularly as it would contribute to global climate change - in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.	CU 14
Tristan Peter-contesse	April 7, 2013	I am deeply disappointed in the inadequacy of this analysis, particularly its failure to consider the potential contributions of alternative energy sources to the future energy portfolio of the US. If the analysis makes the assumption that "regulatory pressures and technological advances could counter" the trend toward increasing energy intensity of crude production, it must also consider increasing global pressures to move away from greenhouse-gas intensive sources of energy in general.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tristan Peter-contesse	April 7, 2013	In terms of the project's "national interest", I respectfully note that the positive economic impact of the 35 permanent and 15 temporary jobs projected to result from pipeline operation is negligible, and far outweighed by potentially negative environmental impacts to Threatened & Endangered Species, floodplains, soils, and surface waters.	PN 05
Trudy Gardner	April 13, 2013	I cannot believe we are still debating this issue after all the recent spills. Do we need more proof that the oil companies make too many mistakes and that pipelines are not foolproof?	RISK 14
Trudy Ramirez	March 28, 2013	There is no need to invest further into toxic and damaging fuel sources when there are viable clean and sustainable sources available.	ALT 01
Tsreitz	April 11, 2013	It is in the national interest for energy infrastructure and our national security	PN 01
Tuesday Metcalf Hofts	April 22, 2013	Investing in this project diverts resources, expertise, and time that would be better spent investigating new, cleaner ways to fuel our energy needs. Finding sustainable alternatives to fossil fuels must be done now, for we are on the brink of being too late to preserve whats left of our natural environment. We need to focus on long-term, well-planned solutions, not short-term, harmful "fixes" like the pipeline and we need to do it now. Lets stop wasting time on fossil fuel extraction. We need to move forward, and take our place as a leader in clean energy.	PN 03
Turkewitz	April 18, 2013	the construction of the pipeline would constitute a statement that this country considers the vast destruction of the Canadian boreal forest, to expose the tar sands, to be a morally defensible act.	ACK
Turkewitz	April 18, 2013	The scientific evidence for human-induced climate change is overwhelming. National security demands that our country explore every possible avenue to slow the release of hydrocarbons and other substances that are contributing to atmospheric warming.	PN 02
Twila Yednock	April 2, 2013	We all know this oil is not for the United States, but it is an easier way for Canada to get it to tankers to ship overseas....yet the USA will bear the terrible environmental risks of this pipeline.	PN 07
Tygarjas Twyrls Bigstyck	March 15, 2013	The oil industry can't clean up regular oil. They obviously can't clean up tar-sands oil when, and I say when because the oil industry has made it obvious they are incapable of drilling safely, the next spill occurs. I'm not comfortable with more children throwing up, developing rashes and having burning eyes (1:12) because of the greed of people who don't care about human life.	RISK 30, RISK 08
Tyler Lemburg	April 22, 2013	I would like to explain the impact of building this pipeline on the greenhouse gases we emit. Oil sands are a notoriously difficult resource from which to extract energy. So much so, that the amount of energy it takes to use oil sands is as much energy as we receive from it. Further, doing so requires more carbon emissions that add to those created when this energy is used.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Tyler Santiago-gamble	April 11, 2013	In a time and day when conservation and preservation of our mother Earth is most important we can't continue the harmful, dirty burning of oil. It's time to find a new energy source and building this pipeline would set the great United States of America one big step backwards in today's world.	PN 02
Uncle Bill Abbott	April 21, 2013	America needs the Keystone Pipeline to free us from Middle East oil dependence	PN 10
Unruh, Jessica K.	April 14, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy. As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services. These promising economic impacts do not even account for the significant benefits that American businesses and drivers will see thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	PN 10
Ursel Schlicht	April 5, 2013	Please consider the desastrous breaking tar sands pipeline spill in Arkansas as the last reminder to do everything in your power to reject the pipeline.	ACK
Val Beasley	April 2, 2013	Rather than destroying a pristine Canadian CO2-removing boreal forest the size of New York state and replacing it with a toxic dump site releasing contaminants that aggravate global warming while poisoning wildlife and people, it's time to lead.	CLIM 18
Val Colenso	March 11, 2013	Aside from the temporary jobs the Keystone XL pipeline would provide, albeit with apparently little regard for the consequences of inevitable oil spills, I question why we are looking to transport Canadian tar sands oil the length of our land to the Gulf of Mexico, just to ship it to China.	PN 07
valarie jackson	April 22, 2013	we do not want a foreign country declaring eminent domain and coming across our country near our precious ogalllala aquifer with a vulnerable oil pipeline which they could sell to any country they wish to.	PN 07, LEG 02
Valeria Vincent Sancisi	April 13, 2013	this ill fated decision assures the creation of massive amounts of Superfund Brownfields that generations will have to deal with.	RISK 03
Valerie Coushaine	April 11, 2013	I am dismayed by the threat of accidents due to poor design, construction and / or upkeep of pipeline infrastructure. I am disgusted by the toxic chemicals in tar sand oil spills that contaminate the air I breather and the water I drink.	RISK 14
Valerie D Mulcaire	March 4, 2013	We need to invest in solar and wind infrastructure as well as in research for sustainable energy resources.	ALT 01
Valerie D Mulcaire	March 4, 2013	We need to both reject the Keystone tar sands pipeline and implement strict carbon limitations through cap and trade.	CLIM 18
Valerie Evans	April 22, 2013	I feel very stongly that burning tar sands reserves would surpass our remaining carbon budget, bringing about catastrophic climate change.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Valerie Grussing	March 15, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline … ignores its catastrophic impacts on our climate	CLIM 12
Valerie Grussing	March 15, 2013	The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline.. ignores the pipeline's s.ignificant risk for toxic spills	RISK 07
Valerie Hobbs	April 22, 2013	I'm deeply concerned about the environmental impact the XL pipeline would have on the aquifers and water quality. Please find ways to provide clean energy and protect our natural resources!	WRG 01, PN 02
Valerie Kack	April 2, 2013	I am writing to ask that you support alternative energy sources to oil.	ALT 01
Valerie Sanfilippo	March 19, 2013	please encourage wind and solar energy projects, clean cool energy, thank you.	ALT 01
Valerie Sanfilippo	March 19, 2013	NASA Scientist James Hansen has said that the Keystone Pipeline burning dirty tar oil is 'game over' for the CLIMATE, which would irreversibly make worse STORMS, WINDS, & FIRES, tthis is a macro environmental impact that would not be able to be reversed or mitigated.	CLIM 14
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	[When consumed, the bitumen carried by the Project] will release more CO2 than our already polluted planet can handle	CLIM 14
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	too many landowners and farmers have had their land taken away from them by eminent domain to build KXL. This is unacceptable. A foreign country should not be granted common carrier status for minerals that are not destined for American usage	LEG 02
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	little to none of the dirty, extremely corrosive dilbit tar sands oil will go towards American energy independence	PN 04
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	Diluted bitumen is extremely corrosive and more more difficult to clean up than crude oil.	RISK 08
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	we all know how well industry crude oil cleanups have gone in the past—not well at all.	RISK 08
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	it is not a matter of if the pipelines spill but when, and how much irrepairable damage these spills will cause.	RISK 24
Valerie Thatcher	March 7, 2013	Why not offer subsidies for clean energy and put people to work in an industry that they can feel proud of, instead of offering workers "deal with the devil" dirty energy jobs that effect their health and the health of their families?	SO 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
		One portion of the mining operation is comparable to a huge, vast metropolitan area, probably much larger than the city of Victoria. This is just one of a number of mines, 10 mines so far as of February 2012. There are about another 40 or 50 proposed mines in the approval process. No tar sands mine in Canada has actually ever been denied approval, so it is essentially a rubber stamp.	
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The other method of extraction is what's called the in-situ where massive amounts of water are super-heated and pumped through the ground, through vasts networks of pipelines, seismic lines, drill paths, compressor stations. This maybe not appear quite as repugnant as the mines, it's even more damaging in some ways. It impacts and fragments a larger part of the wilderness, where there is 90 percent reduction of key species, like woodland caribou and grizzly bears, and it consumes even more energy, more water, and produces at least as much greenhouse gas. So these in-situ developments are at least as ecologically damaging as the mines.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The world's largest and most devastating environmental and industrial project is situated in the heart of the largest and most intact forest in the world, Canada's boreal forest. It stretches right across northern Canada, in Labrador, it's home to the largest remaining wild caribou herd in the world, the George River caribou herd, numbering approximately 400,000 animals. All across the boreal, there exists incredible abundance of wetlands. Wetlands globally are one of the most endangered ecosystems, an absolutely critical ecosystem. Wetlands clean the air and water, they sequester large amounts of greenhouse gases, and they're home to a huge diversity of species. In the boreal, they are where almost 50 percent of the 800 bird species found in North America migrate north to breed and raise their young.In Ontario, the boreal marches down south to the north shore of Lake Superior. And these incredibly beautiful boreal forests were the inspiration for some of the most famous art in Canadian history, the Group of Seven were very inspired by this landscape, and so the boreal is not just a really key part of Canada's natural heritage, but also an important part of Canada's cultural heritage. In Manitoba, the east side of Lake Winnipeg, is the home of the newly designated UNESCO Cultural Heritage site. In Saskatchewan, as across all of the boreal, is an incredible network of rivers and lakes that every Canadian school-age child learns about, the Peace, the Athabasca, the Churchill, the Mackenzie, and these networks were the historical routes for the voyageur and the coureur des bois, the first non-Aboriginal explorers of northern Canada that, taking from the First Nations people, used canoes and paddled to explore for a trade route, a Northwest Passage for the fur trade.In the North, the boreal is bordered by the tundra, and just below that, in Yukon, the incredible valley, the Tombstone Valley. And the Tombstone Valley is home to the Porcupine caribou herd. The Porcupine caribou herd is well known in the context of its breeding ground in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The wintering ground is also critical and it also is not protected, and icould be potentially, exploited for gas and mineral rights.The western border of the boreal in British Columbia is marked by the Coast Mountains, and on the other side of those mountains is the greatest remaining temperate rainforest in the world, the Great Bear Rainforest.All across the boreal, it's home for a huge incredible range of indigenous peoples, and a rich and varied culture. These groups have retained a link to the past, know their native languages, the songs, the dances, the traditions. Perhaps part of the reason for such strong cultural traditions is because of the remoteness, the span and the wilderness of this almost 95 percent intact ecosystem. These people who have lived so sustainably in this ecosystem for over 10,000 years have much to teach us as we face the environmental crisis of climate change today.In the heart of this ecosystem is the very antithesis of all of these values. This is the Alberta tar sands, the largest oil reserves on the planet outside of Saudi Arabia. Trapped underneath the boreal forest and wetlands of northern Alberta are these vast reserves of this sticky, tar-like bitumen. And the mining and the exploitation of that is creating devastation on a scale that the planet has never seen before.	ACK
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	A new report released April 16, 2013 from environmental groups shows that the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline would, if approved, be responsible for at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year,	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	raw tar sands oil (dilute Bitumen or dilBit)...is slated for processing in Port Arthur or Houston prior to being transported overseas, most likely to China, for their consumption. This is promoting a huge disincentive to a sustainable clean energy future for North America, China, and ultimately the planet...There is a proposal to build a pipeline to take huge tankers, 10 times the size of the Exxon Valdez, through some of the most difficult to navigate waters in the world, where only just a few years ago, a B.C. ferry ran aground. When one of these tar sands tankers, carrying the dirtiest oil, 10 times as much as the Exxon Valdez, eventually hits a rock and goes down, the worst ecological disasters this planet has ever seen will result. By 2030, an almost four-times increase in production is proposed, industrializing an area the size of Florida. In doing so, a large part of our greatest carbon sink will be destroyed and replaced with the most high greenhouse gas emission oil in the future. The world does not need any more tar mines. The world does not need any more pipelines to wed our addiction to fossil fuels. And the world certainly does not need the largest toxic impoundments to grow and multiply and further threaten the downstream communities. And let's face it, we all live downstream in an era of global warming and climate change. What is needed is action to ensure that Canada respects the massive amounts of freshwater held in their country. These wetlands and forests that are our best and greatest and most critical defense against global warming need protecting...The tar sands could threaten not just a large section of the boreal. It compromises the life and the health of some of our most underprivileged and vulnerable people, the Aboriginal communities that have so much to teach us. It could destroy the Athabasca Delta, the largest and possibly greatest freshwater delta in the planet. It could destroy the Great Bear Rainforest, the largest temperate rainforest in the world. And it could have huge impacts on the future of the agricultural heartland of North America.	CLIM 06, ALT 09, CU 01, CU 05, PN 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	And of course, these tailings ponds -- well, you can't see many ponds from outer space and you can see these, so maybe we should stop calling them ponds -- these massive toxic wastelands are built unlined and on the banks of the Athabasca River. And the Athabasca River drains downstream to a range of Aboriginal communities. In Fort Chippewa, the 800 people there, are finding toxins in the food chain, this has been scientifically proven. The tar sands toxins are in the food chain, and this is causing cancer rates up to 10 times what they are in the rest of Canada. In spite of that, people have to live, have to eat this food in order to survive. The incredibly high price of flying food into these remote Northern Aboriginal communities and the high rate of unemployment makes this an absolute necessity for survival. Not that many years ago, Garth Lentz was lent a boat by a First Nations man, who said, "When you go out on the river, do not under any circumstances eat the fish. It's carcinogenic." And yet, on the front porch of that man's cabin, Lentz saw four fish. The First Nations man had to feed his family to survive. And as a parent, Lentz just can't imagine what that does to one's soul. And that's what humankind through the tar sands extraction operation is doing. The boreal forest is also perhaps the Planet's best defense against global warming and climate change. The boreal forest sequesters more carbon than any other terrestrial ecosystem. And this is absolutely key. The most concentrated greenhouse gas sink, twice as much greenhouse gases are sequestered in the boreal per acre than the tropical rainforests is being destroyed by the extraction of tar sands oil. This carbon sink is being turned it into a carbon bomb. And we're replacing that with the largest industrial project in the history of the world, which is producing the most high-carbon greenhouse gas emitting oil in the world. And we're doing this on the second largest oil reserves on the planet. Just 70 miles downstream is the world's largest freshwater delta, the Peace-Athabasca Delta, the only one at the juncture of all four migratory flyways. This is a globally significant wetland, perhaps the greatest on the planet. Incredible habitat for half the bird species you find in North America, migrating here. And also the last refuge for the largest herd of wild bison, and also, of course, critical habitat for another whole range of other species. But it too is being threatened by the massive amount of water being drawn from the Athabasca, which feeds these wetlands, and also the incredible toxic burden of the largest toxic unlined impoundments on the planet, which are leaching in to the food chain for all the species downstream.	CU 01
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The tar sands pipeline terminates in Port Arthur and has links westerly to the greater Houston area. Both of these locations are placing where people shouldn't live. However, the residents, usually minority and of lower income, will be exposed to the emissions from the processing of the dilBit. Their health will be impacted. And who pays for their care? The average tax payer through increased health costs for all and increased county and city taxes.	CU 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vaness Hamilton	April 22, 2013	Pipeline Spills The tar sands pipeline that spilled a million gallons of toxic heavy oil into Michigan's Kalamazoo River last summer illustrates the dangers this type of uniquely corrosive oil will bring along the Keystone XL route. The oil is still on the bottom of the river and just covered by mud. There is no method to properly restore the waterbody to its state prior to the spill. Just recently, the spill in Arkansas occurred and is in the process of being cleaned up. A river of black oil running through a neighborhood stopped the normal course of people's lives. Along the pipeline route, this event may be repeated due to the combination of pipeline material and the corrosive, abrasive nature of the dilBit passing through the pipe. Our oil spill recovery technology has not advanced since the Exxon Valdez spill. Technology to clean up dilBit has yet be invented. Where the pipeline passes near a water source used by Nestle for bottled water, the pipeline is actually being constructed in heavier material to prevent a pipeline rupture. Why isn't this material being employed or required to be employed all along the pipeline if it is approved?	RISK 10
Vanessa Brand	April 21, 2013	Some have asked why the tar sands aren't just transported to the east or west coast of Canada. The reason--Canadians don't want this pipeline. They are fearful of the implications. The political climate in Canada about the pipeline is so hostile that TransCanada feels its best option is through the United States. I think it sends a strong message that the majority of Canadians don't even want this pipeline in their country.	ALT 05
Vanessa Brand	April 21, 2013	I am also concerned about the temperature of the pipeline. Because the tar sands are so thick, much friction (and, thus, heat) will be generated. Some reports indicate the temperature will be in the 120-150 degree Fahrenheit range. This heat will affect the root structure of the crops my dad grows, adversely affecting his yields. The negative economic impacts of the Keystone XL pipeline to farmers and ranchers cannot be minimized.	SO 12, RISK 11, VEG 04
Vanessa Brand	April 21, 2013	Contrary to popular belief, the proposed route for the Keystone XL pipeline still crosses the fragile soils of the Sandhills and Ogallala Aquifer of Nebraska. As the name implies, soil in the Sandhills is very sandy. Sand is a porous material that would allow tar sands to permeate groundwater supplies. Once in an underground water supply, the tar sands would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to clean.	SOIL 07, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vanessa Brand	April 22, 2013	Also, the type of fuel extracted from tar sands is diesel rather than gasoline. The diesel market is much greater is foreign countries (such as China, Brazil, and European countries) than it is in the US. Therefore, I dont buy the argument that the pipeline will help decrease US dependance on foreign oil when very little of the product will stay here. Experts have even stated that the gas prices, especially in the Midwest, will increase, rather than decrease, if the pipeline is built. This is an economic impact that will affect all Americans that purchase gasoline.	PN 04
Vanessa Brand	April 22, 2013	First, I would like to focus on the effects a leak in the pipeline would have on underground water supplies. Despite the safety measures TransCanada claims are in place, the pipeline will still leak, a fact even TransCanada admits. Tar sands, which have to be diluted with harmful chemicals such as benzene, are more corrosive to pipeline materials than oil. This coupled with the increased heat and pressure needed to pump viscous tar sands increases the risk of a leak. Contrary to popular belief, the proposed route for the Keystone XL pipeline still crosses the fragile soils of the Sandhills and Ogallala Aquifer of Nebraska.	RISK 11, RISK 07, RISK 12, RISK 14, RISK 24, WRG 01
Vanessa Brand	April 22, 2013	I am also concerned about the temperature of the pipeline. Because the tar sands are so thick, much friction (and, thus, heat) will be generated. Some reports indicate the temperature will be in the 120-150 degree Fahrenheit range. This heat will affect the root structure of the crops my dad grows, adversely affecting his yields. The negative economic impacts of the Keystone XL pipeline to farmers and ranchers cannot be minimized.	VEG 04, SO 12
Vanessa Brand	April 22, 2013	As the name implies, soil in the Sandhills is very sandy. Sand is a porous material that would allow tar sands to permeate groundwater supplies. Once in an underground water supply, the tar sands would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to clean. Many Americans along the proposed path of the pipeline, including my parents, depend on clean ground water for home use, irrigation of crops, and watering of livestock. Even a small leak would pollute underground water supplies to the extent that farmers and ranchers would no longer be able to live on the land they claim home and make a living doing the work they love. If their water supply becomes contaminated, how will they live and irrigate their crops?	WRG 05, RISK 08
Vanessa Prell	April 14, 2013	Instead work to secure our future with green energy.	PN 02
Vanessa Warheit	March 13, 2013	Stopping this pipeline would be a critical, public, and powerful message of hope that change IS possible	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
VanHousenK	April 18, 2013	We house 10,000 head of cattle to feed and take care of. I feel as if the feed yard is my second home. The pipeline will be run one mile from the feed yard. The cattle are in constant need of water. The water comes from the ground, which is the exact place this poisonous muck will be if there's a spill or leak. If that water gets contaminated from that poison, what is going to happen to all the cattle? Where are we supposed to get our water? Cows can't drink from a water bottle.	RISK 10, RISK 06, WRG 01
Vanita Calkins	March 11, 2013	The citizens of this country are extremely tired of the blatant lies trotted out in "reports" done by (or paid for by) the very industries that are supposed to be checked by them. We need open & honest regulation, based on real and unbiased science - not propaganda sponsored by those who stand to benefit financially. Can it get any more clear? Fox guarding the henhouse?	PRO 01
Vaughn Anderson	March 22, 2013	The least that must be done is to DEMAND that all owners,all developers, all installers, all operators and all investors related to industrial intrusions such as the Keystone XL pipeline AND CLAIM THAT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE WILL CAUSE NO PROBLEMS must be willing (required) to POST a FIVE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLAR BOND against all environmental problems and detrimental problems to people, farms, businesses, recreational activities, wildlife and homes to the extent as determined by these groups that the perpetrators have caused and created these adverse problems.	SO 16
Vaughn Anderson	April 11, 2013	The least that must be done is to DEMAND that all owners, all developers, all installers, all operators and all investors related to industrial intrusions such as the Keystone XL pipeline be required to POST a FIVE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLAR ($500,000,000,000) BOND against all environmental problems (air, land, and water) and detrimental problems to people, farms, businesses, recreational activities, wildlife and homes to the extent as determined by these groups that the perpetrators have caused and created these adverse problems	PN 05
Vaughn Flora	April 10, 2013	Please look at revising the environmental review of the Keystone Pipeline.	ACK
Vencille Hipke	April 22, 2013	The risks I would have to take and potential loss of my whole operation due to a leak would leave a taxpaying loss on our area. At the present time the pipeline is shown to cross right over top of my farmsteads well. From there it would disect a couple springs of water that flow into a Dam that supplies all the water to our 1000 head Cattle Feedlot. Even a small leak would be the end of this operation! And I dont know that I would ever feel safe drinking or bathing in the water for fear of finding out too late that there were small underground leaks that go unnoticed until something major happens	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Venida Chenault	March 24, 2013	The fact that the United States government is allowing a multi-national corporation condemn property of American citizens in order to shove this pipeline down our throats is one of the most disturbing aspects of this debate.	LEG 02
Venida Chenault	March 24, 2013	More compelling is the environmental impact of this pipeline on the water systems and aquifers throughout the United States, particularly when many states are facing significant droughts and adverse impacts on existing water supplies.	WRG 01
Venstra, Elizabeth	April 5, 2013	Recently, I tried noting on the State Department's web site my displeasure with the Keystone XL pipeline application generally, but also specifically with the fact that the only public hearing has been scheduled in Nebraska. I believe that the Keystone XL pipeline would affect residents of many states, not just Nebraska, and so public hearings ought to have been scheduled in more locations in order to give more people the opportunity to attend and share their feelings with the State Department about the pipeline. Although I know that I can submit comments electronically, still, this project is important enough to me that I would have tried to attend a hearing in person if there had been one within, say, a six-hour drive each way from my home, instead of a twelve-hour drive (I can't quite make the latter work in my schedule).	PRO 07
Verba Weaver	April 9, 2013	It [the assessment] fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	RISK 07
Verdenal Johnson	March 11, 2013	The conflict of interest in this study is outrageous .	PRO 01
Verna Bloom Cocks	April 18, 2013	The only people who will benefit from this horrendous idea are the people who will profit from the Pipeline financially. All the rest of us will suffer for what promises to be an ecological disaster...aka an accident waiting to happen!!!	PN 05
Vernon N Vogt	April 22, 2013	If this pipeline goes in and when it leaks it will ruin our water which our lives depend on this. Without water we have NOTHING.	RISK 07
Veronica Enrique	March 19, 2013	Not a viable solution long-term solution to current challenges – an immeasurable destruction of future resources!	ACK
Veronica Mcclure	April 4, 2013	A thorough study will reveal more detailed and accurate information regarding what specific wildlife is truly at risk.	ACK
Veronica Placzek	April 13, 2013	The project will bring good jobs to Nebraska and other midwestern states.	SO 02
Veronika Safarova	April 1, 2013	All of that time and money spent cleaning up spills could be used to create alternative energy using the sun, wind, water, and bio-fuels.	ALT 01
Veronika Safarova	April 1, 2013	I understand that some US citizens argue that it's a chance to be less reliant on foreign fuels, however, we should focus our money and energy on alternative energy sources, which are abundant and can create long-term, sustainable green jobs on U.S. soil.	ALT 01
Veronika Safarova	April 1, 2013	The risks associated with sending more tar sand oil through America is far too great, especially when we have other options for energy sources.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vic & Barby Ulmer	March 6, 2013	In addition, such an investment in further use of any oil, but in this case, the dirtiest form of crude means further CO2 in the air and its consequences to climate change.	CLIM 05
Vic & Barby Ulmer	March 6, 2013	This threatens the health and safety of the people and the environment.	RISK 06
Vick Lesh	April 22, 2013	DO NOT allow Canada to pipe this filthy oil through our country risking our water supply and poisoning the air	ACK
Vick Lesh	April 22, 2013	This will not make gas cheaper, it will not help our economy and it will not make us less dependent on foreign oil.	PN 04
Vicki Deseive	April 12, 2013	Please save the aquifer .with out water Nebrasba would be a desert.	ACK
Vicki Fischer	April 4, 2013	We need clean green energy not dirty tar sands oil.	ALT 01
Vicki Fischer	April 4, 2013	I thought the whole idea behind postponing XL the last time was to obtain a real environmental review that exposes the real deadly environmental impact of this proposed project.	LEG 04
Vicki Fischer	April 4, 2013	One spill could wipe out the water supply for thousands if not millions of people.	WRG 01, RISK 07
Vicki Fox	April 6, 2013	The argument for approving the Keystone pipeline is that tar sands will be developed anyway and the oil will make its way to the gulf one way or another. The disaster in Arkansas with the oil/sand spill belies that argument. It is up to Canada and Exxon on whether to development the tar sands. It is up to us to protect our people and to make selling the oil from the tar sands so exensive to make it economically unfeasible.	RISK 14, PN 05
Vicki Leidner	April 15, 2013	We need to take the lead in curtailing carbon emmissions-not enable them.	ACK
Vicki Pratt	April 22, 2013	The toxic diluted bitumen is dangerous and harmful to humans, our water supply, and the environment. The pipeline is going to leak and the thick tar sands oil is not easy to contain or clean up.	RISK 24, RISK 08, RISK 30, WRG 01
Vicki Ray	April 11, 2013	The pipeline disaster in Arkansas alone should be enough reason to send the environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline back to the drawing board.	RISK 13
Vickie Eha	March 11, 2013	The method of removing the oil from the ground in Canada is a dirty method, using alot of energy to remove it, and replacing toxic chemicals into the environment too.	CU 01
Vickie Eha	March 11, 2013	If the pipeline were sabotaged, or had a fracture and leaked into our ground there, it would contaminate a large aquifer of water we depend on for farming and life.	RISK 04
Vickie Steen	April 5, 2013	Put your votes and concerns behind new ways to generate energy and protect the environment!	PN 02, ALT 01
Vicky Foster	April 11, 2013	Please take action to stop Keyston XL. The true and potential environmental destruction that will occur from this project are totally unacceptable	ACK
Vicky Lockwood	April 5, 2013	And yet the State Department's report lies about its environmental impact ...it was comilied by an exTransCanada employee!	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Victoria Connor	April 1, 2013	We will run out of fossil fuel, soon, and if we burn it all it will most certainly be too late for us.	PN 02
Victoria Connor	April 1, 2013	The corrosive properties of the tar sands oil only increases the likelihood of a spill.	RISK 11
Victoria Countryman	April 11, 2013	More Oil is not the answer to our energy needs, it's green energy, invest heavily in innovation and progressive new ideas,	ALT 01
Victoria Hathaway	April 17, 2013	Why should American citizens risk damage to our land and aquifers so Canada can sell oil to China?	PN 05
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	Allow [the Keystone XL Pipeline] by railroad if you must but not underground!	ALT 04
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	Processing [Tar sands oil] where it is and literally piping oil underground would even be a safer alternative.	ALT 08
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	If [the Keystone XL Pipeline is] kept above ground... a leak would and could be detected immediately!	ALT 10
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	It certainly would help jobs if [the Keystone XL Pipeline is] kept above ground.	ALT 10
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	[The Keystone XL Pipeline may] affect the water that is needed to grow crops and water livestock that is instrumental in feeding our nation!!	RISK 07
Victoria Johnson	March 1, 2013	The Union workers will have jobs laying this pipeline but not many locals for long. So this is not a long term solution for job creation!	SO 04
Victoria Light	March 10, 2013	And, the State Department and other government agencies must stop the insane practice of using Industry people to write the reports needed for government oversight and decision-making. Rather, you should be using 3rd parties who have no money-stake in the outcome, and who can give you objective, scientifically-based test results and proper analysis.	PRO 01
Victoria Miller	April 22, 2013	As Transcanada already has one pipeline through Nebaska why dont they put the second one if we as a country really need a second one right next to the first one which runs just west of Lincoln?	ALT 03
Victoria Miller	April 22, 2013	As Transcanada already has one pipeline through Nebaska, why dont they put the second one, if we as a country really need a second one, right next to the first one which runs just west of Lincoln?	ALT 03
Vikki Schick	March 11, 2013	This project has short term employment gains in construction at a cost of an energy intensive project to extract filthy fuel, while it endangers U.S. agricultural lands. We do not need to continue helping out oil companies. Lets do things right and put our priorities on clean energy sources.	PN 08, PN 02
Vincent Alvarez	March 28, 2013	Follow the example of a country like Germany. Solar power and wind power, that is the future. Keystone XL is the pas	ALT 01
Vincent Domeraski	March 28, 2013	Burning oil to produce crude oil is worse for the planet than drilling. The administration cannot justify support for Canadian tar sand oil on an economic basis, much less an environmental or moral one.	PN 08

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vincent L	March 28, 2013	the SEIS fails to: account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil;	CLIM 05
Vincent L	March 28, 2013	[the SEIS fails to]examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada;	CU 01
Vincent L	March 28, 2013	the SEIS fails to:adequately address safety concerns, including the increased corrosion and clean-up risks posed by tar sands.	RISK 11
Vincent L	March 28, 2013	the SEIS fails to: protect sensitive wildlife habitat and natural resources along the pipeline route, in particular the Ogallala Aquifer and Sandhills region;	WRG 01, WI 21
Vinit Allen	March 19, 2013	Pls do not allow the pipeline to go in thru the US. We should be focusing on renewable energy and reducing our use of fossil fuels ASAP.	ALT 01
Vinit Allen	March 19, 2013	Mainstream scientists are virtually unanimous in stating that the one sure way to avert the worst consequences of climate change is to decarbonize the world economy by finding cleaner sources of energy while leaving more fossil fuels in the ground. Given its carbon content, tar sands oil should be among the first fossil fuels we decide to leave alone.	PN 02
Viola Wagn	April 17, 2013	I believe it would be unethical to put the water source which millions of people depend upon for life at risk.	ACK
Viola Wagn	April 17, 2013	When the tar sands area is fully harvested in Canada, the entire region will surely be devastated. The water supply our relatives in Canada depend upon for life is also at risk. Our First Nations relatives are fighting the expansion also. Every tree, every plant, every water source, and every animal will be sacrificed in the corporate march to move the crude through this proposed pipeline.	ACK
Viola Wagn	April 17, 2013	The project will desecrate the land. I have ancestors buried all over the 1851 and 1868 Treaty Territory. As many people know, we didn't always bury relatives in the cemeteries we know today. There are many unmarked graves all over this Turtle Island. The bones of our relatives rest everywhere. Some have fossilized into stone. Who gives anyone the right to trample all over these fmal resting places and physically disturb ancient graves just for a few more gallons of gas or oil?	CR 02
Viola Wagn	April 17, 2013	There have already been many spills from the existing Keystone and other pipeline. Again, I fail to see how we can we clean up oil spilled into water; espedally oil already leaked into our underground water source. I really don't think a cleanup of that magnitude can be accomplished by average human beings.	RISK 26, RISK 08
Viola Wagn	April 17, 2013	You are threatening the water source of millions, many of them children. The potential for contamination is not worth the risk.	WRG 01
Violet Boyd	April 12, 2013	Consider the risk for toxic spills and what it will do for the environment and climate	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Violet Young	April 22, 2013	PLEASE SAY NO TO THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE. There are PLENTY of ALTERNATIVE methods of fuel that need to be identified, explored and implemented. NOW IS THE TIME to do something different.	PN 02
Violeta Villacorta	April 10, 2013	Please commit to real sustainable solutions. You know the detriment to people and planet fossil fuel causes. No to KXL, Fracking and all fossi fuel. Yes to Solar, Wind, Geothermal, and other clean alternatives!	ALT 01
Virgil Pfennig	April 17, 2013	From an environmental viewpoint, why carry crude oil on a ship over an ocean when we can ship the oil the most reliable and environmentally friendly way which is by a pipeline.	ACK
Virgil Pfennig	April 17, 2013	Canada will produce their oil sands resource with or without the support of the United States. Either way, Canada will find a market for their resource no matter how much environmental opposition there is. It's too valuable resource to leave in the ground and until a suitable and economical alternative is developed, people demand crude oi	PN 06
Virgil Pfennig	April 17, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline is definitely in the national interest because it will provide a reliable and safe crude oil supply to the US. This crude oil will replace supplies that are being purchased overseas which are not reliable.	PN 10
Virginia Adams	April 3, 2013	It is also extremely important that we protect our water resources. Here in South Dakota water is a precious resource that we must not allow to be squandered. I object to the pipeline coming through any part of the USA because it is not a matter of IF but WHEN there will be spills. All of the water in our country must be protected.	RISK 24, RISK 07, WRG 01
Virginia Bieren	April 4, 2013	Destruction of our natural water supply from the earth is at stake. Leakage of the oil in the pipeline is another potential threat to our environment over the years that can cause continual damage to our earth and peoples. It is not worth it to destroy so many things and cause so much damage to the environment	RISK 07
Virginia Brown	April 13, 2013	it is obvious from the Arkansas spill that the oil companies do not have a handle on how to deal with tar sand spills.	RISK 08
Virginia Burris	April 17, 2013	Yes, this will produce jobs -- most temporary.	SO 04
Virginia Czarnecki	April 8, 2013	The EPA believes that the methodology used by the State Department is inaccurate and could underestimate greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 20 percent. Given that the expected lifetime of the Keystone XL pipeline is fifty years, the EPA notes that the project could yield an extra 1.15 billion tons of greenhouse gases using the quantitative estimates in the EIS.	CLIM 04
Virginia Czarnecki	April 8, 2013	The draft EIS regarding the proposed Keystone XL pipeline is deeply flawed and biased as it was prepared by ERM, a company with close ties to TransCanada.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Virginia Ellen	April 17, 2013	The latest Environmental Impact Statement was both inaccurate and incomplete -- it ignores risk for toxic spills, catastrophic impacts on our climate, and the clear consensus among financial analysts that Keystone XL would be a tipping point for further tar ands development.	ACK
Virginia Fahnestock	April 22, 2013	I do not understand how you could possibly even consider appproving this pipeline when TransCanada is using 2 different chemicals to "push" the tar sands through the pipeline. TransCanada will NOT disclose what chemical is being used. Please look at what happened in the Kalamazoo River when tar sands oil leaked in pipelines. That water is no longer drinkable. If that is not enough, look at Mayflower Arkansas. The before and after pictures make me physically sick to my stomach. The Ogallala Aquifir provides drinking water to multiple states besides Nebraska and is instrumental in farming and ranching. One leak like Kalamazoo Michigan or Mayflower Arkansas would leave the State of Nebraska with basically no Agriculture, no ranching, no drinking water and an income basically screwed.	PD 04
Virginia Leeker	April 22, 2013	Please reject Transcanadas plan to route their pipeline through the Ogalla aquifer. Clean water is more important!	WRG 01
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	There are many more jobs to be found in development and creation of clean energy resources.	ALT 01
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	Raising CO2 levels and wasting precious water supplies are certain to hasten planetary climate change and death.	CLIM 14
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	Communities near the refineries where the Keystone XL pipeline would terminate, many of them low-income and communities of color, already live with dangerously high levels of air pollution. The Keystone XL pipeline would further exacerbate the heavy burden of pollution and environmental injustices these communities confront.	EJ 02
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	The construction of Keystone XL will not lessen U.S. dependence on foreign oil—rather, it will feed the growing trend of exporting refined products out of the United States, thereby doing nothing to enhance energy security or to stabilize oil prices or gasoline prices at the pump. If completed, it will successfully achieve a long-term objective of Canadian tar sands producers only—to gain access to export markets.	PN 02
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	Hazardous spills already occur regularly from Canadian pipelines. In summer 2010, a million gallons of tar sands oil poured into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan from a pipeline run by another Canadian company, Enbridge. The spill exposed residents to toxic chemicals, coated wildlife and has caused long-term damage to the local economy and ecosystem.	RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Virginia Leslie	March 21, 2013	The Keystone XL pipeline would traverse six U.S. states and cross major rivers, including the Missouri River, Yellowstone, and Red Rivers, as well as key sources of drinking and agricultural water, such as the Ogallala Aquifer which supplies two million Americans.	WRG 01
virginia marcussen	April 22, 2013	This area is the "lifeblood" for not only Nebraska but other states that get their water supply from the Ogallala Aquifer. Should any leakage from the pipeline occur this could result in a major disaster for a large area of the country.	RISK 07
Virginia Medina	April 22, 2013	do not allow the pipeline to be put anywhere near the Ogallala aquifer! I enjoy the nice clean water I drink and use to water my yard. My parents enjoy clean water for their alfalfa and soybean crop	WRG 01
Virginia Mees	April 13, 2013	Why do we have to do what the Canadian oil companies want us to do? This is our land not the Canadians. It is too important to even think about building this terrible pipeline.	ACK
Virginia Mees	April 13, 2013	There will not be enough jobs created to justify the risks taken by this terrible pipeline.	PN 05
Virginia Mees	April 13, 2013	Please think about the damage this pipeline can do to the aquifer if will be passing over. If it breaks, it will contaminate the water for millions of people.	RISK 07
Virginia Mitchell	April 22, 2013	This EIS statment has again a conflect of interest with TransCandas writing the EIS, Our questions were not answered.	PRO 01
Virginia Mitchell	April 22, 2013	We do not want Keystone XL to come in and risk damaging the Ogallal Aquifer and our lively hood.	WRG 01
Virginia Smedberg	April 14, 2013	Building a new pipeline now will lock us in to higher carbon emissions.	CLIM 14
Virginia Smedberg	April 14, 2013	Tar sands oil is thicker, more acidic and more corrosive than conventional crude. Transported under high pressure, it poses a far greater risk of leaks along the pipeline route.	RISK 14
Virginia Witmer	March 7, 2013	No reputable climate scientist supports the building of this pipeline, particularly when so many other energy possibilities exist.	PN 02
Vita And Michael Miller	April 9, 2013	I do not believe that the Keystone XL Project will do anything to allow energy independence in the U.S. …. This dirty oil will simply go on the open market to be sold to the highest bidder.	PN 04
Vitra Garcia	March 18, 2013	I'm very concerned that you played golf ON THE SAME DAY AS THE BIGGEST CLIMATE CHANGE MARCH IN WASHINGTON and the foursome also included Jim Crane, who owns the Floridian and baseball's Houston Astros, but more importantly, is a major investor in Keystone XL.	ACK
Vivian	March 27, 2013	We are suffering and our children will even more so when they do not have air to breath nor water to drink nor food to eat.	CLIM 14
Vivian	March 27, 2013	Our air, water and ability to grow food are at risk.	PN 09

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vivian Frommer	March 11, 2013	I've also read that the State Department used a contractor of TransCanada to help write the report. At a time when the American public distrust our federal government more than any time in our history, basing an important decision on information from someone with a financial interest will be seen as more Washington dishonesty. This decision must be based on impartial science, not financial greed.	PRO 01
Vivian Jao	March 28, 2013	If the Pipeline goes through, it's not a matter of "if" a leak occurs, it's a matter of "when."	RISK 21
Vivianne Mosca-clark	April 5, 2013	There should not be any support from the government to protect a company that hurts the people and environment.	PN 05
Vladislav Blanton	April 11, 2013	As we all, as a country and as a world move towards taking care of our homeland, the planet, there is less and less room for the destructive processing of mining, processing and transporting oil, and a thorough environmental review will make that abundantly clear. I urge you to put our health and climate above oil industry profits and a desire for "the show to go on." It is responsible and affirmative to learn from our mistakes. I firmly desire that you give the Keystone XL the in-depth environmental review that it deserves for all life that it effecets. Thank you.	PN 02
Vollers	April 18, 2013	It seems to me that the answer is to move the pipeline east so it is not over the aquifer. That solution will create even more jobs and keep it away from the aquifer.	ALT 06
Vollers	April 18, 2013	Its not a mattter of if the pipeline leaks but when and where. Move the pipeline East to where it is not over the aquifer or build a refinery in S.D. or northern NE. Both of those options make more jobs and would help decrease the risk to the aquifer. A refinery would do much more to decrease fuel prices.	WRG 04
Vt Matters	March 8, 2013	[The KXL pipeline and tar sands oil shale development will continue to accelerate global warming]… and continue to' murdertens of millions since 2010 from sea level rise, severe weather events, and especially food crop failures from those events, which have shoved over 500 million into starvation and malnutrition.	ACK
Vt Matters	March 9, 2013	In addition to tar sands and oil shale spewing an additional 30-70% more pollution into an already saturated atmosphere, the warming oceans are releasing large amounts of methane from the ice balls and there's now a massive methane cloud hanging out over the Atlantic. As you will know, increasing tar sands production is nothing less than a carbon time bomb which will further threaten climate catastrophe. A thorough review of the climate impacts of increased tar sands development encouraged by the Keystone XL pipeline should surely conclude that the impacts are too great to justify the permitting of this misguided effort.	CLIM 13
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	“Science As A Contact Sport” by Dr. Schneider, colleague of James Hansen	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	“Storms of My Grandchildren” by Dr. .James Hansen; adamant that the tar sands put the planet over a permanent irreversible cliff 2015	REF

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	Chasing Ice--the deterioration of the major ICE SHEETS, released 11-2012 and on the National geographic Channel after 4-22-2013	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	NPR, PRI's the World, 3-8&3-92011 w Mark Hertsgaard, 11-29 & 11-30-2012, 12-7-12 on Typhoon Bopha	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	NPR, TALK, Science Friday, 1-22-2011, 11th Annual "Changing Climate, Changing Oceans", 3-4-11, 1-20, 54, 11-30 & 12-7-2012, 3-2-12 & 2-1-2013 w Michael Mann, and 10-21-11 w Amory Lovins about “REINVENTING FIRE”--how to grow GDP by 158% w millions of jobs, leave the DEBT in the dust, get a Sustainable Future.	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	NPR's Fresh Air, 8-26-2010 Biography on the corrupt Koch Industry, 5-2-2012 "Private Empire--Exxon Mobile's corruption" by Steve Coll; these two companies have poured hundreds of million into corrupt Rt. Wing Think Tanks--Cato, CEI, Heritage, Marshall Institute, Mercantus so they would produce fraudulent stud	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	PBS, Democracy NOW 2-19-2013	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	PBS, Frontline's "Climate of Doubt", GOP-BIG OIL's "Disinformation Campaign" since the 1980s, further accelerated since 2007 by Koch Industries and Amer for Prosperity with the production of fraudulent studies	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	PBS, Need to Know, 2-25-2011 and 6-24-2011 on the flooding in Norkfolk, VA already costing millions w discussions with Mark Hertsgaard; also 8-14-2012 talking to Climate Central about “Global Weirdness”, also discussed on NPR Fresh Air 8-14-2012	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	PBS, NOVA, "Megastorms--hurricane Sandy and the severe storms of the future", "Secrets Beneath The Ice"--the melting to Antarcrtica and a 60 ft sea level rise by 2100 or 3 ft by 2025 flooding coastlines around the world including more than a dozen major US cities costing TRILLIONS	REF
Vt Matters	April 22, 2013	PBS, NOW, 2010 how the Muldives, Palau and other Islands, Bangladesh are being inundated with sea level rise. 300,000 have already been displaced	REF
W. Malcolm Byrnes	March 22, 2013	Moreover, investing so heavily in the oil delivered by the pipeline at this stage will steer our country away from more environmentally friendly, low carbon emission technologies such as solar and wind.	PN 03
W.e. Bennett, M.d.	April 13, 2013	This dilbit goes to China but we bear the environmental cost of the inevitable ruptures and pollution.	PN 07
W.l. Shriner	April 24, 2013	Though not in our country, the strip mining of the Alberta coniferous forests represents environmental assault of the highest order.	CU 01
Wade Gruhl	April 13, 2013	The Keystone XL project is a terrible idea that should be stopped immediately. It will exacerbate global warming and climate change, destroy pristine land in Canada, and be a risk for people who live near the pipeline. Further, it will slow our transition to smarter energy sources.	CLIM 14
Wade Womack	April 19, 2013	Canada should build the pipeline across their own land and ship it to us, like OPEC.	ALT 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wader	April 22, 2013	energy independence.	ACK
Walker Bennett	March 14, 2013	The petroleum has already been contracted to China and France.	PN 07
Walker Bennett	March 14, 2013	Only 35 permanent jobs will be created for Americans	SO 04
Wally Juchert	March 15, 2013	The oil sands material….produces more green house gases than crude oil.	CLIM 05
Wally Juchert	March 15, 2013	(KXL) would provide jobs to build and maintain a pipe line and it would increase capacity at refineries on the gulf, but the cost is too great.	PN 05
Wally Juchert	March 15, 2013	The oil sands material is extremely toxic.	RISK 12
WalstromJ	April 18, 2013	This pipeline is targeted to cross the Verdigre Creek and Niobrara River areas, both designated scenic by the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT! It takes A LOT of time and money, A LOT, to get this federal designation…lots of lawyers, specialists representatives & other staff. This federal designation is supposed to be a means to protect the flora & fauna, and water quality of those areas. It makes no sense then that this pipeline is being allowed to go through this very vulnerable federally protected area.	WRS 10
WalstromJC	April 18, 2013	The Niobrara River was just given, officially, the designation "ENDANGERED", ranking included in the top ten U.S.Waterways that are endangered. Why then is an entity such as the very toxic XL Pipeline, being allowed to encroach on this area that has been assigned an offical endangered designation as well as a federal scenic designation, meant to protect it?	WRS 10, WRS 09
WalstromW	April 18, 2013	We need to protect the future of the earth and create a future for students like me by investing in clean energy.	PN 02
Walt Carr	April 17, 2013	Also Canadian scientists have discovered the same kind of birth defects in fisheries near tar sands extraction sites as our scientists found in the Gulf waters after our massive oil spill disaster.	CU 02
Walt Punke	March 10, 2013	Hold the wealthy, under-taxed oil companies at 2% hostage for a return to the 1968 tax rates on all income over $500,000 before even considering this project or cuts to our earned benefit of Social Security. If the pipeline has to be approved require a tariff of $5 per barrel for every barrel that is sent to a USA port for export to another country.	SO 16
Walt Sears	March 7, 2013	...by permitting the building of the Keystone XL pipeline the U.S. government is essentially facilitating and supporting this horrendous means of producing fossil fuel.	PN 05
Walter Craft	April 14, 2013	Big business does not have an automatic right to make billions of dollars while destroying the quality of life for those not able to move away to a protected area.	EJ 03
Walter Hales	April 15, 2013	And think about the abuse of eminent domain in multiple states as states and Canada allow the pipleline to be build over private land	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Walter Hales	April 15, 2013	The huge refinery in Texas that would receive the oil will export it. Why else a refinery on the coastline?	PN 07
Walter Linck	April 17, 2013	It now seems clear your initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed by not fully accounting for the carbon footprint of the pipeline. A new assessment finds that it would carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants.	CLIM 11
Wanda Crawford	April 9, 2013	Allowing this project to move forward shows a blatant disregard for the citizens of our country, the environment, the wildlife, fresh water, clean air, etc.	PN 08
Wanda S. Ballentine	April 20, 2013	The most comprehensive study by Oil Change International of Keystone's climate impacts shows that it would carry 181 million metric tons of CO2, equal to 51 coal plants worth of carbon. Or as much CO2 as 37.7 million cars on the road - more than are currently driving in California, Oregon, Washington, Michigan, New York and Florida combined. This would, in one move, offset the equivalent of 45% of the emissions reduction achieved by President Obama's CAFE standards, his greatest environmental achievement to date.	CLIM 11
Wanda S. Ballentine	April 20, 2013	The State Department also forecast there could be an additional 0.88 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent released annually if the project were built. Tar sands fuel is up to 19% more greenhouse gas intensive than conventional fuel, and also releases methane, many times more destructive than CO2.	CLIM 12
Wanda S. Ballentine	April 20, 2013	The destruction to wildlife and their habitats is horrendous - the boreal forest of Alberta has become a disaster. Fish in the Athabasca River are deformed, as are wildlife all along. This TED video states it very clearly: "The true cost of oil" http://www.ted.com/talks/garth_lenz_images_of_beauty_and_devastation.html	CU 01
Wanda S. Ballentine	April 20, 2013	We don't need the oil from Keystone, and we won't even get it – its mostly going for export. 60% of the gasoline from refineries receiving Keystone XL oil is ALREADY being exported.	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wanda S. Ballentine	April 20, 2013	Last year, there were 364 spills from pipelines that released about 54,000 barrels of oil and refined products. Even brand-new pipelines can spring a leak: TransCanada's Keystone I Pipeline, began carrying dilbit from Alberta to the U.S. in 2010, and has suffered 14 different leaks. Between 2008 and 2012, “spills”sent an average of 3.1 million gallons of hazardous liquids per year, according to data from the Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration. Those spills - most commonly caused by corrosion and equipment failure - caused $1.5 billion in property damage.	RISK 26
Wanda Stapleton	April 23, 2013	We in Oklahoma value our environment filled with lakes which are quite valuable to us. We don’t want them polluted with Keystone pipeline breaks and spills which have occurred in other areas---the latest in our neighboring Arkansas.	RISK 07
Ward And Anne Stoops	April 9, 2013	The damaging effect the Tar Sands Project will have on our enviornment is undeniable. With the combination of renewabel scources of energy- solar, wind, geothermal, pus the vast natural gas deposits, there is no need for it.	PN 02
Warren F. Wade	April 4, 2013	I believe that the world will be best served if the tar sands are left in the ground, and the federal government concentrates on renewable energy sources and the improvements to the national power grid necessary to efficiently utilize this energy.	PN 02
Warren Fremling	April 20, 2013	this is a no win situation for us. We don't receive any of the gas. It subsidizes a private company. It threatens to damage our envirnonment - and it will!	PN 05
Warren Fremling	April 20, 2013	There are no safeguards here.	RISK 21
Warren Gold	April 13, 2013	The leaks already associated with this pipeline before it is completed clearly demonstrate the danger to the local environment in addition to the earth as a whole.	RISK 14
Warren Metzger	March 10, 2013	I am deeply disappointed and distressed that your State Department has produced an environmental review of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that ignores the climate impacts of extracting the dirtiest fuel on the planet. In the wake of Hurricane Sandy and other deadly weather events, our government should not be whitewashing the very real and disastrous effects of climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wayne Brumley	March 11, 2013	That a representative of Trans Canada was allowed to write the environmental impact report submitted by the EPA makes this an excellent example of how corporate corruption is behind virtually everything the government does today by tilting the playing field so corporations are nearly always allowed to run roughshod over the people and planet to gain unlimited profit while the people are stuck with the bill for not only that corruption but with the consumption tax imposed in the form of profits not by any form of government but by those same corporations that control the government's from neighborhoods to Federal by the legalized bribery to control office holders, regulators and even the media to propagandize for their favored representatives and issues to control all outcomes of those issues to insure that they achieve maximum gain regardless of harm to the people, country or planet. Until corporations forced their installed representatives to change the rules a corporation had to prove it was operating in the public's and the country' best interests or it's right to exist at all was terminated. If that were the standard observed today Trans Canada, as well as many other corporations that exist solely to take wealth from the people and country to enrich the few would be figuratively strung up in the public square. It has been claimed by those few who profit from the new standard that gathering wealth by fair means or foul is the sole reason for corporate existence and that a corporation has all the rights of personhood but must be immune from accountability for the responsibilities that a real person must abide by. As has been suggested: I will recognise that a corporation has personhood when one is executed for the crimes it commits instead of being given a pass just because it amasses wealth for the already wealthy. It is because that there are two men that will see the profits from this gamble of risking the planet for to amass further wealth and those to men are the same men bankrolling the corruption that twist our representative of the people form of government into a representative of the oligarchs. instead since these two men, the Koch brothers, own the refineries that will be the only receiver of the tar sands and the lone exporter of the refined products of them thus handing them yet another monopoly they can exploit to amass even greater corrupting influence; specifically more money to corrupt absolutely that which already far more controlled by money than the votes of the people.	PRO 01
Wayne Daniel	March 9, 2013	and the U.S. State Department's review of the project fails miserably. The review does not meaningfully assess Keystone XL in a manner that accounts for the project's tremendous impact on climate and environment.	LEG 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wayne Daniel	March 9, 2013	Specifically, the review fails to examine impact to boreal forest habitat wildlife; to account for carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil; to protect sensitive wildlife habitat and natural resources along the pipeline route; and to adequately address safety concerns, including increased corrosion and clean-up risks.	RISK 14
Wayne Davis	April 18, 2013	This construction will provide many jobs for the skilled union workers within our state.	SO 06
Wayne Larsen	April 22, 2013	The Sandhills are an ecologically important landform that would suffer greatly from an oil leak should the proposed pipeline go through the state.	RISK 07
Wayne Larsen	April 22, 2013	Please help prevent contamination of the vital Ogallala aquifer which supplies water to much of Nebraska my home state.	WRG 01
Wayne Mayo	April 2, 2013	I DEMAND YOU WAKE TO HELL UP & protect our planet for future generations by revising THE TRUMPED UP, PAID FOR BY TRANSCANADA, LIE-LACED, WHITE WASH environmental impact statement to reflect what we all know to be true: that the Keystone XL pipeline is all risk and no reward.	ACK
Wayne Roth	April 11, 2013	We have almost loaded our atmosphere with enough CO2 to push us past 2°C. At the world's current rate of emissions roughly 32-34 GtCO2/yr we will add the final 565 GtCO2 necessary to push us beyond 2°C, in a mere 17 years. James Hansen and scores of other top climate scientists have said the addition of 2°C beyond pre-industrial global temperature is dangerously high. We are already far beyond the 300ppmv CO2 that has been the top limit of atmospheric CO2 for at least the last 1 million years. In 17 years we will breach 450ppmv atmospheric CO2. THIS IS SUICIDAL.	CLIM 05
Wayne Roth	April 11, 2013	And think carefully about this comment from Paul Gilding - http://paulgilding.com/cockatoo-chronicles/victoryathand.html "Timing is the key shift the world needs to make in its thinking – this is no longer about the future, it’s about now. We don’t have 20 years to decide to act; we have 20 years to complete the task. If we follow the science, then in 20 years we must have removed the coal, oil and gas industries from the economy and replaced them. It’s simple, it’s urgent and perhaps most importantly, it’s now achievable."	PN 02
Wayne Roth	April 11, 2013	http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-20120719	REF
wayne shearer	April 22, 2013	If they want to build another line, they should be able to put it next to the one that is already in service in eastern Nebraska	ALT 03

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wayne Weseman	March 12, 2013	I also believe that strict environmental safeguards be employed in the construction and operation of the pipeline. One would be that the operators of the pipeline provide a several billion dollar bond to cover or begin to cover any damages caused by misfeasance.	PD 01, LEG 08
Weber, Michelle (fischer)	March 14, 2013	The draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) affirmed what states along the pipeline route determined in their own environmental reviews-this project is environmentally sound and should move forward.	ACK
Weber, Michelle (fischer)	March 14, 2013	the Keystone XL Pipeline has undergone the most rigorous review process of any pipeline in U.S. history and demonstrated its environmental integrity	ACK
Weber, Michelle (fischer)	March 14, 2013	While the state ofNebraska did not have any specific permitting or siting requirements at the time ofTransCanada's initial application for a Presidential permit, a state-level process was established. This process allowed for the examination of alternative pipeline siting that would avoid the Sandhills region ofNebraska, which has a high concentration of wetlands, areas of shallow groundwater, and a unique ecosystem. The	ACK
Weber, Michelle (fischer)	March 14, 2013	benefits include the creation of more than 42,000 construction jobs, which would bring in wages of about $2.05 billion, as well as another $3.3 billion in other spending. Indeed, it is in our nation's interest to move forward on this project that will create American jobs and facilitate the delivery of oil to U.S. refineries from good, reliable sources, instead of relying on oil from unpredictable sources and unstable regions throughout the world.	PN 10
Weir Group PLC	April 19, 2013	Canadian energy development makes a substantial contribution to our business (The Weir Group - engineering) in the US and Canada by supporting jobs, growth, and value-adding research and development activity. It also supports many US-based businesses that we rely on throughout our supply chain including engineering, construction, professional services, and health and safety.	SO 09
Weldon, Scott	March 22, 2013	I know that you are only looking at the impacts of building the pipeline and what happens in the vicinity of the pipeline, but you should be looking globally at the airborne impacts of refining the tar sands oil. If this is done scientifically, the pipeline would not be justifiable.	CLIM 09
Weldon, Scott	March 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is a horrible idea for the following reasons: Due to the heated tar and chemicals being forced through the pipeline, it will have ruptures and cause massive spills, just like the other tar sands pipelines.	RISK 11
Weldon, Scott	March 22, 2013	The Keystone XL Pipeline is a horrible idea [because] The jobs created are infinitesimal (a couple of hundred full-time, a couple thousand construction). This doesn’t justify building the pipeline.	SO 04

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wende	April 17, 2013	The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL are the equivalent of adding 9 million cars on the roads of America when you consider the total emissions of tar sands and the refining process.	ACK
Wendy	March 30, 2013	https://sphotos-b.xx.fbcdn.net/hphotos-ash3/166720_608188192542914_1174050213_n.jpg ExxonMobil pipeline ruptured today about 20 miles northwest of Little Rock, Arkansas. The spill forced the evacuation of dozens of homes. Oil spilled onto the road and lawns. ExxonMobil says the breach was in a pipeline that originates in Illinois and carries crude oil to the Texas Gulf Coast. This comes on the heels of the 30,000 gallon tar sands spill in Minnesota	RISK 14
Wendy Dorn-Recalde	April 22, 2013	Also, why should sovereign land-owners in the United States be forced to give up their property to a Canadian corporation, for the profit of that corporation? There is no "right" reason that would make this part of the issue okay to any rational person. This is our land, our water, our resources. We do not want them endangered by outsiders and our own government.	LEG 02
Wendy Dorn-Recalde	April 22, 2013	We are already struggling with water quality due to the high levels of nitrates in our ground water. The last thing we need is contamination on top of contamination with the inevitability of a tar sands spill. Watching the clean up efforts in Michigan, it becomes apparent that we simply do not have the technology to make this a realistic and safe endeavor.	RISK 07
Wendy Fast	March 28, 2013	The Kalamazoo River has still not been cleaned up from it's pipeline spill. The question is not what to do IF there's a leak. In reality, what will be done WHEN there's a leak. This pipeline is projected to cover vast areas of our county--displacing many US citizens in the process.	RISK 29, RISK 24
Wendy Fast	April 11, 2013	The small spill in the Kalamazoo river is STILL NOT CLEANED UP, and now we have Mayflower. These are only a small sample of what XL wants to carry. It is not IF it spills. Realistically is it WHEN. And even without spills, the pollution from it is unacceptable. For my grandchildren, and everyone else's offspring, please keep us safe from this pipeline.	RISK 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wendy Feiereisen	April 4, 2013	Our planet Earth is so fragile, please weigh the concequences of not treating it respectfully and carefully.. In light of so many oil spills (historically), and now the recent spills of fuels in Utah and Arkansas, even the smallest disaster leaves a terrible imprint on our environment! Multiply these current accidents by the size of the proposed Keystone Project, and a spill or breakdown there would be beyond devestating! beyond catastrophic!	CU 17
Wendy Futrick	April 4, 2013	tar sands oil sinks to the bottom of the river and becomes nearly impossible to remove.	WRS 04, RISK 08
Wendy Hines	April 21, 2013	The chemicals used to make the tar sands oil liquid enough to keep flowing are very corrosive and will corrode the pipes and cause leaks. The pipeline runs through the Ogallala aquifer and the Nebraska sand hills. The aquifer provides water to Nebraska and Wyoming	WRG 01, RISK 14
Wendy Volkmann	March 18, 2013	The SEIS is incorrect in its conclusion that the keystone XL pipeline will not contribute to climate change	CLIM 12
Wendy Volkmann	March 18, 2013	Dirty tar sands oil will only add to our climate crisis - which IS a crisis.	CLIM 14
Wendy Volkmann	March 18, 2013	The alberta tar sands will NOT be developed to the same potential if the KXL is not built	PN 06
WhatleyM	April 18, 2013	With 57 extra safety conditions that TransCanada has agreed to, as well as the multitude of safety advances that the pipeline industry that is made over the last several years, Keystone XL will be the safest pipeline ever built in the United States.	ACK
WhatleyM	April 18, 2013	I would like to submit a study commissioned by CEA and conducted by Dr. Ernie Goss of Creighton University which concluded that the project will increase overall economic activity in Nebraska by $817 million in 2013 and 2014 alone.	REF
Whiting, Dan	March 1, 2013	After reading that [excerpt from SEIS text regarding ability of rail to ship oil], I have to question why we would pay to build this pipeline at all. You're admitting we already have the capacity to ship all the oil.	ALT 09
Whiting, Dan	March 1, 2013	Not to mention it feeds our addiction to burning fossil fuels and that is causing rapid climate change, leading to "Once in a lifetime" weather events that now happen every year.	CLIM 17
Whitney Rubin	March 29, 2013	an independent study conducted by Creighton University economist Ernie Goss found that the Keystone XL pipeline will provide $418 million in economic benefit to Nebraska, including over $160 million in local tax revenue. The study also indicated that between construction and operation, over 5,000 jobs will be created.	SO 10
Wilfred Candler	March 4, 2013	The SEIS suggests the alternative of shipping the tar-sands oil by road or rail. This is strictly out of left field. Clearly the environmental movement would equally oppose this method of accessing the oil sands.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wilfred Candler	March 4, 2013	The SEIS is simply tone deaf to the whole issue of Global Warming and Climate Change. …… Moreover the SEIS is tone deaf to the possibility that the Climate Protection Act, recently introduced into the Senate might pass. Given a $20 a ton of CO2 tax, is there any expectation that it would be profitable to use the pipeline, even if already built!	CLIM 18
Wilfred Candler	April 13, 2013	This would seem to make an open and shut case against building the pipeline: Alternative (rail) transport is (or will become) available. A derailment is infinitely to be preferred to a (latent) "spill". The rail alternative is projected to produce twice the permanent jobs in the US as compared to the pipeline. Though not examined by the SEIS the cost of additional rail engines and tanks is likely a small fraction of the pipeline construction cost. In the event that the President's announced policy of reducing emissions is successful, rail will need to redeploy its extra tank cars. The pipeline would be a "stranded asset". "A derailment is infinitely to be preferred to a (latent) 'spill'"? Yes, because a derailment can be identified the moment it occurs, a "spill" may release large amount of dilbit before it is even identified, and even more before it can be stopped. A derailment is likely to involved only a few tank cars, a spill has no natural upper limit.	ALT 04
Will Elkins	March 28, 2013	Furthermore, the people most affected by the toxic fallout from this dirty pipeline are citizens that live in low income communities of color. Please protect our citizens from Environmental Racism!	EJ 01
Will Thomssen	March 20, 2013	I support the Keystone project because in the project will employ thousands of construction workers, These are great paying jobs and bring economic boost to the area as well the country.	SO 02
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	The soil this pipeline is running though is porous and will allow a rapid exchange of the viscous, acidic Bitumen to run through, which will not only change the pH of the environment but also pollute the surface water runoff that percolates directly into our ground water; our drinking water	WRG 01, RISK 02
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	Im honestly astounded that members of our greedy nation are so set on jeopardizing a water source that serves over 8 million people for a dirty oil source.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	the EIS and the SEIS have continually been subcontracted to a bias third party that works directly with oil and gas companies. I have moral concerns with the eminent domain tactics that TransCanada has pulled on our nations land owners placing risk towards their farming operations. … I have concerns that the Secretary of Transportation has still not released their analysis of dilute bitumen with their 18 month timeline slowly approaching and we are pending a permit on this project with out their analysis completed.	PRO 01
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	In his "Analysis of Frequency, Magnitude and Consequences of Worst-Case Spills from the Keystone XL Pipeline", the University of Nebraska professor John Stansburry states that a contaminated plume could extend more than 450 miles at concentrations exceeding the Safe Drinking Water Act Maximum Contaminant Level [1] . To me this is simple math, 130 miles is less than 450 miles which means our community is at risk, once again! It is a fact that the Keystone I pipeline has leaked 14 times since 2010. I have no trust in TransCanada's statements dismissing the concern of a future oil spill. Keystone XL is an extra-large, high-capacity pipeline and it will spill. What is TransCanada's plan of action to stop and or clean up a water source over 300,000 people? There is no way our city's Public Works/Utilities Department could rapidly filter out the toxic chemicals, of which we know very few that will be flowing in this pipeline.	RISK 13
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	Mixed use energy depending heavily on solar and wind with a new, high-efficient energy grid is a long-term approach that will create thousands of jobs permanently, unlike the Keystone XL pipeline. Please take this note into consideration and change the route of our future's energy sources..	SO 05
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	I have a concern that the NEDEQ states that this pipeline is not crossing the fragile Sand Hills of Nebraska but when you look at the map from three years ago, it blatantly shows that this region IS still in the Sand Hills of Nebraska.	SOIL 07
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	As I'm sure you know by now the pipeline covers a large portion of the Ogallala Aquifer, one of the largest fresh water sources in the United States. No need to highlight the risk here as it should be obvious that we can not replace a fresh water resource.	WRG 01
Willa Tharnish	April 22, 2013	In addition to the Ogallala Aquifer, I need to point out that the pipeline crosses the Platte River. Approximately 130 miles downstream from is the water that my community relies upon for our day-to-day lives. The Platte River directly provides drinking water for Lincoln as well as the communities surrounding the city.	WRS 01, RISK 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Willard & Lynn Traub	April 11, 2013	During the tenure of President Jimmy Carter, when embargoes were creating our early experience(not including wartime rationing) with energy shortages, tar sands were looked at as a possible energy source. 35 years ago they were deemed too risky from environmental and economic reasons. I don't think current technology advances make a significant difference. This project should NOT be approved	PN 08
Willene Mcrae	April 1, 2013	I can't believe the State Department would issue a draft EIS on the pipeline and say that it would not adversely effect our environment. Are the oil companies really that powerful now that they are running the state department?	ACK
William & Pauline Reynolds	April 21, 2013	The Keystone Pipeline will help the burning of fuel that we must keep in the ground if we want to avoid disastrous climate change	CLIM 14
William Allen	April 4, 2013	Intentionally or otherwise, you have made the draft SEIS files very un-user friendly. The file sections numbering is inconsistent making it a real chore to download all of the sections to combine them into a single cohesive document. Please provide a SINGLE FILE of the Draft SEIS for those who wish to download one file and not play all of these games. We have the bandwidth and the time. You have an obligation to make total access as simple and transparent as possible. Option #2: At least renumber the file names in the proper numeric sequence for compilation.	PRO 03
William And Cynthia Crutcher	April 4, 2013	I am perplexed to understand how the Courts have used the law that makes it possible for pipelines to get a right of way without exception in the US, but how that law is somehow extended to another country.	LEG 02
William And Cynthia Crutcher	April 4, 2013	no consideration for toxic spills was give to the environment or human exposure that will definitely happen as predicted by the builders own admission.	RISK 30
William Atkins	April 11, 2013	Yet this pipeline that would delivery more fossil fuel that will contribute significantly to carbon dioxide emissions is being seriously considered	CLIM 14
William Boardman	March 4, 2013	What about the impact of the pipeline on climate change? Are you deliberately implying that there is none? Do you understand that that conclusion would be wrong?	CLIM 12
William Burgett	March 26, 2013	It will promote energy independence in North America and will create jobs, therefore wealth, at a time our country greatly needs it.	PN 10
William Callebert	April 7, 2013	I urge you place the long term benefits of discouraging the use of environmentally detrimental oil extraction techniques, such as tar sand extraction, over the ephemeral economic benefits that they would provide by denying the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Carney	April 21, 2013	burning tar sands oil will devastate our climate	CLIM 14
William Carney	April 21, 2013	transporting tar sands oil won't help our energy independence.	PN 04
William Carney	April 21, 2013	tar sands offers minimal jobs…	SO 02
William Chase	March 6, 2013	Further, the report concludes that with the pipeline's proposed mitigation measures in place, construction and operation will have no meaningful effect on the U.S. environment, or endangered species	ACK
William Chase	March 6, 2013	At the same time the report concludes that the pipeline will have no meaningful effect on the climate, even if you accept (you shouldn't) the dire predictions of the most extreme climate computer models, as Canada will extract oil from its oil sands with or without the pipeline	CLIM 13
William Chase	March 6, 2013	The oil would simply get to market through less efficient means.	PN 05
William Chase	March 28, 2013	We need to release all forms of energy to put folks back to work.	PN 05
William Claiborn	April 22, 2013	Environmental impact study was badly flawed, understates risks.	ACK
William Curley	April 15, 2013	But overarching all particular concerns is the need to slow global warming generally, The Keystone XL pipeline project is a giant step towards extending planetary dependance on hydrocarbon based fuels, bring with it at an increasing rate all the associated threats to sustainability of the ecosystem and human life on earth.	CLIM 14
William Damien Reed	March 26, 2013	Enbridge's response and clean up efforts have been universally criticized by local and State officials, the EPA and the NTSB. Allowing this company the responsibility for more pipelines across our Nation would be a huge mistake .	ACK
William Davis	March 14, 2013	As Secretary of State John Kerry said six years ago, "we're on an urgent clock" to confront fossil-fueled climate change, which he compared to the threat of nuclear weaponry as a "man-made" and "uncontrolled" weapon with "the ability to change life as we know it on this Earth." Kerry's recognition of the scientific necessity to keep global concentrations of carbon dioxide below 450 ppm should preclude the possibility of building a pipeline designed to pump 7 gigatons of carbon dioxide worth of tar sands crude over decades.	CLIM 18
William Davis	March 14, 2013	Environmental Resources Management (ERM) was paid an undisclosed amount under contract to TransCanada to write the statement, which is now an official government document.	PRO 01
William Davis	March 14, 2013	http://www.care2.com/causes/state-department-keystone-xl-report-written-by-transcanada-hiree.html#ixzz2NXC4pZzk	REF
William Davis	April 5, 2013	It was written by a TransCanada hack and is completely illegitimate.	PRO 01
William Davis	April 9, 2013	It was written by TransCanada [consultants]and is NOT an honest or unbiased review of the environmental impacts of the Keystone XL pipeline project.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Davis	April 22, 2013	The State Department's environmental impact report, written by TransCanada hacks, lies about its environmental impact and there are rumors that this sham document will be used to approve this climate killing pipeline. This is a perfect example of how corporations pollute our democracy into a foul corrupt and fascist corporatocracy. Those responsible for allowing vested interests to compose environmental impact statements should be fired, if not jailed.	PRO 01
William Dazey	April 15, 2013	Do not build these pipelines. Build wind turbines throughout Houston - Austin area. On Hw 290 especially. Let's reinvest our money from oil which is a non-renewable resource and into sustainable programs that are known to work without causing harm.	ALT 01
William Dazey	April 15, 2013	My grandfather was a key contributor to the production of oil pipelines in Alaska...those pipelines are now leaking. If we create more pipelines, they will leak. We will have oil all over the continent of North America.	RISK 14
William Edgar	April 9, 2013	That assessment [is] wrong on a number of fronts. It concedes the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, but claims they need not be considered.	CLIM 13
William Edgar	April 9, 2013	It fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route -- a danger underscored by the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas.	RISK 13
William F. Whitsitt, Ph.D.	April 19, 2013	The KXL project will also provide a significant private sector economic stimulus to the states and localities along the pipeline route during its construction. As the hundreds of labor union members who spoke in favor of the KXL project as i did at a State Department hearing in Oklahoma know well, it is estimated KXL will create over 13,000 high-wage construction and manufacturing jobs related to building the pipeline. In addition, the Canadian Energy Research Institute (CERI) has found that the economic impact of oil sands development is expected to lead to the creation of more than 342,000 new U.S. jobs over the estimated four years that construction will require.	PN 05
William Fields	March 6, 2013	[The] potential devastation to the aquifers beneath this pipeline is not worth the risk.	ACK
William Gerber	April 13, 2013	I also recognize the continued and increasing damage that the buildup of greenhouse gases are doing by raising the temperature of the earth and its oceans. I'm enough of a pessimist to wonder if it isn't already too late to save human life on the earth. Now that the tundra is beginning to melt, and with that more and more methane will be released, are we not seeing the beginnings of a divergent feedback loop that will eventually destroy us all?	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Haley	April 13, 2013	As a retired steamfitter/pipefitter I have worked on different pipelines around the country. There has never been one that hasn't had a failure at some point. That isn't to say the workmanship was bad, rather it's the nature of pipelines. Pipes wear out from the inside where you can't easily tell, even with modern equipment that they send down through the pipes. IF BUILT, IT WILL BE A DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN.	RISK 14
William Harpham	April 5, 2013	The xl pipeline is nothing but a big scam. They want a bigger pipe line so they can pump oil faster accross the country to ship it oiut over seas, means more profits.	PN 05
William Harris	April 13, 2013	If we must have an XL pipeline, make it only ten miles long and build a refinery specifically to refine it when it enters the US. Limit sales of the refined products the the US. If the pipeline is built as planned, and refined on the coast of Texas, the refined product will be shipped and sold to other overseas markets,so we citizens get to bear the risk without receiving any of the benefits.	PN 07, ALT 08
William Henderson	March 11, 2013	The consulting firm that prepared the recent environmental health study for the State Department has ties to the Canadian pipeline company, as reported recently in the NY Times. The lack of objectivity of the study author renders its conclusions baseless and irrelevant.	PRO 01
William Hess	April 4, 2013	In fact, my understanding is that the official assessment was paid for by one of the pipeline contractors (TransCanada). Sounds like we've hired the arsonist to be fire chief.	PRO 01
William Kerschner	April 11, 2013	I am uncomfortable not only with this particula pipeline project, but also with this Canadian Tar Sands project that is ruining vast tracts of Canadian wooldands.	CU 01
William Killpatrick	April 2, 2013	It is imperative you revise the EIS not simply to reflect -- but to place extraordinary emphasis on -- what we all know to be true: that the Keystone XL pipeline is all risk and no reward.	PN 05
William Krakauer Md	April 22, 2013	Every study, every scientific opinion, insists unequivocally that Keystone XL Pipeline, through not only its immediate effects but through even more devastating long range repercussions, is extremely dangerous, and potentially destructive not only to the whole US but to the whole world's climate	CLIM 12
William Krinsky	April 12, 2013	As we move forward to a clean energy future, there is no room for the most destructive oil on the planet, and a thorough environmental review will make that abundantly clear. I urge you to put our health and climate above oil industry profits and give the Keystone XL the in-depth environmental review that we deserve. Thank you.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Leavy	April 24, 2013	Our own U.S. EPA has raised grave concerns about the environmental impacts ... that KXL could wreak on the land, water supply, and air quality when a similar failure occurs along the run of this pipeline.	LEG 19
William M. Burns/marlea Evans Burns	April 19, 2013	why would you want to defile water, pollute air, and ruin the lives of those who are too poor to move away from the pipes and refineries	EJ 01
William Manners	April 1, 2013	Yes it may create a few jobs and the holes in the pipeline that will continue to occur as sand is pumped through this pipeline may give a few job security, but at what cost to the world we live in? Create jobs with solar and wind farms that will give us clean energy, rebuild our manufacturing base and not pollute our world! Build electric cars that can be charged from these solar and wind farms, not coal plants! There are lots of ways to create more jobs that do not destroy our planet than this ill-advised pipeline will!	PN 05
William R. Boyd	April 21, 2013	It seems there is no contribution to our own energy independence since the resulting output is available to the world market.	PN 04
William R. Boyd	April 21, 2013	More importantly, the probability of a substantial leak approaches certainty in light of the number of incidents reported in the past.	RISK 13
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	…despite the claims of the EIS that the environmental impacts are minor, these assertions are not supported by the science. Our scientific judgment is that the actual and potential environmental damage are sufficiently severe to reject the Keystone XL Pipeline proposal in order to protect the climate, human health and the multiple ecosystems this project threatens.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	Looking at rail transport as an alternative that would have higher emissions simply ignores the best alternative of not building the pipeline at all.	ALT 07
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	The assertion that the tar sands will not significantly increase global warming is simply not supported by the facts. While this might be said of any single project, this is simply false over the lifetime of the pipeline as even the calculations in the EIS demonstrate. Furthermore, the increase in emissions from tar sand oil reported in the EIS is at the very low end of estimates of the additional carbon dioxide released through the lifecycle of producing and refining tar sands-based petroleum products. These heavy oils are extracted by burning large quantities of relatively clean natural gas to liquefy the heavy bitumen.	CLIM 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	…this project has serious local and regional human health impacts from tar sands extraction and refining: downstream toxic exposures, including carcinogens, for members of the Athabasca Chipewyan and Mikisew Cree First Nations in Alberta. Processing this crude significantly increases air pollution within the United States from the multiple refineries of the highly toxic tar sands bitumen. This places large numbers of Americans with cardiac disease, asthma, and other chronic pulmonary disease at greater risk. The EIS fails even to consider environmental justice issues.	CU 05
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	We have reviewed the draft Supplemental EIS, and find its assertions to be without merit in many critical areas. Also, it is disingenuous to claim that the revised proposal shortens the pipeline by 509 miles, since the southern portion is being built as a separate project, and the impacts of that portion are not included in this EIS. The full project still extends from more than 300 miles within Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. Furthermore, it is clearly designed to pick up additional heavy crude from the Bakken Marketlink projects in Montana and North Dakota, and these impacts are not adequately accounted for.	CU 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	The assertion that the additional oil will be needed by the US seems unlikely in light of the growing oil production within the US and declining demand. In fact, an International Energy Agency analysis demonstrates that the US could be self sufficient in oil in the near future. With imports declining, the need for additional petroleum imports does not seem to be necessary. Alternatively, it is argued that this oil will be sent to idle refineries (another sign that petroleum use has declined) and then exported. Either way, it is unclear what the benefit will be to the United States.	PN 01
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	The assertion that even if the pipeline were not built, the oil would still be produced is inconsistent with the eagerness of the producers and refiners of this very dirty, high carbon product to have the pipeline built. This argument contradicts Administration claims in other cases that “infrastructure” to move products to market is essential for economic growth.	PN 06

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	The EIS states that the likelihood of spills is “small.” Data quoted in the EIS from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration analyzed all oil pipeline spills during a ten-year period. What has not been done is to evaluate the performance of pipelines carrying tar sands crude, or those operated by the firm proposing the XL pipeline, which has a demonstrated higher rate of failure. Hence, the EIS fails to justify why potential spills of tar sands crude are a “small risk” and ignores the on going damage and extraordinary high cost of clean up of the 2010 spill in the Kalamazoo River in Michigan.	RISK 13
William R. Moomaw; John Abraham; Ken Caldeira; Eric Chivian; Terrence J. Collins; Eric A. Davidson; Howard Frumkin; Jennifer Francis; Inez Fung; James N. Galloway; James Hansen; John Harte; Richard Houghton; Robert W. Howarth; Howard Hu; Richard Jackson;	April 2, 2013	Rejecting the XL Pipeline will avoid direct damage to terrestrial ecosystems and water bodies and protect multiple species that live in and pass through these habitats, including tens of millions of migrating North American birds. In addition to these threats, the EIS identifies 13 endangered and threatened species that might be adversely affected by the pipeline within the US.	WI 01
William Ragar	March 10, 2013	Really? you'd believe a phony report compiled by the people that are selling the pipeline? come on i think you know better than that. i know your under tremendous pressure from the oil and gas industry but this is a ultra right wing canadian president trying to sell us the worst environmental disaster ever heard of. tell him to sell it himself and pollute his country instead of ours. wg	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Reilly	March 15, 2013	We should concentrate on clean energy sources and the millions of jobs they will create.	ALT 01
William Rizer	March 27, 2013	Use of the tar sands resource will, as James Hansen has so clearly pointed out, mean "game over" for the climate.	CLIM 14
William Rizer	March 27, 2013	Approving the Keystone XL Pipeline will serve only to greatly extend the use of this extremely dirty petroleum source.	PN 06
William S. Whitney	April 22, 2013	We must avoid more carbon pollution and transition away from fossil fuels as soon as possible, we must invest in less risky energy sources and drive innovation in renewable production and end use. …..Keystone XL will not create many jobs nor influence the price of domestic gasoline.	SO 05
William Satterlee	April 22, 2013	Think of clean energy: WIND-SOLAR- EVEN NATURAL GAS BETTER THAT TAR SAND OIL. POLLUTES WATER, LAND, & PIPELINE BREAKAGE & LEAKS ARE A CONSTANT CLIMATE PROBLEM W/YEARS OF COURT HEARINGS OF WHO IS RESPONSIBLE & A MAJOR LOSS OF OUR JOBS/HOMES/LOSS OF GOOD LAND & PRECIOUS WATER RESOURCES	PN 02
William Schmidt	April 9, 2013	THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON TO STOP THE PIPELINE IS TO PREVENT ADDITIONAL GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE.,. We have seen ample evidence in Hurricanes Sandy and Katrina, the midwest droughts and wildfires, the diminished rainfall throughout the West and increasing insect infestations due to warmer winters. This does not even begin to compare with the damage worldwide (ocean acidification, Russian fires, Pakistan and Australian floods to name a few)WE CANNOT CONTINUE THE CARBON FUEL ORGY. The side effects, which we have so far refused to take into account, are simply too high.	CLIM 17
William Sechrest	March 25, 2013	Creating jobs with skills that last, have a net positive effect, and that build healthy communities should be our country's focus. Limiting our environmental impact to what is out of our control and protecting our environment where it is under our control.	PN 05
William Sechrest	March 25, 2013	What does the Keystone Pipeline represent? Unbelievable environmental devastation, a hugh risk in latent environmental disasters, cultural destruction, and a boon of wealth for who? The Canadian's and the Chinese. Oh, along with a pittance of jobs for the US. I guess the question is, can we return to becoming a beacon rather than playing the follower?	PN 05
William Steele	April 4, 2013	Eminent domain has been used to seize private lands from unwilling sellers along the pipeline route. I am sad to see this confiscation of property from private citizens to benefit foreign companies happen here. Communist China also seizes land from private citizens, but at least in China, the intention is to help the Chinese public at large.	LEG 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Steele	April 4, 2013	From a national viewpoint, the XL Pipeline is clearly not in the best interest of U.S. citizens. The companies mining the bitumen and operating the pipeline will benefit enormously from the pipeline, and the U.S. will get a handful of jobs, most of them temporary during pipeline construction. The energy companies will sell their bitumen on the world market to make large profits, but the American people will get only the inevitable oil leaks and spills from the pipeline. This pipeline is obviously not in the interest of U.S. citizens.	PN 05
William Stone	April 24, 2013	Canadian oil through the pipeline will replace the declining foreign oil that currently feeds the Gulf Coast refineries. This will ensure ready access to secure, reliable crude oil from a firedly and policy-aligned partner in Canada.	PN 01
William Stone	April 24, 2013	Many US businesses benefit from the Canadian oil sands development and the US-Canada energy relationship, including construction and engineering, advanced technology,l environmental, and health and safety services.	SO 09
William Thygerson	March 10, 2013	I am terribly upset about the environmental impact statement on the Keystone pipeline. Not only does it understate the impact increased use of tar sands oil will have, it does so in the most transparently dishonest way -- it was written by a contractor to the Canadian oil company building the pipeline.	PRO 01
William Tom	April 16, 2013	its construction will damage and spoil it's surrounding area with construction debris and impede the migration of wildlife	WI 02
William Tracy	April 4, 2013	Also please look into the stories that landowners initially recieved letters that from TransCanada that threatened the use of Iminent Domain if they refused to allow the pipe to go thru their land. The thought of a foreign corporation threatening to use Iminent Domain is infuriating and shows they are nothing but a bunch of bullies.	LEG 02
William Underwood	March 14, 2013	The oil from tar sands is a high bitumen resource requiring excessive heating and or dilution with other dangerous materials to allow it to travel via pipeline. The simple physics of these processes make pipeline safety questionable at best.	RISK 14
William Wade	April 6, 2013	The pipeline will assure the release of millions more tons of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels to the atmosphere at a time when such emissions should be reduced to zero or as practically close to zero.	CLIM 14, CLIM 11
William Walz	April 19, 2013	There will be are many other uses for hydrocarbons in the future. We should wait to extract hydrocarbon sources until we have a better understanding of how to prevent atomospheric carbon accumulation.	PN 02
William West	April 18, 2013	Now is the time to advance climate solutions, not develop the dirtiest oil on earth that will only make climate change even worse. Lead the charge of focusing our money, energies, and workforce into converting to clean sustainable energies. This will liberate America, put Americans to work, and energize our country.	PN 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
William Wilson	March 17, 2013	After reading the Cornell University study and other reports I am convinced the State Department ignored the truth of these reports to use the industry supplied data and now the president will likely be corrupted as well. I can only hope for one honest person, Kerry to look at the past corruption and look at the truth that the TarSands would be dramatically expanded and harm so much that it simply is a crime against humanity so certainly not in the countries best interest to give cancer to children and asthma to others.	PN 08, CLIM 14, RISK 30
William Young	March 16, 2013	Please examine the extensive environmental and climate impacts of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. A diligent study would reveal the project's significant negative effects, and would lead to the pipeline's ultimate rejection.	PN 09
Willis Patterson	April 15, 2013	My first and most major concern, is that none of the companies are willing to pay any REAL damages, when major damages occur.	PD 01
Willow Teegarden	April 4, 2013	More solar and other clean energy development, is good for our economy and our health.	ALT 01
Wilma Bradbeer	March 7, 2013	The [DSEIS finding that] the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline poses no significant pollution or climate change problems...can't be true considering the huge amount of fossil fuel power involved in mining the tar sands	CLIM 07
Wilma Frauenberger	March 15, 2013	Already in Oklahoma, (…) Oklahoma needs the economy on an upward trend, not the downward trend we have been on since Obama took office. It is time to understand the people can't pay more in taxes, they are near desperation trying to survive the health care that plan forced on Oklahomans and others, and we need the improvement the pipeline and expenses attributed to it to help our economy NOW	PN 10
Wilson, Jane A.	April 19, 2013	To condone the extraction of tar sands is to condone the annihilation of vital ecosystems, the lives of many indigenous people and possibly some of our best-loved (and endangered) species, like the whooping crane.	ACK
Wilson, Jane A.	April 19, 2013	The health effects of tar sands extraction and refining are not being taken into account because if they were, tar sands would not be economically viable. As in the burning of coal, the true costs are being dumped on the community in the form of severe health problems, including rare cancers, while the polluters get away scot-free.	CU 08
Wilson, Jane A.	April 19, 2013	There is little chance any of this oil will stay in the U.S. It is bound for the export market with one of its hubs being Port Arthur, TX. TransCanada has told shareholders it wants to expand its markets	PN 07

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wilson, Jane A.	April 19, 2013	Lastly and most of all, I fear for our lifeblood – our water. In Mayflower, city officials want Exxon to move the Pegasus pipeline OUT of their watershed. And here in Nebraska, we're fighting to keep the KXL out of critical waterways like the Niobrara, the Platte and most importantly, the Ogallala Aquifer. As an agricultural state, we cannot afford the risks to our water and land. And contrary to what you may have heard, the new route in Nebraska still crosses our fragile Sand Hills and the Aquifer.	WRG 06
Wilson, Norma	April 18, 2013	What kind of jobs? Most will be temporary, and none of them will be in our long-term interest because our climate is broken, and TransCanada's Tar Sands XL pipeline would only make it worse.	PN 05
Wilson, Norma	April 18, 2013	If diluted bitumen entered the aquifer, would a clean-up be possible?	RISK 07
Wilson, Norma	April 18, 2013	Diluted bitumen spills are very difficult to clean up. The 2010 spill into Michigan's Kalamazoo River has not been cleaned up yet.	RISK 13
Wilson, Norma	April 18, 2013	[Recent] spills indicate that TransCanada is not investing in as much safety equipment or in the number of inspectors needed to detect leaks and prevent large spills.	RISK 14
Winni Troha	April 9, 2013	Please start looking up! Stop digging in the ground for poisons. The Sun is obviously Earth's essential and abundant energy source, powerful and cleansing Why dig up pollutants ? If we can build the infrastructure for oil and gas, why can't we build the infrastructure for solar power? I have been waiting 45 years for the change to solar power. After years of proof that fossil fuels are destroying the air, fresh water, land and seas, why would you even consider building more pipelines for odious oil? It's a terrible idea. Solar for life.	PN 02
WinstonK	April 18, 2013	TransCanada repeatedly made both oral and written representations they would take easements by the use of eminent domain. Pursuant to Nebraska Revised Statute 57-1101. This is clearly taking property under the color of state law.	LEG 02
WinstonK	April 18, 2013	the map of the Sandhills….TransCanada presented the map to the State Department in 2008 that indicated the Sandhills were far larger and includes the land which is part of their current route. The map currently being used is the EPA eco-regions map. When this map was presented to the legislature in the 2000 session special session in the form of LB 5, TransCanada opposed it. Therefore, there is no legislative authorization for the use of the EPA eco-regions map.The fact that TransCanada has concealed their own version of the Sandhills and supported the version that they officially opposed is the work of a bad actor.	LEG 16

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	I would like to commend the State Department for executing a thorough and transparent Draft SEIS for the Keystone XL project.	ACK
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	The draft SEIS concludes that rail and barge alternatives are still economically viable given the strong demand for heavy crude amongst Gulf refineries.	ALT 04
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	Alternative transport methods- namely rail and barge - will require significantly more displacement of land and result in greater energy use and carbon emissions.	ALT 07
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	The likelihood of an incident leading to a release or spill of crude oil is much lower for pipelines than other transport methods.	ALT 07
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	Even with these less attractive alternatives [(rail and barge)], rejecting Keystone XL will not eliminate the demand for heavy oil transport. Nor will rejecting the project deter the production of Canadian oil sands.	PN 06
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	As discussed in this draft SEIS, the project offers the most efficient, safest and least intrusive method for transporting Canadian and Bakken crude to markets in the Gulf Coast region.	PN 09
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	By supporting domestic production and oil imports from our ally Canada, instead of politically unstable countries, we will strengthen both our national security and energy security. Access to affordable, stable supplies of petroleum remains one of the most vital components for a growing economy.	PN 10
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	Keystone XL will be critical to improving American energy security and boosting our economy.	PN 10
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	American businesses and drivers will see [significant economic benefits] thanks to an increase in safe, abundant supplies of crude oil to fuel the economy.	SO 08
Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce	April 2, 2013	As the draft SEIS outlines, the project will support over 42,100 jobs during the construction phase and will generate over $5 billion in economic activity, including $2.05 billion in worker salaries. For local governments along the pipeline corridor, $65 million in tax revenue will help fund necessary infrastructure projects, education and medical services.	SO 08
Wittenberg Center	March 23, 2013	the existing study makes no mention of the impacts to the Canadian Boreal forests, nor native Historical, Sacred and cultural sites. Eminent Domain will likely be used to take lands from Native and non- native peoples that would not be right.	LEG 02, CU 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wm Noblin	April 9, 2013	Please stand up and be counted as a forward thinking renewables supporter leading our nation toward the only energy that can move us into the future and save our small precious planet.	PN 02, ALT 01
Wolfgang Rougle	April 11, 2013	How can State acknowledge the climate-wrecking impacts of tar sands oil, but claim there's no need to consider them? Surely if there is one major issue that will affect Americans' lives in the next fifty and a hundred years and beyond (and frankly, in the next twelve months) it's climate change! We all know the pipeline will aggravate climate change, so why is that not profoundly relevant?	CLIM 13
Wolfgang Rougle	April 11, 2013	The draft environmental assessment also fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route. Just weeks ago, families were forced from their homes by a large spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas. If the pipeline is approved, that tragedy will be repated many times over. This is a significant risk that is very important to all normal Americans along the pipeline route (and anywhere else, for that matter).	RISK 13
Wolter, Christine A	April 22, 2013	I strongly urge you to move ahead with the Keystone Pipeline Project, in order to increase jobs in a very static job market and make our country less dependent on foreign oil.	PN 10
Wren Osborn	March 10, 2013	What exactly is the pipeine's carbon footprint. What is its methane footprint? Tthat wasn't even studied. What is the greenhousegases footprint of the fuel that will be burned by foreign nations to enrich a foreign company? That is too high a cost for America and its citizens.	PN 05, CLIM 05
Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio	April 22, 2013	It is an insult to America that TransCanada-contracted consultants were allowed by the State Department to materially shape the Environmental Impact statement.	PRO 01
Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio	April 22, 2013	[the SEIS ignores] the damage that would be done to the mighty Ogallala Aquifer, which provides 30 % of the nations ag irrigation waters. One need only look at the toxic slurry ponds left over from the processing of the tar sands in Alberta to see the horrendous impact on living things: wildlife landing on those ponds die. The crude sludge would poison the aquifer, and cleanup of that underground treasure would be next to impossible. The main ingredient in tar sands is bitumen -- used to compound asphalt for paving. It is water-impervious and as such not remediated easily.	RISK 07, CU 02, RISK 08, RISK 12, WRG 01
WrightJ	April 18, 2013	I come from the Ihanktonwan Oyate Nation from...South Dakota. I'm a treaty delegate for the Ihanktonwan. The Keystone XL has never been to our nation to consult with the general council, the governing body of our nation.	CR 01
Wyatt Urlacher	April 22, 2013	Additionally, an expert safety review by the US Department of Transportation’s Pipeline and Hazard Materials Safety Administration is still needed.	RISK 23

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Wylie	April 18, 2013	http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20090629_caritas-in-veritate_en.html Sections 48-51	REF
Wyn Hoag	March 9, 2013	It is ridiculous to review just a small part of the process – the building and operation of the pipeline - and declare that there is no impact on climate change. Though the 3.19 million metric tons per year of CO2 to be emitted in operating the pipeline, annually, is not an insignificant amount, it is only a small part of the total emissions of the extraction, transportation, refining and burning process. Right now, Alberta Tar Sands exploration is limited by its inability to get this dirty material out of Canada. This is for the best. The State Department is not doing its job of protecting Americans if allows this dirty material to be disseminated through the world, causing us to reach 450 parts per million of carbon in the atmosphere, an irreversible tipping point for our climate. Research has shown that the global average temperature will rise eleven degrees Fahrenheit, causing huge increased population pressure on Northern regions, greatly increased violent weather patterns that will destroy U.S. businesses along all the coasts, and massive poverty as a result of these changes. The petty mitigation measures encouraged by the EIS will do nothing to stop the damage that the life cycle of the Tar Sands oil will create.	CLIM 12
Yahoo	March 22, 2013	This pipeline will have irreversible effects on our country and Enviornment.	CLIM 14
Yahoo Member Service.	March 19, 2013	Do not do this. It will set a terrible precedent for future renewable energy programs. Let's do things right for future generations.	CLIM 18
Yahoo! Mail	March 15, 2013	the production of oil from tar sands is one of the most inefficient and environmentally damaging methods of extracting oil. The oil produced is of poor quality and its use creates more greenhouse gases. From mining to use, tar sands oil is bad for the environment and contributes too much to climate change to be worth the cost.	CLIM 05
Yahoo! Mail	March 15, 2013	In addition to the environmental damage of construction and the history of unacceptable maintenance and spill mitigation of such pipelines (re: the Kalamazoo River spill in Michigan)	RISK 13

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	A RESOLUTION DEMANDING THAT THE UNITED STATES UPHOLD THE RIGHTS OF THE IHANKTONWAN DAKOTA/NAKOTA OYATE AND OTHER INDIGENOlJS NATIONS AND THEIRR MEMBERS WITH RESPECT TO CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL SITES BY CONFORMING ITS REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE TO FEDERAL LAW AND TREATY RIGHTS AS DESCRIBED HEREIN: WHEREAS, the State Department has failed to properly involve Indigenous Nations in its review of the proposed project, neglecting its kgal obligation to engage with Indigenous Nations on a GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT basis. And WHEREAS, the State Department has erroneously stated in the Draft SEIS that it consulted with lhanktonwan Yankton Sioux Tribe at least one hundred fifty nine (159) times which is a gross misrepresentation of information, as the communications in no way qualify as '·Nation to Nation" consultations, and WHEREAS, in order for consultation with Ihanktowan Oyate to qualify as "Nation to Nation", such consultation must occur on lhanktonwan homelands with the General CounciL and WHEREAS, that meetings conducted with THPO entities are not "Nation to Nation consultations; as THPO's are regulatory entities, and	ACK
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that this Resolution will be served to the Department of State at the Public Hearing in Grand Island, Nebraska on April 18, 2013 by the Treaty Delegates and the Chairman of the Yankton Sioux Tribe or his designee, along with the Resolution enacted on April 4 which was prepa red for the April DOS meeting in Rapid City, vvhich was cancelled; und.	ACK
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall in no way be interpreted to validate the imposition of United States law on the sovereign lhanktonwan/Yankton Sioux Nation in violation of the valid and legally binding treaties between the lhanktowan Oyate and the United States, and the lhanktonwan Oyate fully reserves all rights under the 1851 Treaty which was signed at Ft. Laramie, the 1868 Treaty in support of the lhanktonwanna and other Bands of the Oceti Sakowin (Seven Council Fires) which was signed at Fort Laramie and BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED. that this Resolution will be delivered to the State Department by delegates or designees of the Treaty Steering Committee; in cooperation on behalf of the lhanktonwanl Yankton Sioux General Council and Treaty Council.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	The General Council of the lhanktonwan has the responsibili ty to ensure the preservation and protection or the Ihanktonwan people aga inst infringement and depredations on traditional, hi storical, aboriginal and Treaty lands and Ina Maka (Mother Eart h) and. WHEREAS: The Department of State through the KXL Pipeline has completely disregarded this environmental threat to our Nation and other said sovereign Indi genous Nations who have not had free. Prior and in formed consent in this intrusion in our territories. And	ACK
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS: This linguistic evidence corroborates that the Dakota. Nakota. Lakota linguistic groups had an aboriginal homelands that created a cultural landscape that contains thousands of cultural and historical sites. This cultural knowledge belongs to Indigenous peoples and the people belong to the landscape, whereby traditional knowledge dwells in specific places/lands located in the KXL Pipeline Corridor which are irreplaceable, and	ACK
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE GENERAL COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2013-13 A "RESOLUTION OF DECLARATION" 1. TO ACT WITH INHERENT, LAWFUL AND SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY OVER OUR LANDS, WATERS AND AIR AS RECOGNIZED BY ARTICLE 32 OF THE UNITED NATIONS DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES. 2. IN ORDER TO FURTHER DEFEND AGAINST DEPREDATIONS OCCURRING ON 1851 TREATY LANDS AND OCETI SAKO WIN 1868 TREATY LANDS. 3. TO DEFEND THE INTERNATIONAL TREATY OF JANUARY 15, 2013 TO PROTECT THE SACRED AGAINST TAR SANDS, AND LASTLY 4. PREVENT INTRUSIONS ON ABORIGINAL AND HISTORICAL LANDS OF THE IHANKTON WAN OY ATE AND OCETI SAKO WIN LANDS." Whereas: Would not have signed the I 85 I and 1868 Treaties if the ancestors had known the United States would consistentl y violate them up to even today; and WHEREAS: Signers of the above mentioned treaties can act and shall act against any depredations occurring within respective homelands. And	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS, if the 2011 Programmatic Agreement is followed the State Department would make its decision without taking into consideration the impact of a proposed projcct on cultural and historic sites, as required by federal statutes whitch preempt any inconsistent regulations, and WHEREAS, we refuse to allow the United States to deny us our rights to preserve and protect what we hold sacred through violations of its own federal laws, and THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the lhanktonwan / Yankton Sioux Nation does declare that Indigenous Nations have not been properly involved in the review of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline as a whole and have been forced to participate in a fragmented divisive process, which does not allow tribes to share information with each other in a cooperative manner even though the lands on which Indigenous Nations' sacred, cultural, and historic sites are found often overlap, and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the lhanktonwan/Yankton Sioux Nation demands that no decision be made with respect to TransCanada's application for a Presidential Permit because Indigenous Nations have been denied the right to survey the full length of the proposed pipeline route by tribal surveyors and spiritual persons who possess the unique cultural and spiritual knowledge to conduct this work. And	CR 01
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS, the use and contents of a programmatic Agreement are crucial factors in consulting the protection of cultural and historical sites of significance to all tribal nations, and WHEREAS, both "signatory parties" and "invited signatories" have certain rights to amend or terminate the 2011 Progrnmmatic Agreement, and WHEREAS, the 2011 Programmatic Agreement included eleven (11) federal agencies and six (6) State Historic Preservation Officers as "signatory parties," and it include two state agencies in Montana as well as TransCanada as "invited signatories," and WHEREAS, despite the fact that forty-four (44) interested Indigenous Nations notified the State Department that they wished to participate in the consultation process, not a single Indigenous Nation was allowed to be included as a "signatory party" or even an "invited signatory" to the 201 I Programmatic Agreement, and WHEREAS, by excluding Indigenous Nations from "signatory party" status, the State Department not only deprived interested Indigenous Nations of the ability to protect their interests through signatory rights described above but it also relegated Indigenous Nations to a status inferior to that of state agencies, and WHEREAS, the State Department has not yet indicated whether it intends to use the 2011 Programmatic Agreement, whether it will seek to modify the 2011 Programmatic Agreement, or whether it will create a new Programmatic Agreement to be incorporated in the SEIS	CR 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS, the State Dcparlmemt cannot determine the impact the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline would have on cultural and historic sites until the affected lands have been properly surveyed, and WHEREAS as of October 2012 more than 8,514 acres of the proposed project corridor remained unsurveyed, and	CR 02
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS, the State Department's failure is particularly egregious with respect to the surveying process to identify cultural and historical sites that will he harmed if it approves the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, and	CR 02
Yankton Sioux Tribe	April 18, 2013	WHEREAS: The Department or States Keystone XL Supplemental Impact Statement blatantly disregards the role of our relatives the "wamakanskan" the literal translation f'or the animals oi'Turtlc Island (North America) by minimizing their status as endangered species and further declaring that the fox, burying bee tle, whooping crane, black-footed ferret, least tern, pallid sturgeon and certain bat species (see SEJS Yankton comments) will not be affected by the KXL Pipeline which is an unacceptable intrusion to the delicate ecosystem that these species impart to our culture; and	TES 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	The Ihanktonwan have invited the Ponca and the Pawnee to revisit the January 23, 1863 Peace Treaty from 150 years ago; and give notice to the United States that they have violated the 1863 Treaty by refusing to listen to the Pawnee, Ihanktonwan!Yankton Sioux objections to the intrusion of the Keystone XL Pipeline on Treaty Lands and aboriginal territory that the eastern Keystone Pipeline has already been constructed in eastern South Dakota despite adamant objections of the Ihanktonwan; and The Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Nakota/Dakota are a non-Indian Reorganization Act Government and retain a traditional form of government which requires "nation to nation" consultation with the inherent authority of the Tribe; the General Council and this has not been done by the Department of State in regard to Keystone XL; andThe United Nations Declaration on the Rights oflndigenous Peoples contains sovereign principles that declares our inherent authority to abide by these protocols of natural law and we hereby attach this document as we endorse it. WHEREAS: Underneath the responsibilities of man a declaration that was passed by the American States and whereas the Department of State and Department of Interior on denying us the opportunity to conduct our responsibility to man and to protect our environment. And underneath the Geneva Convention in 1976 we filed The Red Paper in Geneva, Switzerland and in this document we declared the right to live as a common man. And because of the Carter Administration, under Secretary James Watt, they declared the Great Plains States a national sacrifice area which encompasses our aboriginal territories of Oceti Sakowin.At this Grand Council hosted by the Yankton and the Pawnee, a new Treaty will be signed to reinforce the position of Peace between the Pawnee and the Yankton and other Nation allies to protect Ina Maka and our people against this environmental threat to said sovereign Indigenous Nations who have not had "free, prior and informed consent' in this action and violation of the 1863 Peace Treaty; and	ACK
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We act with inherent, lawful, and sovereign authority over our lands, waters, and air, as recognized by Article 32 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights oflndigenous Peoples which provides: States shall consult and cooperate in good faith with the indigenous peoples concerned through their own representative institutions in order to obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources.	ACK

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We mutually agree that tar sands projects present unacceptable risks to the soil, the waters, the air, sacred sites, and our ways of life including: Greenhouse gas pollution that could lock the planet onto a path of catastrophic climate change.	CLIM 14
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We mutually agree that tar sands projects present unacceptable risks to the soil, the waters, the air, sacred sites, and our ways of life including: The irreparable harm to irreplaceable cultural resources, burial grounds, sacred and historic places, natural resources, and environmental resources of the central plains region which is the aboriginal homelands of many Indigenous Nations.	CU 05
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We mutually agree that tar sands projects present unacceptable risks to the soil, the waters, the air, sacred sites, and our ways of life including: The destruction of rivers, lakes, boreal forests, homelands and health of the Cree, Dene, and Metis peoples in the Northern Alberta tar sands region and downstream Dene communities of Northwest Territories	CU 05
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We agree to mutually and collectively, as sovereign nations, call upon the Canadian and United States governments to respect our decision to reject tar sands projects that impact our sacred sites and homelands; to call upon the Canadian and United States governments to immediately halt and deny approval for pending tar sands projects because they threaten the soil, water, air, sacred sites, and our ways oflife; and, confirm that any such approval would violate our ancestral laws, rights and responsibilities. ARTICLE VII We agree to the mutual, collective, and lawful enforcement of our responsibilities to protect our lands, waters, and air by all means necessary, and if called on to do so, we will exercise our peace and friendship by lawfully defending one another's lands, waters, air, and sacred sites from the threat of tar sands projects, provided that each signatory Indigenous Nation reserves and does not cede their rights to act independently as the tribal governments see fit to protect their respective tribal interests, further provided that each signatory Indigenous Nation reserves its inherent sovereign right to take whatever governmental action and strategy that its governing body sees fit to best protect and advance tribal interests affected by the pipeline project consistent with the agreements made herein and subject to the laws and available resources of each respective nation.	CU 05, CR 02

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We mutually agree that tar sands projects present unacceptable risks to the soil, the waters, the air, sacred sites, and our ways of life including: The negative cumulative health and ecological impacts of tar sands projects on Indigenous Communities.	RISK 07
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	The Pawnee Nation and the Yankton Sioux Tribe now stand in unity and pledge to mutually defend and support each other in their commitments to protect against destruction of their sacred sites, the cemeteries in which their ancestors rest, and the Ogallala Aquifer which are threatened by TransCanada's proposed construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.	WRG 01, CR 02
Yankton Sioux/Ihanktonwan Oyate	April 18, 2013	We mutually agree that tar sands projects present unacceptable risks to the soil, the waters, the air, sacred sites, and our ways of life including: The threat of pipeline and tanker oil spills into major river systems, aquifers and water bodies such as the Salish Sea, the North Pacific coast, and the Ogallala Aquifer.	WRS 09, WRG 01
Yard Core	April 22, 2013	Thank you for spilling: Tar sands oil spills onto American soil with alarming frequency. Some Representatives think Exxon spilling 200,000 gallons of tar sands oil from a pipeline into Mayflower, Arkansas is not a big deal — in fact, the corporation should be thanked for the whole ordeal.	ACK
Yard Core	April 22, 2013	A completed pipeline would emit the CO2 equivalent of 51 carbon-polluting coal-fired power plants. The science is clear: increasing CO2 emissions is bad for the climate.	CLIM 11
Yard Core	April 22, 2013	The State Department’s Draft (EIS) concludes that the tar sands oil would be extracted even if the pipeline is not constructed. This is not true: the pipeline would move 830,000 barrels of oil each day, whereas moving it by rail is not feasible.	PN 06
Yard Core	April 22, 2013	Drill here, drill now, send abroad: Though people often make the case that more tar sands oil from Canada helps American energy security, it is clear that much of this oil would just be shipped abroad into the international petroleum market.	PN 07
Yarger	April 21, 2013	The end result of this project for the people and future generations in Nebraska, the United States, and the world itself will be too negative compared to the short term gains.	PN 05
Yarger	April 21, 2013	Having written and reviewed many environmental and permitting documents, the biggest thing I often found missing was good mitigation plans for the project itself or if things went wrong.	RISK 05
Yoga Liz	March 18, 2013	I do NOT envision this method as an energy source that belongs in our present our in our future and our children's.	ACK
Yoga Liz	March 18, 2013	First problem: the State Dept. did not write the EIS: it was prepared by a consulting firm that works for TransCanada.	PRO 01

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Yolanda Valdez	April 11, 2013	If we are to proceed forward, the infrastructure to be developed is wind and solar energy at a national level.	PN 02
Yolanda Valdez	April 11, 2013	What happened in Arkansas is bound to repeat again. Our soils and water will be contaminated and homes will have to been evacuated not to mention the death and ill effects it will have on both humans and animals.	SOIL 01, RISK 07
Yonat Michaelov	April 4, 2013	Invest in alternative clean energy.	ALT 01
Yonat Michaelov	April 4, 2013	please, spare us the pollution, the harm, the sickness, the dead animal and cancerous Tumors	RISK 07
Yvette Pratt	March 18, 2013	We do not need this crap that will destroy our environment. It is toxic to extract and when there is a spill, which there always is due to substandard enforcement of safety regulations, impossible to clean up.	RISK 23, RISK 08
Yvonne Arner	April 22, 2013	The route is not acceptable on any level. The pipeline is not acceptable! Even Canada doesn't want a pipeline of TransCanada built there!...Live up to your promise of clean energy and energy independence. Start making alternative energy sources the main concern not an afterthought.	PN 02
Yvonne Arner	April 22, 2013	Read the unbiased research NOT the research provided to you by TransCanada and your co-workers in the State Department that have been in bed with Big Oil.	PRO 01
Yvonne Hansen, Ed D	April 11, 2013	The environmental review must also assess the serious threat that Keystone XL poses to communities along the pipeline route and those surrounding the Gulf Coast refineries that would process the tar sands. The Port Arthur, Texas, community already bears a heavy load of toxic chemicals in the air and water thus harming infants and the infirm. People get sick and die due to the dirty air and water in this area of the Gulf.	RISK 07
Yvonne Kaylor-Arner	April 22, 2013	Putting people to work to sustain our earth rather than destroy it is the right decision. [Put] the United States of America in the forefront for the research and development of alternative sources of energy….We could be the go-to country for expertise in how to help sustain our environment and atmosphere.	SO 05
Yvonne Zivkovic	April 22, 2013	As someone who cares deeply about our environment, and firmly believes that sustainable technologies are the only way to save our world, I am very troubled by a project as dangerous and invasive as the Keystone XL Pipeline.	PN 05
Zac Lasher	March 29, 2013	Burning through the oil in Alberta's tar sands would have devastating impacts on the world's climate.	CLIM 14
Zach Franklin	April 18, 2013	Climate change is a truly existential crisis that threatens the habitability of our country and planet. We must to everything in our power to give future generations of Americans what we have all enjoyed - a country where they can live and thrive.	CLIM 14

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Zachary Nickerson	March 10, 2013	As for its impact on climate change, the tar sands require several times more energy to extract than conventional oil, and the Congressional Research Service estimates that the end result is about 14% more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional oil. According to NASA's Jim Hansen, "the total carbon in tar sands exceeds that in all oil burned in human history." Basically, all of the progress we have made or will make in the near future towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions will be undone if we continue to support the development of the tar sands. A paper published in Nature in April 2009, "Greenhouse-Gas Emission Targets for Limiting Global Warming to 2C," stated that in order to meet our stated goal of limiting global warming to 2 degrees Celsius, 80% of fossil fuel reserves will have to remain in the ground. Due to its energy intensive extraction process, the tar sands seems like an excellent place to start in deciding which reserves must be left undeveloped.	CLIM 05
Zachary Nickerson	March 10, 2013	I take issue with statements in the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Keystone XL Pipeline related to it's impact on tar sands development and climate change. According to the report, construction of the pipeline will have little impact on tar sands development because the tar sands will likely be developed anyway. However, the alternative western route pipeline proposed by Prime Minister Harper would necessarily require the approval of several indigenous Canadian tribes that have emphatically stated that they are unwilling to allow this pipeline to cross through their lands. Other alternatives, such as railroads or trucks, should be rejected even more firmly than the pipeline because of their inefficiency.	CLIM 14
Zachary Nickerson	March 10, 2013	In addition, I am greatly concerned that the integrity of this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement may have been compromised by the participation of Environmental Resources Management, working under the pay of TransCanada. Clearly, we cannot possibly expect such an entity to be unbiased on a matter so important to its employer's future profits.	PRO 01
Zack Hamilton	April 22, 2013	This project is not in our National Best Interest, nor is it a safe project to bring across our nations most valuable resource the Ogallala or High Plains Aquifer. During our most resent drought "that we are still in mind you" the Aquifer is the only reason that our Nation had a corn crop this last year.	ACK
Zack Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The job numbers are inaccurate and misleading…… This pipeline is a export pipeline, it will not help us obtain lower gas prices.	PN 04
Zack Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The RISK that this project holds is by no means worth the reward of exported oil and few jobs that this project will provide. Let us put our laborers to work building renewables energy sources like wind and solar which my state could benefit from greatly.	PN 05

Sender	Received On	Comment Text	Theme Code(s)
Zack Hamilton	April 22, 2013	The product that it contains is highly toxic and is not crude oil. As the EPA has stated while trying to clean up the Kalamazoo spill this product is not anything like typical crude oil, it SINKS! And not to mention contains highly toxic benzene a known cancer causing carcinogen.	RISK 29, RISK 12, RISK 30
Zapf	April 18, 2013	Last July the town of Jackson [WI] was hit by a really bad spill, contaminating the water and the environment. Residents had to leave their homes and move into hotels. Although it took some time and great amounts of money, they're back at home. But they still can't drink their water. I harbor great concern for their health. Many now want to leave their homes. They want to sell them but can't. Why? Nobody wants to buy that property. So this spill has several - has severely affected all these people in a very big, bad way just like the other spills we've seen before, Arkansas, Kalamazoo, Michigan, and so many other areas, by either tar sands or other fuels.	RISK 07
Zayanne Thompson	April 10, 2013	We urgently need to be working towards solutions for cleaner energy, and the Keystone XL moves in the opposite direction.	ALT 01
Zayanne Thompson	April 10, 2013	The environmentla review draft for the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is very disappointing. It does not address leaks and spills, like the one that just happened in Arkansas.	RISK 13
Zoya Kocur	April 4, 2013	We need to move AWAY from oil, especially environmentally filthy and polluting tar sands oil. We need to move toward renewables with big tax credits and federal research dollars.	ALT 01