

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. As a scientist, I have been following the technical studies concerning, and predictions of, climate change for many years now. I am troubled that we are near, or may have passed, the point where positive feedback, of at least three kinds (cropland weather, polar ice melt, ocean acidification), results in unstoppable disaster. If survival of humans and their cultures is supremely important, the Keystone pipeline is insane. Dr. Ken Knowlton M.S.

04/15/2013

(dr.) Ken Knowlton

Canadian Tar Sands are dirty and I don't want them running through our Heartland. How would benefit from the sale of the oil after refinery? China? No thanks!! -- Abby Nonnemacher

04/15/2013

Abby Nonnemacher

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Adam Blumenthal

04/15/2013

Adam Blumenthal

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. P.S. Please Force Japan's Yakuza-Run TEPCO to accept a MASSIVE INTERNATIONAL EFFORT TO DEAL WITH THE TRIPLE MELTDOWN OF FUKUSHIMA-DIYACHI IMMEDIATELY! What are you waiting for? Don't you care about your daughters?, Michelle?, the American People?, future generations? ... EVIDENTLY NOT. Sincerely, Adam Casey

04/15/2013

Adam Casey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. Look how well the existing Tar Sands Pipelines have done: <http://www.nbcnews.com/id/26315908/#51423728> (3: minutes in) . What fun to think taxpayers are footing the bill because the oil companies are exempt from this type of spill; after all, it's not *OIL* yet, it's a bitumen mix(more toxic than crude oil)! And although the Enbridge spill was predicted to be a one month cleanup and \$5million, it is to date almost 3 years and more than \$700 million. Let's get that CHAINED CPI going, so the disabled, seniors and veterans can foot the bill!! 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Aggie Lukaszewski

04/15/2013

Aggie Lukaszewski

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. It is now well-known that tar sands oil will be for export and will do nothing to lower petroleum costs in the USA or enhance the energy security of the USA. It would be criminal for us to bear the costs of environmental damage while, at the same time, not reaping any benefit from the tar sands oil. Lastly, the multitude of jobs promised by the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline have been shown to be a mirage- an image grabbed out of thin air by the Pipeline cheerleaders. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Alan Dube 3

04/15/2013

Alan Dube

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I understand the enormous pressure that you are under to approve the pipeline, and the major political assault that will occur if you reject it. I understand that a President can't do everything he wants to do. But I want you to know that there are many people like myself who believe in sound and sustainable energy and environmental policy. I think the number of people who agree with this is growing and I think it can grow more as more leadership is exerted on this issue. The tar sands project is terrible for the land, terrible for the air, terrible for the people whose property is near the mines or the pipeline, and does nothing for the long term energy requirements of the U.S. or the world. The money spent on it would be better spent on renewable energy projects - which will create as many or more jobs and provide more energy for use right here in our country without the dangers of the pipeline. Thank you. Sincerely, Alan Meyer

04/15/2013

Alan Meyer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's very important that you stand up for principals, in this case protecting the environment. This is a chance for you to demonstrate your promises to protect the environment are more than campaign rhetoric. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Albert Hunt

04/15/2013

Albert Hunt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The leadership of this country needs to ask themselves a simple question: Are you willing to continue to do that which is wrong for the pursuit of monetary gain & power at the expense of others? Hopefully, people will choose and do the Right Thing!!! Sincerely, Albert Sanguillen

04/15/2013

Albert Sanguillen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Im a Civil Engineer getting a master's degree in environmental and sustainability engineering, and I know thump piping tar sands oil from the north is not the answer to our energy needs. The technologies I and my colleagues are working on are very close to being ready for market and will drastically reduce US energy needs. We need time to develop these technologies and the Keystone pipeline will undermine our efforts. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Alex Haeger

04/15/2013

Alex Haeger

Dear State Department, I oppose this pipeline for 2 reasons: It aids and abets development of tar sands oil in Canada that will contribute substantially to global warming. It has a high risk of an environmentally damaging oil spill that could contaminate a major aquifer. Thanks, Andrew Alexander

04/15/2013

Alexander, Andrew W

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. Obama, Writing to you now from my home in , a coastal city which was devastated a few years ago by the Gulf Oil Spill, I would like for you to know that I do not blame you for what happened to my lovely home. It is still feeling the impact of the terrible event. Political pressure caused you to allow the Gulf to open up for drilling. I was 10 when you where elected, and I thought that the time had come that we had someone in the White House who knew the full environmental impact of his/her actions. I routed for you in one of the most densely McCain areas in my state. I was told that you would help my family. But the oil spill happened. You were blamed viciously in my community. But I still defended you. But you are stepping to far. Sir, I know that you have the choice in this matter of the Keystone XL Pipeline. You are destroying people's homes, lives, and communities wherever you allow this pipeline to go. Ecosystems are going to be disrupted with major repercussions. And most of all, you are yet again endangering my precious Gulf. The place that I expect to spend my life working in as a Marine Biologist. My schools have told me that I have say in this as a US citizen, so I call upon that power to call for you to stop this. This entire pipeline is unsafe, and mark my words, should it be built, I almost know for sure something will go wrong. During the election you said that you were all for the environment. But you are making yourself a liar, not only in my eyes, but the eyes of the American public. Mr. Obama, please do not allow this pipeline. The Gulf is all I have. Endangering it is endangering my future. I am quite literally begging you to stop the Keystone XL Pipeline in it's tracks. Sincerely, Alexandra Baskind

04/15/2013

Alexandra Baskind

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We do not need this garbage. Sincerely, Alfred Robinson

04/15/2013

Alfred Robinson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please, please, please reject this pipeline and look into stopping the use of ALL of this high carbon sludge that is already running through existing pipelines to avoid more un-cleanable disasters like those that happened in Arkansas and Michigan. Sincerely, Alfred Sasiadek

04/15/2013

Alfred Sasiadek

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am sending this message to ask you to support the rejection of Keystone XL. Last month, a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. This spill should raise a red flag as another indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. There are 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. This month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. We need climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Please do what you can to prevent another disaster similar to the one that occurred in Arkansas and stop Keystone XL. Sincerely, Alice Okeefe

04/15/2013

Alice Okeefe

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How about saving that Ogallala Aquifer that runs under almost all of the middle America States and holds fresh, pure water? No guarantee that this Aquifer won't be affected by stupid greed, which is what this Keystone XL Pipeline is all about, anyway. Thanks, POTUS, for trying to do the best for all of us!

Sincerely, Alice Shaw

04/15/2013

Alice Shaw

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. TAKE AN HOUR>>>read the dirty fact about oil production. RESTORE AMERICAN LEADERSHIP>> PUT OUR MONEY , and JOBS, INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF RENEWABLE ENERGY. I KNOW, our American economy is virtually bound to Big Oil....but let it go. We will survive. Sincerely, Alicia Alexander

04/15/2013

Alicia Alexander

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, When an environmental review ignores real environmental concerns one would wonder what you are really trying to say. Its time for this administration and the democratic party to grow a pair and start representing the people who voted you back into office. The Keystone pipeline is not in the best interests of our country. It serves the interests of the oil interests and China neither of which voted you into office. 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Allen Heide

04/15/2013

Allen Heide

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Three major spills in the past few weeks -- Columbia, Texas and Mayflower, Arkansas and Ontario, Canada -- should be evidence enough that the Keystone XL pipeline is a dirty, dangerous and deadly proposition. One that we are not prepared to transport or clean up! 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. How would this be moving forward? I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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.

Sincerely, Allison Chin

04/15/2013

Allison Chin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. How can we allow this pipeline to continue being built when the facts are that spills are a regular occurrence on the existing lines, and we have no known technology to clean them up? How can we say "okay" to adding this to more people's lives or to the environment as a whole? I am outraged by these facts. We know the company has NOT taken safety seriously. We know thousands of people and miles of land have been negatively affected already. This is the dumbest idea America has considered in a very long time. We know it is toxic. We know it pollutes. We know it spills. We know it is hazardous to humans and animals. We know there is no clean up method. Let's agree to this for our country?!? Have I woken up in a foreign and lesser country whose government no longer cares about the living things on it?? The thought of Keystone being allowed to continue makes me question the direction of this country enough for me to consider leaving my beautiful home here in the precious USA. And that is not small; I love this country & value my rights and liberties... but I will not support anyone, or any institution, that supports Keystone and allows this kind of madness to continue unchecked. Please don't ruin this country for us and future generations. Sincerely, Amanda Heck

04/15/2013

Amanda Heck

Dear President Obama, We have too many clean fuel alternatives to oil for you to even be considering this pipeline; hemp, solar and wind, just to name a few. DO NOT CHOOSE PROFITS OVER OUR PLANET. You can be the president who helped us make the vital move towards environment-friendly energy and changed the world for the better. Make the right decision, President Obama! -- Ambrosia Danu United States of America

04/15/2013

Ambrosia Danu

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I seem to remember that as a candidate you ran on a platform of promoting a greener economy and put forth many initiatives to support green businesses. These promises to the American people, are in part, why I voted for you, Mr. President. Reject this pipeline and uphold your ideals for cleaner energy and a cleaner, safer world for all of our children. Sincerely, Amie Wilson

04/15/2013

Amie Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you so much for your time! Remember when you make this decision, to think of our future, our kids, who will inherit the mess that the tar sands will lead to. We can find a cleaner way. Be the President who makes the CHANGE to a cleaner America. You can do it! Sincerely, Amy Gentry

04/15/2013

Amy Gentry

To the US State Department, I'm writing to urge you to stop the Keystone XL pipeline from becoming a reality. This project will do irrevocable damage to our country and the climate. This dirty pipeline would put the water supply of millions of Americans at risk, hasten the destruction of Canada's boreal forest, trespass on Native American lands and worsen the climate crisis -- without lowering gas prices or increasing U.S. energy security. With the effects of climate change already causing hardship to families across America, we simply can't afford to let this polluting pipeline through. 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. Future spills are not just possible they are certain. All pipelines leak and we should not trust a company who has had so many leaks in such a short period of time. 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, we will worsen our already dangerous climate problems and the impacts on Canada's boreal forest will be irreversible. If this administration truly wants to take a stand on climate change now is the time. We can't keep bemoaning the fate of our crops and our shores and our people on one hand while supporting the very industry that causes these problems with the other. The cost of this pipeline to our country as a whole is not worth the benefits to a select few. I urge you to consider these things and make a decision based on our shared future, our public health and our environment. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Amy Schwarzer

04/15/2013

Amy Schwarzer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Additionally, we are supporting the middle east by continuing to use crude oil instead of natural resources. Please use this \$\$ to invest in renewable and/or local resources. Sincerely, Amy Vanderboegh

04/15/2013

Amy Vanderboegh

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please make your inaugural speech promises a reality. Stop the Keystone XL Pipeline and continue your efforts in green energy technology. Invest in our future and in the future of our children. An OFA supporter and a contributor to your campaign Sincerely, Anamarie Velasco

04/15/2013

Anamarie Velasco

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I Will Never Vote Democratic Again if you approve this pipeline. Sincerely, Andre Sunnen

04/15/2013

Andre Sunnen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This cannot possibly be what you want your Presidency to be remembered for in the history books our great-great-grandchildren will be reading a hundred years from now. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Andrea Bonette

04/15/2013

Andrea Bonette

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is obvious that the oil companies are not capable of preventing oil spills or cleaning up after one quickly to mitigate the damage. They will kill this planet to make money. They should not get free rein to do so. Sincerely, Andrea Sweeney

04/15/2013

Andrea Sweeney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department In order to ensure future human vitality, this project needs to be rejected! We as a nation and as a species can adapt and through ingenuity and innovation, can prosper! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Andrew Carr-harris

04/15/2013

Andrew Carr-harris

Dear President Obama and Mrs. Michelle Obama We all know that the Keystone Pipeline is a bad idea. I have 4 children. DS5, DS4, DD2 and DS6mo. I would like to think they will live a wonderful full 80+ yrs like they should. With the world in its current climate, I worry about how their quality of life is going to be affected by the unfriendly environmental decisions that were made by others in power in yrs before they even understood what it all meant. Please please please say NO to it. It's not just about right now. It's about all of us and the future generations. Global Warming is not fake. I know your girls too would want their children and grandchildren to have a good life on this planet we all have to share. Oil is not that important and we have PLENTY of rail to get it where it need to go. The icebergs in the article are melting and with more drilling, and fossil fuel and oil based living and dependency, we are all in for a world of hurt. Please do the right thing. You already signed the Monosato Protection Act. Please don't let me think I voted for you in vain for my last 2 precious votes. -- Angela Proud Citizen of the United States of America ____

04/15/2013

Angela

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please President Obama, if you are truly sincere about climate change and the environment, STOP the pipeline. As you have stated, we can create many new jobs with renewable energy sources, this is not one of them. Thank you and God bless you. Sincerely, Angela Gioe

04/15/2013

Angela Gioe

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We should be investing our money in clean and safe sources of energy. The technology is there. It's time to embrace it. Our world cannot continue to go down this road of destruction. We have to think of our future. Let's not continue down the road of allowing the oil companies to dictate what our needs are. Sincerely, Anita Bottari

04/15/2013

Anita Bottari

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please remember that oil companies promise everything when they are trying to get a permit, but when the spill comes, the people of the country and the wildlife are the victims. Sincerely, Anita Moser

04/15/2013

Anita Moser

Dear Officials, You have before you the health and welfare of our country's citizens. I do not believe there is any greater threat and danger to us now than the XL Trans Canada Pipeline being approved and signed off. XL's hubris and disrespect for people's lands and rights are outrageous. We cannot afford any more pipe spills or trampling of lands and water. Please do not give your votes of approval. That would be sacrilegious, never to be repaired. Sincerely yours, Anita Ward

04/15/2013

Anita Ward

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We don't need a foreign pipeline running through our country and then having it shipped to another foreign country. I love my country too much to see this happen. Sincerely, Ann Breeden

04/15/2013

Ann Breeden

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I am beginning to regret that I have voted for you, not once, but twice. Please restore my confidence in you. and stop this pipeline. Here is your chance to make good your campaign claims to do something about climate change! Sincerely, Ann Cantrell

04/15/2013

Ann Cantrell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. IF YOU DON'T REJECT THIS KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE YOU ARE SIGNING OUR COUNTRY'S DEATH WARRANT, IT'S AS PLAIN AS THAT. PLEASE TAKE THIS HUGE STEP AGAINST THE TAR SANDS. THANK YOU . ANN GILLETT
Sincerely, Ann Gillett

04/15/2013

Ann Gillett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The health and safety of people around the world must come above greed. Time is running out, The power of money should never be allowed to destroy the future of our children, our children's children... Think seventh generation. Our native American people have been right all along. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I'm sure you have a conscience, and I'm also sure that the wrong decision on your part will weight on your sconscience for a long, long time. Sincerely, Ann Morgan

04/15/2013

Ann Morgan

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I do not support the development of this pipeline. I feel there are better ways to invest our money on our energy crisis. Invest in renewable energy!!!! Please! Sincerely, Anna Fairehrenreich

04/15/2013

Anna Fairehrenreich

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. When clean water is \$20 per glass, will you and those in power be content? It begins to look as if the Future is already fated to end with this Generation of Greedy Vultures, rather than soar with the majestic Eagle, who has died due to lies and victimization of the innocent and helpless. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Anna Phipps

04/15/2013

Anna Phipps

Leading scientists have said that the KeyStone pipeline will mean the end of this planet. Arkansas gave us a glimpse of the future if we are so foolish as to proceed with this pipeline. Anne Paisley

04/15/2013

Anne Paisley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Although everyone is speaking of this issues of Climate Change - I am also speaking of the issues of Environmental Existence into the Future. Do you know how many Pipeline Leaks and Explosions/Disasters have happened in our nation in the last 10-100 years? I am working up an analysis currently. I am shipping the analysis to DC as soon as completed. I refuse to watch as our nation drinks carbon fueled water, our animals and humans eat carbon fueled waste and our nation loses it's foothold world wide due to our disrespect for the WORLD.... I have experience in and out of Oil & Gas Corporate Offices in both and , contacts throughout the lands.... This is NOT a positive affirmation for the future - SAY NO To Oil Sands and the Pipelines for now. It is our future existence we are risking. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Anne Smylie

04/15/2013

Anne Smylie

I deeply opposed to the proposed tar sands project! Foreign companies on either end of the pipeline profit while US citizens lose property value, personal health, air quality, and water quality. These losses are not in the National Interest! Every water supply we have is increasingly more important with growing populations and increasing draught. Accidents have proven so far that tar sands pipelines are not safe, the first responders unprepared and at personal health risk, and water bodies are unable to be cleaned. It is highly irresponsible to move forward with such a massive project without safety and cleanup of the toxics understood. Pipelines are not safe, irregardless of what other transportation methods they are compared to! Spilled tar sands are permanently damaging. The foreign companies who profit are not to be trusted with our health, air, land, and water! Do not play a part in this destructive process! It is not in the National interest to enable these foreign companies with this export pipeline!!!!!! Urgently, Anne Tindell

04/15/2013

Anne Tindell

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Annie Riley

04/15/2013

Annie Riley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please plan for the future and the welfare of the environment and the people of our country and reject this plan. thank you I know you will take the intelligent choice. Sincerely, Anthony Goldston-Morris

04/15/2013

Anthony Goldston-morris

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am very concerned about the rapacious search for oil profits. Please consider how I and millions of others feel about the race to harvest oil before a safe secure technology is in place. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Anthony Gordon

04/15/2013

Anthony Gordon

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Apparently the oil companies have never heard of Murphys Law (If something can go wrong), let alone Reillys Law. BP once made oath and swore that oil drilling in the Gulf was absolutely safe.

Sincerely, Anton Musset S Thurmond

04/15/2013

Anton Musset

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It flies in the face of reason to develop a pipeline that will expose Mother Nature on the North American Continent to so much short-term and long-term disruption and damage when clean energy technology is our future. Sincerely, Antonia Hoffman

04/15/2013

Antonia Hoffman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. One way corporations justify environmental destruction is in the name of JOBS! This way they perpetuate their agenda is through GREED and NEED. They find greedy people that are selfishly motivated and will follow their agenda for the \$\$LOBBYISTS\$\$. Sincerely, Apollo Environmental Artist

04/15/2013

Apollo Environmental Artist

April 15, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker: I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, Andy Popovic

04/15/2013

E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I believe the most crucial items are our water supplies/aquifers & our air - these items will be constantly at risk IF the Keystone XL goes thru. Sloppy workmanship is usually a cause of spills, accidents.... The spills create added expense & never seem to get cleaned up adequately! Use the \$\$\$\$\$ that are planned to do this project to develop "GREEN" energy! Please, we NEED to protect human as well as all animal & fish life! Sincerely, Arlene Hansen

04/15/2013

Arlene Hansen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL We need to move forward to responsible stewardship of earth for our children and ourselves. We also need the jobs that can come from alternative energy sources. And we need a fairer economy on a global and national scale. Keystone undermines everything. Sincerely, Arlene Scanlon

04/15/2013

Arlene Scanlon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. Obama - you and I are the same age, you have been blessed with this position, listen to your heart - not your mind, not your lobbyists. Ask your daughters what kind of earth they want, what kind of energy future they want. Listen. Sincerely, Audrey Cullen

04/15/2013

Audrey Cullen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You've had your personal change you can believe in - low level politician to bmoc and, of course that's all that really matters. But, as a passionately self absorbed guy, you might just want to consider that your legacy, as lame as it is, will be rewritten just as Reagan's has been and the rejection of Keystone XL could be one footnote worth pinning your hopes on.

Sincerely, B Elsbach

04/15/2013

B Elsbach

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear President Obama, Stopping climate change is essential for your girls' future, and that of their children. Making the hard choices now will help protect that future, and at the same time elevate your legacy in history as one who wasn't afraid to stand up to the rich and powerful for the greater good--like Franklin Roosevelt, who cared deeply for the disenfranchised and impoverished. Please take the long view and prevent this short term decision from undermining your children's, and my child's, future. Thank you. Sincerely, Barbara Boyle

04/15/2013

Barbara Boyle

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I respect President Obama and Secretary Kerry very much for their views on the environment. I believe they have our best interests in mind. Please do the right thing and STOP this from happening! Thank-you, Sincerely, Barbara Caskey

04/15/2013

Barbara Caskey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. By not rejecting the Keystone XL, it will impact the future of our children (all living creatures on earth). I've come to the conclusion that politicians just do not care anymore about anyone but themselves and their cushy jobs. I had so much hope that if anyone could step up to end the corruption in our government from the 30 past years of GOP abuses, that it would be you. However, our media is still in the pockets of corporations (as most politicians), and most Americans are misinformed by our corporate news, so we will continue to slowly go over the cliff... Sincerely, Barbara Colbert-Pace

04/15/2013

Barbara Colbert-pace

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This pipeline is short-sighted in every aspect, from the potential consequences of breaks in the pipeline, to even using the tarsand oil in the first place and to the consequences of refining the oil and shipping it some where else. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Barbara Cooper

04/15/2013

Barbara Cooper

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Keystone XL pipeline will do nothing to bring the US closer to energy independence. The potential for a spill, as evidenced by the recent spill of 84,000 gallons of tar sands in Arkansas, is not worth the risk of permanent damage America's groundwater and agricultural land. We must start moving into a post-carbon economy and a first step is to deny the Keystone XL pipeline. Be willing to take the heat. Speak the truth about this pipeline and contradict the misinformation that the oil companies and the Republicans in their pockets are spreading. Short term profits should not trump the future of our children and a healthy planet. Sincerely, Barbara Ervin

04/15/2013

Barbara Ervin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I also find it alarming the way Exxon has been able to suppress news coverage of the Arkansas spill. However, I have seen pictures of the result. Have you? And that's just a relatively small leak! Sincerely, Barbara Franjevic

04/15/2013

Barbara Franjevic

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We do not have to go back to the Stone Age to be environmentally responsible. Fossil fuels ARE the stone age. Put those resources and jobs into clean, renewable, secure domestic energy for now and future generations. PLEASE do not approve this if you care anything about what kind of world we leave for our descendants; obviously Congress does not. Sincerely, Barbara Fry

04/15/2013

Barbara Fry

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The United States should not take the risk of having Canada transport oil across our country to export for their profit to other countries. I am part of the majority that do not want the Keystone XL pipeline to cross our land. Sincerely, Barbara Gurtler

04/15/2013

Barbara Gurtler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is obvious that the oil companies do not have the technology to clean up the oil spills they create. The tar sands oil is the dirtiest oil and Exxon has shown it has no idea how to clean it up once it spills over the land and poisons it. You must reject the insane Keystone XL plans and stop this insanity! Sincerely, Barbara Jane Gaborow

04/15/2013

Barbara Jane Gaborow

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Two Words, Malia and Sasha. That's why you MUST reject the Keystone Pipeline. Because you are a good Dad. You put your kids and their health and safety first. So do I. Veto KXL for YOUR kids and for my kids and grandchildren, and for the kids in Europe and Africa and India- For all the kids on the planet. You are also one of the smartest men in Washington. That's why I voted for you. Because you got it. You know that climate change is real, and you have said you were going to be a leader and DO something about it. Mitt Romney said he would approve the Keystone Pipeline line Day One on the job which made people in the know shudder. That's why we voted for you instead. And for other reasons. Like gun control, you got it. And you put kids and people first. No decision could be more important than this one ! Invite James Hansen and scientists to the White House to discuss this with you. What a horrible legacy this would be for you if you alone had the power to make a difference and slow down the carbon emissions and you didn't do it and years from now everyone, including your own children, would blame you for not doing something will you still had the chance. Please, we need to leave an inhabitable world for future generations. Please DO THE RIGHT THING and stop foreigners from stealing our land to profit a few already extremely wealthy individuals. Don't let them build an export pipeline, drag it across our country to a tax free zone in Texas, endangering our water supplies, our property, our citizens. Study Kalamazoo... It is NOT in our national interest to allow TransCanada to do this. It is terrible what is happening to the native people in Alberta. We must help them and ourselves. You have got to reject the damn thing !! I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
Sincerely, Barb Leahy

04/15/2013

Barbara Leahy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department In a nutshell: STOP thje Keystone XL pipeline! * It's bad for the environment * It does nothing for the economy OVERALL (think of the huge cost of inevitable spill cleanup! * It diverts attention away from the FUTURE needs for cleaner power, not dirty coal. Quite simply, we don't want it! Sincerely, Barbara Whitaker

04/15/2013

Barbara Whitaker

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. There is no greater threat to the future of this world than global warming and climate change. Please think long and hard when considering whether you say yes or no. Nothing else will matter, not people's jobs or terrorist bombings, or anything else, if we don't stop polluting our life giving precious earth.

Barbara Wold

04/15/2013

Barbara Wold

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Why a pipeline from Canada to Houston? For sale on the world market, of course. Huge profits for the Koch brothers at the cost of environmental devastation for us. Please stop them. Sincerely, Barrie Johnson

04/15/2013

Barrie Johnson

Please find attached a letter from the VA Chamber of Commerce regarding the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for Keystone XL Project. Best, Samantha Quig Manager of Government Affairs Virginia Chamber of Commerce

04/15/2013

Barry E. DuVal

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The only matter that should be brought up from beneath the earth is pure, healthy spring water. Everything else needs to remain exactly where it is, because most of it is anathema to our breathing environment. That also goes for tar sands and all of that junk that is lying around with a big sign on it saying DO NOT USE FOR ANY PURPOSE AT ALL!!!!!! Let;s keep working on our harnessing the power of the sun until we come up with the right sort of solar energy devices that will change and clean up our environment. BG Sincerely, Ben Golem

04/15/2013

Ben Golem

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, I voted for you for President twice. Both times you got my vote because in my judgement the alternatives were potential disasters. However, having lived through your first term which was characterized by your extremely ambivalent actions on many critical issues, I had strong reservations about your ability to handle complex issues and, of even greater importance, to stick to certain values and not give in to the Republicans, no matter what, on the most critical value issues.... such as Social Security. I believe that this pipeline thing is even more critical than the social security issue. It is courting..."courting" isn't a strong enough word) a disaster of unbelievable proportions, one that most assuredly will happen regardless of all the soothing words of the developers. How you can believe anything Exxon or any other of these monsters that suck the life blood out of our country, solely for personal gain, I don't know. But you apparently do. You apparently have difficulty with complex issues. You wax eloquent in talking about new sources of energy, better education, better health and on and on. You are gifted with a wonderful voice, but sorry to inform you that what is needed now is brain, not stentorian, reassuring voices. Your speech writers tell you the correct things to say to persuade the public of your wonderful intentions, but your actions are so inconsistent that now, after hearing you tell everyone how wonderful you are, you are coming up against your last chance to make a "big time" choice. This is the time when the public is waiting to see what your values truly are, to see what you are really made of. Will you cave in once again to the likes of Boehner and McConnell and the rest of that crew or will you for the first time in your presidency pound your fist on your desk and say "NO MORE." "There will be no pipeline."..... And go to the people with it. No more weaseling out of your responsibility. No more mellifluous tones of conciliation with opponents who hate your very guts. This is it. This is the issue that will make or break the rest of your presidency. Take a good look at photos of the recent oil spills and tell us honestly whether you'd approve of that happening in your yard. Sincerely, Bernard Fine

04/15/2013

Bernard Fine

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If you can promise no human errors, no earthquakes, no sabotage, and no machine failure nor hydrologic shifting, perhaps the pipeline would not harm us. If you cannot assure us of such causes of breakdowns and polluting, then do not harm us. Reject Keystone XL. Sincerely, Betty Hunter-Clapp

04/15/2013

Betty Hunter-clapp

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr President: I don't have to tell you why. I am sure you know. But I can tell you how I feel many miles away. I can feel the pain in the pit of my stomach at the very thought of the pipeline. Sincerely, bev anslow 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Beverly Anslow

04/15/2013

Beverly Anslow

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mrs. Beverly McGill

04/15/2013

Beverly McGill

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The US doesn't need or want this oil. The pipeline will make a few very rich people richer. It will do nothing for the rest of us except to make vast areas uninhabitable and to increase global warming and climate change. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Bill Becker

04/15/2013

Bill Becker

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is time to quit pretending you are doing anything but pimping for the most profitable corporations in the history of the world regarding the Keystone XL project and start paying attention to the potential disaster this pipeline will - not might - bring during its first "accident". 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Bill Dunton

04/15/2013

Bill Dunton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department How can you not see the dangers? Danger from spills; danger from climate change. Pay attention to the American people and reject this very bad idea.
Sincerely, BJ Novitski

04/15/2013

Bj Novitski

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. Those who profit from endangering the health and well-being of the population must be held accountable when their enterprise causes harm. Accountability, of course, means bearing the full cost of clean-up, restitution, and restoration. If we had such accountability, there would be far less interest in pursuing environmentally questionable projects like Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Bob Christopher

04/15/2013

Bob Christopher

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Unless you stop the Keystone pipeline, all your talk about the environment is just that: talk. We don't need the oil. Reallocate \$350 billion a year from the "defense" budget, shift it to the Army Corps of Engineers, and build a clean-energy infrastructure. In this way, you might actually earn the Nobel Peace Prize that, given your record to this point, you have not earned. Sincerely, Bob Schildgen

04/15/2013

Bob Schildgen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. An all of the above energy policy is a vote for the status quo, which is a vote for fossil fuels regardless of their impact on climate change and the environment. You can't have it both ways; you can be a visionary leader or you can be the president who sold out the environment for political gain. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Bob Witmer

04/15/2013

Bob Witmer

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. President Obama: The time for leadership in support of planet Earth is now! Demonstrate that the encouraging words that came from you regarding the real problem of climate change was more than rhetoric! The number of American jobs created pale in importance when compared to environmental impact from the CATASTROPHIES THAT WILL HAPPEN. Ordinary Canadians don't want this travesty, and neither do we! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Bobbi Keck

04/15/2013

Bobbi Keck

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please do not allow tar sands to be moved across our country. They appear to be horrible and filthy - why should we have to deal with them? If Canada wants them refined, let them do it themselves. We already have messes on our hands from tar sand spills. If it goes through, it should have to go through the backyards of its biggest supporters. I bet they wouldn't want that. Stop the Keystone XL pipeline now! Sincerely, Bobette Bisbee

04/15/2013

Bobette Bisbee

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you truly cared about your daughter's and your future grandchildren, I don't see how you can approved this disastrous Keystone Pipeline. Do we need MORE Arkansas Disaster's to happen, before you do the RIGHT thing for our Children's FUTURE? Need I mention how the Artic is Melting, eventually causing more floods, like in Norfolk VA? What about other countries that's low lying, whereby the Residents had to vacate their homes? Are you taking any of this into consideration? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Bobie Johnson

04/15/2013

Bobie Johnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I write to request that the air be cleaner tomorrow than it is today for my five grandchildren. Please do not even TRY to pull the wool over my eyes on this dirty Keystone deal! Read my lips---no Keystone XL Pipeline in the USA. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. NO, NO, NO Keystone XL Pipeline in the United States of America! Sincerely, Bonnieclare Erling

04/15/2013

Bonnieclare Erling

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The recent tar sands pipeline spill in Mayflower, Arkansas poured nearly 10,000 barrels of 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. How can we even begin to consider allowing the Keystone XL pipeline to be constructed when these kinds of spills can happen? 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. We cannot consider another pipeline until we address the causes and consequences of pipeline spills such as this one and make sure there are better systems in place to make sure these kind of spills don't happen in the future. Besides the potential harm caused by oil spills, we must also consider that by accepting plans to build such a pipeline we are at the same time jeopardizing our future and the future of those who come after us. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. Tar sands oil extraction not only contributes to global warming through the burning of fossil fuels; huge tracts of Canada's Boreal Forest are destroyed in the process. This is not a sustainable practice and any support for this kind of environmental destruction I believe is a step in the wrong direction for our future and our children's future. I expect climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Brad Findlay

04/15/2013

Brad Findlay

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Getting oil out of the ground faster does not guarantee you will make money faster, in fact recent expeditions have proven that it is actually more expensive to rush. Sincerely, Brandon Nicholson

04/15/2013

Brandon Nicholson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. What does it take to convince you big decision-makers that Keystone XL Pipeline is bad, very bad for America, and the world? How about actually leading on this issue? The only benefit America would get from this filthy, disaster-prone, very long pipeline would be for a relatively few, short-term jobs. This makes no sense. In fact, it is ludicrous. Devastating the climate of the globe by burning filthy fossil fuels, spewing the filth all over the nation by the inevitable leaks -- without even a financial benefit for America. You'd have to be insane to approve it -- or bought off perhaps? What a pathetic legacy you are leaving behind as the first Black president. What a disgusting disappointment you are. I'm sorry I voted for you. Sincerely, Brenda D.

04/15/2013

Brenda D.

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The tar sands pipeline in Arkansas, which spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood, is one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier form of oil. The Arkansas spill also raises 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. One of the questions which leaps immediately to mind is why we would take on all the risk in this endeavor, for none of the profit. It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in fossil fuels. Many of the administration'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. It's time for real climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Brenda Dingley

04/15/2013

Brenda Dingley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I grew up on a Kansas farm where my father and mother spent their lives conserving water and the land. My sister went to college in _____ and shared a ho use with other people. She tells the story of how aghast they were when she came down the stairs and asked if anyone wanted to use her bath water, as we knew never to waste it. I moved to , Nebraska in my twenties and learned to _____ love the vast space, the hidden ranches, the roaming cattle. It has a timeless beauty that speaks to my heart. Now I live in , _____ Nebraska where we are learning to again ration water because of the drought. I do worry about our dependence on oil and how it is changing our environment. I would love to see more wind energy--we had a windmill on our farm. I would love to see more solar. I do not want to see what might happen to the Ogallala Aquifer if there were ever a break in the pipeline. If you ever drove highway 2 through the sandhills of Nebraska, you would see how close the water is to the surface. It is a beautiful space, a ranching way of life, a life support for a large portion of our country. I do not understand why it should be put at risk when we could continue to develop alternative sources of energy that do not have the real and potential threat to our environment. Please do not allow the pipeline to be built across our nation. Sincerely, Brenda Doxtator

04/15/2013

Brenda Doxtator

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. How can we even consider supporting the destruction of the pristine boreal forest in Canada by allowing any pipelines to transport the filthiest oil on the planet? Are you only listening to those who would profit? You should be listening to those who care about the future of this planet for YOUR KIDS and MINE. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
Sincerely, Brenda Lee

04/15/2013

Brenda Lee

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I have written on this subject numerous times and I always get the same reply: "It will provide jobs", "It will be safe" "this oil is no different than any other", etc., etc. None of those are true! This is not about one pipeline, it's about the whole approach to taking care of our exceedingly fragile, and increasingly damaged environment -- are we just going to burn it up, wear it out, and kill anything that gets in our way? Or, are going to be brave, and wise stewards of our planet, and get serious about tending to our only home in universe so our children's children will have beauty and health in the world they live in? You, Mr. President, have the power to make something better happen. Please, put Earth first and reject this pipeline. Sincerely, Brenda Sageng

04/15/2013

Brenda Sageng

To Whom It May Concern, I would think it would concern most if not all. Thank you for reading my letter. I am concerned about furthering our doomed dependence on oil with the implementation of the Keystone project. Putting tar sands oil into production is said to be the equivalent of, "game over" for our climate, according to Dr. James Hansen, perhaps the most respected scientist on the subject. And the State Department hired a team of oil industry experts to "study" the environmental impacts. This makes me feel so ashamed for our government. Who will have the courage to say "WHEN"! I want to ask the State Department to reject the Keystone XL pipeline project and know that it will be the most courageous act it can make toward a sane future... or how about just, a future... any future. Global warming is THE topic of our time. There is no other topic any more. Yes, I am willing to pay more for fuel. Yes, I am willing to do without. Yes, I am looking for leaders who will address this difficult issue with scientific facts and the courage to tell us the truth about our tenuous situation with oil and greenhouse gasses. No, I am not happy to put it off for the future generations who will have to live with the consequences of our greed and short-sighted ambitions. No, I do not want to live with the extinction of 100's or 1000's of species so I can drive or fly somewhere nicer than here. Saying NO to the Keystone Project would set a new precedent that we are looking at real solutions for a future that could be livable for our children and grandchildren. We are ready to take a brave step toward a real future. We need brave leaders to take us there! Thank you again for reading my comments, Sincerely, Brennan Van Blair

04/15/2013

Brennan

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Tar sands oil burns significantly dirtier than its petroleum based counterpart. Groundwater supplies will be tainted, especially when efforts are not made to avoid major reservoirs (i.e. the Oglala Reservoir). While the temptation to create jobs in the short term may be great in these tough economic times, a careful look at the big picture indicates that very few jobs will be permanent additions. In fact, it seems that the only major beneficiary of this pipeline would be Canada (or at least its oil executives), who would then have the infrastructure and means to sell oil on the competitive world market, as opposed to the "friendly" prices the United States has been benefitting from for years. Sincerely, Bret Stokesberry

04/15/2013

Bret Stokesberry

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need to stop spending so much time and money on an out dated technology. We need to stop relying on the oil companies and get american back on track with science and technology... We need to starting investing in new technology and attacking the root source of energy... The SUN. Let's find a solution and not just some temporary aide.... We need to stop use the stuff that is killing us.. Sincerely, Brett Rubbo

04/15/2013

Brett Rubbo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department President Obama, Approving the Keystone Pipeline would be incredibly irresponsible in the eyes of our grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Be a leader, keep future generations in mind, and Do Not Approve Keystone. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Brian Remler

04/15/2013

Brian Remler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. In fact, a leading climate scientist has said it will be "game over" for the fight against global warming if KXL is approved. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I have been signing on to letters and petitions against KXL for years, all during your administration- but somehow KXL won't go away. It should have died an ignominious death a long time ago. Drop it and help the world win a big victory for the future. Sincerely, Brian Schill

04/15/2013

Brian Schill

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I do not believe the Keystone pipeline is an appropriate place for you to compromise. There is very little benefit from this project to justify the inherent risks. Sincerely, Brooke Bishop

04/15/2013

Brooke Bishop

I support it, we need it for the economy right now...

04/15/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Why sacrifice the rest of the planet to uncaring big oil interests? They have consistently proven themselves to be totally self-serving, without a thought to the safety or health of those they exploit. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Bruce Brancati

04/15/2013

Bruce Brancati

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Besides its effect on climate change and the possibility of more oil spills, the pipeline would cause a massive increase in tar sands production, which would really tear up the landscape up in Canada where the tar sands are. Sincerely, Bruce Denney

04/15/2013

Bruce Denney

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Brynn Utela United States of America

04/15/2013

Brynn Utela

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Where do we draw the line in the on going free for all exploitation of this country's resources? At the wholesale destruction of our air, water, and land for short term profit. Our elected officials have got to weigh in on this matter. Where are the checks on this profiteering at the expense of the quality of life? If they do not start coming from the current crop of elected officials, we will be trying new ones. And then new ones. Until someone gets it. Sincerely, Burt Griswold

04/15/2013

Burt Griswold

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Stop the political bullies, call their bluff. We need stand up leadership now not stand down. It has been a greedy business stampede destroying our environment for way to long. Sincerely, Candace Mullett

04/15/2013

Candace Mullett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We must immediately begin to move away from fossil fuels, and therefore we should not facilitate the exploitation of an extremely carbon intensive fossil fuel, the Canadian tar sands, but make that exploitation as difficult and unlikely as possible, and publicly lead towards that end. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Carl Glitzenstein

04/15/2013

Carl Glitzenstein

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Do you REALLY want your legacy to be an almost 2000 mile pipeline carrying the dirtiest crude possible LEAKING all over the US for hundreds of years in the future Obaba? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Carl Muecke

04/15/2013

Carl Muecke

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Carla Boccella RN

04/15/2013

Carla Boccella Rn

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please think of the future of our planet, and your children, and reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please honor your commitment as President and make the environment a top priority. Your Legacy depends on it. Thank You! Sincerely, Carla Pfahler

04/15/2013

Carla Pfahler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Change for the better is never easy and requires at least one man strong enough to help ease others into it as well as educate the masses of the realities of failed past mistakes. I believe you can be that man we need to move forward healthily. I voted for you both times and have faith and trust in your willingness to do that which is right and not that which will make a quick buck. Thank you. Carlos Collins 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Carlos Collins

04/15/2013

Carlos Collins

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. There is no such thing as a pipeline that does not leak. Our waters are polluted. Our lands are polluted. The air is polluted. All in the name of big corporations who are sucking the life out of this country. Stop Them! Sincerely, Carmelina Derrico

04/15/2013

Carmelina Derrico

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need Solar, Geothermal, & Wind! Please repeat! We need Solar, Geothermal, Wind! Please repeat.....
Please stand your ground againt this backward thinking energy source! Sincerely, Carmen Marranco

04/15/2013

Carmen Marranco

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. On behalf of the Earth and all that lives upon her I ask that no more desecration of life be allowed. Life is sacred. Respects due. Sincerely, Carol Aspinwall

04/15/2013

Carol Aspinwall

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is nasty business. Remember getting tar on your feet while walking in sand at the beach... ? You know what a foul mess cleaning it up that was! Imagine all the square feet poor earth will need to have have cleaned up (over and over) if this this greedy short-sighted insanity goes forward. Do the right thing! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Carol Cole

04/15/2013

Carol Cole

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I car about clean , safe water, taking care of our environment and lands and human health, this is why I oppose the massive risks of the keystone xl pipeline!!All this pipeline will do is help Canada export THEIR oil from the gulf coast and WE will have all the risks of spills and water and land contamination. WHY??? FOR WHAT GAIN??? Please support America and its lands and people not big oil company profits! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Carol Egslaer

04/15/2013

Carol Egslaer

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Keystone XL pipeline is dangerous, plain and simple. It will be an environmental disaster of epic proportions. It will devastate our country. President Obama, you promised us a vision of a clean, green energy future. The rest of the world is investing in clean energies, are we to go the way of the dinosaurs? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Carol Keyworth

04/15/2013

Carol Keyworth

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please stop Shell's plans to drill in the Arctic. Stop giving away coal buried under federal lands so coal companies can turn around and sell it overseas AND stop the Keystone XL Pipeline project. Sincerely, CAROL KROK

04/15/2013

Carol Krok

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This pipe line is the WORST idea yet. It will bring the most polluted of all oil thru our country & add more carbon than ever to our air. The only ones who will benefit are the oil companies, while our chances or huge spills in pristine areas will increase. If our presidnet is really concerned over global warming, he must stop this pipeline!!!! Sincerely, Carol Singer

04/15/2013

Carol Singer

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please Mr President, I voted for you because I believed you were the one strong enough and far seeing enough to make the tough choices we need to protect our environment and preserve these great United States for future generations. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Carol Spillane-Mueller

04/15/2013

Carol Spillane-mueller

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please, Mr. President, instead of pouring monies into fossil fuels exploitation, can we please increase research and utilization of alternative energy sources? There are so many options to reduce use of fossil fuels. Changes in lifestyles may be necessary, but the alternatives are a continued pattern of damage to this planet's ecosystem and the health and well-being of its inhabitants. Thank you for considering options - God bless you. Sincerely, Carol Wolf

04/15/2013

Carol Wolf

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I can repeat what has been already stated, but looking into the future, I hope your grandchildren and great grandchildren will be proud of decisions you've made that benefitted their generations. Sincerely, Carole Capoun

04/15/2013

Carole Capoun

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you don't reject this ... it will be a major turning point in our fight to save the environment. Look at all the oil spills that continue to happen! The potential to contaminate our water aquifers is huge! Bad, bad idea! Prove that Big Oil doesn't have you in their pocket, too. Be courageous & reject it. Carole Heise Sincerely, Carole Heise

04/15/2013

Carole Heise

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. Just be the decent person and put the environment BEFORE profit. If we don't take care of the environment, it can't take care of us! Thank you, very much. Sincerely, Ms. Caroline Buboltz

04/15/2013

Caroline Buboltz

Attn: Genevieve Walker U.S. Dept. of State Rom 2726, 2021 C. Street. NW Washington, DC 20520

Attn: Comments Regarding Keystone XL SEIS northern segment April 15, 2013 Dear State Department Representative, I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). - - The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. - - Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer. - - During TransCanada's initial claims regarding its Presidential permit, it noted that it would create from 20,000 to tens of thousands of jobs. This has not occurred even fractionally in - - According to the SEIS, only 35 permanent jobs would be created and 15 temporary jobs for pipeline inspection, repair and maintenance would result as a part of this pipeline's approval. - - 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. - - 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. - - Tar sands crude constituents are highly corrosive, acidic and easily ignitable, even by the spark of a tool. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline product is meant for export. 60% of the oil refined on the gulf coast is already destined for export. -- Caroline Vornberg

Dear State Department Representative, I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). - - The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. - - Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer. - - During TransCanada's initial claims regarding its Presidential permit, it noted that it would create from 20,000 to tens of thousands of jobs. This has not occurred even fractionally in - - According to the SEIS, only 35 permanent jobs would be created and 15 temporary jobs for pipeline inspection, repair and maintenance would result as a part of this pipeline's approval. - - 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. - - 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. - - Tar sands crude constituents are highly corrosive, acidic and easily ignitable, even by the spark of a tool. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline product is meant for export. 60% of the oil refined on the gulf coast is already destined for export. -- Caroline Vornberg

04/15/2013

Caroline Vornberg

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Obama, we elected you because we believe you would stand up to corporate interests, not cave into them. You know the XL pipeline would be a disaster for our children. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Carolyn Norr

04/15/2013

Carolyn Norr

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Where is the candidate I voted for? What have you done with him? You really don't need a PhD in Climate Science (a Harvard law degree should be enough) to understand the critical, immediate need to do everything possible to slow global warming. You must act NOW. It is simply immoral not to consider the future of the planet. Also, the people in island nations who are being flooded out of their homes should move to the top of our immigration list since we are in large part responsible for their plight. Since I live at the end of the southern part of the KXL, I strongly resent having a foreign company (TransCanada) use eminent domain to take private property to send diluted bitumen (What are those solvents, anyway?) to foreign refineries in free trade zones to be refined and shipped out of the country. We get all the pollution and they get all the profit! Talk about a third world country! That is what America is rapidly becoming! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Carolyn Stonecipher

04/15/2013

Carolyn Stonecipher

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The Keystone XL Pipeline is not the legacy that our children deserve. You promised big steps in the right direction for clean, renewable energy. Taking bigger steps towards fortifying the fossil fuel industry does not make sense with the original goal. Taking both paths is not possible. We have taken one for long enough. It has served its purpose and it is time to let it go. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Casey Abernathy

04/15/2013

Casey Abernathy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please Mr. President, climate change is a very serious issue that must be combatted immediately before the environment goes through serious global changes. The United States and other developed nations will not be able to live at such high standards if the environment persists to warm and be more severe. Sincerely, Casey McCarthy

04/15/2013

Casey McCarthy

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I've written you before regarding my concerns about the Keystone XL and its effect on climate change. You responded with a form letter citing your commitment to an "all of the above" approach. Mr. President, you know such an approach is going to do little to nothing to slow our rapid approach to the climate change point of no return. It's like claiming to be committed to better nutrition four our children and then turning a bunch of four year-olds loose on a buffet that has a tiny bit of broccoli hidden under a mountain of ice cream and cookies. Which do you think they're going to choose? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Do the right thing. You very well know what that is. Sincerely, Cassandra Shepherd

04/15/2013

Cassandra Shepherd

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you do not reject the keystone pipeline, politics or not, your daughters are going to be cleaning up a mess that you helped to create. It is inevitable. You have done such good as President, it would be a shame on so many levels to vote yes on this. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
Sincerely, Cat C

04/15/2013

Cat C

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. We humans are not so wise as we like to think. Until we can truly, honorably protect the environment upon which we depend, we have no business destroying it for the sake of convenience. Take leadership on this challenge now. Sincerely, Catherine & Hal Martinez

04/15/2013

Catherine & Hal Martinez

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I'm only 19 years old. I worry not only what world my children will face, but I worry what I will face in the coming years. Do the right thing. Sincerely, Catherine Hollister

04/15/2013

Catherine Hollister

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You promised us you would bring change. If you do this you will be leveraging our future to the few right wing politicians who have had a strangle hold on you for the last few years. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Catherine Jahn

04/15/2013

Catherine Jahn

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. We cannot currently manage the spills that occur on an almost daily basis in this country, not to mention the illegal dumping of toxic wastes. Why do you want to add to this problem? Would it be OK if you and your children were living in the Arkansas neighborhood that was just contaminated? Or any of the many other places that have been polluted with oil and tar sands? Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Cecilia Norris

04/15/2013

Cecilia Norris

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. The oil industry has not demonstrated the ability to avert environmental disaster. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Furthermore, it continues to be increasingly evident with the recent hearings on the Real Estate scandal, that most of our government is in the pockets of giant corporation. Are you one of those people, President Obama. Are will continue to fight for the people who elected you? I voted for you because you promised to fight climate change. If you allow this pipeline you will be renegging on this promise. Sincerely, Celia Pearce

04/15/2013

Celia Pearce

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. In short no way Jose. It is my understanding that this oil will be shipped to places other than the US. We get squat from this pipeline. Sincerely, Charles Antonietti

04/15/2013

Charles Antonietti

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. In the end our use of fossil fuels will create disaster. Better now for prices to slowly rise which will drive a push for conservation and sustainable alternatives. Conservation must stop being a "dirty" (no pun intended) word. In mid summer here in Flo rida (read 90/90. 90% humidity and temp.) we always bring a sweater or jacket to keep warm in the A/C . Read Jared Diamond's "Collapse". Flawed in some ways, on target in others. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Charles Edelstein

04/15/2013

Charles Edelstein

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department How many times are we going to be surprised by the eco-catastrophes that we cause. There is clearly some disconnect between the perceived risk and actual risk of these projects. The administration has supported clean energy generation technologies, but this pipeline is a major step in the wrong direction. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Charles Murray

04/15/2013

Charles Murray

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL Mr. President, the verdict is in and the XL-Pipeline will be a TOTAL AND COMPLETE DISASTER for WE THE PEOPLE. You seem not to hear the cries of the people. However, it seems that every corporation has your time, your ear and your favor. What a sad commentary on a Democracy.. Sincerely, Charles Rogers

04/15/2013

Charles Rogers

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The incentive from the right to build XL is that of job creation, this is just minimal in the broader picture. As for Americans reaping the benefit of lower prices at the pump as a result of its construction, most of the product will go overseas and be burned there. The First Peoples of Canada have a big stake in more development of the oil resources in Canada , they are against its creation knowing full well the exploitation of these resources are overwhelmingly detrimental. PLEASE DON'T ALLOW IT Sincerely, Charles Yeaman

04/15/2013

Charles Yeaman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I am currently a college student at University studying Environmental Science. I care about the environment and I voted for you in my first election because I trusted that you would be willing to protect the environment from people better than others. Climate change is a severe problem and it needs to be addressed and continuously fought against. When using and promoting the use of such a dirty fossil fuel, it's hard to decrease the effects that climate change has on the environment. 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. 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. 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. The environment deserves climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you. Sincerely, Chelsea Saber

04/15/2013

Chelsea Saber

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If this administration approves the pipeline, it is approving the enhanced destruction that climate change brings, and it's going against sound, scientific evidence of that destruction! This president needs to support science, not profits for big oil to the detriment of the environment and Earth. Exactly, what, Mr. President, do you wish to leave your daughters and your grandchildren? Sincerely, Cheri Gaspero

04/15/2013

Cheri Gaspero

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. Keystone XL explicitly divides America by seizing lands necessary for communities and their heritage farms, and wilderness areas that are necessary for heritage animals to survive and thrive. 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. What has happened here and repeatedly in oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico, Alaska, and along any number of other shorelines is inexcusable and you know it. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It's high time along time ago to invest in renewable energies, and its high time to seize the opportunity to push America to an energy infrastructure that does not destroy existing wilderness or communities. Sincerely, Cheryl Maslin

04/15/2013

Cheryl Maslin

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. KEYSTONE XL SUCKS DIRTY RICH PENIS AND GENTLY LIFTS FATTY GEEZ BALLS IN A GENTLE LIFT. DON'T LAY DOWN SOME HUGE TOXIC PIPE NIGGERS EVERYWHERE WANT TO NEVER SEE. BLOWN UP OR OTHERWISE. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Chris Wilkerson

04/15/2013

Chris Wilkerson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department WE WANT AND NEED RENEWABLE ENERGY! WE DO NOT WANT MORE DIRTY ENERGY! Please do not underestimate the importance of your vote. Do the right thing for humanity. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Christa Fenton

04/15/2013

Christa Fenton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I have always believed in you as a person and our president. Please do not compromise so much that you wind up having been an ineffective president. If there are those who do not want to help with your true vision then it is on them. I, for one, will respect you more for standing up for what is right than compromising and being a part of what is wrong. Sincerely, Christian Dollahon

04/15/2013

Christian Dollahon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department On Inauguration Day, you stated "we will take control of climate change!" Well, how do you propose to do that when land rapists like Keystone XL continue to get their way and destroy our country?? 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 the devastating Keystone XL Pipeline is approved, and we all stand by silently as that company develops tar sands! Such twisted, destructive, greedy development and exploration is NOT NECESSARY! Thankfully, increasing environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee. Stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a huge step against the tar sands concept! After the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas, there should be no question in your mind, Mr. President, that this pipeline will never be safe. I demand climate leadership from this administration -- because I expect you to live up to your word!. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't let us down, and don't knuckle under to ANY such project in the future! Sincerely, Christian King

04/15/2013

Christian King

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I can't believe that after the incredible environmental disaster suffer by the BP oilspill you are even considering the Keystone XL pipeline. Are you really for this country or not? Sincerely, Christina Anderson

04/15/2013

Christina Anderson

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Mr. President: Please get your priorities right! We have only one planet and we, especially government, are stewards of it. When our air, water, soil, have become so polluted we must protect ourselves against them, when our food is so transformed, comtaminated, that we can't eat it without taking all kinds of corrective supplements, when the beauty that uplifts our hearts, inspires our creativity, gives us the art our souls need, has disappeared, and we cannot see the sunsets through the rubble of landfills, when all of this happens because we are not putting the planet first, what is the use of money? Can we eat money? Can we breathe it? Mr. President: The Keystone Pipeline must be rejected. Yes, there are huge pressures to install it. But we must do the right thing. Please, please, please, Mr. President. Oppose the Keystone XL and the tar sands! Christina Pages, Ph.D.

04/15/2013

Christina Pages

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Mr. President: Please get your priorities right! We have only one planet and we, especially government, are stewards of it. When our air, water, soil, have become so polluted we must protect ourselves against them, when our food is so transformed, comtaminated, that we can't eat it without taking all kinds of corrective supplements, when the beauty that uplifts our hearts, inspires our creativity, gives us the art our souls need, has disappeared, and we cannot see the sunsets through the rubble of landfills, when all of this happens because we are not putting the planet first, what is the use of money? Can we eat money? Can we breathe it? Mr. President: The Keystone Pipeline must be rejected. Yes, there are huge pressures to install it. But we must do the right thing. Please, please, please, Mr. President. Oppose the Keystone XL and the tar sands! Christina Pages, Ph.D.

04/15/2013

Christina Pages

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Mr. President: Please get your priorities right! We have only one planet and we, especially government, are stewards of it. When our air, water, soil, have become so polluted we must protect ourselves against them, when our food is so transformed, contaminated, that we can't eat it without taking all kinds of corrective supplements, when the beauty that uplifts our hearts, inspires our creativity, gives us the art our souls need, has disappeared, and we cannot see the sunsets through the rubble of landfills, when all of this happens because we are not putting the planet first, what is the use of money? Can we eat money? Can we breathe it? Mr. President: The Keystone Pipeline must be rejected. Yes, there are huge pressures to install it. But we must do the right thing. Please, please, please, Mr. President. Oppose the Keystone XL and the tar sands! Christina Pages, Ph.D.

04/15/2013

Christina Pages

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's clear this pipeline will never be safe. I expect continued climate leadership from this administration. Please reject Keystone XL. Thank you.
Sincerely, Christine Davey

04/15/2013

Christine Davey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Big Oil companies are terrifyingly incompetent -- except, of course, when it comes to profits. Hasn't the Arkansas disaster taught us anything? It's so sad. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Let's make the brave move on this one. Thanks for considering humane logic!

Sincerely, Christine Holmes

04/15/2013

Christine Holmes

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There is no amount of money that can replace what is destroyed by the Keystone XL Pipeline! It will never be safe. Please be the President I voted for to leave a legacy of leadership, courageously standing up to big oil companies and leading everyone by your great example to preserve the planet, specifically by stopping climate change. Sincerely, Christine Kidd

04/15/2013

Christine Kidd

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. There is nothing good about Keystone XL - zero, nothing. I am embarrassed as a citizen that my country would actually even consider supporting the destruction of a critical carbon sequestering forest, the placement of a pipeline of this filthy product to cross our land. Stand up and say NO! Sincerely, cinda gaynor

04/15/2013

Cinda Gaynor

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. JUST SAY NO! Stop this insanity! This is no way to move into a greener future and the "new" green economy. Sign it with a BIG NO for the Keystone XL pipeline! Sincerely, Cindy Romain

04/15/2013

Cindy Romain

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I ask you as a college student, an environmentalist, an American, and as an inhabitant of this incredible country and planet of ours, for the sake of ourselves, our descendants, and the environment and all the beauty and resources it has to offer us, to reject the Keystone Pipeline. Thank you. Sincerely, Claire Matthews

04/15/2013

Claire Matthews

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The economic benefits of this pipeline may be gained by a few; employment opportunities are minimal; habitat destruction would have a huge impact; and the potential for environmental disaster is massive. Why are you even considering the Keystone Pipeline????!!!!!! Sincerely, Claire Meggs

04/15/2013

Claire Meggs

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I live in Arkansas, just a few miles from .

Mayflower is currently suffering from pipeline that burst in a residential neighborhood. Most everyone in the State of Arkansas was unaware this ancient pipeline even existed, let alone ran through our own backyards. The devastation to the wildlife, homes, air quality, water quality and lives of those in the area may NEVER return to normal. PLEASE do not pass the Keystone XL Pipeline!!!! You made a solemn promise to us that you would protect the environment if elected. Please do not sell out to the big oil companies and Republican pressure. Stand firm and do what is right for our planet. Be the President that will be remembered for leaving the planet a better place, not raping it for profit as so many before you have done. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Clarissa Peters

04/15/2013

Clarissa Peters

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This is not a job creator at all. Why do you want us to be a 3rd world country. This is the kind of stuff that we used to (still do), just run it thru that place so we can get it at the end. Only in this case there is nothing to get at the end. It does nothing to promote energy independence. Please do Not ok this dangerous pipeline. Look at what just happened in Mayflower Arkansas. Sincerely, Colin Kay

04/15/2013

Colin Kay

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department How would you feel if this was your home that you shared with Michelle and your daughters? I can only imagine that a typical middle-class American would feel rather hopeless... The conversation doesn't even have to go as far as climate change.
Sincerely, Colleen Gilligan

04/15/2013

Colleen Gilligan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please invest time and money into renewable energy sources that stop the advances of global warming. The future will be bright if we harvest solar, wind and the waves energy. Bright minds can make this happen.

Sincerely, Colleen Moss

04/15/2013

Colleen Moss

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please don't steer the country in this very wrong, dangerous, environmentally unjustifiable direction by approving the Keystone pipeline. We're asking you to make a stand. Please don't compromise on this. Sincerely, Colleen O'Neill

04/15/2013

Colleen O'Neill

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Experts are saying that it's "game over" for the climate if the plan moves forward. And Exxon's recent pipeline spill in Arkansas highlights just how underprepared oil companies are to respond to inevitable pipeline failures. Sincerely, Connie Nelson

04/15/2013

Connie Nelson

Secretary Kerry: Please do not approve the Keystone XL pipeline. There are much better, more sustainable ways of providing jobs than this tar sands oil pipeline. It requires more energy and water to produce than other oil drilling. It produces more CO2 than other fossil fuels. Leaks are dangerous and more numerous because of the corrosive chemicals used to thin it. Let's expend our capital and provide good jobs through intense public/private investment in renewable energy sources. Connie Rayor

04/15/2013

Connie Rayor

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We as the people of this country want you as our president to do what you have said you would do. We want clean energy and this pipeline is any thing but. Please, do what you have said you would do. We voted for your ideas and we expect you to do what you've said. So, how about it, Mr. President. thank you very much for your time. Sincerely, Connie Schneck

04/15/2013

Connie Schneck

04/15/2013

Connie Weichman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is SUCH a no-brainer! There is nothing to be gained and EVERYTHING to be lost if we continue to use fossil fuels. Let the USA become one of the leaders in SUSTAINABLE energy production. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Constance Hatch

04/15/2013

Constance Hatch

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Aside from all of that, is it not our nation's goal to make the transition to more sustainable energy practices? Oil is no longer the solution to a need for energy sources, we need to halt projects such as this in order to aid the push for green energy and a more sustainable industry. Please keep your word and use the authority you have to direct our nation down a path of progress, not one of a sedentary people. Sincerely, Corrie Noah

04/15/2013

Corrie Noah

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Really? Drop the greed & do what's right. I've personally seen this working as a Field Appraiser, & what it does to the surrounding environment is absolutely devastating. Just because a company says their all about safety & doing everything by the book doesn't mean all of their employees act the same. I've taken the safety corse in Colorado for Exxon & Mobile, so I know how to be safe & productive on a well site/station. The fact remains, we are destroying what we love & hope for, & action must be taken immediately to stop any more harm than we've already caused. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Courtney Stevenson

04/15/2013

Courtney Stevenson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You realize this oil is harder to refine and it's going overseas. If you put an end to this we can find an alternative. There are already alternatives out there... Please do not ruin our earth. Dont let them. Sincerely, Cristina Dorsey

04/15/2013

Cristina Dorsey

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I have supported both of you in all you have done. However, the Keystone XL and tar sand are not something anyone should support, and jobs is a poor rationalization. That can be achieved through clean energy. Support the environment and those who supported you by closing this issue forever! Sincerely, Cynthia Jackson

04/15/2013

Cynthia Jackson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. So much irreversible harm can result from this. 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. What can go wrong could be catastrophic, in terms of global sustainability, species extinction, health, and basic human survival. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Without taking action to reject Keystone XL, it's not a question of what might happen, but when, and it could be imminent. All of us are counting on you to stand up to stopping Keystone XL and protecting our ecosphere. Sincerely,
Cynthia Roth

04/15/2013

Cynthia Roth

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Kirtland Air Force Base dumped 24,000,000 gallons of Aviation gas and jet fuel in Albuquerque's drinking water aquifer. The Keystone pipeline will dump more. You should put a stop to the pipeline and order clean up at Kirtland AFB. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, D McCoy

04/15/2013

D McCoy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We have one earth, if we lose it we are lost too. Don't let this pipeline ruin the valuable resources we have, resources that are more important than oil could ever be. Sincerely, Dakota Keller

04/15/2013

Dakota Keller

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet .Rejection of Keystone XL is a must if the administration intends to seriously pursue limits on climate change. Give in on this battle and you have lost the war. Sincerely. Dan W. Bench

04/15/2013

Dan Bench

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please don't be swayed by powerful interests. There are a small number of people with degrees in science who say climate change isn't happening. They're financed by the fossil fuel industry. The fossil fuel industry (and nuclear industry) have a record of turning pristine areas of the planet into places where breathing the air and drinking, or even showering in the water makes people and animals die. Some of the most powerful people in this world put their wants ahead of the needs of the vast majority. It's not necessary or justifiable, morally or financially. We've been heading down the wrong road since Ronald Reagan took the solar panels off the White House and diverted our resources to making war and profit. The security of future generations depends upon us changing direction. Doing the right thing has seldom been popular. Those most revered have been the ones who've realized that choosing the more difficult path is the right choice in the long run. That's how we've moved forward. We shouldn't judge our progress by how rich a few can be but by how secure is the majority. Climate change and nuclear pollution will be the most expensive and devastating issues for the next millennium. Let's not make it harder for future generations than we already have. It's time to change course. Be the leader with the boldest vision.
Sincerely, Dan Broadway

04/15/2013

Dan Broadway

This Keystone Pipeline idea is ill-advised, ill-conceived and if this boondoggle (which would be the environmental equivalent to the "war" in Iraq) goes through, it would attest to the fact that OUR COUNTRY has fallen into the hands of über-rich special interests with no loyalty to country, the People, or the environment – but only to their own corporate bottom line – and to hell with everything else – including the United States of America. You might as well burn the flag, rip up the Constitution, abandon Washington DC and turn everything over to Wall Street. Just look what happened in Arkansas recently. The Keystone Pipeline has the potential to create a problem a hundred times worse. Protect our nation's water supply, not the interests of billionaire Canadians and their poisonous sludge they are trying to pass off as oil.. You want energy? You want energy jobs? Then build some wind turbines. Sure, you don't get a quick profit return. But once upon a time America invested in the future. Now it seems we are only investing in the downfall of America. Dan Courtney,

04/15/2013

Dan Courtney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. As a conscientious Canadian citizen I do not wish to be associated with any plan to export dirty oil that may destroy the sensitive land and water of our neighbours to the south. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Dan Lafreniere

04/15/2013

Dan Lafreniere

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. President Obama I spent countless hours in support of your Campaign to win the presidency for both of your terms. I will implore you to stand with the side of history that vows for environmentally friendly energy practices. Please do not let those of us who fought for your 2nd term down. We did so with thoughts that you would actually be a president on our side. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Dana Bravata

04/15/2013

Dana Bravata

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Are you ready to get real? The time is now and the answer is clear. NO to the XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Dane Pollok

04/15/2013

Dane Pollok

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Why are we using our infrastructure to save the KOCH BROTHERS \$2 Billion a year so they don't have to move their oil a different route. The USA and Canada will never see a drop of that oil. It is all for India and China. They have the money let them pay it! If they can build a western town just for their family. They can afford to move their dirty oil sludge a different route! Sincerely, Danee' Costa

04/15/2013

Danee' Costa

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Really it comes down to this, you can keep searching and bleeding the earth of its oil but we are still using it at a higher rate than it can be produced. Stop now while there's still an earth to save and you can profit off a new energy source. Sincerely, Danica Benninghoven

04/15/2013

Danica Benninghoven

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. One more oil spill. As a committed citizen concerned with climate change and policies affecting it, I've expected your Administration to take such pipeline problems into account, but I haven't seen public reference to your concerns. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Daniel Goldrich

04/15/2013

Daniel Goldrich

To Whom it May Concern, Please don't authorize the Keystone Pipeline! It is unnecessary, and will contribute mightily to climate change. The Massachusetts coastline is eroding, and houses are falling into the sea. That is only one of the many reasons that we must address climate change. Sincerely,
Dan Ruben --

04/15/2013

Daniel Ruben

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Lets stop putting a bigger bucket under the leaking roof and fix the roof. it is time to stop being dependent on oil, not only foreign but domestic to. One simple thing to do, is move the speed limit back to 55 mph. This will improve mpg's by 10 percent. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Daniel Smith

04/15/2013

Daniel Smith

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is stupid. It hurts to believe in people who keep on doing stupid things. It hurts to vote for people who don't care about the planet. People who don't care about tomorrow. Really depressed people who don't believe in anything, who maybe should let good caring people lead for a change. This is really stupid. Sincerely, Danielle Chalmet

04/15/2013

Danielle Chalmet

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If this could pass right by Mr. Obama's back door, then ok, but it will not be near anyone with power or money - just stop and help us get off oil now!!! Sincerely, darby drew

04/15/2013

Darby Drew

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The proposed Keystone XL Tar Sands pipeline project (KXL) would slice through the heartland of America for the primary purpose of carrying up to 830,000 barrels per day of dirty tar sands oil from Alberta, Canada to Gulf Coast refineries. If KXL is completed, the bulk of this toxic oil would go through America - not to America - as most of it would ultimately be exported to international markets. Proponents of KXL argue that this project will create thousands of jobs and increase energy security. These assertions, however, are both exaggerated and easily refuted. The reality is that job creation in the US as a result of KXL would be minimal. The claims that KXL would create over 100,000 jobs are wildly overinflated. It is well documented that these numbers were based on the flawed and poorly researched Perryman study commissioned by TransCanada. The State Department review indicated that KXL would create approximately 3,900 temporary construction jobs and 35 permanent jobs. A report by the Cornell University Global Labor Institute stated 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" and that "new permanent US pipeline jobs in the US number as few as 50." The idea that KXL would significantly promote energy independence is also unfounded. Proponents of KXL who believe that this pipeline would provide energy security for America have been seriously misinformed. The majority of the tar sands oil would be exported. Of the companies that have contracted for the majority of the oil that would flow through KXL, all but one are foreign. The only American company (Valero) primarily focuses on exports and has explicitly detailed its export strategy to its investors. It is abundantly clear that the KXL is focused on oil for export, not for energy security. It should be obvious that Canadians are not interested in providing energy security (or jobs) for Americans any more than Americans are interested in providing energy security (or jobs) for Canadians. These comments by prominent Canadians further support the fact that this oil is not primarily destined for US consumption: "I am very serious about selling our oil off this continent, selling our energy products off to Asia. I think we have to do that." - Stephen Harper, Canadian Prime Minister February 10, 2012 "For Alberta, the strategic imperative is that we get our products to the ocean, so that we secure global prices for our products. The solutions are additional pipelines to the West Coast, to the East Coast, and also train-car delivery of bitumen and oil products to the coast." - Ken Hughes, Alberta Energy Minister January 3, 2013 "We have a duty to ensure that our resources, especially Alberta oil and gas, get to new markets at a much fairer price. We absolutely must find ways to get Alberta oil to multiple customers around the world and get a competitive price." - Alison Redford, Alberta Premier January 24, 2013 KXL would not reduce gas prices in the US. In reality, the opposite could occur as KXL would divert oil away from Midwest refineries, so that it could be sold for higher prices in the export markets. It has been estimated that KXL could cause gas prices in the Midwest to rise by 10 to 20 cents per gallon. While there would be no significant benefits for the American public from KXL, there would be plenty of risks. It is clear that this pipeline poses unacceptable risks to the environment. Pipelines leak. Period. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, more than half a million barrels of oil and other hazardous liquids have spilled from pipelines in the US in the last five years alone. Tar sands oil is unlike conventional oil. It is a viscous mixture of sand, clay and water that is saturated with a dense form of petroleum called bitumen. It also contains a cocktail of deadly chemicals, including nickel, lead, chromium, mercury, arsenic, selenium and benzene. It can only flow through pipelines at high temperatures and pressures where it becomes a corrosive and abrasive hot sandpaper-like liquid, which increases the chance for leaks. Additionally, traditional clean up techniques are ineffective when tar sands oil spills, especially when it flows into water, where it sinks to the bottom. Claims that KXL won't leak are tenuous at best.

TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline spilled 12 times in its first year of operation. In July 2010, a tar sands pipeline run by another Canadian company (Enbridge) ruptured in Michigan, spewing more than one million gallons of tar sands oil, much of which flowed into the Kalamazoo River. That spill exposed residents to the toxic sludge, endangered wildlife and caused long-term damage to the local ecosystem. The recent pipeline leak in Mayflower, Arkansas, where tar sands oil oozed into a residential neighborhood and nearby Lake Conway, reconfirmed that we are not prepared to either transport or clean up dirty, heavy, toxic tar sands oil spills. The KXL route poses a clear threat to water safety. The pipeline would cross more than 1,000 bodies of water threatening water that is critical for both drinking and agriculture in the Midwest. The pipeline's risk to water has not changed with the new proposed route as it would still cross the Ogallala aquifer, a key freshwater source for millions of Americans in the Great Plains states. KXL would also exacerbate climate change. Producing a barrel of oil from the tar sands generates significantly more greenhouse gas emissions than a barrel of conventional oil. Well-to-wheel CO₂ equivalent emissions for an average barrel of conventional crude oil range from 466 - 487 kg. Several initial reports estimated that well-to-wheel CO₂ equivalent emissions for tar sands oil are 5 - 17% higher than emissions from conventional oil. However, subsequent research has indicated that these estimates may be too low. A US EPA study determined that well-to-wheel emissions from tar sands oil may actually be 8 - 37% higher than emissions from conventional oil. To make matters worse, a recent report indicated that the current analyses underestimate the climate impacts of the tar sands by about 13% because they don't account for a byproduct of the refining process called petcoke that is increasingly being used as a cheap, carbon intensive coal substitute. Some people have argued that the tar sands oil would be extracted with or without KXL, negating the climate impact of the pipeline. It is true that tar sands production will not stop if KXL is not built. However, KXL would lead to increased tar sands production as it is the key to getting tar sands oil to the refineries that serve international markets in a cost effective manner that would maximize profits. Although tar sands oil could be shipped by rail, this is not an economically viable alternative. It currently costs about \$31 per barrel to ship the tar sands oil to the Gulf Coast refineries via rail. Shipping it by pipeline is estimated to cost between \$7 and \$9 per barrel. Even if rail costs were to come down substantially, it would still be significantly more expensive to utilize rail. Profit margins on tar sands oil are incredibly tight. The cost difference between pipeline and rail transport is significant enough that expansion would likely be prevented if KXL is not built. New projects would simply not have sufficient margins to withstand the higher cost of rail transport. Tar sands production is one of the world's most environmentally damaging activities. It destroys vast swathes of pristine boreal forest. It uses massive amounts of water from rivers, which get turned into toxic waste and dumped into giant tailing ponds. While it is true that we cannot prevent Canada from ravaging the earth by exploiting the tar sands, we do not have to be an accomplice in this crime. Approving KXL would lead to an increase in this destruction, with no significant benefits. KXL is a bad deal for the planet and a bad deal for Americans and a great deal for TransCanada. Whose side should we be on? Sincerely, Daria Kurkji

04/15/2013

Daria Kurkji

RE: Reject Keystone XL Based on Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to the Environment Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama: 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, 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. 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. Sincerely, Darlene Waters

04/15/2013

Darlene Waters

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- David Buesch United States of America
____ This message was submitted via Avaaz at http://www.avaaz.org/en/no_tar_sands_valdez/?reply.
To respond, please e-mail reply+nokxl@Avaaz.org

04/15/2013

David Buesch

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Let me start by saying I am a card carrying, tree hugging environmentalist; opposed to nuclear power for thirty years. I cannot sit back and watch our planet destroyed to enrich those who control our energy. Global warming is not a hoax; having stuck our head in the sand for 30 years we now have a crisis. The planet needs more energy, more than solar panels and wind generators will ever provide. If environmental groups don't start advocating for clean, safe nuclear power we will continue to get more tar sands oil and fracking--there is no alternative.

Permanently damaging our planet in search of carbon dioxide producing fossil fuels is insane when an alternative is at our fingertips. I grew up in the 60's in and had dire ct experience with SMOG. As a kid we were not allowed outside on certain days when the air was un-breathable. My eyes watered and my chest hurt if I went out to play. If you believe statistics, more people have died from fossil fuel than were killed from the bomb at Hiroshima. Nobody has been killed from direct exposure to radiation at a Nuclear Power Plant (except at Chernobyl where the Soviets' were making bomb grade material). To this day nobody has died as a result of the Tsunami at Fukushima, even the workers who went inside the containment are alive. I believe Big Oil realized the potential splitting the atom would have on power generation, and a full-scale plan of deception was put in place. Now, their propagandists are hard at work playing down the reality of climate change caused by burning oil and coal: That's deception, their need for profit has keep Radiophobia alive. When the computer age began, Moore's Law dictated the development of computers. The understanding is "every year a product will be half he size, or twice as fast". This has reduced a computer the size of a house, to a device enormously more powerful that will fit in your pocket. It only took fifty years. In that same amount of time we have done nearly nothing to improve our nuclear energy technology. Despite supercomputers to design them, and modern materials to build them, a new age nuclear reactor has not been built for commercial use. At this stage, the world needs nuclear energy. It is the greenest and cleanest source of energy available on the planet. The sun is a nuclear power source, tapped into with solar panels when the sun is shining. It may be that a better power source will be discovered in the future, but we have come along way in fifty years, why not green flag nuclear power; nothing else will get us the power we need and it will take time to develop. We can't afford to be ignorant any longer. We need to stop rubbing sticks together for heat, crawl out of our caves, and unleash the power under our feet. How long did it take men of medicine to acknowledge washing hands saved lives? Germ theory was around for 100 years before doctors of their day swallowed their pride and admitted dirty hands killed people. How many died from their stubbornness? Will we continue to harm our planet because of ignorance? A modern nuclear device is around the corner if only we give up our stubborn paranoia about radiation and learn the truth. We have radioactive devices in our home and on our bodies with no ill affect; many would argue some types of radiation are beneficial to the human body. We need to be open minded about nuclear energy, this is a new age; old serotypes don't work. A progressive attitude is required---not stubbornness. Thorium is an abundant rare earth element with stockpiles in reserve around the world. It is in the dirt we walk on. A shovel full could power a city with a new age reactor causing no radiation difference and giving useful nuclear bi-products as waste. Allowing the possibility of accepting clean nuclear power gives scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs, and inventors the willingness to develop new technology. The world is dieing for it! Everybody needs to change their mind about nuclear energy and advocate for the development of new age reactors. Learn the truth, and educate their loyal followers about radiation and its benefits. Mobilize the troops in a new direction--instead of protesting the status que. Big Oil will fight New Nuclear; they don't want to lose one drop of profit. A new energy product, like a compact nuclear device, would change the economy of the world. What would have happened had the United States not started the computer age? Can we afford to let another country

capture the energy future because our oil giants are stuck on Greed, using their influence to control energy policy through our fear of radiation? The next great idea is already in our collective consciousness because the need is there. The world was ready for Columbus and he appeared, we were ready for the Wright brothers when they came along, When Bill Gates and Steve Jobs arrived--they couldn't be stopped. Now is the time for energy freedom and a new world of harmony. Radiophobia is a myth! It's time to allow a renaissance in Nuclear Energy. Clean Coal is impossible; Clean Nuclear is achievable. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, David Deick

04/15/2013

David Deick

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, When confronted by decisions on the fate of ecosystems and the very real likelihood of human deaths and suffering due to severe droughts and storms like Sandy, it is perhaps correct to say that defending the environment is politically "tough". I'd ask what isn't politically tough nowadays? The polluters have a clear agenda of making more money, whereas ecosystems have no agenda except to attempt to survive. And, environmentalists have an agenda that is based on defending the Earth and all living creations. Which agenda is the higher calling? Pretty easy answer to that one if you ask me. So, if saying its a tough issue politically gets you off the hook on the XL pipeline, I'd say shame on you. That's a cop out. Rosa Parks, Cesar Chavez, Alice Paul and Abe Lincoln could have said its just too politically tough, indeed they were advised by many to just let well enough alone. But, they didn't and their legacies are clear and unassailable. What will your legacy be? "It's just too tough"? Or will it be a courageous stance that sends a clear message to the World? Your choice. I'm praying you protect the Earth. Dr. David Drake

04/15/2013

David Drake

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

AMOCO FRACKED my Colorado Home in 1995=====THEY SCREWED ME for three years and paid me 50cents on the dollar for my LOSS after Federal Court denied suit and my Attorney's spend \$600,000 and Amoco spends \$5,000,000 TO NOT PAY ME and offered me \$50,000 for a \$450,000 ranch

Sincerely, David Field

04/15/2013

David Field

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Global warming is real. Humans are poor at long term threats with short term costs. We will all be judged by future generations on how we react to global warming, so far we have been failing them. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, David Holbrook

04/15/2013

David Holbrook

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Rejection of Keystone XL will satisfy the treaties with the Sioux Nation and other tribal groups who are planning a fight in the International Court of Justice that the US signed in 1851 and 1858. We will stand with the Sioux and other Native American Nations on this issue. Sincerely, David Jehnson

04/15/2013

David Jehnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President please reject this pipeline because it will majorly increase our carbon pollution and will not benefit Americans at all because it is all going to be exported out of the country! We also face major spills at any time through the country! Congress wants to pass this because transcanada will put tons of cash in their pockets if they vote this in/is that also why you are considering this-because their can be no other reason! Please reject this in all Americans best interest and keep our pollution levels down-Don't give in to corporate interests! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, David Johnson

04/15/2013

David Johnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Personal Comment: Not only does the Keystone pipeline risk the aquifiers and water tables and ecological systems everywhere the pipeline is, by allowing the shipping and thus the pumping of the Alberta oil sands, it will make the solving of the global climate change crisis impossible. Stop the Keystone pipeline. We are doing our best in British Columbia to stop the Enbridge tar sands oil pipeline through pristeen BC to the west coast. The US needs to do its part as well! I am a dual US/Canadian citizen living in _____ and voting absentee fro m, _____ Minnesota. I voted for President Obama (twice) and progressive causes and supporters. This is a progressive cause. Stop the Keystone pipeline NOW!!! Sincerely, David Myers

04/15/2013

David Myers

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It is not in the United State's strategic interest to allow for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Climate change is real and represents an existential threat to society as we know it. Facilitating the further development of the Canadian tar sands only adds to the problem. Yes we need jobs, but they should be in the renewable energy sector. I look to you for real leadership on this issue. Sincerely, David Neidel

04/15/2013

David Neidel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, I urge you to reject the Keystone Pipeline. The jobs generated will be negligible and the potential for environmental destruction huge. I am sure you've heard all the arguments. Please choose to take a stand against 'business as usual' when it comes to green house gasses. 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.

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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, David Noyes

04/15/2013

David Noyes

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, We need to both reject the keystone pipeline and simultaneously use this very moment to make the long-needed, SERIOUS commitment to act (and LEAD) on climate change at the federal policy level. The scientific evidence that DEMANDS our action grows every day, and it is terrifying! The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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.

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. Sincerely, David Sillman

04/15/2013

David Sillman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Nothing can be more important to myself and others I speak to throughout our community. Show us you are a genuine leader and start making positive changes for the world we leave our children!! Sincerely, Dean Cherno

04/15/2013

Dean Cherno

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Native Americans have DECLINED permission to run the Pipeline through their lands, thus making it a treaty issue. We want clean energy, and we want political leaders who have the courage to effect this change. We are the People, and the Oil Corporations are NOT supposed to be calling the shots. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Dean Leh

04/15/2013

Dean Leh

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I feel very strongly about this issue and agree with the sentiments below. We should not have to endure ANY more tar sands spills! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Deb Scott

04/15/2013

Deb Scott

04/15/2013

Debbie Riddle

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Debi Mohan

04/15/2013

Debi Mohan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Deborah Allen

04/15/2013

Deborah Allen

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please do everything possible to STOP the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline project. The United States of America cannot fight climate change while simultaneously investing in one of the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet! There is no going back once this project takes place. We owe it to future generations and the planet to STOP the Keystone pipeline! Thank you for your time and support. Sincerely, Deborah Greig

04/15/2013

Deborah Greig

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I haven't written anything against the Keystone XL pipeline, because I wasn't convinced. Well, all of the pipeline leaks have convinced me. We seem to have the technology to recover this oil, but not the technology to do it, and ship it, SAFELY. Find another way. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Deborah Harrison

04/15/2013

Deborah Harrison

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This is the 21st century. It's time to forge ahead with clean energy sources and leave oil behind. The future of our children and grandchildren depend on it. Sincerely, Deborah McDow

04/15/2013

Deborah McDow

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Mr. President, please remember the promise you made to invest in clean energy sources. You must know that the Keystone XL is a disastrous project and goes directly against what you made us believe you were about. Please acknowledge the pleas of the American people and reject this project once and for all. Thank you. Sincerely, Deborah McDow

04/15/2013

Deborah McDow

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. IT IS NOT JUST THE SPILLS. IT IS BURNING THIS FILTHY STUFF. WE ARE SPEEDING TOWARDS A 3C + NOW OF TEMPERATURE CHANGE AND ALL THE CONSEQUENCES THAT COME WITH IT. WAKE UP, MR. PRESIDENT!!! Sincerely, Deborah Silverman

04/15/2013

Deborah Silverman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The koch brothers don't deserve to have their planet killing pipeline. Think--before you sign any thing- not after. This WILL ruin the united states. Its not if, its only when. Please hold up to your promises we all deserve at least that. If you allow this to go forward we all will know the devil got to you. Sincerely, Dee Preston

04/15/2013

Dee Preston

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please consider the unbelievable, damaging impact this measure will have, and is having, on our beautiful planet. Please be the people we hoped you would be when we voted for you, people who love and protect this planet and all who occupy it. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Delma Mindel

04/15/2013

Delma Mindel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department After the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear that the KXL pipeline will never be safe. That line is not original, I copied it. But I'm convinced of its logic. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Denise Curry

04/15/2013

Denise Curry

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We need the XL pipeline completed - for energy dependance, for jobs, for progress in our overall economy. Your record with investments in alternative energy are deplorable, and fossil fuels are still the mainstay moving forward for the long term. Please accept the XL Pipeline project - we need this, and our alternatives are minimal. The environmental impacts, regardless of opinion, are non invasive and safe. Sincerely, Dennis Cooper

04/15/2013

Dennis Cooper

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department There is only one sane choice to make regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline -- VETO IT. You rejected it once, so, please, make that your final determination. I do not support the unrestrained exploitation of the newly discovered shale oil deposits in the USA, but logically speaking, sir, if we have as much as two trillion barrels of it, enough to make us the world's largest oil producer, then what reason is there to risk building a 1,200 mile pipeline across our country to transport Canada's filthy tar sand oil, the most environmentally threatening fossil fuel on Earth? The reason, we know, would be the tremendous profit involved. If it passes, Keystone would provide riches for the few, and an unacceptable level of pollution for us all. You're an enigma, Mr. President. You seem(ed) to be the transformative president that our country and the world needs at a time when human activity is threatening its very existence with climate change and other forms of environmental devastation. We elected you because of your intelligent rhetoric. You've made bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency, so please don't allow something as contradictory and potentially devastating as Keystone to pass? We need to break the grip of capitalist money on our lives. It is obvious that profit should NOT alone be the determining factor behind the production of human needs. And those who make the most money should not dominate our government as they presently do. You seem to be straddling the fence, however. Your ideas are wonderful except in the many ways they kowtow to monied interests. This is where you lose the people's trust. Listen to your own rhetoric. Do what you know is right, and I'm certain that you do. Help us, please by rejecting the Keystone XL Pipeline. The raucous noise from the right will stop when they realize that this is for their own good, too. Thank you for your time. I hope you actually read this. DPS Sincerely, Dennis Schafer

04/15/2013

Dennis Schafer

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. "A righteous man regards the life of animals" - PROVERBS 12:10; "If you have men who will exclude any of God's creatures from the shelter of compassion & pity, you will have men who will deal likewise with their fellow men" - FRANCIS OF ASSISI; "I hope to make people realize how totally helpless animals are, how dependent on us, trusting as a child must that we will be kind and take care of their needs...(They) are an obligation put on us, a responsibility we have no rights to neglect, nor to violate by cruelty...." - JAMES HARIOT; "The greatness of a nation & its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated" - MAHATMA GANDHI. Sincerely, Despina M. Andrelus

04/15/2013

Despina M. Andrelus

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is an absolutely ridiculous idea that is completely unnecessary; because the new "green energy" technology is here! It is called water and it is so abundant. The nice thing about water as the new fuel is that it is so inexpensive; like you knowfree! And it cannot be sold to the highest bidder because it belongs to all of us citizens of these United States and it is not for sale. Go to H4GAS.com and check it out.

Sincerely, DeVaughn Slone

04/15/2013

Devaughn Slone

Apr 14, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Stand strong to protect the health of our citizens. You must be the trustee of our health and a true advocate for the environment. I am writing as a Certified Nurse-Midwife, interested in the health of mother and babies. Sincerely, Ms. Dian Sparling

04/15/2013

Dian Sparling

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. AS A HEALTHCARE PROVIDER, I CANNOT STRESS ENOUGH THE IMMINENT HEALTH RISKS THE XL PIPELINE POSES TO OUR CITIZENS. STOP THE PIPELINE BEFORE WE NEED TO DEAL WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH DAMAGE Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Dian Sparling

04/15/2013

Dian Sparling

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. You owe it to your constituents to deliver what you promised during the last presidential campaign. 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. Please, please stand firm in protecting the environment. Be a true champion of the earth! 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Diane Brown

04/15/2013

Diane Brown

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please reject this pipeline!!! I envision multiple spills over time along the line. These spills will pollute the ground and harm the environment as well as animals? It makes no sense to pump oil that far!!! Sincerely, Diane Hardy

04/15/2013

Diane Hardy

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Today is day 2 of the Keystone XL comment sprint! We're driving comments to the State Dept. focusing on the pipeline's impact on wildlife. KXL would grow the tar sands, which are already driving herds of caribou to extinction. Spills along the pipeline route would threaten the endangered whooping crane, and climate change would pose an even greater threat to all wildlife.

Sincerely, DIANE KASTEL

04/15/2013

Diane Kastel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President, i was one of your early supporters. psychically and financially, and I want to continue to, believe in you but you are beginning to disappoint me. On the Keystone XL Pipeline, you are starting to act like a Republican. i.e. "Damn the science. What do they know? Let's build the damn thing." This, on top of your recent budget proposals, has me deeply concerned that, in your second and last term, you will not leave the legacy we elected you to leave. Please reconsider your position on this. Let's put money into building a clean energy system, independent of others (especially our enemies) and let's invest in the future of our country, not those of our adversaries. Thank you. Sincerely, dick gary

04/15/2013

Dick Gary

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How can an across-the-middle-of-America pipeline even be contemplated when you can see in Arkansas how badly they are prepared to cope with spills? This is the equivalent of suicide, if not for the world, then certainly for this continent!!! How much abuse can our environment take? Frankly, thinking about the consequences is the only thing that makes me glad to be an old lady, as the future looks more and more bleak and scary for this world. Sincerely, Dolly Schertz

04/15/2013

Dolly Schertz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.. There is too much at risk for a short term profit for oil and gas and politicians who are pushing to pass this. The long term loss could be polluted land and water for our future. Without water, than what? Sincerely, Dolores Campbell

04/15/2013

Dolores Campbell

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. *I want my children to live in a world that is not only safe physically, but spiritually: one that puts human life above the temptation of greed and temporary wealth. My family and I don't want the pipeline!

Sincerely, Dominique Hunter

04/15/2013

Dominique Hunter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Who will benefit from this pipeline , Not Us , just the oil companies . The oil is to be shipped overseas , We just get the LEAKS . Sincerely, Don Mullinex

04/15/2013

Don Mullinex

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. EITHER OUR PRESIDENT WORKS FOR THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY ON A FRAGILE PLANET, OR HE IS A PUPPET OF THE ROGUE NETWORK OF ULTRA-RICH AND POWERFUL WHO WANT TO MILK EARTH DRY IN THEIR LIFETIMES AND HAVE NO REGARD FOR THEIR OWN CHILDREN AND ALL LIFE. THIS IS TREASON, FOR WHICH THE PUNISHMENT IS DEATH. FAIR ENOUGH, SINCE YOU ARE SENTENCING ALL OF US CITIZENS TO THE SAME FATE, ONLY MORE SLOWLY..... Sincerely, Don Richardson

04/15/2013

Don Richardson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please hold a larger vision for the health of our country and the health of the planet. Please don't be short sighted and give in to making decisions that can not be reversed. Please say no to the Keystone XL Pipeline. We voted for you each time with the hope that you would stand up to corporations. Just say NO.

Sincerely, Donald Grumbine

04/15/2013

Donald Grumbine

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President this pipeline that you have bravely held off on approval has still not proven to those of us in opposition to be necessary. Overwhelming evidence, masked by big oil money, will eventually destroy our infrastructure if approved. Don't allow your great environmental record thus far destroy your goal to save our planet and nation and your own historic greatness. Thank you. Sincerely, Donald Kadidlo

04/15/2013

Donald Kadidlo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. President : these sticky, corrosive oils are just too toxic to be pumped thru some of the most sensitive and important water retention lands in the Mid West. Additionally, the extraction of the oil from tar sands is too costly in process and to the environment in the forest lands of n. America. Please bite the bullet and do what is best for the future - Kill the Keystone Donald E. Smith, DVM

04/15/2013

Donald Smith

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I realize that the lobbying pressure and massive donations from O'L companies and the Saudis make the pipeline irresistible to some, it must be stopped for the good of all the people on earth who will be affected by climate change! Sincerely, Donald Wolochow

04/15/2013

Donald Wolochow

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department There is no excuse for approving this pipeline. The only reason to let it go forward is to further line the pockets of big oil at the expense of the country and the environment. While I might expect that from the Republican party, I had hoped your administration might be different. Prove that you are more than an empty suit and stand against this potential environmental disaster. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Donna Cassidy-Hanley

04/15/2013

Donna Cassidy-hanley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's only a matter of time before the next spill occurs, how many times does it need to happen before we see that it is not worth the risk! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Donna Hunt

04/15/2013

Donna Hunt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If we have learned anything from the spill in Arkansas, it's that pipelines are never 100% safe. We have the technology, we just don't spend the time and money needed for design and maintenance. Keystone would be providing the very dirtiest fuel. Do we really need that? This administration should be providing climate leadership. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Donna Tucker

04/15/2013

Donna Tucker

Dear Secretary Kerry, I urge you to oppose the Keystone XL pipeline. The obvious: People, organizations, and nations whose income currently depends on fossil fuels are arguably among the wealthiest and most influential in the world. They are understandably opposed to losing the current source of their tremendous wealth. They are heavily invested in promoting climate change denial and misinformation. We all know about the overt type of denial that says that we are not in a climate crisis, and this non-crisis is not caused by our use of fossil fuels. The not-so obvious: There are *two* distinct types of denial and misinformation regarding the climate crisis and fossil fuels. The less overt, more dangerous type of misinformation denies the fact that we CAN meet all our energy needs, maintain our national security, grow the economy and create jobs with exclusively clean, renewable (solar, wind, hydro - not nuclear) energy technology that exists TODAY. The more dangerous misinformation denies the fact that we do NOT need fossil fuels. This less overt denial is more dangerous because it can lead those in positions of power who KNOW that burning fossil fuels is extremely dangerous to make decisions based on incorrect information. Please do not accept as accurate any reports that deny this fact: The technology exists TODAY to transition our nation to wind and solar power, while meeting our national security needs, growing the economy, and creating jobs. We CAN transition all civilian energy sources to wind and solar within the next several years, while working on next-generation DOD vehicles and hardware which will run on clean, safe energy sources in the future. It CAN be done. We do NOT need fossil fuels (or nuclear energy sources). We DO need bold, effective leadership. The worst form of climate change denial and misinformation denies the fact that we can thrive WITHOUT fossil fuels. We do NOT need fossil fuels. We do NOT need Keystone XL. Keystone XL is a danger to national security and the health and safety of all Americans because Keystone XL is a significant contributor to our UNNECESSARY dependance on fossil fuels. By fueling (pun intended) our addiction to fossil fuels, Keystone XL is a danger to the Earth's atmosphere, the Earth's climate, and the health and safety of the citizens of the United States. Furthermore, the global climate crisis does not discriminate. People of all nations need the carbon level in the Earth's atmosphere to stay within a safe upper limit. The United States can lead the transition to solar and wind energy production, distribution, and use. We can be a model for other countries and help them make the transition to solar and wind power while growing our diplomatic friendships and strategic relationships. Granted this is a tremendous challenge that requires bold, effective leadership. I believe that you are the type of leader that could accomplish this challenge. I urge you to do everything in your power to oppose the Keystone XL pipeline. I urge you to implement a plan that will end the use of fossil fuels and help us transition to clean, renewable energy. Thank you. Dorianne Dantowitz

04/15/2013

Dorianne Rena Dantowitz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Once you destroy our environment you can never recover again. This pipeline is a terrible idea. It will only help big oil companies in Canada and not help Americans, will only create about 40 jobs and will destroy aqua systems that is the only water supply to millions of people. The pipeline carrying tar sands has proven over and over to be very damaging to the areas that it crosses. THEY BREAK and send millions of toxic tar over our neighborhoods!!!! Stop them before it happens and we all know it WILL happen....
Sincerely, Doris Buyarski

04/15/2013

Doris Buyarski

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You have had to deal with more controversy than any recent president and I am hoping you continue with dealing with the threat of climate change. This pipeline could be a devastating to the environment. How much more can we take. Please do not let the pipeline go through. Sincerely, Dorothy De Ocampo

04/15/2013

Dorothy De Ocampo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Also, the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics have stated that we need to build on our conservation successes, continue to improve energy efficiency, and develop renewable, non-polluting sources of energy. We've not really emphasized and subsidized that yet, compared to the degree with which we have subsidized the oil industry for decades. Let's not ruin vast quantities of water and land by such procedures as developing tar sands and building pipelines. That destruction can't really be un-done. Please do the right thing. Sincerely, Dorothy Wonder

04/15/2013

Dorothy Wonder

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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 ill-effects of tar sands. 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. I am counting on climate leadership from your administration, and this leadership requires the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you for all your hard work, and all the good you have done. Our environment is the area of the greatest importance, and deserving of the most protection - as all other issues pale without a healthy planet. Thank you for considering my comments. Sincerely, Dotty Caldwell

04/15/2013

Dotty Caldwell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you knew anything about constitutional law eminent domain you would know it was not designed to generate corporate profits. At least not until corporations took over the country. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Doug Landau

04/15/2013

Doug Landau

Apr 14, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I know this is a tough political decision, Mr. President, but I think it's one that you need to make for the sake of future generations on our planet. Sincerely, Douglas Howard

04/15/2013

Douglas Howard

Dear Sirs: I am sure that you have heard the pros and cons on the proposed Keystone pipeline. There is nothing I can add except a warning that approval will launch us further down the road to self destruction through climate change. The evidence is already apparent. As an environmental historian, I can think of no other decision in my life time that will have such far reaching consequences. Please think of the welfare of your grandchildren. Sincerely, Douglas Hillman Strong

04/15/2013

Douglas Strong

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The level of greed in corporate board rooms is more than adequate to do the work of America's enemies. I am sure they will greet Washington politicians with great joy when you all arrive in hell.

Sincerely, Douglas Thompson

04/15/2013

Douglas Thompson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Everything is wrong with this plan, from the gross scarification of pristine wilderness in Alberta just east of the Northern Rocky Mtnains, to pipelines thousands of miles long to reach a tax-free refinery and foreign shipping zone that primarily benefits rich oilmen, to the certainty of major oil spills in US States along the pipeline, to water and air pollution along the corridor and around all the facilities including the Texas refineries, and ultimately to accelerating already scary global warming. Please note that the consequences of global warming are not linear; they feed forward to accelerate additional catastrophic destabilization of the Earth's atmosphere and oceans. 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. 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. 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. I respectfully request climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Dr. Thomas Broker

04/15/2013

Dr. Thomas Broker

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I oppose the pipeline, not because it will inevitably leak, but because it represents a continuation of our short-sighted policies, while the landscape is laid waste so that we may maintain our consumptive lifestyle leaving little for future generations. The Alberta oil sands only postpone the inevitable end of oil; they are not an answer. I oppose the pipeline because of the tremendous lack of respect it implies for the Earth and all living things. Sincerely, Dwight Neuenschwander

04/15/2013

Dwight Neuenschwander

Mr.President, At what costs to the environment will the country go to, just to make oil cheaper?! A pipeline spanning from Canada to Texas would pose massive environmental risks. Look at Exxon and Shell their pipes have failed causing massive environmental disasters. And where is the media coverage on the issue? Oh that's right, the government is allowing Exxon to censor local media stations attempting to report on the issue. Maybe if big business didn't have their hands in the pockets of so many government officials, our government could be for the people again - sadly it's not, it's for the corporation. NO KXL PIPELINE! Sincerely a pissed off citizen.

04/15/2013

Dylan Ochala

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I find it difficult to understand how after so many pipeline failures that your administration is still considering permitting the Keystone XL Pipeline to move forward. Let's be honest it's all about money. You have nothing to lose by rejecting this pipeline. Let's draw a line in the sand to keep this potential environmental disaster from every happening by refusing to allow the Keystone XL Pipeline from moving forward. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, E.B. Mc Laughlin

04/15/2013

E.b. Mc Laughlin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. When Meghan Hammond imagines the Keystone XL pipeline, she can't help but think of the Kalamazoo River. "The oil is still not cleaned up," said Hammond, referring to the fallout of a July 2010 Enbridge pipeline rupture that spewed more than 20,000 barrels of Canadian tar sands crude oil into the Michigan waterway. "That's a good example of what could happen to York, Nebraska." The 25-year-old family farmer in Co unty got another potential preview on Friday, when an Exxon Mobil pipeline burst in Mayflower, Ark., releasing up to an estimated 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil and reportedly forcing the evacuation of some 40 families. Hammond told HuffPost in a subsequent email that the latest spill "affirms" her fears. "Pipelines leak," she said. "It's a matter of when." 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Edward Kavanaugh

04/15/2013

Edward Kavanaugh

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am reluctantly concluding that current technology is not adequate to control the risks from the tar sands pipeline, and that the benefits aren't worth it. The consequences of non-approval may also have been oversold, since the Canadians are reported to have admitted that a US rejection will slow the project -- rather than simply diverting output to other export markets. At a minimum, this thing needs to be delayed until the evidence of controllable risk is much more convincing. The XL pipeline should NOT be approved at this time. Sincerely, Edwin L Barber III

04/15/2013

Edwin L Barber III

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You know the right thing to do is to disapprove of the Keystone XL Pipeline. JUST DO IT AND LET'S GET ON WITH THE CLEAN ENERGY AGENDA! Sincerely, Edwin Swanson

04/15/2013

Edwin Swanson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I am 70 years old. I gave up time and money, working 7 days a week at Organize for America on your election campaign. My husband and I did not run up credit card debit buying gas to get to OFA headquarters to have Keystone built. This pipeline MUST be stopped. Fracking is wrong, THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE IS WRONG. Sincerely, Edwina Beard

04/15/2013

Edwina Beard

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Oil spills are destroying the environment by polluting land and water. Arable land and clean drinkable water are far more important than dirty oil that will be shipped overseas. Evil greed is destroying this country and the oil pipelines are one of the worst examples of it. You can't drink oil and you can't eat it. There is already too much hunger and too much water pollution. The pipeline will increase the suffering of both man and animal when it leaks just like the other pipelines have. Stop Keystone XL and shut down the other pipelines. Oil can be shipped via train in double walled rail cars. Millions of barrels have already been shipped via train. It is safer and provides permanent jobs. It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration'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 it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years in Michigan, Utah, and Minnesota, etc. it's clear this pipeline will never be safe. Sincerely, Elaine Kelly

04/15/2013

Elaine Kelly

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It was so many decades ago that I attended the College of Environmental Design in , Colorado, and it really seems that the lack of progress we have made in getting away from dirty, big Oil is very, very sad. We could have had so much; jobs, safe and healthy ways of living, and new paradigms. But we just get the same old filthy, dangerous way of doing things. It seems so antiquated, and backwards. Please see the documentary, "Greedy Lying, Bastards, dear President. We can change, but we need strong, courageous leadership on your part. I know you can do it! Lead the way, President Obama, I worked hard to get you elected! Sincerely, Elise Casby

04/15/2013

Elise Casby

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The oil companies have demonstrated over and over again that they do not have technology to prevent spills and then haven't demonstrated the know how or the resources to react quickly enough to avoid irreparable damage. Yet they post excessive profits year after year. Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Brocious

04/15/2013

Elizabeth A. Brocious

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I speak for the children that do not yet have a voice to vote or express themselves to be heard. I speak for the future of our environment and the health of all. I implore you to not allow Keystone XL to go through. Sincerely, Elizabeth Draper

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Draper

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, The real problem with the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is that there WILL be spills. Human beings cannot built things that don't break. Cf: the recent spill of tar sands oil in Arkansas. Please 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. Thank you. Sincerely, Ms. Elizabeth Gilchrist

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Gilchrist

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. I am deeply concerned about climate change and the future for our our children and grandchildren. It is our responsibility to offer them a future in which they will have access to clean air, clean water and good food. If we continue to ignore climate change and give money and support to oil companies and horribly damaging projects like the Keystone XL, we are putting the planet and its inhabitants in grave danger. The time to turn things around is now. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Elizabeth Pressman-Cooper

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Pressman-cooper

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE YOUR ADMINISTRATION WILL ENCOUNTER. YOU ARE A FATHER...I AM A GRANDMOTHER. WE OWE IT TO OUR CHILDREN AND OUR GRANDCHILDREN TO KEEP THIS ENVIRONMENTALLY DISASTROUS PROJECT FROM GOING FORWARD. Sincerely, Elizabeth Shirah

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Shirah

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The Arkansas spill tells what is in store for us by approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. we have only started progress on clean energy, PLEASE KEEP WORKING TO SAVE OUR PLANET !!!! Future generations are counting on US !! Sincerely, Elizabeth Stevens

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Stevens

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Elizabeth Williams United States of America ____ This message was submitted via Avaaz at http://www.avaaz.org/en/no_tar_sands_valdez/?reply. To respond, please e-mail reply+nokxl@Avaaz.org

04/15/2013

Elizabeth Williams

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. This is why. In order to fight climate change we need to stop investing in the most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Ellen Emmerich

04/15/2013

Ellen Emmerich

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Our use of fossil fuels is killing us and everything else. We do not have any real safeguards against the damage we are seeing now in Arkansas, and in numerous other locales. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ellen Goldin

04/15/2013

Ellen Goldin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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 will be erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. (The focus must be on the environment. That said, and believed, I need to add that the public hearing held in , TX on this issue in prior years was the most blatant sham of a hearing I have ever seen, and I worked in government for more than 30 years as well as having attended a few public hearings in Texas's state government. I think there is some corruption in the State Department on Tar Sands. That is relevant too, to what some people are saying...which is that the President is listening to poor advice on Tar Sands.) Sincerely, Ellen Hansen

04/15/2013

Ellen Hansen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department "We are like tenant farmers chopping down the fence around our house for fuel when we should be using Nature's inexhaustible sources of energy -- sun, wind and tide. ... I'd put my money on the sun and solar energy. What a source of power! I hope we don't have to wait until oil and coal run out before we tackle that." -Thomas Edison, inventor (1847-1931) 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ellen Witherite

04/15/2013

Ellen Witherite

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How many spills will it take 'til they say that too many lands have been ruined? How many times must the white dove fall with dark hydrocarbons in her lungs? The answer, my friends, is pollution all around, the answer is flailing in D.C. Sincerely, Eloise Linger

04/15/2013

Eloise Linger

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department For your children and children's children, I implore you to please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Elsie Uffelmann

04/15/2013

Elsie Uffelmann

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please put our tax money, time and effort into exploring new and sustainable renewable energy resources. Sincerely, Elysabeth Williamson

04/15/2013

Elysabeth Williamson

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is obvious that fossil fuel needs to take a rest, slow down, calm down. Black gold will be probably needed but not now. We need to start reducing pumping carbon into the air now. We all need to take a breather. If you want to build the pipeline fine. However lets talk expensive. Lets talk money. Money talks. If someone wants pipeline built on their property well charge a hoot and a holler. If the hole that it comes of well charge for that. Tax the dag nab out of it. Money talks and perhaps some of that money can be plowed back into efficiency and renewables until we find. that neverending source of energy. This is the discouraging word. Tax the heck out of the bonanza 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Emi Kaneshiro

04/15/2013

Emi Kaneshiro

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We count on our elected leaders to make wise, informed, and thoughtful decisions; please keep in mind our shared futures and our mutual investment in a clean, sustainable environment, President Obama. Do not pass the price of appeasing the oil industry onto the next generation. Sincerely, Emily Whitman

04/15/2013

Emily Whitman

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. JOHN, YOU GOT MY LETTER & COPIES OF MY LETTERS TO THE WHITE HOUSE, Correct? I'll call the public communication # (202) 647-6575 and be sure and check in with them about it by week's end. THANKS! Sincerely, Mr. Eric Stowe

04/15/2013

Eric Stowe

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you don't reject this pipeline, we might as well call it the Obama-line. It is the worst possible step to take at this time and will ensure the U.S.'s culpability in making the planet unfit for human life in the future. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Erica Johnsen

04/15/2013

Erica Johnsen

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Say no to the Keystone XL pipeline. Stand up for the citizens of the United States who deserve to have a safe drinking water supply. Stand up for the environment in what may be the only thing this administration does to combat climate change. No reward, all risk. We demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Erin Buhl

04/15/2013

Erin Buhl

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The American people do not want this pipeline. More importantly, the animals, plants, and water systems cannot support it. Our environment is what enables us to survive: it is our heart, our lungs, and our breath. The environment is not just some frontier to be conquered for short-term profit. Do we have a need for independent energy? Yes, but we have an existential crisis of health and wellness in this country. We cannot allow people and animals to be poisoned by their food and water supply to provide a small economic stimulus. Support Jill Stein's Green New Deal, and make infrastructure building a green energy system our #1 jobs-creation priority. This nation's energy policies are driving us 200 MPH toward a brick wall, when we need to get off and walk away in the opposite direction. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Sincerely, Erin Dodge

04/15/2013

Erin Dodge

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This is not the legacy you want for your presidency. This doesn't bring clean energy to our citizens; it doesn't help the planet to reverse global warming if processed and used elsewhere; the inevitable spills and toxic pollution to our potable water and arable soils in its path are irreversible, and your name will be on all those atrocities to our planet and its occupants. Sincerely, Erna Luering

04/15/2013

Erna Luering

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How many spills will it take for us to realize that the XL Pipeline is NOT safe? How many acres of land must be ruined before we admit that we're making a big mistake and we must stop before it's too late? Sincerely,
Esther Breslau

04/15/2013

Esther Breslau

I am opposed to this pipeline for the very reason what it is doing to our earth and the lack of responsibility for the damage done.

04/15/2013

Esther.mauricio

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Great speeches followed by broken promises can do more damage than a broken pipeline, just look at what happened at the last midterm elections.
Sincerely, Eugene Brady

04/15/2013

Eugene Brady

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I've been sending comment and after comment asking you, President Obama, to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. You know that the pipeline can only be destructive - and that nothing good will come out of it in the end. If there is any positive at all, it will only be temporary. Long term affects of environmental destruction and global warming will be the legacy of this project and your Presidency. We are better than this. What kind of future do you see for the children of this country - and that includes your children? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Eva Brunner

04/15/2013

Eva Brunner

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, INSIDE THE D.C. BELTWAY NO ONE KNOWS/CARES ABOUT THE HORRIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTERS THAT AWAIT OUR LAND AND WATER FROM XL. THIS XL PIPELINE IS BP ON STEROIDS. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO CLEAN UP. BENZENE CAUSES CANCER. OUR MEDICAL CARE SYSTEM WILL BANKRUPT DEALING WITH THE CANCERS THAT WILL COME FROM THESE SPILLS ON LAND WHERE THEY CAN'T BE HIDDEN FROM SIGHT. ONLY BIG OIL REALLY WANTS THIS. NONE OF THE OIL FROM XL WILL BENEFIT THE CITIZENS HERE. IT IS FOR INTERNATIONAL MARKETS. WE ARE JUST THE PATSY FOR CANADA. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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.

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. Sincerely, Eva Gate

04/15/2013

Eva Gate

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Listen, You can do the right thing because you are not up for re-election. The right thing is to follow the wisdom of the elders, the Native Americans who plan for the future 7 generations and not the 7 largest corporations. It's time to wean ourselves off of oil and onto sustainable fuels which fuel sustainable growth...while we still can. Just Say NO to Keystone! Sincerely, Eva Kronen

04/15/2013

Eva Kronen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The Keystone XL is a bad idea: bad for the climate of our planet; bad for the 1,179 miles of land it would cross. Please, don't let it happen. Sincerely, Evan Hill

04/15/2013

Evan Hill

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Every day we learn more about the fragility of the environment. NOTHING is as important as protecting the environment for present and future generations. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Every day we learn that oil companies are not to be trusted with something so precious. Sincerely, Eve Kavanagh

04/15/2013

Eve Kavanagh

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I have 3 young grandsons and you have two lovely daughters. The natural world we leave for them is vitally important. We need to put preservation of what is left of our environment ahead of monetary considerations, for their sake even more than our own. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Evelyn Melancon

04/15/2013

Evelyn Melancon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. You can help to keep Canada from destroying the last boreal forest on the planet. Your move to increase energy efficiency in motorized vehicles is laudable. Please continue to support renewable resources so that one day our country can become carbon neutral, consuming no more carbon for energy than we create. I am willing to decrease my carbon footprint by 50%. Feel free to ask all American citizens to do the same. Sincerely, Floyd Elterman

04/15/2013

Floyd Elterman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration'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 it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. As a Floridian, I have very urgent concerns about climate change and catastrophic storms, but I also feel very strongly that TransCanada has no right to threaten the critical aquifers the pipeline would cross in other states. Nothing about Keystone XL is in the best interests of our country. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Frances Dunham

04/15/2013

Frances Dunham

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I grew up in a Virginia coastal community. Ships would often illegally dump their oil before coming into port. Oil spills are terrible. They are dirty and unhealthy. They kill wildlife and expose all life to toxic chemicals. The oil stays around on the land seemingly forever. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Frances Mckay

04/15/2013

Frances Mckay

April 15, 2013 KeystoneComments Dear KeystoneComments, As a person of faith, I am writing to ask that the U.S. State Department reject the Keystone XL pipeline permit. 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. The SEIS' conclusion that the Keystone XL will have no impact on climate — because there will be continued demand for oil with or without it — is a dubious argument. The SEIS does not consider the fact that tar sands oil is three times as carbon intensive, and the pipeline would hasten its extraction. 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. 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. In his inaugural address, President Obama said, "We will respond to the threat of climate change, knowing that the failure to do so would betray our children and future generations." It is becoming more and more obvious why we must Move On Way Beyond fossil fuels and this will be a perfect example how this is easily attainable. Big Gas has now given us two tragic outcomes around last holiday season an Elementary School Carbon Monoxide Leak sending scores to the hospital and quoting Atlanta FD, "The worst CO poisoning in Atlanta's known history!" Another couple just south of Indianapolis blew up their neighbor's house and half of the block to boot. Big Oil is not to be outdone as just yesterday Exxon was ordered to pay \$236 Million in damages for what they did to the ground water in New Hampshire. Exxon also brought us the pipeline rupture in Arkansas last week that is flooding a subdivision with about 5,000 barrels of Crude. Now they are trying to enforce a no fly zone over the site so they can cover and conceal as much as possible. Funny a year ago I watched a Keystone XL spokes man say how there would never be any leaks, I wonder if he had his fingers crossed. 3 weeks ago the Fukushima Nuclear Plant nearly had yet another meltdown when for several days properly exchanging the cooling water became impossible, the suspected culprit A Rat!, Closer to home last weekend Georgia Power managed to blow up a portion of their Coal Power Plant near Cartersville. And these are the same folks who are spending \$14 Billion of our dollars to build more Nuclear Reactors. Hey folks I am all about Nuclear Power...when it is 89,000,000 Miles away and given to us by the Good Lord during His Creation. The Sun provides more energy than we could ever use, we must just harness it. After all how many Solar Panels or Wind Turbines blow up, explode, or risk contaminating half the State with gamma rays of radiation. President Obama and Secretary Kerry, on behalf of a safe environment for future generations and God's Earth, please reject the Keystone XL permit, and instead help us pursue a clean, sustainable energy future. Sincerely, Franchesca Lane

04/15/2013

Franchesca Lane

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. KXL is wrong. The U.S. has a glut of oil. Natural gas is going to replace oil and coal and push our economy forward. We so need to move away from oil and coal not to more. Sincerely, Frank Mora

04/15/2013

Frank Mora

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please consider what the future will hold for your children if we do not take serious action now on carbon emissions. The Keystone pipeline endangers our aquifers and environment with no real benefit to the vast majority of Americans. And those are the people who, like me, elected you. Sincerely, Fred Holden

04/15/2013

Fred Holden

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Dear President Obama , dirty oil does not help reduce pollution as you know so the decision is easy don't give in to the Keystone XL Pipeline, I supported you both elections from the beginning and you have made many good wise decisions in the past now please do so on the Keystone XL Pipeline . Sincerely Mr Fred Zimmerer Wi S sincerely, Frederick Zimmerer

04/15/2013

Frederick Zimmerer

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. You can stop this, and should given your pledge to do everything we can to stop climate change. I expect you to do the right thing for the health of our planet. Sincerely, Frodo Okulam

04/15/2013

Frodo Okulam

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 industry is 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 the government allows a tar sands pipeline nearly 10 times the size of the Pegasus line to bisect the country and run through one of the most important aquifers. It is foolish to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration's advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress will be erased if the tar sands are developed. I 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. Sincerely, Gabriel Gardner

04/15/2013

Gabriel Gardner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Isn't what's happening in Mayflower, Arkansas enough for you to get the message? Put people before oil companies! You promised, once again, while running for re-election to be a strong advocate for climate change. Is this another lie? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Gail Bell

04/15/2013

Gail Bell

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. DEAREST PRESIDENT OBAMA -FIRST LET ME SAY I LOVE YOU AND BELIEVE IN YOU. I WOULD LIKE TO SAY THANK YOU FOR STOPPING THIS KEYSTONE DISASTER, THANK YOU FOR MAKING THE ONLY REASONABLE SENSIBLE CHOICE AND BEING MAN ENOUGH TO STAND YOUR GROUND FOR ALL OF US!! I WOULD VOTE FOR YOU AGAIN TODAY IF I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO!!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Gail Calhoun

04/15/2013

Gail Calhoun

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mrs. Gail Heath

04/15/2013

Gail Heath

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. But even if it could be made the safest, that's not the point. The point is, 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. Even if the pipeline were to give several thousand American workers lifetime jobs (assuming this is a realistic possibility), how can anyone want to weigh or to even consider this short term benefit against the long term damage to the millions of Americans and their children, Mr. President, who have to live in what is euphemistically called "a less hospitable environment"? 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. We urge you to make what could be the key decision of your presidency, the right one.

Sincerely, Garrett Quinlivan

04/15/2013

Garrett Quinlivan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration's advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been welcomed by your green supporters, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if you approve the Keystone XL Pipeline to allow expansion of the environmentally ruinous tar sands exploitation. 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. The fact is Canadian heavy oil producers see America as a soft touch: they know they will face enormous opposition from Canadians if they try to build pipelines over the Rockies to the Pacific coast so they can market their crude oil internationally. More bitumen has very little to do with American energy independence. Midwest refineries are already gutted with the stuff. After the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear that the Keystone XL pipeline will never be safe. It is simply an oil spill waiting to happen. There are other ways to transport dilbit south without another high capacity pipeline crossing neighborhoods like Mayflower, AK. You promised action on global warming, now is the time to step up. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Gary Lane

04/15/2013

Gary Lane

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department NOT " IF " , BUT "WHEN..." Canada has prioritized its self preservation, let the US own the inevitable catastrophe. Corporate Personhood feels no pain. And the American public is media narcotized. . Future generations, Planetwide, might be inconvenienced by progressively radical climate instability -- but tireless, responsible Corporate Persons will "figure something out." So why not ? Sincerely, Gary Robert

04/15/2013

Gary Robert

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The longer we continue to feed energy demands with other than sustainable or renewable energy, and as the demand grows more and more as population increases, the sooner we destroy our environment and we will run out of oil and gas. There is nowhere to go once that happens. Sincerely, Gayle Burns

04/15/2013

Gayle Burns

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department A DECISION IN FAVOR OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE WOULD EXPOSE THE IGNORANCE - STUPIDITY - AND LACK OF FORESIGHT OF THE MANY POLITICIANS INVOLVED. IF THIS PIPELINE GETS THE OK FROM OUR PRESIDENT - YOU WILL HAVE THE REASON WHY PEOPLE HAVE COMPLETELY LOST RESPECT FOR THE LEADERS OF OUR COUNTRY - - - 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Gene Sengstake

04/15/2013

Gene Sengstake

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Seventeen hundred miles of pipeline of tarsands crude, what could possibly go wrong? Sincerely, Gene Tinelli

04/15/2013

Gene Tinelli

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I hope you will think very seriously about all the potential dangers this high carbon energy source poses for the planet. Once built, this pipeline can't be unbuilt; it will only deteriorate. The jobs it would create would only be temporary. There isn't a good reason for it; it would benefit only Exxon and Exxon shows record profits quarter after quarter on the backs of all the rest of us. I hope you are not in their pocket. We progressives expect more from you. Thank you. Sincerely, Geneva Andrews

04/15/2013

Geneva Andrews

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Genevieve Fujimoto

04/15/2013

Genevieve Fujimoto

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Do the Right Thing. The pipeline will add great harm environmentally to the environment, to humans and all that is living and organic. Profits do not make up for degradation and loss of life. Thank you. Sincerely, Genevieve Yuen

04/15/2013

Genevieve Yuen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It is all done by humans and they always make mistakes, mistakes that we can not afford. We need to be getting off oil not making it easier to pollute and damage the planet. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Geoffrey Wheeler-Bartol

04/15/2013

Geoffrey Wheeler-bartol

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. In addition to the above reviews, I strongly recommend a thorough comparison with rail transport, which seems to offer a safer method of moving the tar sands. Sincerely, George Nelson

04/15/2013

George Nelson

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Why add more damage to our environment? We have 5 wonderful grandchildren aged 10-2mo. whose health we hope to protect, by keeping our entire global environment cleaner. More potential spills from an inefficient method of extracting oil, for profit of only a few? At what COST to the citizens, the future wage earners of our country? PLEASE, halt this nonsense, and work for CLEAN energy. Sincerely, George Pantely

04/15/2013

George Pantely

U.S. Department of State, I am writing to voice my opposition to the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. I have a few fundamental issues with this pipeline: None of the energy transported by this pipeline will be utilized by the United States. The oil will be refined in the U.S. and then shipped to China. Now how does this help our energy problem? The historical problems with oil and gas delivery pipelines (ruptures, breakages, spills etc.) have increasingly common now. Here in Utah we have had to deal with several pipeline ruptures in the last couple of years. One rupture, that just recently occurred, threatens a major fishery, one that provides huge economic benefit to the citizens of Utah. There have been numerous spills with many pipelines throughout the U.S.. I cannot see how our safety and the safety of our wildlife and wildlands can be traded for a short term job producing pipeline transporting oil that goes to China. If Canada wants to get the oil to China so bad, let them run the pipeline across their country! As an avid outdoorsman, angler, and hunter I say - No, No, No on the Keystone XL pipeline!! Sincerely, George Sommer

04/15/2013

George Sommer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Invest in clean, sustainable energy. The Keystone, and all like it, are just recipes for disasters that will forever negatively affect our earth and the lives that live on it. Clean Energy does no damage ever. Be BOLD!!!!!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Georgia Franklin

04/15/2013

Georgia Franklin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You are the hope of all who love our wild life and wild places, as well as our environment. You are now protected from precautions about 'the next term'. You can act according to your heart to fight climate change, to protect our environment for your daughters and for coming generations. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Gerald Gabel

04/15/2013

Gerald Gabel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Time has run out for discussion on climate change. Stopping the pipeline is an action that could slow the effects of climate change. It is important that we act quickly and take bold action that will benefit the Earth's future. Sincerely, Gerald Neff

04/15/2013

Gerald Neff

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My husband and I supported you and voted for you because we believed you shared our values. I do hope you will stand with those of us who are opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline. We believe the evidence shows that the Pipeline will create conditions that will make it impossible to fight climate change effectively. We hope we can count on your administration to play a firm leadership role in creating clean, sustainable energy for now and for our future. Thanks you. Gerriiana Koeniger

04/15/2013

Gerriiana Koeniger

I am totally against this ghastly pipeline being put in anywhere in the USA. It is a horrible and dangerous pipeline. I wish it was not even being considered at all. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). That is an unacceptable situation. Of course the public NEEDS and WANTS to make comments! Come on! Plus, the pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. That to me is way too risky to even think of. Please, I implore you all, dont let the XL Keystone pipeline be built, in Nebraska or Texas or ANYWHERE else! Thank you. Ginger Bradley

04/15/2013

Ginger Canyon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I listened to the Diane Rehm show last week and learned about how inefficient tar sands is as a source of energy. I also visited Germany last year and learned about how much progress they have made using solar energy. One week, the were able to generate more than 50% of their energy used with solar. If only the US could be leading this change. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't let us down President Obama. Keep your word. Sincerely, Ginna Browning

04/15/2013

Ginna Browning

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I read a quote from Ansel Adams saying: "It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the enviromenr". You may be stressed but our voice as people counts. Reject this pipeline because there would be no turning back. Sincerely, Giovanna Paz

04/15/2013

Giovanna Paz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This country is too beautiful to have pools of oil in our subdivisions and backyards where our kids play. Please do not allow the Keystone Pipeline go forward. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Glenda Ehrle

04/15/2013

Glenda Ehrle

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Additionally, are there guarantees that the tar sands sludge once processed will be producing gas and oils actually for use in the United States? Or are we just underwriting and taking huge risks with our wildlife, natural resources, essential water supplies not to mention risk to human life for more profits for the oil companies so they can sell their product to other countries? If they end products are not exclusively sold in the US and Canada, then let them build a refineries in Canada at the production sites. There has to be a tremendous amount energy consumed in the refining of this sludge to produce a usable product. What about the waste by-products? Are they going to dump them in the Gulf of Mexico? Stop caving in to these bastards! It is more than time to put serious efforts into renewable, far less dangerous, far less pollution producing alternatives. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Glenn Beller

04/15/2013

Glenn Beller

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Water supply, both quality and quantity, is put at risk with Keystone XL. Once compromised, the water will not be clean again or at least not for a very long time. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Gloria Shay

04/15/2013

Gloria Shay

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. President, . Why not have that shit spill all over in Nebraska, Kansas or north Texas ranch land! I maintain that it will cost plenty whether the material is shipped long distance or done at a refinery built closer to the source. The less miles traveled, the better. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Gordon Heavern

04/15/2013

Gordon Heavern

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. With Algae Systems predicting success in making already carbon-negative algal bio-diesel cost-competitive with petroleum in only three more years (2016), a pipeline for oil is likely to be well on its way to becoming obsolete by the time it is completed. If we need anything piped into the Great Plains states, it is water for irrigation--not for crude oil and really bottom of the barrel crude oil at that. Sincerely, Grace Adams

04/15/2013

Grace Adams

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. This project is wrong in more ways than I can enumerate. Where to start? First, it has nothing at all to do with US domestic energy security. This pipeline would support Canada to selling oil overseas. There is no energy resource advantage whatsoever to the US, or, for that matter, to North America. Second, tar sands oil is harder to pipe, not easier. The request to use thinner steel in the construction of this pipeline is a pretty good indicator of where this project's priorities lie. It is conceived by and for interests that will happily take (or, let us take for them) any risk or embrace any poor design to make a buck. Third, why does Canada feel the need to apply political pressure in support of the pipeline. That can't be because it's mutually beneficial, since in that case the US would be motivated to accept without pressure. It can't be because the energy development involved is actually necessary, since in that case, it would certainly be economical for Canada to create refineries of its own. It's pretty clearly because there is an opportunity to externalize some costs. They get to sell their oil. We get to accept the risk of spills and the environmental cost of refinement. Are we (the general population of the United States, or the -- representative -- government of same) not done accepting these cost on behalf of the oil industry? If not, why not? How many more billion dollar disasters will it take? I didn't even get basic decency (in the form of caring stewardship of our environment), prudence (in the form of not racing to expend a last-ditch resource before it is desperately needed), or natural beauty into the top three. In my opinion, anyone even seriously considering permitting this project is either a fool, or is one of the small minority of people profiting from this cost externalization. I certainly wouldn't elect either sort of person to a public office.

Sincerely, Graham Cummins

04/15/2013

Graham Cummins

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This means a huge deal to everyone involved in environmental rights/justice. We've been building this movement that can only result in a more active, intelligent, and healthy citizenry and humanity. Obama we are counting on you to do the right thing- you have roots in activism. You understand what we have been fighting for. This moment is historic. We look towards hearing you forgo any extensions and side-measures and give the fossil fuel industry a straightforward NO! Thank you Sincerely, Grant Collier

04/15/2013

Grant Collier

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President, I urge you to leave a legacy of environmental leadership your daughters will be proud of. Do the right thing here and reject this outrageous 'disaster in waiting'. Sincerely, Greg Mitchell

04/15/2013

Greg Mitchell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I just watched the Keystone congressional discussion on CSpan. This is what the Canadian oil executives told our representatives while trying to convince us to ruin our country: The reason Canada won't build its own pipeline is because of resistance from the intelligent folks from British Columbia who don't want to ruin their province. Have we become Canada's dupes? This ridiculous pipeline must be stopped. All is forgotten and forgiven oil companies despite the Gulf of Mexico and so many other areas destroyed by this filthy energy source. Let's build an infrastructure to accommodate a clean energy resource. Greg Nayman 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Greg Nayman

04/15/2013

Greg Nayman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The Keystone XL Pipeline is an alluring temptation at a time that we, as a nation, need the jobs it would bring, and would benefit from the energy independence it might help foster. Your political adversaries will no doubt continue to hammer you if you take the courageous step of rejecting this pipeline, and of trying to explain to the nation why it needs to be rejected. Please exercise that political courage, Mr. President. We cannot effectively fight climate change caused by excessive carbon dioxide emissions if you allow the pipeline to be built, which will lead to the construction of a refinery for Canadian tar sands in Louisiana, unleashing one of the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuel refining processes on the planet. The momentum that the environmental movement is experiencing in Canada gives us all some hope that if Keystone XL is stopped, we may also be able to stop the refining of tar sands altogether, and not just force a relocation of the refinery. Even assuming that we could somehow clean up the refining process, the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas, and hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, make it fairly clear that the tar sands pipeline technology is not where it needs to be. For our children's sake, we need to protect the health of Mother Earth. We need to work to develop sources of domestic energy that are less harmful to our planet, like solar and wind and geothermal energy. Someone needs to explain to the American people that new technologies are always developed in fits and starts, with failures as well as successes. And we need to learn from the experience of the Germans and others, and develop renewable energy sources intelligently, giving our opponents fewer failures to criticize. You said, in your first inaugural address, that we would invest in research that will help us use nuclear energy safely, and dispose of nuclear wastes safely, and that we would develop "clean coal" technologies. These are worth endeavors, as well. Mankind has, throughout history, favored short term economic gain over the health of the planet, and if we shrug our shoulders now and join that tradition by allowing the Keystone XL pipeline to be built, knowing that it is an environmental disaster in the making, the judgment of history and a just God will weigh heavily upon us. If we exercise courage, doing what must be done to keep our air and water clean and pure for our children and grandchildren, making the short-term economic sacrifices involved in doing so, we will earn their gratitude, and will honor our Creator, the Creator of this marvelous planet we all call home, who once looked upon it, and called it good. Sincerely, Gregory Hill

04/15/2013

Gregory Hill

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It is paramount that the presidential actions reflect the presidential speeches. When action does not follow words, a leader is not trusted anymore. I have trusted you twice with my vote, believing during your two terms you would stick with the values and principles you advertised for in your books and speeches. Climate change is the greatest threat of our time. I am 34 years old and I am really worried about the country and planet our kids will inherit from us. The choices we make now will affect our kids and their kids. Your administration's advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been important to show your actions agree with your speeches, but that progress will be erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands, the dirtiest oil in the world. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Gustavo Pinheiro

04/15/2013

Gustavo Pinheiro

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The spill in Arkansas is just an example of the problem that the Keystone XL could cause. I don't want to live in gallons of spilled oil in my street and house. Sincerely, H E Davis

04/15/2013

H E Davis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Someone has to start walking the walk. You said you would. OK, prove it. Now's your chance to do the right thing. The myth that the US will get the oil, or needs it (we're exporting gasoline. Oil company greedy dumbshits know no morality) is just that. It won't create any sustainable jobs. Your turn to stand up to the loud, the greedy, the intransigent. Please do so. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, H McFadden

04/15/2013

H Mcfadden

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Time and time again, these large companies who should be enforcing the safety, sustainability and integrity of their construction and mechanisms DO NOT HOLD UP their end of the bargain. How many spills and leaks and disasters does it take to learn our lesson and withdraw our trust? We must not give them yet another opportunity to wreak havoc on our environment and safety. Sincerely, Hannah Ingram

04/15/2013

Hannah Ingram

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As an engineer who works in an industry where we need to get everything right, all the time, well I get to see human fallibility in action regularly. I don't want fallible humans building this pipeline. And I don't want investment in infrastructure supporting extraction of oil from tar sands. What a step backwards. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Hannah Lazarus

04/15/2013

Hannah Lazarus

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. To continue with this pipeline is equivalent to poisoning our wells, something an enemy would do. For the government to support this pipeline is equivalent to the government being a government of the corporations, by the corporations and for the corporations, and an enemy of the populace. Please reject this pipeline, for the sake of the nation and the world. Reject Canada's pressures, and reject the corporate scam on which this pipeline is based. Sincerely, Hans Von Briesen

04/15/2013

Hans Von Briesen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The FULL story of all the processes required to extract this very dirty oil from the shale or tar sands should be told and understood by the public so they will understand the environmental risks involved; the chemicals, the water amounts, and the risks to the aquifers as it transported in the pipelines. Sincerely, Harlan Petersen

04/15/2013

Harlan Petersen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Why take a chance on this pipeline -- just to please the big oil industry? Tar sands oil is too expensive, too polluting & too environmental risky! Sincerely, Harold Hutton

04/15/2013

Harold Hutton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you pass on KXL, you'll be condemning the United States to be the evil country it has the potential to be, the one that the rest of the planet is weary it is. Historians looking back on this period of human existence could very well look at Keystone as the moment at which the greatest country on the planet solidified its stance on global environmental destruction. Not only will I, personally, be disappointed in you and in our country, for its lack of courage and intelligence on this matter, and, moreover, on the issue of climate change, but your decision could cement mine, and many other's, opinion of you for the rest of our lives. When faced with the decision to stop finding more fossil fuels, and start initiating the transition, you'd have come up short. America has all the potential to lead the world out of this climate crisis. If a country has that ability, it's this one and if a man had that ability, it's you, not Bill Mckibben or Al Gore. Please, president Obama, help this country put itself on the international map as the just leader of the free world again. Be the president we all hoped you'd be. Sincerely, Harrison Beck

04/15/2013

Harrison Beck

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The risks of this type of pipeline is too great--the penalties of things going wrong falls on the innocent, not on the owners. The cost of failures must be shifted clearly on the owners, which is the only way plans of this type will be stopped or slowed. Harry and Teresa Wernecke Sincerely, Harry And Teresa Wernecke

04/15/2013

Harry And Teresa Wernecke

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, Are you really for slowing climate change? Are you really for the needs of people over the needs of a few corporations? Are you really for the capacity of this planet to support life in the near and distant future as well as now, in local areas vulnerable to a tar-sands pipeline break? If you are, you will not let the XL pipeline be built. My children and I hope that you are. Sincerely, Harry Mishkin Sincerely, Harry Mishkin

04/15/2013

Harry Mishkin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. if you really mean it when you say you want to do what is best for the entire country, then for pete's sake reject the Keystone XL. Look at what happened in Arkansas and multiply that by hundreds even thousands and you will come up with what's going to happen across our beautiful land if this horrific sludge is allowed to be shipped across our land, that doesn't even count all the other dangers to our quickly dwindling water supply. You have already given in to these right wingnuts too many times, and what has it gotten you? NOTHING! Take a page from Harry Truman and get the guts to say, "the buck stops here and if you don't like it, then fire me." Stand up to these people, the majority of Americans voted you in for this second term, counting on you holding your own and ours against these radical imbeciles who if you let them win, will sooner or later destroy our entire country. Sincerely, Hassie Gaugau

04/15/2013

Hassie Gaugau

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need to invest in clean, renewable energy! I have MS and I believe it's because I am sensitive to the many pollutants in our environment. Our planet is dying, and I'm tired of politicians taking the side of profit and big business. Please stop this pipeline and take measures to protect this planet--for all of our children and grandchildren! Sincerely, Heather Manthey

04/15/2013

Heather Manthey

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. This greed and stupidity seems to go hand in hand with big oil. Please make protecting our environment more of a priority! Still upset over the Monsanto Protection Act getting though, too. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Heather Myer

04/15/2013

Heather Myer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please, please - more tar sands drilling and distribution pipelines are just hundreds more spills and breaks. There are better ways and products. Learn from the past, look at the damage already done, and don't add to the destruction that has already taken place!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Heidrun Friedrich

04/15/2013

Heidrun Friedrich

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I cannot understand why you could possibly consider giving your approval to the pipeline. People seem to think that it would ease America's need for oil but you must know that the oil wouldn't stay in America. It would probably end up in China. And in exchange for a few temporary jobs we risk extremely dangerous pollution, perhaps to the aquifer. Look at the leak that just happened! Sincerely, Helen Giambrauni

04/15/2013

Helen Giambrauni

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department (1) Use of oil from the Alberta tar sands will significantly increase global warming. (2) There will be devastating oil spills. (3) Large portions of the taiga of Alberta are being destroyed, including significant wildlife habitat. Sincerely, Helen McGinnis

04/15/2013

Helen McGinnis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We are not moving fast enough and hard enough to deal with global warming that is already upon us. Dirty tar sands are the worst possible energy source and likely to speed up the advance of global warming. SO WHY ARE WE PERMITTING, AND PROMOTING, THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAR SANDS, ESPECIALLY NOW THAT WE HAVE SEEN IT'S DESTRUCTIVE SIDE? STOP AND THINK BEFORE YOU ACT! Sincerely, Helen Santiago

04/15/2013

Helen Santiago

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Accidents to pipelines can cause many forms of pollution especially to groundwater. If people are not able to drink the water they have access to, it is almost murder. Don't think that there cannot be an accident to the Keystone XL because, at some point, an accident will occur. Sincerely, Helen Templeton

04/15/2013

Helen Templeton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. WITH ALL THE POLLUTION SURROUNDING US, LAND SINKINGS, ENCROACHING ON WILD LIFE TERRITORIES,, AND EXTERMINATING THEM FOR THEIR ENVIRONMENT, TO GRAB THEIR LAND, THIS IS WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE MENTALITIES OF GREEDY CORRUPTED GOVERNMENT, CONGRESS, ETC ETC ETCCUT IT OUT NOW, THIS IS NOT GOING TO GAIN POSITIVE RESULTS.....TO SUM IT UP, THIS IS A BLATANT CRIME ... Sincerely, Helena Hernandez

04/15/2013

Helena Hernandez

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. WITH ALL THE POLLUTION SURROUNDING US, LAND SINKINGS, ENCROACHING ON WILD LIFE TERRITORIES,, AND EXTERMINATING THEM FOR THEIR ENVIRONMENT, TO GRAB THEIR LAND, THIS IS WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE MENTALITIES OF GREEDY CORRUPTED GOVERNMENT, CONGRESS, ETC ETC ETCCUT IT OUT NOW, THIS IS NOT GOING TO GAIN POSITIVE RESULTS.....TO SUM IT UP, THIS IS A BLATANT CRIME ... Sincerely, Helena Hernandez

04/15/2013

Helena Hernandez

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My whole family (5 of us) are all totally opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline project. It is an environmental disaster any way you look at it and must NOT be allowed. Sincerely, Helga Spector

04/15/2013

Helga Spector

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It doesn't make sense to risk polluting our land, water and air for the profit of a few people! The oil from the tar sands will not even be used in this country, but will be exported. The risks clearly outweigh the benefits to our Nation! Sincerely, Hendrica Regez

04/15/2013

Hendrica Regez

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Clearly, the only beneficiaries of the pipeline and arctic coal mining will only be the companies doing it. Frankly, they don't give a damn about the rest of us. I pray that you, Mr. President, do. Sincerely, Henry Markowitz

04/15/2013

Henry Markowitz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please try harder to save our planet. You need to address the horrible practice of hydraulic fracturing also. How is it that you seem to be completely dismissing the fact that you have 2 daughters who will be living with the dirty water, earth and air that you choose to leave them. You're a bright man. Use your smarts and your common sense. If you've been bought by oil and gas companies well, woe to us all including your children. Wish I hadn't bothered voting for you. Sincerely, Holly Porterfield

04/15/2013

Holly Porterfield

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. peace holy, this is another asking me to sign with a different source, then what I signed today. what I proposed is a speed rail that daily can deliver more oil than the Alaskan pipeline did daily. it seems about 300 plus tank cars on high speed rail, 200mph takes about 6 hours to travel then a few days Alaskan pipeline takes to deliver same about of oil same distance. it seems will be safer & more cost effective, in this time when high prices of fuel demand the pipeline at the cost of a few. for over 3 billion people exist then around 1970 when a gallon of gasoline was 25 cents compared to todays almost \$5.00 a gallon for the last 2 years. people got to eat & growing plants requires fuel as to harvest & what needs to get the food into your mouth that is nutrient rich that you need. Sincerely, Holy Holily Holian

04/15/2013

Holy Holily Holian

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is time to stand up to Big Oil and say no to the continued ravaging of our planet. Generations to come will be grateful for your decision to deny the polluters of our home so that they may have a better place on which to live. Sincerely, Hugh Null

04/15/2013

Hugh Null

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- isabel cooney United States of America
____ This message was submitted via Avaaz at http://www.avaaz.org/en/no_tar_sands_valdez/?reply. To respond, please e-mail reply+nokxl@Avaaz.org

04/15/2013

isabel cooney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It takes courage to oppose big business, but I am confident that you care enough to protect the world of your daughters and their peers. I urge you to provide the impetus needed to change the destruction of our natural world. Sincerely, Isabel Delatorre-Hansen

04/15/2013

Isabel Delatorre-hansen

To Secretary Kerry and fellow officials at the State Department, I am writing this letter to express my strong opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline. I ask that the State Department would reject the request for the pipeline. The pipeline represents a far too serious threat to the health and well-being of millions of people, and it represents a move in a direction--oil-dependency--that we should be moving away from. There are far too many risks associated with this project, and as we've seen in recent years, the damage caused by some kind of pipeline failure could adversely affect millions of people and cost billions of dollars to federal and state governments. If State Department officials take that long-term view on this project, I believe very strongly you will come to realize the potential damage and economic cost that this project would actually entail. The short-term economic "benefits" would be far outweighed by the cost to the nation in the long-term. We have an opportunity to avoid this damage to our country, and to make decisions that will support our true long-term interest and the well-being of our nation and its citizens. I beseech you to reject this project. Thank you very much for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Jeremy Lehrer

04/15/2013

J Lehrer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please don't approve this greedy, destructive, unnecessary project. Thanks. Sincerely, J. Cherr

04/15/2013

J. Cherr

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President, You have already taken more flack for trying to do right things than any of the rest of us could endure, but for the sake of the environment and consistent with your principles, please use your power we gave you to say NO to Keystonse. Rev. J. David Johnson Sincerely, J. David Johnson

04/15/2013

J. David Johnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's clear to everyone that the XL Pipeline is a bad idea. It's also clear that the people/corporations who still support it don't care about the consequences, they're just fueled by greed. If the White House continues to support this disaster in the making, then I'll know beyond a shadow of a doubt that the party I believed in is no different than "the other party", that greed is the only motivator in Washington today, It's not what the people want, not what's ultimately right, it's only about how much the bribe is to get what the Corporate Person wants. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, J. Tripp

04/15/2013

J. Tripp

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You have both indicated concern about climate change. You are also both aware of the need to reduce carbon emissions and move quickly to a renewable energy future. Congress is often an obstacle to needed changes but you don't need Congress to do what is right here. The signs and costs of climate change couldn't be clearer. Keep some of the dirtiest oil in the world out of the climate change pipeline. Reject Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer

04/15/2013

Jack Nelson-pallmeyer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.O: k., so I know it is already being built,even though it is not officially approved yet, but I have an idea what to do with it. Do not allow any oil in it, you will have to extend the top part out of that nasty tar sands well, up to where there should be lots of clean water. Just put water in the pipeline, it will be worth more than crude oil soon, and worse case scenario, if it breaks, it will flood somewhere. You will have to keep it from freezing of course, maybe some of that heated tape or something. It could solve drought issues, pipes coming off it, going to drought areas. There seems to be plenty of water in Canada, and it is probably pretty clean where it does not get mixed with oil or chemicals from fracking and mining. It could be filtered with reverse osmosis and ultraviolet light , for drinking, or used to irrigate dry farm land, fight fires, or dumped into rivers that are running low. We need good water more than oil. Most other countries have water reserves and plans. This could be ours. We can and have survived without oil, but not water. Our aquifers and drinking water is being contaminated with nasty chemicals that don't go away. and dare I say, that the excess fracking water being pumped into the caverns in Pa., is going to contaminate your water in the caverns at camp David. They are connected somewhere, or used to be. Maybe it is why the bats are getting sick living in the caves. and closing all those cool caves to the public? I remember as a child , we were able to explore, go spelunking, etc. Please think about what the world really needs to survive, clean water, air, land, and bees to pollinate uncontaminated crops. The Monsanto protection act was a huge mistake. Our food has been contaminated, bees and bats killed, and we are virtually powerless to change it. I hope you get this message soon. Sincerely, Jackie Dow

04/15/2013

Jackie Dow

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I know it is already being built so instead of approving the pipeline for oil, keep it clean and transport water instead of oil. If it spills, it will be easier to deal with, and we will be needing more water than oil. We can't live without clean water, and it would certainly be helpful in extreme drought conditions. It would take a little re-engineering to prevent freezing and breaking, but would be so worth it. Of course the pipe line would have to be extended North to a clean water source. I can't even imagine how dangerous it would be to the environment and wildlife, and humans if there were another accident with oil. We could save our aquifers rather than endanger them if you would only approve its use for clean water. Canada has a lot of water. Please, seriously consider this plan instead of letting an oil company ruin another part of our beautiful country. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jackie Dow

04/15/2013

Jackie Dow

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. PLEASE SAY NO!! Tar sands can NOT be cleaned up and after hearing the owner of TransCanada speak in front of Congress - the US federal government will not receive one red cent for the tar sands shipped out of our ports! Ridiculous! They get ALL the profits and we get all the toxic dumping and the cost to clean it up. JUST SAY NO! TransCanada is taking away US citizens properties in TX - foreign companies own the HIGHWAYS - how did that happen? Rick Perry perhaps? You know, he used to be a Democrat - before the oil companies started padding his pockets; now he's a greedy bastard. Please President Obama, don't just say NO - say HELL NO! A toxic conduit right through the center of our country - I've been saying that you will go down in US History as the greatest President ever. Don't let XKL be the thing that you are remember for. And stop the imminent domain crap in TX... it's one thing for our own government to seize our property - it should be illegal that our courts, our laws and our rights can't stop a foreign country - oil tycoon - to illegally take our land. MAKE IT STOP!! Just say No. John Boehner (the orange man) is a disgrace and doesn't deserve respect, otherwise, I would have addressed him as Speaker. He owns stock in 7 companies that will prosper off of the toxic conduit. He's a traitor and should be shot for treason. Why he is allowed to obstruct and destruct our country is beyond me! You are the leader of the free world (well, not so free) - you are the head of the DOJ - you are the head of EPA - you are the head of the SEC -- investigate these treasonous Republicans. Press charges!! And by the way, while you're at it - extradite George Bush and Dick Cheney - they have already been convicted - and guilty of war crimes. You know this. Extradite. I'm tired of being disgraced for harboring known terrorists and criminals. I'm willing to pay all my monies to help our country and the world - I've never been a greedy person - and I believe in helping others to prosper - I'm willing to help anyway that I can - but GWB and DC are criminals. Extradite them. Sincerely, Jacqueline Darnell

04/15/2013

Jacqueline Darnell

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Stop the ruination of our land, air, and water--not to mention our health. Oil rhymes with SPOIL, and that is appropriate because it spoils everything in our environment. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jacqui Goeldner

04/15/2013

Jacqui Goeldner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I am an 81-year old native of this region who sees nothing to justify the construction of the Keystone pipeline. The Sandhills and the surrounding parts of Nebraska remain one of the unsung wonders of the world, in my view, and the threat to this region posed by Keystone is incalculable, only ridiculously justified by the arguments in favor. In fact, there is no reason at all to encourage the development of the Tar Sands. I have friends there and I am well aware of the despoliation of the boreal environment by the development. 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. 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. And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas and the previous spill in the Kalamazoo River, along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will never be safe. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, James Christensen

04/15/2013

James Christensen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Just on the off hand chance that you are not as reactionary as your past actions are leading us to believe (social security), please make an exception in this case and cancel this pipeline endeavor which will pump for our use and others the filthiest oil in the world.. Sincerely, James Fairley

04/15/2013

James Fairley

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The tar sands are a disaster, from start to finish. Not only are they absolutely toxic for the climate, the mining process destroys the pristine Boreal Forest and threatens Canadian First Nations. Then, because the tar sands are so heavy and corrosive, the export pipelines are more likely to spill than conventional pipelines -- we saw this just days ago when rivers of oil poured through Arkansas backyards where children usually play. Two other spills happened that same week in Canada and Texas, and the first Keystone pipeline spilled 12 times in its first year alone. The 2010 Michigan tar sands spill, which sickened children and killed family pets, still hasn't been fully cleaned up. Ask yourself: Do you want this in your home? Do you want it in your town? Do any Americans deserve to live in a community with these risky pipelines -- or in a world with a threatened climate? TransCanada executives get the profits, the rest of us get the risks. I am completely against this toxic export pipeline! Tar sands will not help our energy security. Keystone XL is almost assuredly an export pipeline that would send oil through America, not to America -- its destination refineries export 60% of their products. Furthermore, top scientists say the tar sands are "game over" for the climate and the Pentagon has routinely identified climate change as a threat to our national security. There are countless reasons to oppose the tar sands, one of the most extreme fuels on earth. Stopping Keystone XL will be a huge step forward in that effort! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, James Field

04/15/2013

James Field

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Every time there is a keystone xl pipeline SPILL in the future people will remember that YOU were the one who approve it! After all you have done in office is this how you want to be remembered? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, James Hall

04/15/2013

James Hall

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please just say no! We don't need it, we don't want it.
Sincerely, James Johnston

04/15/2013

James Johnston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is the wrong direction for our country. Please take the bold steps we need to reverse climate change in time. Sincerely, James Mihalisin

04/15/2013

James Mihalisin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We need public hearings and a full disclosure of every chemical in the Keystone XL pipeline before we can allow the possibility of the harmful environmental effects that we have seen in other states and with other petroleum industry activities. Although the pipeline offers the prospect of short-term gain, we are concerned that it also offers the prospect of long-term damage to private and public properties. In the near future, we may have energy to support transportation, but our population will be so sick that this will not matter. Texas already boasts some of the highest cancer, respiratory and infant mortality rates in the country; and we need to safeguard our public health. So our legislators need to speak for the Texas and U.S. citizens and require full disclosure of chemicals and their impact on human health, before we can continue to bear the consequences of the this expansion.
Randy and Valerie Paton Sincerely, James R Paton

04/15/2013

James R Paton

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Keystone is nothing but a gift to the oil companies. It's pipe across the U.S. to oil refineries where it will be shipped oversea's leaving nothing but profits for the oil companies and the pollution for us. Not to mention the increased rate of leaks that will happen due to the higher pressure needed to move the slurry of oil sand and chemicals. This is a no brainer. Just say NO TO KEYSTONE. Sincerely, James Shepherd

04/15/2013

James Shepherd

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. After seeing what happened in Arkansas, it makes me oppose Keystone XL even more. Having a tar sands pipeline anywhere near the Ogallala Aquifer or any other fresh water supply is the definition of insanity! The only technology they have for cleaning up tar sands oil is paper towels. That's just not good enough, and we must reject Keystone XL. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, James Tyler

04/15/2013

James Tyler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. As an environmental sociologist engaged in research and teaching I have examined the issues related to the XL Pipeline and tar sands and fracking procedures in general. It is my view that this rush to these methods of obtaining oil and the use of pipelines to carry this material is a serious mistake; one that we and future generations will deeply regret. The XL Pipeline involves several errors both to those living in the areas proposed by the pipeline, the horrible damage that leaks will cause, especially to the Ogallala aquifer, the rivers that would be crossed, and the wildlife that will be killed, and the waste of time and money when we should be making every effort to develop wind and solar sources of energy. Please reject this pipeline! Sincerely, James Williams

04/15/2013

James Williams

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please veto any legislation that includes plans for this environmental nightmare. There are better ways to provide energy and the planet is irreplaceable. Please do not submit to the special interests promoting this and stand up for the majority. Thank you James Wilson

04/15/2013

James Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I didnt vote Obama to have to worry about the keystone pipeline! Please choose green and lets remove these old ways of thinking and doing to make way for a green future. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jamie Damaschke

04/15/2013

Jamie Damaschke

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Please keep the future of our environment, country and earth in mind. We can do without this project. Please concentrate your efforts on more earth friendly and sustainable forms of energy for our future. Thank you Sincerely, Jan Beach

04/15/2013

Jan Beach

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Many of us who were uneasy about the wisdom of installing the Keystone XL pipeline before are now alarmed about allowing this project to go forward. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jan Crean

04/15/2013

Jan Crean

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I cannot imagine the pressure you, as President, face daily. It seems to me the position is making decisions from conflicting oppositions; One, the people, US Citizens, who elected you, and two, Corporations with deep pockets who fund campaigns. I would think the pressure is off to satisfy the latter now that you are in your last term with no possibility of returning and thus no need for the funding. Please show the American people that you truly mean what you say in your Speech on the Environment and climate control. Leave a legacy of The President that "Walked the Talk". Your actions will speak more loudly than words. This country right now needs a leader that is strong and is we (the nation and the planet) are at a pivotal point. We all know it is the best for the higher good of all....including those who know no better and fight for the opposite. Thank you for stepping up to the plate. I see you guided and supported and know in my heart as you do that stopping Keystone XL is the right thing to do. Blessings Jan 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jan Gallagher

04/15/2013

Jan Gallagher

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The Keystone Pipeline is a really bad idea. There is nothing positive about future environmental disasters! Don't make future generations pay for the greed of the oil industry. There are alternatives and it's time to stop the destruction of our environment. Thank you. Sincerely, Jana McKeeman

04/15/2013

Jana McKeeman

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please look to the future and learn from the past. Oil spills not only hurt the environment at the time, they have lasting effects on wildlife and human life. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jane Bartosz

04/15/2013

Jane Bartosz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jane Burton

04/15/2013

Jane Burton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There will be nothing but contempt for any decision other than rejecting this insane project. Please help us, the people, and the earth by doing the right thing as our President and leader. Sincerely, Jane Corinne

04/15/2013

Jane Corinne

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The recent tar sands oil spill in Arkansas demonstrates that it is exceedingly difficult to clean up a spill like that and no one really knows how. They are spreading paper towels over it....if that is the most effective method they have we can't afford to risk spills from any such pipeline. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jane Groebner

04/15/2013

Jane Groebner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Personally, I have been in construction since 1977 and would hate the creation of jobs this pipeline would bring if it were not for the destruction the tar sands oil and its poisoness CO2 product will bring to the environment. Job creation should come from rebuilding our infrastructure, not through a pipeline. Sincerely, Jane Millard

04/15/2013

Jane Millard

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As the Sierra Club keeps reminding us, oil from the tar sands is about the nastiest fossil fuel there is. It can only be developed at great cost in water quality and cost to the northern forests. Furthermore, because the tar sands are so heavy and corrosive, the export pipelines are more likely to spill than conventional pipelines. Last month, a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood-- 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. We are seeing, over the last few years, record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- persistent reminders that climate change is already upon us. But clearly we cannot fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jane Russell

04/15/2013

Jane Russell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department WHAT CAN GO WRONG, RIGHT? WE MUST ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THINGS ALWAYS GOES WRONG AT SOME POINT, SOMEWHERE, AND THE PRICE IS JUST TOO HIGH TO PAY WHEN DEALING WITH OIL. ALL THE NEW JOBS IN THE WORLD DON'T MEAN A THING IF WE HAVE POLLUTED THE AIR, SOIL, AND WATER IN OUR "HOME," THE EARTH. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jane Sheaffer

04/15/2013

Jane Sheaffer

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Recent events in Arkansas have shown that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. Keystone XL would produce a literal bisection of our country and potential effects on aquifers. Climate change is worsening, and our country needs to step up as a leader in avoiding the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. I expect climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Jane Whitney

04/15/2013

Jane Whitney

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Janice Foss

04/15/2013

Janice Foss

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
UNFORTUNATELY, WE HAVE A PRESIDENT THAT TALKS OUT OF BOTH SIDES OF HIS MOUTH. OBAMA WANT TO PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT, BUT THEN HE PUSHES OIL DRILLING IN THE ARCTIC, EXPANDS THE FAST FORWARD FOR FRACKING EVEN THOUGH IT HAS CAUSED AIR, AND WATER POLLUTION LET ALONE EARTHQUAKES. OBAMA THE BIG BOSS WANTS THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO MAKE A STUDY, BUT TO WHITEWASH IT SO THE PIPELINE WILL GO THROUGH. OR, ARE YOU WHITEWASHING THE STUDY BECAUSE OF BACK DOOR POLICIES WITH OIL COMPANIES, OR DO YOU OUTRIGHT WORK FOR THEM? IN EITHER CASE THE STUDY WAS SUPERFICIAL, AND OIL THAT IS ALREADY DIRTIER THAN DIRTY OIL WILL NOT NOT HELP OUR ENVIRONMENT. EVEN THE EMPLOYMENT NUMBERS THE INDUSTRY PUTS OUT ARE PHONY. SHOW SOME DAMN INTEGRITY FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT, AND OUT HEALTH AND STOP SELLING US OUT LIKE OUR PRESIDENT HAS. Sincerely, Janis Loveday

04/15/2013

Janis Loveday

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Extracting oil from this resource is not only dirtier than other sources, but has a great destructive impact on our natural environment. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. We all have inherited our planet. We must be stewards and preserve it well to the future that we leave it to. Sincerely, Jaquair Gillette

04/15/2013

Jaquair Gillette

I would like to voice my support for the Keystone Pipeline project. I feel it is in our nation's best interest to construct this pipeline under the current proposal. Jared Manwaring

04/15/2013

Jared K. Manwaring

Dear Ms. Walker, I oppose the new application from TransCanada Corp for the proposed Keystone pipeline that would run from the Canadian border to an existing pipeline in Nebraska, for the following reasons: 1. As we have just witnessed in Mayflower, Arkansas, pipelines leak and cause irrevocable, permanent damage to private and public property. Historically oil companies have to be forced to clean up their messes, and the oil proposed to be transported is particularly difficult to clean up. 2. Building the pipeline in the U.S. will benefit neither our job market, nor our energy security. The vast majority of the construction jobs for this pipeline would be temporary and any economic benefit of such jobs must be offset by the negative impact of future environmental and property damage caused by the Keystone XL. As for energy security, much, if not most, of the oil proposed to be transported will end up in the East Asian and European markets. In addition, the U.S. is barred from buying oil that has a higher carbon footprint than "traditional oil" (per section 526 of the Energy Independence and National Security Act). In conclusion, the proposed pipeline must be denied in any form if the U.S. has any hope of doing our part to hold global temperature increases to "manageable" levels. It is time to stand up for the environment, not business interests. John Harney

04/15/2013

Jay Harney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL I am 85 years old and not concerned about myself, but am concerned about future generations of all countries. Put the effort into renewable energy and preserving life here on this planet Sincerely, Jay Johnson

04/15/2013

Jay Johnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Knock it off with Krystone XL, Barack! We need to be done with oil right now. -- Sincerely, Jay Lender

04/15/2013

Jay Lender

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This might be a canned message but I couldn't say it any better. So, please accept it as if it came directly from my lips. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, JD Skinner

04/15/2013

Jd Skinner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. President, If you agree to going ahead with this pipeline, there will no longer be hope for the well-being of this planet. Your act will destroy our well-being, not to mention that of future generations. Your most hurtful action will be your longest-living legacy. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jean Evans

04/15/2013

Jean Evans

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. THAT WOULD BE MY CHOICE, TORNADO ALLEY ON THE BIGGEST FAULT LINE IN THE COUNTRY, ADJACENT TO THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER... I AM SORRY I THOUGHT THE QUESTION WAS, WHERE CAN WE PUT KEYSTONE XL THAT WILL DO THE MOST DAMAGE? Sincerely, Jean L Corcoran

04/15/2013

Jean L Corcoran

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If you believe global warming is real, you cannot support this filthy pipeline. such a pipele will never be safe. Recent events have established this as a fact-an inev itability. The only questions are when, where and HOW ANYONE WHO HAS SPOKEN AS ELOQUENTLY AND WITH SUCH CONVICTION ABOUT CLEAN ENERGY AND PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT AS YOU HAVE, CAN SUPPORT SUCH A PROJECT. Please!

Sincerely, Jean Lavassaur

04/15/2013

Jean Lavassaur

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My twelve year old son and I participated in the non-violent protest against the Keystone XL in when you visited a couple weeks ago. You may not have seen us but we were a large, loud and diverse group. I wanted to show my son how we should stand up and speak out when there is an issue so big it affects the entire world. Will the thousands of voices be enough against big oil? Please Mr. President, do the right thing for our children and our children's children Sincerely, Jeanne Carlson Sincerely, Jeanne Carlson

04/15/2013

Jeanne Carlson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's more than the lives of animals if something goes wrong. It would threaten the lives of millions of Americans for generations if something goes wrong. Please say NO! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jeff Price

04/15/2013

Jeff Price

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr President, Greenpeace will tell you the following which they have included in a chain mail to present to you as 'evidence' the XL pipeline is a bad thing... ----- "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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone

XL." ----- In reality, and GP knows this, there are thousands of miles of crude oil, gas and distillate pipelines across this country which have been in place for up to 100 years and are operated safely every day. The obfuscation and lies GP chooses to tell are appalling and detrimental to the safety and growth of this country. Join us, the concerned Americans for energy independence, and say yes to the XL pipeline which will significantly increase our security through greater energy independence and tell Greenpeace to tell the truth about energy and the way that it's delivered. Sincerely, Jeff Wilson

04/15/2013

Jeff Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The keystone pipeline is a disaster waiting to happen... Why would we move forward on such a messy proposition? This is bad business, bad politics and bad for our country...REJECT THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE PROJECT... 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Jeffery Young

04/15/2013

Jeffery Young

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. ***SIDE
NOTE*** The time has come to stop drilling. It is quite evident that the solution is to stop on any action that continues the same practices that have left the earth and its inhabitants in a state of devastation and emergency. Sincerely, Jenell Lopez

04/15/2013

Jenell Lopez

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I vote to invest in energy and technologies that have a lesser impact on the environment. I know that we are a smart enough and resourceful enough peoples to do so - and we need to set a good example for other countries coming into their developmental stages. Sincerely, Jenna Ackerman

04/15/2013

Jenna Ackerman

As a concerned citizen of the United States of America, I do NOT want the pipeline in my backyard or anyone's backyard.

04/15/2013

Jenni McMaster

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 9/11 has been exploited into profit and drilling gambits for Big Oil. It's not about oil independence (is this pipeline, drilling in rough seas in ANWAR, drilling that resulted in the BP oil catastrophe and more about keeping all this oil in the US? Let us stop the lies and perception manipulation). I've watched the Democratic Party turn Republican and help roll back decades of environmental protections: that is how 9/11 has been exploited. But also at work in the proliferation of reckless, profit over environment and Nature policies is so-called government-corporation "partnership." This partnership is, in practice, collusion. Benito Mussolini defined fascism as the marriage of government and corporations. And this is exactly what is happening in the United States: the public and environment be damned. Nature is being exploited for corporate profits, and politicians bought off to get the "job" done. "No" to Keystone. And "no" to politicians who do not care about democracy or the future of this country. We're being run by sociopathic plutocrats who have turned the United States in a 1%-er's sorry excuse of a banana republic where Oil Companies rack in record profits and get subsidized by taxpayers at the same time (socialism for the 1%), and pay little or no taxes. No, for the one-hundredth time to Keystone and to politicians who act as oil company fronts. Sincerely, Jennifer

04/15/2013

Jennifer #n/a

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. 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. Sincerely, Jennifer Kelley

04/15/2013

Jennifer Kelley

I strongly oppose Keystone XL because it is not in our national interest. From a perspective of national security, we should be investing in localized sources of renewable power AND efficiency, not building pipelines across the breadbasket of our country to Gulf of Mexico refineries that have poisoned their local populations and seriously damaged the watersheds. 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. We don't need their oil and we certainly don't need their toxic mess.

Multiple pipeline ruptures in recent weeks strengthen the urgency to oppose this toxic and destructive project which will further privatize gains while socializing risks. The only reason to build this pipeline is to expand TransCanada's profits and further expand tar sands production in Canada. Thank you,

Jennifer Koskinen

04/15/2013

Jennifer M Koskinen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I plead with you to wake up to a more enlightened view of energy,our nation+the planet not only for ourselves but for future generations and all the life forms we share our jewel planet with. Sincerely, Jennifer Mcewen

04/15/2013

Jennifer Mcewen

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. People in power need to make decisions that are best for the average person and our global climate rather than what is best for big business. More drilling, more pollution, and more damage to our environment is not the way. In this era of technology and advancement, I find it hard to believe that big businesses are still getting away with ruining the earth. Who does this earth belong to? Human kind was given this earth and all of its amazing natural resources, but the human race is slowly destroying it. What gives Keystone or any other such project/company the right to destroy the earth? We must remember we are all in this together!!!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jennifer Nahm

04/15/2013

Jennifer Nahm

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You believe there is climate change because of human activity. The XL pipeline is not a safe way to challenge the environment. Please stand up for the environment and don't let the pipeline become a reality. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jennifer Robins

04/15/2013

Jennifer Robins

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We elected you based on your commitment to protect our environment and create a safer country for us and our children. Please remain strong in your promises and do not become a "George Bush Puppet" for big oil companies. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Jer Houston

04/15/2013

Jer Houston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. "America, the beautiful" is no more due to the constant destruction of our land, rivers, environment, air, health, from Big Oil/Gas/Coal. They have turned every town, city and state across the country; as well as our coastal regions into "toxic wastelands". We demand you to say "NO!" to the Keystone XL, on behalf of the people and lives lost, for an end to this madness by corporate corruption within our government

Sincerely, Jer Jarvis

04/15/2013

Jer Jarvis

Dear State Department Representative, I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). - - The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. - - Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer.

Regards, Jeremy Amos

04/15/2013

Jeremy Amos

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, Let me keep it short and simple: An administration that cares about the future of this country and the world will kill Keystone XL. Sincerely, Gerald Fowler Sincerely, Mr. Jerry Fowler

04/15/2013

Jerry Fowler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I remember reading a book called "Athabasca" that was written many years ago that warned about the harm that was being caused to the environment in Canada by the production of oil from the tar sands there. It would be a completely irresponsible act to put in a pipeline that could cause severe problems with the environment in both Canada and the U.S.. Please VETO this project Mr President. Thank you Sincerely, Jerry Spruill

04/15/2013

Jerry Spruill

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please help protect the environment, the United States from terrible oil spills, and the native people of Canada from having their land ruined and their waters polluted. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jesse Moore

04/15/2013

Jesse Moore

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department REJECT THE PIPELINE! THIS IS IT MR OBAMA, THIS IS THE TURNING POINT IN HISTORY. PLEASE BE A PART OF IT. Sincerely, Jessica Chagnon

04/15/2013

Jessica Chagnon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.voted for you. Please do not let business and oil speculation destroy that which cannot be bought at any price. I am old. I voted for you. I do not want to believe you would participate in the earth's destruction.

Sincerely, Jill Frawley

04/15/2013

Jill Frawley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department During the election, I knew exactly where Mr. Romney stood on the Keystone XL pipeline. He told us he would expedite its approval the minute he took office and I believed him. I voted for President Obama because I truly thought he would stop this pipeline from crossing our border. I knew he cared about our planet, future generations and our country and I felt my feelings were further validated when I heard his inaugural address. The fact that I have to write this letter is still difficult for me to comprehend. I make less than a year teaching high school, but because of President Obama's commitment to renewable energy (during his first term), I was able to afford an all electric Nissan Leaf that I otherwise would not have been able to buy. A free charger (normally around \$2500) was installed in my garage because of a research and development program backed by his Administration. I am able to lead by example and to show my students, that yes, we can survive painlessly on clean energy. We discuss the pounds and pounds of CO2 that are saved during my commutes because of President Obama's belief in renewable energy and his commitment to slow climate change. If this pipeline is approved, what will we talk about now? Climate change isn't the only issue to consider. The Ogallala Aquifer provides drinking water for millions of Americans and their livestock, and provides irrigation for crops. The ranchers and farmers that rely on this aquifer grow food that all of us depend on. Every spill has the potential to impact our entire country, not just the Midwest. Although the State Department's report downplays any risk of ground water contamination, it only makes vague assumptions of what the authors' believe may happen when (not if) a spill should occur. But the deformities, abnormalities and deaths already caused by the chemical sludge which will pass through that pipeline have been well documented. The State Department cannot afford to make a wrong decision. Back in the 70's and 80's, before we understood what we have to lose by contaminating ground water, I lost both my mother and grandfather and many rural farming neighbors to cancer. One can argue that we didn't know the health risks then, but we can no longer use that argument. Please don't let that happen to anyone again. This Administration has a choice. Its legacy can be the turning point in saving our planet from climate change and from further groundwater contamination - or it can choose to decimate its own citizens and their livelihoods. What will it choose? Thank you for considering my words. Sincerely, Jill Irvin

04/15/2013

Jill Irvin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is unbelievable that you, Secretary Kerry and President Obama are still even considering the pipeline after the Arkansas spill. Do the American People mean nothing to you? If is your responsibility to keep us safe from harm.... especial when greed and special interest is trying to tak advantage. PLEASE REJECT THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE. Please HAVE OUR BACKS, just as we had yours during the campaign. Sincerely, Jill Keith

04/15/2013

Jill Keith

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I think all the facts need to be figured out before we do this. I have heard it creates jobs and then it doesn't. I have heard we will make it better than before, then we can't be 100% sure. I have heard we don't have a choice, then I hear we do. I hear A LOT of people against this so lets look at it before we say yes! 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jill Simpson

04/15/2013

Jill Simpson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Instead of the pipeline why not build a new state of the art refinery in North Dakota ? Sell a value added product all over the the northern part of our country. Sincerely, jim bambenek

04/15/2013

Jim Bambenek

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The following facts will be found in the majority of replies you receive, but for one believe immediate laws should be imposed on those who built such a pipeline without anyone in town of Mayflower (or any other city in US knowing of its existence). The builders should not only be expected to pay for all cleanup of the spill, but also pay for all medical expenses of the residents for the next 10 years (for late forming illnesses). PENALITIES: Those responsible should pay to the city an amount equal to profit the owners would have made on the 10,000 barrels of tar sand. All personal, corp., city, county, state, and federal involved need tried for any illegal events, primarily for not protecting one of our most needed elements, other than the sun and that is h2O - WATER. WE can not LIVE without it. Oil = \$\$\$ to most people today, but we have live almost 2 thousand years with no oil. Try that without water! Blood pressure's going up - you get picture - no penalty is good enough. Canada and US oil companies want the pipeline, So, let them both build it across CANADA and hope it doesn't damage our water supplies. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jim Brown

04/15/2013

Jim Brown

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The wind blows mightily through here west of . Why don't I see any wind farms here? Much of the land here belongs to the BLM, instead of leasing it to rich cattlemen (who, as well as their cattle produce too much methane gas) it could be producing wind power and letting the wild horses run free. Sincerely, Jo Walters

04/15/2013

Jo Walters

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. And above all we need an answer whether existence of man has to fit into a market defined "suit" or market initiatives should serve man and environmental conditions. Sincerely, Joachim Blass

04/15/2013

Joachim Blass

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I believe that you are very sincere Mr. President when you say that we need to be concerned not only for the present but also for future generations. Therefore, I respectfully ask that you carefully consider the negative impact this pipeline will have on the environment. Thank you for your service to the country.

Sincerely, Joan Agro

04/15/2013

Joan Agro

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please reject the Keystone pipeline. Sincerely, Joan Marie Davidson

04/15/2013

Joan Marie Davidson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. One spill can cause catastrophic damage for decades, this has been proven time and time again. We have to get funding in place for alternative energy, oil is not the answer anymore and time is running out too fast. Rachel Carson outlined how toxins enter our whole ecosystem and it is about time we take the advice she advocated. I have seen too many loved ones affected by cancer that was man made- no more.

Sincerely, Joan Miller

04/15/2013

Joan Miller

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, When is this madness going to end? When all our water sheds are polluted? Please make decisions that help this planet make it into a healthy future rather than ones that line your pockets. Please. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Sincerely, Joan Taves

04/15/2013

Joan Taves

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We've now seen just how "safe" tar sands are. Can we really afford to support a fuel source that not only has a huge negative impact on the environment at large, but is dangerous to Americans living around the pipelines? Tar sands are not worth the risks. Please stop the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline! Sincerely, JoAnna Redman-Smith

04/15/2013

Joanna Redman-smith

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If we intend our children and grandchildren and all life around us to have a livable future, the XL pipeline must be rejected. I want your legacy and mine to be avoiding the worst effects of climate change. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
JoAnne Eggers

04/15/2013

Joanne Eggers

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. In 2010 we had a tar sands spill in the Kalamazoo River in Michigan that is still not cleaned up. Last year we saw a pipeline rupture dump thousands of gallons of oil into the pristine Yellowstone River. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 BARRELS (not gallons) 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. Namely that the tar-sands pipeline owners are not mandated to pay into the oil clean up fund because they do not fall under the definition of "traditional oil". We have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change. We need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Joanne Wirtz-Ryan

04/15/2013

Joanne Wirtz-ryan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Petroleum, especially this brand of petroleum, deserves to be kept deep in the earth, where it was born. When it is brought to the surface, there is surface contamination at its source, leak and spill contamination all along its route, surface contamination at its refinery destination, air contamination as it is refined into gasoline and other products, then further air contamination when it is burned as a fuel. Petroleum contaminates. Instead of continuously giving permission for more and more drilling and shipping and spilling and contaminating, just stop the cycle. Let's focus on renewable energy. There are combustion engines now that run on air. We have the sun, we have wind, we have waves, etc., etc., etc. We do not need to keep providing extremely costly subsidies to corporations whose only contribution to our nation is to destroy the planet we live on. Stop the cycle. Sincerely, Joby McClendon

04/15/2013

Joby McClendon

RE: Reject Keystone XL Based on Significant and Unavoidable Impacts to the Environment Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama: In your State of the Union address you vowed to tackle catastrophic climate change. As a wildlife artist and biologist 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, and the grave risk to our environment and communities from toxic pipeline spills (its proposed route crosses migration routes thousands of years in use!). 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. 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. Sincerely, Jodie Adams

04/15/2013

E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I was in the oil & gas industry for 30 years and am very familiar with the risks you are taking if you approve the Keystone pipeline. All you need to do is look at the problems that occurred in MN & AK and the environmental impact they had. Also why would approve a pipeline that the Canadians don't want across there own country. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Joe Fuchs

04/15/2013

Joe Fuchs

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. That begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. And if the question of jobs comes up, it has come to my attention that this pipeline will only create 35 permanent jobs, aside from the distinct possibility that there will always be some sort of clean-up operation involved with this entirely too risky development. Take consideration for Keystone off the table. Sincerely, John Bartels

04/15/2013

John Bartels

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I voted for this administration and the leadership of Barak Obama in two elections, but I am now disenchanted with the failure to execute that is becoming so evident. I will no longer vote. I am convinced that all the hoopla in the senate and congress is just a diversion from the fact that this country is owned and operated by corporate entities and the oil industry. I no longer care who is in charge. You are all either complicit in the conspiracy or powerless to right the ship of state. The pyramid builders are still in control; only the propaganda has changed. Sincerely, John Cannatella

04/15/2013

John Cannatella

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, John Curtis

04/15/2013

John Curtis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Clearly, 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 that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be Completely erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas (which as of this writing is getting Worse as the largest source of water there is now also contaminated) along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will Never be safe. They found a 22' gash in the Arkansas tar sands pipeline. This Arkansas tar sands pipeline is 1/10 the size of the Keystone XI which, if approved, will be under 10x's more pressure and 10 times more Volume. Please, Do the Math! There is no way possible that this Keystone XI will not leak and when it does, it will dwarf the BP Gulf Oil spill. I write to demand Real climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the absolute and final rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, John D. Stickle

04/15/2013

John D. Stickle

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, My wife Joy and myself strongly oppose the harmful effects of the KdystoneXL pipeline. Sincerely, John DeHarpporte

04/15/2013

John Deharpporte

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood last month, we were starkly reminded that piping oil around the country is not safe, clean, or healthy. 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. I supported President Obama in both of his presidential elections. I went door-to-door in 2008 and 2012. I am deeply disappointed in the lack of environmental leadership from this administration. You screwed up with Solyndra. So what? Get back on that horse and make something important happen. Start by rejecting the Keystone XL pipeline. This comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, must be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Sincerely, John Dukovich

04/15/2013

John Dukovich

To the Reviewers of Public Comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement regarding the proposed construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline: I am a resident of the State of New Jersey where I own a small produce farm serving customers in the _____ City markets. I am a father of three children, and two grandchildren. I am also a member of the Board of Evangelical Environmental Network, and an elder in the Presbyterian Church in America. I am deeply familiar with impact of changing weather patterns; I care for my children and their children; and I believe in a good Creator who owns and rules the world. These compel me to convey to you my objections to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement which was issued on March 1, 2013. The EIS is a lengthy analysis, and I don't have the capacity to examine it in all its details. Despite the high-profile spills that have occurred since its issuance, I haven't examined the credibility of its findings that TransCanada's extra safety measures will assure us that spills won't plague us, as other pipelines are doing today. And I haven't followed the arguments about environmental justice, although the poor and the least powerful social groups are virtually always the most harmed by fossil fuels projects like these. Rather, I have focused on the climate-related findings of the EIS. In this arena, I would respectfully ask the State Department to address what I consider to be three significant deficiencies in the analysis: The EIS clings to the idea that the tar sands will be fully developed regardless of what we do with the KXL: We can't do anything anyway, the analysis essentially assumes. The EIS ignores the reality that in the struggle for Earth's climate, time matters: Opening the carbon floodgates now is much worse than potentially opening them later. And the EIS uses some of the lowest numbers in assessing just how carbon-polluting the tar sands really are. We can't do anything anyway The EIS says that if we stop the KXL now, we won't cut tar sands production by more than 1%. And if every single pipeline proposal from the tar sands is killed, then by 2030, we will have only reduced production by 2-4%. Currently, the tar sands produce around 1.8 million barrels of oil per day. The KXL would add another 830,000 barrels per day of shipping capacity. That's an increase of 36% from this one project. The higher upstream emissions alone (not including transporting, refining and burning the stuff) will be equivalent to the annual emissions from 6.3 coal-fired power plants or over 4.6 million cars. (See: http://www.pembina.org/oil-sands/os101/climate#footnote1_u8eycct) To me, 36% is a big jump in capacity. But still, the EIS tells us that approving the KXL won't significantly add to tar sands production and emissions. It cites two reasons. First, there are other pipeline proposals, and – implicitly – they'll probably be approved. In fact, there are four other pipeline proposals in various stages of planning. Two are in application stages, one has just been proposed, and the last one is still conceptual. They all are smaller than KXL, and the most important – Enbridge's Northern Gateway – has to overcome fierce opposition from British Columbians and the legally-empowered First Nations tribes. All the others are years away, and face unknown obstacles. (See Pembina; p. 5) Secondly, the EIS seems to ignore all risks to any other tar sands transportation proposal. And even if all the pipelines get killed, tar sands production won't suffer by more than 2-4% by the year 2030. None of that decrease is because the "bitumen" (or tar) won't move: it will be a little more expensive to ship it by train and truck, and that extra cost will cut demand a tiny bit. And how comfortable should the EIS be that it's possible to move all that bitumen by train or truck? Let's start with the present situation: There are 2,750,000 barrels per day of proposed projects on the books. Four of them are pipelines (KXL being the largest) and they account for 99.3% of the total. The other is a railroad project, and it amounts to 0.7% of the total. It hardly registers in Canadian plans. But the EIS assumes that this puny effort will swell into a behemoth and entirely replace the pipelines, if we don't say yes to the KXL. Of course, this is a dreadful way to start an EIS. 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. It's like those old movies where "earthlings" are warned that "resistance is futile." 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. Resistance is not futile, and the EIS should not assume that it is. Time doesn't matter. It takes time to change the world. Sustainable energy technologies take time to develop. International agreements take time to negotiate. And the effects of climate chaos, as devastating as they are, take time to drive home the need for action. But the logic of the EIS relies on the notion that a huge increase in tar sands carbon emissions now is no more risky than a potential carbon explosion of equal dimensions in 2030. But this cannot be. Every year, the cost of solar, geothermal and wind power comes down. Fuel efficiency standards are increasing sharply, reducing demand for the dirtiest oil. This year, CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere have grown to 396.6 part per million; but in 2030, they'll be about 433 ppm, even if the growth rate doesn't increase (and it's increasing). By then, we'll certainly have had many more Katrinas and Sandys; Texas and Arizona will likely be essentially dry and burnt; coastal communities will no longer debate the reality of rising sea levels; and numerous developing countries will likely be acknowledged as non-viable climates for their people. Most importantly, the Congressional struggle against climate science will likely be little more than a distant memory. But it appears to me that the EIS falls into the trap of assuming that climate chaos won't have consequences: nothing will change; resistance now will be circumvented later; the world will not find the will to mitigate harm to the climate. When it comes to climate disruptions, time is not our friend: carbon-choked air and acidic oceans take forever to clean themselves. But in this one arena – the public will to act – time certainly works for the citizens of this country, and against the power of the multinational oil companies. With the passage of time, we will no longer ignore the things we once ignored, before floods ravaged our coasts and droughts burned up our forests. Time does matter. We are struggling to minimize harm to the Earth until people of goodwill everywhere stand up for what can no longer be suppressed.

Choosing the least alarming data I was surprised to find the EIS asserting that tar sands oil, when measured on a life-cycle basis (or "well to wheel") is only 17% more carbon polluting than the average oil refined in the U.S. The EIS figures appear to be at the very low end of the spectrum. Even more notably, the EIS suggested that, as oil supplies everywhere become scarcer, the tar sands' carbon premium will likely decline, as other sources become dirtier. I'm not suggesting that 17% more greenhouse gases per equivalent gallon is not serious. If I go out and buy a highly efficient car that gets 40 mpg, gasoline made from 17% dirtier crude oil is like having the emissions of a much less efficient 34 mpg car. That's a big drop. But it's not nearly as big as other analyses tell us. The Department of Energy reports that the extraction of tar sands oil is 2.3-4.0 times more carbon polluting than conventional oil, resulting in at least a 22% well-to-wheel carbon penalty. (See National Energy Technology Laboratory, Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Emissions, November 2008; p. 12). The EPA has set the tar sands carbon penalty at as much as 37%. (See U.S. EPA: Letter of Cynthia Giles to Dept. of State; July 16, 2010; [http://yosemite.epa.gov/oeca/webeis.nsf/%28PDFView%29/20100126/\\$file/20100126.PDF](http://yosemite.epa.gov/oeca/webeis.nsf/%28PDFView%29/20100126/$file/20100126.PDF)) And in Europe, the fuel-quality directorate determined that the average tar sands life cycle carbon intensity is approximately 23% worse than the average conventional crude used in Europe. I don't have the expertise to say whether these tar sands are 17% dirtier, or 22%, or 23%. But I am reasonably sure that if this country and our world proceed with the development of the dirtiest of fossil fuels, no matter how abundant they may be, our children will not inherit a country, or a world, capable of supporting them in the way the earth does today. The levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere today are already higher,

by a huge margin, than they have been during the entire history of mankind – however you wish to measure that period. I cannot understand how the State Department can produce an EIS related to a project which will speed and expand the dirtiest of these carbon pollutants on a massive scale, and then find that there is so little environmental impact. Thank you for considering my comments on the Keystone XL Draft EIS. John Elwood John Elwood

04/15/2013

John Elwood

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. We can not continue to push for Green Energy while we stab ourselves in the back allowing dirty fossil fuels to flow and inundate the world with fossil fuels. Why must we process Canada's dirty oil and, we, our country undertake the total risks of environmental destruction of our homes? 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. You can not tell us you are for the "People" and then put them in harms way. You can protect us of the dangers of "CLIMATE CHANGE" and the "WORLD" by rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, John F Delgado

04/15/2013

John F Delgado

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't you dare do this. You've been screwing over the citizens who put you in office. With your bill that protects Monsanto's crimes and with your proposal for chained CPI that will screw over seniors and veterans. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!! Sincerely, John Gagnier

04/15/2013

John Gagnier

Please approve the Keystone Pipeline. It is safe and will boost the economy, create jobs and make our Country safer. Thank you John Hiller

04/15/2013

John Hiller

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department What's wrong with Canada processing their own tar sands? Why should we expend our water supply and dirty our air, as well as chance another destructive pipe line break? Sending tar-sands 1700 miles in the U.S., when it could or should be processed at home spells disaster for the United States. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, John Ingle

04/15/2013

John Ingle

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Hello! As a SPED Teacher, journalist, parent, environmentally aware individual and representing my entire family I am furious at the State Departments clear lack of integrity. It is one thing to take an unpopular position or present strong, science-based evidence to support that position, but it is entirely another to intentionally mislead with industry-generated claims that the educated community is flat wrong to sway public opinion. That is called immoral manipulation, it is wrong and it is illegal for our State Department to pretend this latest "Study" is an unbiased reasonable presentation of a full body of fact or opinion. Some industry mouthpieces should be fired, as a teacher I most certainly consider this a violation of the code of conduct if you have one, on an issue this large the study should have been done by unquestionable sources. The State Department's latest review of the Keystone XL Pipeline is a cynical sham. The public so easily forgets the Gulf Oil Spill, they are mislead about the severity of significance that the Arkansas spill represents while they manipulate media coverage and through morally bankrupt law, avoid even paying for the cleanup. Who the hell do you represent???? 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- the dirtiest ever source with no accountability for spills because it is not "Oil," where is the integrity in that?. Instead of continuing to allow oil company contractors to determine what is in our national interest, it's time for the Obama administration to step up and reject this pipeline once and for all. The president delivered inspiring rhetoric on climate action during his inaugural speech. But it is his decision on Keystone XL which will determine his legacy on climate. If approved, Keystone XL will be the Obama Tar Sands Pipeline and it will, as our own government's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, mean "game over" for our fight to stop global warming. Almost every single friend I have, most certainly all my friends and family vehemently oppose the Keystone XL and it's rape of Native American Culture, farmers and the clearly evidence based overwhelming wishes of the public to get out of using or selling any fossil fuel and become leaders in renewable sources. This goes through the Oglala aquifer, a national treasure of water. We need some integrity in favor of the founding of this nation on the principal of evolution toward the public good and not corporate criminal legal rape. I hope my points are clear and well taken, you have a higher responsibility to our nation and world. I hope you take it. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you for your undivided attention to this serious matter. Sincerely, John Kersting

04/15/2013

John Kersting

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The argument that this pipeline creates jobs is, at best, short-sighted. Reflect on the long term consequences involved for us and for future generations. Talk about not being able to see the forest because of the trees. don't sign this into law! Sincerely, John Manahan

04/15/2013

John Manahan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I hope you will hear this message, because I have spent a lot of money and time campaigning for you in two elections. I am also a grandparent. And I believe you need to SEND A MESSAGE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE that the environment must and will be taken seriously. The LAST thing you should do is send a message that the future means less to our government than some current dollars. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, John Mann

04/15/2013

John Mann

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. No one can possibly believe that a pipeline over 1,000 miles long will be accident proof. Stand by the convictions you professed in your campaign. Fight for clean energy jobs. NIx this pipeline! Sincerely, John Maruskin

04/15/2013

John Maruskin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Not to mention the purpose path of this pipeline passes over the Largest Aquifer in the country, which supplies water for most of the middle farm region...Pretty hard to grow crops with oil ! Sincerely, John McCarthy

04/15/2013

John McCarthy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please, for my grandchild's sake, reject Keystone XL and invest in R&D of clean renewable energy sources and solutions. Future generations will benefit from what you do with Keystone XL. Don't sell us out.
Sincerely, John Smith

04/15/2013

John Smith

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I voted for you twice and with high hopes. You are in your second term and it's up to you to fight for what is right this term and do the right thing. I will let the rest of the message stand below un-edited. But please don't let us down. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
Sincerely, John Tebbens

04/15/2013

John Tebbens

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You are a Christian man and Christianity believes the natural world was created called the garden of Eden. It was made to last forever and humans were asked to respect it. It contains the sun, wind and other sources to get our energy. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, John Ventre

04/15/2013

John Ventre

I cannot fathom the rationale for supporting a project like Keystone XL. 1. We are taking on all of the environmental risk for this long pipeline. Recent pipeline spills suggest this is not an insignificant risk. 2. We are doing this so ANOTHER SOVEREIGN NATION can export their oil to other countries. 3. We are doing this despite gaining a very few long-term jobs. 4. We are doing this despite the clear evidence that fossil fuel is a destructive present strategy, and even worse for our future. Please. Senator Kerry, stop this pipeline. Sincerely, John Wares

04/15/2013

John Wares

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If we are to have a pipeline ween ourselves off of oil in the next 50 years let us make it clean before it enters the pipeline. The cost is insignificant compared to the damage of one spill. Are we going to hear blah blah blah regarding having a pipeline that threatens the environment or will the oil companies live up to the promise of environmental protection. Nothing in the last ten years tells me the oil companies want to do the right thing, but doing anything possible to extract oil and make money at the expense of "anyone" who happens to be in the vicinity is ok. (fracking as an example) I favor a clean pipeline (if there is such a thing) or one that is environmentally responsible. Not in its present presentation of an illusion of what we need. Sincerely, John Webster

04/15/2013

John Webster

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Keep this ill-advised project from happening! Sincerely, John Witte

04/15/2013

John Witte

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

On 2nd thought: Go ahead. For the sake of jobs and corporate enrichment, build the pipeline. But build it so that it can be used to transport the fresh water that we will, indubitably, be buying from Canada in the near future. We need water here in Western states much more than we need filthy tars ands oil.

Sincerely, Johnnie Aldrich

04/15/2013

Johnnie Aldrich

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please read the below message and ask yourself if all the insatiable greed among the few wealthy in the world is worth the destruction of the planet and its inhabitants? It has to stop! This country is setting a very bad example of how greed is more important than sustainable life on earth. In the end money will not buy clean air, water or food. This country has created a world of greed where only the privileged can afford good healthcare, a good education, and organic food. Please make a decision to do right by this earth and its inhabitants. For once can someone in government do the right thing instead of feeding us lies while watching their personal bank accounts grow? Read on... 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Joie Mrava

04/15/2013

Joie Mrava

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's not easy being green but we must. I saw this sign at the largest protest for climate change awareness in history just outside of the White House. I believe you were out of the city at the time, but I hope you heard the message that we were trying to put across. I know you are in a difficult position, and I know that it is important for you to maintain the support of large corporations like the oil companies to fund your campaigns. You are in a unique position to use your not insignificant power to help us make the strides we need to make yesterday to make this world livable for our children. This means turning your back on the corporations and institutions that are knowingly carrying out devastating projects like this pipeline that will make our planet inhospitable to human life in the not so distant future. You made a promise to make America a leading force in the healing of our environment. You haven't fulfilled it yet but you still have time. Please don't waste it pandering to big oil. Sincerely, Jon Conners

04/15/2013

Jon Conners

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Keystone is the wrong solution for Americans, the Ogallala Aquifer and the planet earth. It's good for a few temporary jobs and the bottom line of oil companies and their subsidiaries. Which is more important???? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Jon Erickson

04/15/2013

Jon Erickson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Big pipelines may be more prone to fail than smaller ones, Physics 101. 312 spills in USA and Kalamazoo spill still not clean. Sincerely, Jon W Candy MD

04/15/2013

Jon W Candy MD

For the record This email is UNCLASSIFIED. From: connie weichman

04/15/2013

Jones, Kerri-ann

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, I live in Arkansas, where we have seen up close and personal the havoc of spilled tar sands oil from a breached ExxonMobil pipeline. Many of us did not know that this pipeline crossed underneath the Arkansas River and was so close to Lake Conway, which the spilled tar sands crude has entered. This spilled oil is not conventional crude oil. It is laced with corrosive chemicals added to it to allow it to flow in a pipeline. The proposed Keystone XL pipeline will carry 4 to 5 times as much corrosive tar sands oil as the pipeline that ruptured in my home state. 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 Ogallala Aquifer. It is not a question of "if" the Keystone Pipeline will leak. It is only a question of "when" and "how often." There are multiple reasons why the Keystone XL project is a disastrous idea. The fuse it will light for climate destruction is one of them. What we have seen in Arkansas the last two weeks is another one. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline. Sincerely, Joseph Hewgley Rogers, Arkansas Sincerely, Joseph Hewgley

04/15/2013

Joseph Hewgley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department CONSERVATION, SOLAR & HYDRO, AND TECH INNOVATION. Peak Oil is upon us. It's time to transition our society and the world onto the sustainable path, not the last-chance-dirty-fossil-fuel path. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Joseph Scarr

04/15/2013

Joseph Scarr

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. To build this pipeline will be suicidal. Fossil fuels threaten all of us, and every living thing on this planet. We must wipe all fossil fuel use OFF THE FACE OF THE EARTH, and the sooner the better. At our house, we use solar. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Our transport system must be modernized. We need to phase out all aircraft asap, and move people around the US landscape with a high-speed intercity electrified rail system, designed and built for the purpose. Electric cars must become standard, and gasoline must be AT LEAST \$8/gallon. Sincerely,
Joseph Snyder

04/15/2013

Joseph Snyder

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Stopping Keystone XL is key to stopping the deadly tar sands, no matter what Big Oil and its allies say. Alternative tar sands pipelines are running into equally stiff opposition and have been delayed. TransCanada executives openly admit that without Keystone, production will be slowed. So if the tar sands don't need Keystone, why is Big Oil spending millions on lobbyists to ram it through? The tar sands are a disaster, from start to finish. Not only are they absolutely toxic for the climate, the mining process destroys the pristine Boreal Forest and threatens Canadian First Nations. Then, because the tar sands are so heavy and corrosive, the export pipelines are more likely to spill than conventional pipelines -- we saw this just days ago when rivers of oil poured through Arkansas backyards where children usually play. Two other spills happened that same week in Canada and Texas, and the first Keystone pipeline spilled 12 times in its first year alone. The 2010 Michigan tar sands spill, which sickened children and killed family pets, still hasn't been fully cleaned up. Ask yourself: Do you want this in your home? Do you want it in your town? Do any Americans deserve to live in a community with these risky pipelines -- or in a world with a threatened climate? TransCanada executives get the profits, the rest of us get the risks. I oppose this toxic export pipeline! Tar sands will not help our energy security. Keystone XL is almost assuredly an export pipeline that would send oil through America, not to America -- its destination refineries export 60% of their products. Furthermore, top scientists say the tar sands are "game over" for the climate -- and the Pentagon has routinely identified climate change as a threat to our national security. There are countless reasons to oppose the tar sands, one of the most extreme fuels on earth. Stopping Keystone XL will be a huge step forward in that effort! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, josie lopez

04/15/2013

Josie Lopez

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I cannot believe the Obama administration is involved in any kind of fossil fuel negotiations. The impact on wild life and people.not only at the site of the exploration but, the possibility of breaches in the pipe lines through numerous states is incalculable. I thought Obama was smarter than that. There are all sorts of weather changes and earth movement we can never predict why take a chance. Mr. Obama it's best you err on the side of people and wildlife why would you continue to allow more fossil fuel contamination or ground water only to line the pockets of the uber rich oil magnets.. Sincerely,
Jovinita meisenbach

04/15/2013

Jovinita Meisenbach

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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 furthers the sands development. 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. The recent tar sands pipeline leak in Arkansas highlights the unique danger posed by this type heavy, dirty fuel. If Exxon, the nation's biggest oil company, was utterly unprepared to clean up this thick, viscous fuel, what can we expect from the rest of this industry? I value the sanctity of this good earth over cheap, American energy and demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Joy Gramolini

04/15/2013

Joy Gramolini

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Joy Shulman

04/15/2013

Joy Shulman

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please do not approve the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline! Sincerely, Joyce Canan

04/15/2013

Joyce Canan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Remember you mentioned climate action in your inaugural speech -- your daughters and the future generations are counting on you making a bold statement with your action to reject Keystone XL. Sincerely, Joyce Iwamoto

04/15/2013

Joyce Iwamoto

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Between 2008 and 2012, U.S. pipelines spilled an average of more than 3.1 million gallons of hazardous liquids per year, according to 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 -- Los Angeles Times, April 12, 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline and all transportation and refining of Tar Sands in the United States. Thank you. Sincerely, Judith Emerson

04/15/2013

Judith Emerson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Keystone will not help this nation financially either. It will do nothing but enhance the finances of a private, multinational corporation which pays too little taxes at the same time that it endangers the health& safety of American citizens, including our children. And it will once again "displease" your base (just like chained CPI). Approval is a lose/lose situation. Please do not approve this dangerous pipeline. Thank you. Sincerely, Judith Rosenstein

04/15/2013

Judith Rosenstein

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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, but it needs Washington support to happen....just as the oil industries had and still have. Stand up for this change that we must make...help the US be the leaders in the clean energy industry- it can work!! Say NO to the tar sands, and to the Special Interest Lobbyist's that do not have a clean and healthy future as their goal. Do the right thing for the future of our country...and send the right message to other countries that we are in the running for CLEAN ENERGY!! Say NO to Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Judy Houdeshell

04/15/2013

Judy Houdeshell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I voted for you both times you ran for President because I believed that you would do the RIGHT things. Now I'm wondering if that was a wasted vote. Sincerely, Judy Rainey

04/15/2013

Judy Rainey

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. How many times do we have to say it Mr. President? "NO!" "NO!" "NO!" You always seem to have no trouble understanding when the Republicans say NO! to you. Why are we going to rip our land apart, poison our underground waters to let this dirty oil spill over our farmlands and cities and into tankers for CHINA! We did not vote to give you another term then have you turn around and give the GOP and the Koch brothers our natural resources to be destroyed for their greed. SHAME ON YOU BRO! Sincerely, Judy Rembacki

04/15/2013

Judy Rembacki

Hi, I am opposed to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. Doing anything to facilitate the further extraction of petroleum precursors from the Alberta Tar Sands threatens the climate balance of our planet. Julia Bent

04/15/2013

Julia Bent

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I beg you to listen to Americans who do not support this pipeline. I'm concerned for our future. We only have so much power to shape our world and I believe it would be a mistake not to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Julia Bly

04/15/2013

Julia Bly

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. PLEASE don't make a short sighted decision that will irreversibly negatively impact our world!!! As it is, we are at a crucial tipping point due to irresponsible energy practices. There are better solutions! Profit margins might not be as large or immediate, but no amount of money will undo the damage done if this should pass! PLEASE, think of your children's future... and their children's future. Sincerely, Julia Rose

04/15/2013

Julia Rose

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I am stunned by the continued disregard of the undeniable fact that we are making our planet unlivable. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I campaigned hard so that you could be our President and I want to trust you to do what is right. All logic tells us that there will never be anything !00% safe about a pipeline and there certainly is not now. Sincerely, Julia Ryan

04/15/2013

Julia Ryan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Pres. Obama, please search your heart. Reject the Keystone Pipeline and march forward in saving our environment from further pollution. You need to leave us a legacy of positive climate cleansing. Sincerely, Julie Baldwin

04/15/2013

Julie Baldwin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Climate scientists state the if this pipeline and subsequent oil extraction is allowed to go through, that it's "game over" for our climate. Please consider our future. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Julie Price

04/15/2013

Julie Price

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I expect climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The warning has been given that if Keystone is approved it will be "game over" for the planet. You may not choose to believe that--but what if the leading climate scientists are right? Do you, Mr. President, want to go down in history as the one responsible for making inevitable the destruction of our beautiful world?!!! Please, please do NOT approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Sincerely, June Martyn

04/15/2013

June Martyn

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. There are alternative energy sources. There are NO alternative habitats, waterways, wildlife of that kind (and their migration paths) or climate! The native populations also have no alternative communities. All of these must be protected. Sincerely, K L Kho

04/15/2013

K L Kho

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. Please Mr. Obama, I am asking you as a citizen of the United States and as someone who filled his vote for you, please reject this pipeline; it can bring nothing but trouble, and what profits it might bring will not go where it should: it will end up in offshore accounts, "safe" from taxes. We elected you to lead us: please don't lead us off a cliff. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kael Beardsley

04/15/2013

Kael Beardsley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, I am one of those people who live in PA that is being surrounded by natural gas crazies. No, not crazy, greedy. This has to stop. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Karen Bagdes-Canning

04/15/2013

Karen Bagdes-canning

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Whe we voted to reelect you you promised to stand up to dirty oil and help our planet regain some support. If you are paying attention to the people and not the lobbyists you will see that 80% of us, the people who voted you into office again, are against tar sand oil production and especially the Keystone XL Pipeline 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Karen Cappa

04/15/2013

Karen Cappa

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Time and time again, we are told by industries their products are safe or they can handle the transport of hazardous materials safely. But time and time again they are proven wrong. 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? We will have to suffer the consequences when breaks in the piping system occur yet only derive a small benefit for the risk involved. Isn't this tar sand coming from Canada but only partially sold to the U.S.A.? I know you are getting pressure from the Republicans and they will scream and yell how you killed jobs by not signing an agreement. It would not be the first time you stood up to them for good reason. Please, make sure you consider all the ramifications on this deal. Sincerely, Karen Sylvester

04/15/2013

Karen Sylvester

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need to PROMOTE CLEAN energy and stop giving billions of dollars away to the oil and gas companies in subsidies! Our future generations will thank us for doing the right thing! Thank you! Sincerely, Karin Peterson

04/15/2013

Karin Peterson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Making gas so expensive people stop buying it, start using carpool and public transportation will drive companies to better efficiencies. The point is not to enrich the gas companies, but make it hurt for everyone so it drives clean fuel innovation and conservation. Just look at Europe. The use of solar and wind is ubiquitous. I have seen tiny wind turbines the size of coffee cans outside apartment windows. I cannot even buy them here. Why are we behind? Fuel is still cheap. Stop that now! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kate Iacovelli

04/15/2013

Kate Iacovelli

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. ---AS THE SUPPOSEDLY INTELLIGENT SPECIES IT IS AMAZING THAT THE SEARCH FOR YET MORE OIL HAS RESULTED TOO OFTEN IN DISASTERS. THE EFFECTS ON THE PLANET WHICH IS ALREADY SUFFERING, THE ANIMALS, AND THE PEOPLE SHOULD TELL YOU SOMETHING. IF PEOPLE ARE THAT SMART THEN WHY HAS NOTHING BEEN LEARNED FROM THIS? WELL, IT IS BECAUSE SADLY GREED HAS MORE POWER THAN ETHICS AND WHAT IS RIGHT. THE PIPELINE WILL ONLY MEAN MORE DISASTERS AND MORE TOXINS FLOWING WHEN THE ALMOST INEVITABLE "ACCIDENT" HAPPENS. THE ONLY ONES WHO WILL BENEFIT FROM THIS ARE THOSE MAKING MONEY AND THAT IS NOT A GOOD REASON TO GO AHEAD WITH THIS PLAN. PLEASE STOP NOW BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE. Sincerely, Kate Kenner

04/15/2013

Kate Kenner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. Where has common sense gone? Why are you not listening to the scientists and the people? Why are you not investing in alternative energy sources when oil is known to be a finite resource the acquisition of which is wrecking our already over-polluted environment? Why do we keep debating these topics when the answers are obvious? We will not long be able to sustain life on this fragile planet if we keep trashing it. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kate Mcwiggins

04/15/2013

Kate Mcwiggins

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The Keystone XL pipeline is wrong on many levels: How it is sourced, how it will affect the area it goes through. It harms both human and nonhuman life. Sincerely, Katharine Tussing

04/15/2013

Katharine Tussing

To whom this may concern, I understand that under the National Environmental Policy Act, a federal agency that is planning to take a federal action that would "significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." An EIS is a tool for decision-making. It describes the positive and negative environmental effects of a proposed action, and it usually also lists one or more alternative actions that may be chosen instead of the action described in the EIS. After reviewing the documents listed on the Department of State's homepage, I must bring your attention to the fact that the draft environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline acknowledges that tar sands are a dirty source of energy with extreme pollution potential, but concludes that the project is allowable because this oil will get to market anyway, with or without a pipeline. I understand that the Department of State may overcome an adjudicatory hearing down the line where an environmental group will challenge this decision as arbitrary and capricious simply because the concern is addressed in the documents, but the dismissal of this concern due to market reasons should not hold water and should not be the response to environmental concerns. More specifically and speaking to the permit, the last paragraph of the first page is disheartening. The permit states that this Pipeline will benefit America so we can pump Canadian crude oil into America, in order to meet the American refinery demands, develop the oil we are currently getting from the Bakken oil, and to decrease independence on foreign oil. 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. The second point I would like to address is mistrust with the current status of the research surrounding this permit. As the Background section of the permit states, the project already underwent administrative procedure and yielded a finding of no significant environmental impact. This should have been an "all systems go" for the project, but the Department announced that a delay was in order to address the sensitive river valleys and aquifers of Nebraska. In particular, 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. 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. Of course, the State Department worked in conjunction with all of the agencies listed on pages 11-12, and of course the project considered mitigation measures. However, 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. It is extremely difficult to understand how the Department of State considers this project within the "national interest" of America. If the conclusion of this project is yes, a Canadian company is issued an American permit to build a pipeline to transport toxic tar sands through our heartland, connecting to refineries in the Gulf of Mexico, for likely export to China. Please understand that the scientific community sees through the avoidance of discussing carbon and the

effects of this project on global warming. As Dr. James Hansen points out, the draft review suggests the climate impacts of the pipeline 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. This is more than double that of all oil burned in human history. This attitude that digging it out and selling it is in the national interest is an antiquated approach to American energy and is far from being in nation's best interest. Digging just encourages more digging, and our carbon footprint will just continue to grow. If this project is approved, TransCanada will have every incentive to milk the massive tar sands basin for all it is worth to their national benefit, not ours. In conclusion, this Pipeline is not in the national interest and this permit should not be approved. Thank you for your time and I hope that the State Department denies this permit. Sincerely, Katherine Kennedy

04/15/2013

Katherine Kennedy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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 COMPLETELY if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. Tar sand development fills the environment with toxics, both airborne and on the ground. This filthy oil is not worth the damage! And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas along with HUNDREDS of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear FROM THE EVIDENCE, BESIDES BEING A MAJOR POLLUTANT, THIS PIPELINE WILL NEVER BE SAFE. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Katherine Miller

04/15/2013

Katherine Miller

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. By merely upgrading most household windows, the savings in terms of conservation of energy would be equal to what would be obtained in Canada's tar sands. Climate change will cause chaos in too many major ways to list. You already know that list. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Kathleen Cox

04/15/2013

Kathleen Cox

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This is a no brainer, for your children & your future generations to come. Please stop this travesty of We The People & Mother Earth. Thank you. PS - it is estimated that a human can live 9-11 days without clean water. Sincerely, Kathleen Kreiselmeyer

04/15/2013

Kathleen Kreiselmeyer

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Mr. President & Mr. Secretary, this happened in my backyard. It has contaminated my city's water source. This could happen on a MASSIVE scale if the Keystone XL pipeline is in use. PLEASE KEEP THIS FROM HAPPENING! YOU HAVE THE POWER TO PREVENT HORRIBLE TRAGEDIES. HAVEN'T WE HAD ENOUGH NATURAL DISASTERS UNDER YOUR WATCH? Earth and her inhabitants (including yourself) are counting on YOU. Sincerely, Kathryn Tipton

04/15/2013

Kathryn Tipton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This country does NOT need tar sands pipelines! What it needs is solar and wind energy and the government supporting those companies involved in this kind of energy! I am sick and tired of oil companies getting their way and we, the taxpayers, pay them to do it. Doesn't look like you're going to get any loopholes taken away by the Republicans... Now that you've offered to make changes in Social Security (which, by the way, is in no case related to our debt!) and making changes in Medicare (which I don't remember you running on - because, you didn't!) are you going to destroy more of the country by putting pipelines that rupture and destroy our water and wildlife too? These companies can't handle the type of 'spill' in Arkansas or anywhere else --- how are they going to handle the type of spill we will have with a pipeline producing 830,000 gallons of garbage a day?!?!? Be smart. Rejecting this pipeline isn't going to hurt you (you can't run again) but it will affect the rest of America for years to come. Sincerely, Kathy Gotkin

04/15/2013

Kathy Gotkin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need to put our efforts into expanding the availability of renewable energy sources, not continuing to wreak havoc on the earth by harvesting and burning fossil fuels. Sincerely, Kathy Martin

04/15/2013

Kathy Martin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We hope that you will fight for the environment and not give in to those who want to only make money to fill their pockets. This is your chance to make oil people realize that they cannot buy you because you are working for the people. Sincerely, Kathy Simmons

04/15/2013

Kathy Simmons

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. How many more oil spills will it take before you finally wake up and stop this dangerous project? How can you possibly allow a foreign country to take the chance on destroying our land? Sincerely, Kathy Wilson

04/15/2013

Kathy Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Water is more valuable than oil. The Keystone pipeline poses too much risk to the Oglala aquifer. Tar sands are such a dirty source of fuel it should be left as a last resort for future generations to exploit. Sincerely, Kay Pence

04/15/2013

Kay Pence

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I am opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline: The risks to the over-heated climate, The destruction of more land and forests in Canada, The possibility of toxic spills and leaks along the pipeline due to poor and unsupervised maintenance, Followed by incompetent clean-up, The psychologically dangerous message of green lighting a broadly opposed and highly publicized and charged project ...all outweigh any jobs (35 permanent jobs) or possible tetchiness from Canada. Yours, Kay Rosen Sincerely, Kay Rosen

04/15/2013

Kay Rosen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is time to look at an energy source that does not degrade the land, destroying its beauty and ability to sustain life. It is time for "Change"! Sincerely, Kb Leeds

04/15/2013

Kb Leeds

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. No one needs billionaires running projects of this nature Billionaires only care for themselves Also rich people should not be allowed to run for office they are only in it to further their money hording

Sincerely, Keith Biodrowski

04/15/2013

Keith Biodrowski

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department President Obama, I am omlloring you to not cave to Big Oil and Republican pressure to build the pipeline. They dont care about the planet or our animals or us! They are filled with greed and only care about profits for THEMSELVES! How often have they tried to convince us that "all will be well" only to be proven that Mother Nature fights back? Already a massive spill in Arkansas and nobody cares. It's barely publicized!!!! All that money and all those " jobs" could be used to build solar fields and wind energy projects! We need to stop listening to those who stand to gain all the money and start listening to the People who are the majority in this great country! We don't want our planet, our beautiful America ravaged by oil spills. I don't believe anything Big Oil says. I am sick of Republicans that seem like they missed out on their primary education! They ignore all truth and cave to lobbyists and corporations because that is who they work for. We are sick of them! We voted you in to office twice because we believe that you are a REAL person that cares about your kids and their kids. We want you to send not only a "No" but a "Hell No" to these dirty crooks and tell them you are eliminating all their tax breaks and they can start paying down the massive debt that has been created by them getting a free ride!!! Please stop placating Republicans! They don't like you and they don't like the People. They will never play fair no matter what they are given. Look at their behavior so far. GreenPeace and others have said: 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I whole heartedly agree and I beg you to take a stand! You only have a few years left to make decisions that will be felt by generations after you! Please maintain your great visionary leadership and think 25 years into the future. Think how many spills there will be... Use prior spills as your measuring point. Look at how much Big Oil promised that they couldn't happen and look at their pattern of denial after they did!! They are criminals! They are liars! They make billions in profits and it does nothing for any of us. Lets build a better world by listening to people who are educated and progressive and who care about our planet and our people. We have very few days on this great Earth. Lets not screw it up. Warmly, Kelly Lieberman

04/15/2013

Kelly Lieberman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We've all seen the potential, as well as real damage this Big Oil boodoggle can and is currently doing. It's way past time to bury it with both ends sealed forever unless it is applied to other uses, say water? Why are you selling out those of us who supported you for so long? Sincerely, Ken Hughes

04/15/2013

Ken Hughes

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. ----- WAKE UP MR. O THE PIPELINE IS A TERROST TARGET WAITING TO HAPPEN DON'T BE A FOOL AND LET YOURSELF GET BUSHWACKED BY THE GOP !!!!!!!!!! Sincerely, Ken Woolard

04/15/2013

Ken Woolard

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 1st step Please read the US National Climate Assessment - we are in a very serious predicament. As a nonlinear dynamicist I can tell you our position has been allowed to reach a very dangerous situation. 2nd step Please lead and participate in a Global War on Global Warming - the lives of our children depend on it to survive. It is by far our biggest security risk. If I were president I would use 3/4th of the defense budget to deal with transforming our economy away from fossil and nuclear power to green energy, mitigating climate change consequences, and helping other nations do the same. Without action on this issue alone all other actions will not matter! I would institute a carbon tax that increases yearly as long as carbon increases in the atmosphere. as a preliminary step Reject the Keystone pipeline to indicate your intentions 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kenneth Foster

04/15/2013

Kenneth Foster

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Oil pipelines are expensive to make, make no new jobs more than the truckers transporting the oil in the past, oil pipelines will spill often through the years, and will transport the oil slower than a snail. Kenwa d'Arc 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kenneth Wheaton

04/15/2013

Kenneth Wheaton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Also of great concern to me and others is the huge amounts of clean water that is rendered highly toxic in the extraction of bitumen and the significant danger a spill or leak presents to our land and fresh water resources. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Kent Wilson

04/15/2013

Kent Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Kerri Kresinski Sincerely, Kerri Kresinski

04/15/2013

Kerri Kresinski

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department When I was in the fourth grade I wrote a letter to former President Ronald Reagan asking him to stop pollution. I assumed, at the time, the only possible explanation that he was allowing so much pollution to go on was that he must not be informed that it is happening and what it does to our environment. I have long since grown up to a much darker truth. The truth is he knew, and they know, and we know, and everybody knows it is wrong and everybody knows it is going on. We are all just waiting for the day when we stop throwing garbage out in our backyard or for more bad things to happen. There are no other options, you literally have a choice to earn that title Mr. President and stand up for what is right. The question really is, what do believe in and do you know how to do what is right? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Kerry McAniff

04/15/2013

Kerry Mcaniff

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I know that energy cost is a very real concern but continuing on the path of oil dependence is short-sighted. This pipeline is an accident waiting to happen! Talk about a great opportunity for a terrorist attack!! This pipeline MUST NOT be allowed. Sincerely, Kim McDonald

04/15/2013

Kim Mcdonald

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Our oil dependence and obsession has gone too far. It is time to start protecting our planet and ourselves better. I know cost is a great concern but the time has come to move forward and not backward. Allowing this pipeline also provides a great target for a terrorist attack. This pipeline MUST NOT be approved. Sincerely, Kim McDonald

04/15/2013

Kim McDonald

Hello, I am writing to ask you to PLEASE not go ahead with building the Keystone pipeline. If this infrastructure gets put into place and into usage, we will be continuing and even accelerating the use of carbon based fuels for energy. This is a terrible idea - the scientific consensus is that the burning of fossil fuels has dramatically increased the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere which has caused global warming. We have already begun to see the great toll that global warming has had on individuals and the economy in the last several years. Floods, droughts, and mega-storms have all hurt and killed people as well as had a huge cost on our economy. We cannot afford to continue this way of producing energy that leads to such destruction. Please say "No" to building this pipeline. Thank you, Kim Erickson

04/15/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department please don't give up your credibility and leadership in the fight against climate change. This pipeline is insane, it represents the carbon industry's refusal to accept the inevitable. But by delaying this shift, they doom themselves to failure and take the rest of us down with them. I voted for you. Please don't destroy the trust I and many other Americans have placed in you. Sincerely, Klaus Mager

04/15/2013

Klaus Mager

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. The drought that has developed in this region has placed an even higher value on the Ogallala 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Krista Glosson

04/15/2013

Krista Glosson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. And with all the drilling worldwide...we are sucking the blood of the Earth out, and collapsing our planet...volcanoes & tsunamis...we've lost 5 seconds of time in rotation of the Earth!!! Sincerely, Kristen Soothill

04/15/2013

Kristen Soothill

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands oil is not the answer to our energy needs! How much yelling and screaming and protesting and writing do we need to do to get you to take another path - a path to sustainable energy production? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Kristin Hoye

04/15/2013

Kristin Hoye

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please and Thank You! For the love of humanity and the earth itself, find it in your soul to do the right thing.

Peace to us all. Sincerely, Kristina Billings

04/15/2013

Kristina Billings

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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.
- * consider who will pay for any spill that could occur. Looking at all of the tar sands oil spill recently, there is a high probability of risk that a spill can occur. The companies transporting Tar sands oil are exempt from paying into America's Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

I advise a rejection of the Keystone XL Tar Sands Pipeline, but if it is not rejected then before permission is granted, a thorough and transparent review of the Keystone XL pipeline is needed to ensure that our communities, wildlife habitat, waterways, and climate are protected. After that, I hope and I believe, the State Department and the President will reconsider and reject the Keyston XL Tar Sands Pipeline. Sincerely, Kyle McAdam

04/15/2013

Kyle Mcadam

the history of the major oils companies, in the wake of a major spill, whether off-shore, or in Nigeria, or Minnesota, or Arkansas, has been pathic. These companies owe no allegiance to any flag, only to the bottom line. The fortunes amassed through the developement of fossil fuels, has been at the detriment of ordinary citizens, and innocent bystanders. When we went to war in Iraq, this was to liberate Iraqi oil from the control of Saddam, and place it in the hands of the international oil companies, which had backed the Bush campaign. We do not need an oil pipeline stretching from our northern border to southern Texas.

04/15/2013

L Davi

sorry I forgot my information for the record: Larry Lambeth,

From: keystonecomments@state.gov Subject: The Keystone Pipeline is NOT in the Best Interest of America Date: Mon, 15 Apr 2013 08:30:38 -0500 America needs clean energy and the climate needs a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. Tar sands fuel does nothing to achieve these two priorities. The XL pipeline creates great risk and no benefits for America. A biased and incomplete assessment by Environmental Resources Management has glossed over the dangers and not considered the adverse impacts on climate change presented by the extraction process, pipeline construction and route, or final combustion pollutants emitted. There is no methodology to deal with the inevitable spills of this thick corrosive product. The Exxon spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, dumped 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. The use of paper towels for clean up emphasizes the fact that the oil industry is unable to safely 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. We are experiencing frequent freakish weather events and record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States and around the globe. These are indications that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress will be erased if we also develop the tar sands. The only reason to build this pipeline is to expand TransCanada's profits and further expand tar sands production in Canada. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Do not approve the Keystone XL because it is simply not in our national interest. TransCanada has already arranged to export the oil shipped through this pipeline to dirty, heavily polluting power plants in foreign nations, allowing them to pad their bottom line and pump more money into tar sands development.

04/15/2013

Larry L

America needs clean energy and the climate needs a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions. Tar sands fuel does nothing to achieve these two priorities. The XL pipeline creates great risk and no benefits for America. A biased and incomplete assessment by Environmental Resources Management has glossed over the dangers and not considered the adverse impacts on climate change presented by the extraction process, pipeline construction and route, or final combustion pollutants emitted. There is no methodology to deal with the inevitable spills of this thick corrosive product. The Exxon spill in Mayflower, Arkansas, dumped 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. The use of paper towels for clean up emphasizes the fact that the oil industry is unable to safely 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. We are experiencing frequent freakish weather events and record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States and around the globe. These are indications that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress will be erased if we also develop the tar sands. The only reason to build this pipeline is to expand TransCanada's profits and further expand tar sands production in Canada. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Do not approve the Keystone XL because it is simply not in our national interest. TransCanada has already arranged to export the oil shipped through this pipeline to dirty, heavily polluting power plants in foreign nations, allowing them to pad their bottom line and pump more money into tar sands development.

04/15/2013

Larry L

To Whom It May Concern: Approving the proposed Keystone pipeline would be completely irresponsible for more reasons than can be listed in a short email, and the State Department should oppose this project. 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. This project cannot possibly be justified. Furthermore the economics of this are all wrong. Yes, it might create some construction jobs in the US for a handful of years, but that is short sighted. If the money being put into this project were invested in the renewable energy sector, many long term jobs could be created. Instead this project is destined to put profits into the traditional hydrocarbon industry, which is clearly a step backward from where the USA needs to be going. It's obvious that corporate lobbyists are behind the push for this project. The economic and resource gains touted by this project are fleeting and temporary, and will not benefit our society in the long run. Given that global warming is really happening, and that our descendants will have to live with the damage, do you want future generations to remember us as those selfish people who wouldn't do something to mitigate global warming? It's the same old story. Big business interests manipulating the government of the people, plain and simple. Please, do not approve the Keystone Pipeline. It is bad business, bad government, and will have detrimental effects for decades to come. Thank you. -Larry Weissenborn

04/15/2013

Larry W

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. This project will pollute both Canada and the United States for the purpose of corporate profit. And what would be the reason for piping the tar sands oil to Texas? It must be the exporting of the tar sands oil to other countries through the Texas ports. At some point we have to consider the importance of clean land and water and a sustaining climate. Without these, we have no quality of life. This month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Laura Cohen

04/15/2013

Laura Cohen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How can you talk out of both sides of your mouth? You campaigned in both elections on CLEAN energy...and you want to fold to big oil with this? Sincerely, Laura Glover

04/15/2013

Laura Glover

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is an environmental disaster waiting to happen!!! PLEASE say NO. Thank you. Sincerely, Laura Jobe

04/15/2013

Laura Jobe

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you really do care about the environment and this country which I greatly doubt considering your past record you will end this dangerous pipeline! It is time to stop lining your pockets with oil money and start working for the idiots who voted for you. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Laura Leifer

04/15/2013

Laura Leifer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Time for BIG TIME investment in clean energy. Without it we will be remembered through history (if there is a future) as the people who poisoned the WORLD. Sincerely, Laura Peterson-Volz

04/15/2013

Laura Peterson-volz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President, I KNOW you are of the light. I hope by the time you get this letter ALL of the government knows without hesitancy how important this is to STOP the Keystone XL Pipeline. Our future and our childrens depend upon it, how can this not be any more CLEAR! Bless you for all you do. It is amazing how you have stayed calm among such chaos. You are in my prayers to do what you can and choose BALANCE! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Laura Walthers

04/15/2013

Laura Walthers

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Your delay in opposing Keystone XL and other protection for what's left of the natural resources of this country is unconscionable and morally offensive by any standards of governance. Why didn't the Obama administration enact New Deal-type legislation to protect human and natural resources, put people to work taking care of the country, maintaining the aging infrastructure and reactivating small family farms????? There must be a way to prevent the losing side--Republicans--from running the country--into the ground. What good is a Democratic administration is corporations rule? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Laurie Robertson-Lorant

04/15/2013

Laurie Robertson-lorant

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I personally remember the first day of the BP disaster as if it were yesterday. I was immediately moved to tears and felt like something horrible was happening in my own backyard as a Southerner although I live hours away from the Gulf. This was way before anyone had any idea that it couldn't be stopped. I am now 56 years old and am finally acting on my gut feelings which I realize is really late but better late than never. This pipeline is A REALLY BAD IDEA. DON'T LET THIS BE YOUR LEGACY. PLEASE. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Laurie Wilder

04/15/2013

Laurie Wilder

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department James Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, says that if the Keystone XL pipeline is built that "it's game over for the planet." Mr. President, it is imperative that you reject the Keystone XI pipeline and that you do what you promised in your campaign - develop cleaner sources of energy. And it's imperative for each of us to ask not what the Earth can do for us, but what we can do for the Earth. Sincerely, Lawrie Hartt

04/15/2013

Lawrie Hartt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department James Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, says that if the Keystone XL pipeline is built that "it's game over for the planet." Mr. President, it is imperative that you reject the Keystone XI pipeline and that you do what you promised in your campaign - develop cleaner sources of energy. And it's imperative for each of us to ask not what the Earth can do for us, but what we can do for the Earth. Sincerely, Lawrie Hartt

04/15/2013

Lawrie Hartt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. ONCE YOU OPEN THIS COUNTRY TO COAL TAR SANDS THERE IS NO GOING BACK. ONCE WATER IS NOT DRINKABLE, BUT PURE POISON, WHERE DO WE GO TO FIX IT? THIS IS JUST A PURE NEED FOR THE ALMIGHTY DOLLAR BY SOME FAT CATS, AND BENEFITS VERY FEW PEOPLE. THIS MAKE NO SENSE THAT WE DESTROY OUR ENVIRONMENT! WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR GOV'T? WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU AND YOUR THINKING? WE VOTED FOR YOU! AT ONE TIME WE HAD HIGH HOPES FOR YOU AS OUR LEADER. NOW WE SEE YOU AS A "LESSER" EVIL THAN THE OTHER GUY. HOW SAD WE ARE SO SCREWED..... Sincerely, Lee Hebert

04/15/2013

Lee Hebert

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this spill-prone energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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.

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. Especially in light of the spill in Mayflower, AK, which sheds light on the exact risks we take when we continue to invest in projects and technologies that are recently doing more damage to the nation than they are making positive contributions to Americans and our economy. This issue is more important than gun safety regulation because it will indiscriminately harm everyone if we do not begin to take action now. Approving the KXL pipeline will make it difficult for my classmates and future colleagues and I to make the responsible decisions in the coming decades. This is the single issue that Congress cannot stall or filibuster, and one which lobbyists presumably have less influence over; significantly, it is also the issue that will impact our daily lives immediately and over the long term. On behalf of all college-aged students who care so much about this decision that its approval will leave us, the future of national leadership, devastated, IN TEARS, and feeling deeply betrayed by the administration that won our votes on platforms of Hope and taking this nation Forward. We certainly had hope that bringing a younger leader into the White House would initiate a lot of the improvements that we will be remembered for. Please take these factors into your consideration before making a decision. I personally believe that to betray my generation of future leaders of America will be to solidify the idea that government is no longer an institution for peace and posterity, but instead, one that mirrors the economic institutions of our time in which people vote with their wallets and not with their civic duty. Sincerely, Lee Oberg

04/15/2013

Lee Oberg

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If the Keystone pipeline goes through the US, Canada will make a FORTUNE and the US takes all the RISKS! 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Lee Reinert

04/15/2013

Lee Reinert

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Enough events have already demonstrated the dangers of this pipeline, and the economics are proving not to be to boast all to the public's advantage; only the oil/gas industry with its already obscene profits and ridiculously low penalties for their recklessness and shoddy standards.. They want the boom, but we'll be stuck with the bust. Time to follow the example of smarter, more progressive developed nations who are already way ahead of us in using renewable and sustainable energy sources. Sincerely, Léna Guyot

04/15/2013

Léna Guyot

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. perhaps it is time for a family conversation to determine the condition of the earth you want to leave your daughters and grandchildren is in order. when we personalize issues the answer becomes clear. picture your backyard in arkansas! Sincerely, lesley shahriary

04/15/2013

Lesley Shahriary

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Remember, President Obama: When it's gone, it's gone for good. It's not like the paper wars in Washington, where abstraction overrides reality. The land, water, flora and fauna that we destroy with our toxins will not cannot be re-created by committee. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Leslie Coutant

04/15/2013

Leslie Coutant

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We need to be focusing on/investing in clean renewable energy sources - NOW. It is a moral obligation for all of us at this point to change our short sighted decision making! This pipeline is shortsighted in terms of the many costs it represents for the future. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Leslie Dressler

04/15/2013

Leslie Dressler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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 that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if it approves the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It's time to put people over profits when planning our energy future. The Keystone XL is too much risk for very little reward. Keep the earth alive; reject Keystone XL. Sincerely, Lewis Okun

04/15/2013

Lewis Okun

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. IF THIS PIPE LINE WERE TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE COST OF GAS TO THE RETAIL CONSUMER I MIGHT BE WILLING TO RUN THE RISK, BUT IT WILL ONLY INCREASE THE PROFITS OF THE OIL COMPANY. I'M NOT INTERESTED UNLESS AND UNTIL WE STOP SUBSIDIZING THEIR TAXES AND CLEANING UP AFTER THEM WHEN THEY HAVE AN OIL SPILL WHICH THEY CERTAINLY WILL HAVE - THEY ALWAYS DO. DON'T SIGN THE BILL WHAT EVER THEY PROMISE. Sincerely, Libbie Botting

04/15/2013

Libbie Botting

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. WORK TO BE DONE; SOCIAL JUSTICE IN GREAT DANGER! PROMOTE FAIRNESS, FREEDOM, JUSTICE, PEACE, HUMANITY, PRODUCTIVITY, WELL-BEING OF GENERAL PUBLIC. RESOLVE SOCIO- POLITICAL ISSUES, BALANCING BUDGET. OPPOSE SO CALLED "FAIR ELECTION ACT" PUBLIC FINANCE MATCHING SMALL DONORS FUND- DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD, RESOURCES BENEFIT "BAD GUYS" AS USUAL. TASKS: TOP PRIORITIES: Society in vicious cycles as in need of revolution, we MUST act: (1). Prosecute, eliminate "MURDER- fraud- crime- injustice networks"= cruel tyranny= robbery machine = ROBBERISM; destroying essences of democracy, capitalism; continuing, on-going; relaying, penetrating every segment of our lives (inc. civic non- profit organizations); expanding here domestically to overseas-foreign countries; with threat, coercion, victimization, deprivation, discrimination; unjust practices, manipulation, influence; bad legislative bills; unjust hidden agenda with false/ misleading excuses (inc. private- public partnership, economic development, housing, school construction, transportation, abandonment of properties, maintenance of "paper roads", nonsense grants, programs; ..., whatever) to benefit/ facilitate "MURDER-fraud- crime- injustice networks" (inc. officials, judges, developers, lawyers, employees, etc.); expand further unjust operation; endless unlawful- immoral acts; rob/destruct resources (rights, land, properties, home, buildings, assets, accounts, income, pension, documents, evidences; public, private; business, civic, political); frivolous litigation, levies, foreclosures, garnishment, guardianship, power of attorney; improper processing of complaints, procedures, proceedings, docketing, bookkeeping, accounting; cause vicious cycles: socio- political- election-media-budget- legislative- system problems; civil-human rights backwards; people-slave. Examples of problems are provided below: ** (2). Restore: principle, fairness, cost-effectiveness, accountability, reliability, capability; fair election, justice, peace (including civic, non-profit organizations), "check and balance"; Restore: TRUE essence of democracy, fair election process; easy access to government, files, records, transcripts; not unjustly manipulated, influenced, misled by wrong person, information, or "official misconduct- government gang- fraud- crime- injustice networks" = serious causes of socio-political election media- budget- legislative problems, which destroy people, families, society, peace, justice, democracy. Based on merits, justification; NO double standards, improper processing of complaints, procedures, proceedings; falsification, false records, tampering of evidence, data; harassment, intimidation (complainant, witnesses); false charges, citation, bond, imprisonment; disparities and improper treatments, etc.; abuse of laws, power, authorities. (3). Promote democracy, fair election, quality, competition, people input (policies, issues, officials, judges); televise public hearings, citizen/candidate forum/debate; maintain, disseminate meaningful accurate information, records, capability, reasoning, good sense of justice, public interest, endurance. Objective screening by meaningful rigorous examinations, evaluations for quality, capability, endurance and public interest. * To capture extended serious problems of "MURDER-fraud- crime- injustice networks" with official misconduct- government gang, please incorporate the following: (A). complaints/ cases: administrative and judicial levels; (B) frequent testimonies before government bodies, official, legislators, law

enforcement, committees, public hearings; local federal; (C) spin-off complaints, improper processing of complaints, procedures, proceedings, accounting, bookkeeping, docketing, etc.; (D) Candidate statements, see Webs and archives. Urge to re-open and investigate Congress.org, DNet (by League of Women Voters), links, etc.; (E) complaints and reports to police, law enforcement, consumer affairs, other authorities/agencies against "fraud- crime- injustice networks"; (F). Numerous TV programs on social issues (Dr. Lih Young: producer, host, speaker). (G). Frequent recommendations/petitions to officials, agencies, law enforcement, local - federal; as individuals or with civic organizations. **

EXAMPLES OF PROBLEMS - "MURDER- FRAUD- CRIME- INJUSTICE NETWORKS"- with official misconduct, government gang- endless unlawful immoral acts: (A): OPM, IRS, DHHS, SSA, DOJ, FBI, DOD, USDA, DOC, USCIS (US citizens/ neutralization services), custom services, various agencies, law enforcement; 3 branches, local federal- global; National Park Service (Prettyman?), Library of Congress (); many financial/brokerage/ accounting/ bill-payment processing/ collection institutions/agencies; insurance, car related businesses, utilities..., more; dealers Lakeforest Oldsmobile; phone/utilities/cable, judges, legal/court personnel, detective/ process server/ impersonators, with phony names, or would not provide names even in the court cases (Complainant could not get access to court files; could not even make copies);

Offices of Treasury, Comptroller, Attorney General: ..

transcribers , Se nators:

Trooper: , State Election Board ; Maryland DOEd

(?), SSA employees and supervisors (especially in , Md), and

(?, probably in N. J.; or other states). Lobbyists/ municipal attorneys/lawyers/affiliates, accountant

(area), and his law firm and lawyers ,

(pho ny person, named as "substitute trustee", but can never be found or contacted even through official agencies); many court personnel and judges (District Court Court of Special Appeals). Court Auditor . State , county health services organizations/ agencies,

Department of Health and Human Services, Co unty Crisis Center, (white, female); Department of Aging; Adult Protective Services, (?),

, etc.; Suburban Hospital, physicians, emergency staff; social worker Jody

(?), case manager (?), M. D. (?), ;

in Maryland: (?), adm inistrator) and nurses, etc.; forensic services,

D epartment of Health and Mental Hygiene: ; numerous psychologists,

psychiatrists, social workers, etc.: , (?) social worker

; Springfield Hospital Center: forensic services, (refused to give full name, despite repeated requests);

Judges , , etc., prosecutors/government attorneys, e.g.,

?), (Co unty Office of Human Rights); District

Court Commission (, Md) ; Co urt Personnel (only initials, no full name

available); many judges, clerk of the courts (,

etc.), other court personnel, various counties, states; local federal; law enforcement, FBI; police e.g.,

in Md. (first name not available), ; officer ();

(Co unty); sheriff: (Female, White, Co unty Md.), (white, male,

Co unty, Md); fire and rescues (abuse, even no fire; conspiracy). (B): The problems are interrelated horizontally and vertically, among all issues, local- global. Clerks of the Circuit Court (Co unty, Md.) ; District Court Clerk , Administrative Judge She riff , etc. government attorney (public, private), law enforcement (FBI, sheriff, police, fire/rescue, etc., contractors) are part of the "fraud- crime- networks: with spying, surveillance, harassment, unlawful search, stealing, robbery, injuries; false arrest, imprisonment, citation, trespass, testimony; withholding witnesses; destroy information, documents, evidence, etc. (C). False/ unjust/ frivolous levies, liens, garnishment, guardianship, power of attorneys, foreclosure, tenant-hold-over-eviction, etc. Thousands of cases are pending in the court systems for years or even decades; believed to be filed by "fraud- crime- networks" to victimize people; without due process, proper services, proceedings; cause homelessness, poverty; not because of the problems of homeowners/citizens, but because of unjust judicial/court/legal personnel, court auditor as part of "official misconduct- government gang- fraud- crime- injustice networks". Judges (unjust, irresponsible, judicially disabled) include

, ; District Judge , Judge ; court personnel/ sheriff, attorneys, affiliated law firms; Sheriffs . , etc. (E). Problems of privatization, irresponsibility, disabilities of government attorneys and judicial/legal/court personnel are very serious, expanding, local- nationwide- global; exporting injustice overseas; , Co unty, Maryland state; New Jersey Co unty, Judge (private attorney), Judge Prosecutor (private attorney) , police . (F) Other people committed, conspired with police and fraud- crime-networks: Private attorneys: (Md.), (Md.), (Md.), (assigned as legal assistance provider to certain counties by Md. Department of Health and Mental Highgiene, but she went around the state for various abuses with , etc. attorneys (public and private), Esq., (?) and law firms (? , in , Md), , Ho spital, etc. Landlord/ landladies e.g., (Md.) and (Md.) had been unjustly influenced/ conspired. (G). MURDER-FRAUD- CRIME- INJUSTICE NETWORKS inc. County Council, Md, ; , Esq. Legal counsel/Chief of staff (any relation to , esq. in New Jersey??), , co uncil hearing coordinators/substitute; Md General Assembly, ; U. S. Congress, Senate, legal staff; , administrative staff, security guard, students (); ; Institute of Peace, conference organizers/ speakers. Sincerely, Lih Young

04/15/2013

Lih Young

I am opposed to the Keystone Pipeline. 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.
Lily Baum Pollans

04/15/2013

Lily Baum Pollans

If we don't protect our water now, we won't get a second chance. There will be a leak or spill at some point in time. The Ogallala Aquifer may be needed to supply water to Colorado, Arizona, California, and Nevada, as well as Nebraska. We must protect every drop of water on our earth. Linda Batliner

04/15/2013

Linda Batliner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. That same dollar investment into alternative power would advance us past the need for fossil fuels, improve the environment and our way of life, and not rob farmers of the homes, remove croplands from food production- another major need, along with not creating the thousand mile site for future disasters and eventually contaminating the aquifer for millions. Sincerely, Linda Boots

04/15/2013

Linda Boots

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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.). We deserve it and climate change is demanding it! I voted for you both times and I want YOU to go down in history as the president who stood up and made the necessary changes to save our planet! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Linda Burke

04/15/2013

Linda Burke

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I live in Texas, and I don't want our beautiful state to suffer a spill like the one in Arkansas. This filthy oil is not easily cleaned up, and it is toxic! Pipelines always leak somewhere, sometime, please do not allow this pipeline to be built! Let Canada run this across their own country, the have coastlines and port, it can ship from there. Sincerely, Linda Harrison

04/15/2013

Linda Harrison

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. +++This is an extremely important decision and it rests on your shoulders. You campaigned for cleaner energy, losing dependence on Oil. and now you want to allow drilling in our Arctic waters and approving this horrible, waiting for a tragic accident (spill). we all know that will be a given at some point. I can't get my head around why you would put not just one state at risk, but the entire Bread basket of America. PLEASE, THIS CANNOT BE ALLOWED, STAND UP FOR AMERICA AND JUST SAY NO.++++++Thank you
Sincerely, Linda Headley

04/15/2013

Linda Headley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Keystone is unnecessary as a cooperative N.A. venture, as artic ice melt before mid-century, will allow movement of Canada's oil to planned O.S. customers w/o a pipeline that operates under an abuse of U.S. Tready protocol. Eminent domain seizures of American's property for Canada's industry profits, is a manifest abuse of Tready Power. Canada's O.S. marketing of its tar sands oil is not in US interests, but favors an existing military-industrial complex controlled by multi-national corporations, which have no loyalty to the USA. Use of this dirty and expensive fuel prolongs the life of a deadly industry, while preventing energy realignment with alteritive fuels to mainstay capacity, which does serve US interests. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Linda Maher

04/15/2013

Linda Maher

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Our generation's legacy for our children and grandchildren is becoming the most shameful in history. We know what we need to do. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone. Profit should not be running our world. Reject this for a better future. Sincerely, Linda McGowan

04/15/2013

Linda McGowan

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am TOTALLY opposed to the development of the tar sands. A solar panel on everyone's roof would be a better use of the money. ! Linda Purdy 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Linda W. Purdy

04/15/2013

Linda W. Purdy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please reject the Keystone XL. Americans and the rest of the world do not need dirty oil. We need clean energy that is safe to extract. Sincerely, Lisa Abele

04/15/2013

Lisa Abele

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the American public and on behalf of citizens of the world: we are all affected by climate change and horrific oil spills that poison our environment. Sincerely, Lisa Drost Nash

04/15/2013

Lisa Drost Nash

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. So many of us voted for you Mr Obama, in the hope that protecting our environment and climate for not only us, but for our children and grandchildren, was a major priority for you. Please don't let us all down. Please Reject keystone now. Sincerely, Lisa Lubinsky

04/15/2013

Lisa Lubinsky

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. I've known, in my heart, all along, that many of the people there, as well as here, don't want such a disaster, neither. 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. The environment in all countries deserves and begs better than another pipeline that's only going to be another disaster waiting to happen. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Lisa Maurer

04/15/2013

Lisa Maurer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone Pipeline State Department Comment Line To State Department Comment Line, The Keystone XL pipeline is 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. 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 I live in KS, I do not want this to be the end of the Earth as we know it!!! do we really want to live in a world full of toxic air, and water! PEACE, LOVE&MUSIC Sincerely, Lisa McKee

04/15/2013

Lisa McKee

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. This project is absurd ... the risks are too great. The proposal should have been killed as soon as it was brought to the table. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Lisa Pereira

04/15/2013

Lisa Pereira

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. PLEASE STOP THIS HORRIFICALLY DANGEROUS PIPELINE. Allowing the KXL to bisect the country is tantamount to signing a death sentence to the millions of people who rely on the Ogallala Aquifer for their drinking water. TAR SANDS ARE LETHAL, and we cannot allow this environmental horror to be inflicted on our people and our nation. We are stewards of the planet, and it is up to each of us to act thoughtfully, intelligently, compassionately, and above all, wisely. For the sake of all of us, DO NOT allow this pipeline to be built!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Lisa Vagner

04/15/2013

Lisa Vagner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I ask you the question, what is more important: clean energy climate friendly energy energy for the future that moves us away from fossil fuels supporting energy that provides abundant jobs energy that does not have the potential to poison the environment OR the complete opposite of every one of the above? The answer seems very simple. Please do the right thing. Sincerely, Lisa Wiggins

04/15/2013

Lisa Wiggins

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. The original Keystone pipeline had 12 spills in its first year. In its entirety, the Keystone XL pipeline is absolutey toxic to our air, water and climate. This pipeline is sending tar sands through America not to America. Will you take responsibility if our Ogalla Aquifer here in Nebraska gets polluted from a spill? The 2010 tar sands spill in Michigan caused physical and neurological damage to people. With all the spils that never get totally cleaned up, you should NOT allow the Keystone XL pipeline to proceed. PLEASE deny a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. It is against our national interest. Sincerely, Loren Lund

04/15/2013

Loren Lund

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Lorena Khalsa United States of America

04/15/2013

Lorena Khalsa

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You say you want to hear from "We the People". We are your base & we are very engaged in embracing the " Greatest Paradigm Shift" ever on Earth. We are speaking and ask that you sincerely listen, be brave & put an end to dirty toxic energy. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Loretta Huston

04/15/2013

Loretta Huston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There have also been several spills in this past year in Salt Lake City- oil leaked from a pipeline into a stream that flowed through the city into Tracy Aviary last year, coating many birds with oil- nobody knew it for days!!! and last month, Chevron spilled into Willard Bay off the Great Salt Lake, right at the time of major spring bird migrations through the area. The U.S. should not be host to this pipeline as there is no guarantee we'll get the oil, but we'll certainly get all the pollution when (not if) there is a break in the pipeline. Don't tell me there will be safeguards against that. I don't believe oil companies when they say there won't be problems. We don't want it at the environmental costs and the snail-like speed the oil companies take care of the problems and pay for their mistakes! NO to Keystone pipeline!!!!

Sincerely, Loretta Mcconnor

04/15/2013

Loretta Mcconnor

To the Secretary of State, Granting the permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline will seem like a very small thing, when the coastal cities of the world are underwater, there are a billion displaced climate refugees, and civilization as we know it is over. Refusing the permit, on the contrary, could be the courageous and correct first step in US leadership to bring the world into a new green energy economy. The administration should now require all its facilities and contractors switch to green energy within 3 years, build and retrofit maximum efficiency, and only use fossil fuel for aviation until algae fuel, or other truly low carbon fuel is available. Louise Stonington

04/15/2013

Louise Stonington

To the Secretary of State Please deny the permit for the Keystone Pipeline, or at least delay the decision for a couple years. By then green energy will have lowered energy costs enough so that the tar sands will not be economically feasible to recover, and we can all use electric cars powered by our solar panels. Government investment in clean energy will create many more jobs, lower the price of alternatives, and make the pipeline an outdated boondoggle. Louise Stonington

04/15/2013

Louise Stonington

Please deny the permit for the Keystone Pipeline The pipeline project is designed to raise US fuel prices. This is not in our best interest. TransCanada put on their website that the pipeline would relieve the glut of oil in the Midwest. The idea being that without that glut they can charge more for oil. For lower energy prices, we need to invest in battery powered vehicles, charge them with solar and wind. We can do this before the pipeline would even be built. Louise Stonington

04/15/2013

Louise Stonington

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Keystone is morally and ethically wrong. Do you have the backbone to act against Big Oil or are you in their pocket? No Oil jobs - put folks to work making alternative energy sources. Term 2 is not going the way those who voted for you dreamed of. Sincerely, Lucia Maria Minervini

04/15/2013

Lucia Maria Minervini

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Do you realize that carrying out your announced plans re the Keystone XL pipeline it is 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 BE ERASED if YOU approve the KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE and develops the tar sands. CANADA'S environmental momentum in 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. And AFTER THE RECENT TAR SANDS SPILL in ARKANSAS IN OUR COUNTRY along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it is not a doubt that this pipeline will never be safe. It is becoming alarming to me that YOU continue supporting KEYSTONE XL AND UNDERMINES MY FAITH in YOUR promises. I demand climate leadership from this administration as YOU ALLOW, even SUPPORT another environmental DISASTER, that is, the KEYSTONE XL DISASTER. Sincerely, Lucy Knoll

04/15/2013

Lucy Knoll

Please stop KXL pipeline

04/15/2013

Lynn Campion

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Try speaking with T. Boone Pickens about this. 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. Let our country be the leader for the world on how to break free from oil addiction. Sincerely, Lynn Hansen

04/15/2013

Lynn Hansen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The whole Canadian tar sands enterprise will go down in history as one of the biggest boondoggles in human history. 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. And all for a "cheap" product whose price will be higher when shipped off our southern coast to foreign buyers. What are we doing to ourselves and the planet for stupid short-term gains for the oil industry. This thinking must change if we are to survive. Let's not facilitate the demise of a huge expanse of the boreal wilderness and jeopardize all those who live along the proposed pipeline. It's clear that industry can't do a perfect job of transporting this filthy oil without accidents and nothing short of 100% perfect is acceptable. Sincerely, Lynn Leopold

04/15/2013

Lynn Leopold

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. A lot of us who voted for you and contributed to your campaign are feeling betrayed by the way you are kowtowing to Republicans and big business. Please give me a reason to still feel loyal to you and the Democratic party instead of feeling angry , ignored and discounted. And don't even think about my contributing any more money unless you stop throwing us under the bus in favor of rich Republicans. Sincerely, Lynn Szwaja

04/15/2013

Lynn Szwaja

Dear Ms. Walker, I am strongly opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline. I believe spills are inevitable. Safe drinking water should be our first priority. Oil spills will no doubt contaminate water sources. I also don't believe that building a pipeline to export oil will help us achieve energy independence. It is critical that we stop this misguided plan. Thank you, Martha Harney

04/15/2013

M Harney

I urge President Obama to not approve the Keystone XL pipeline for the following reasons: 1) The pipeline will not make the USA energy independent. The oil is destined to be refined in the US and then shipped to other countries. 2) Tarsands oil requires extra energy to produce it. It is therefore significantly dirtier than other sources of fossil fuels and will cause greater greenhouse gas emissions than regular crude oil. 3) 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 HYPERLINK "[#_liquidon">http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/SigPSI.html?nocache=5779](http://primis.phmsa.dot.gov/comm/reports/safety/SigPSI.html?nocache=5779)" 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> 4) 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. 5) 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. Thank you for considering this matter. Miriam Weber

04/15/2013

M Weber

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The cost of another spill is too high a price to pay, especially when it comes at the expense of the environment with high profits going to Big Oil. Please do not backslide on what progress you've made. There is no appeasing in this situation, you must say "NO", just as you would to a child when they become petulant. Sincerely, M.A. Armano

04/15/2013

M.a. Armano

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please do the right thing for America and the world, Mr. President. Rejecting the Keystone XL Pipeline is an important step in breaking our addiction to oil and its devastating environmental impact. Sincerely, Mac McMillen

04/15/2013

Mac Mcmillen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I want my taxes to go to renewable energy. Let the oil and coal companies fend for themselves. Their greed has gotten us into the mess we're in. What has happened to our democracy. Our government seems to serve the corporations first. The ones who are sending our jobs overseas! .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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Madeleine Johansson

04/15/2013

Madeleine Johansson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This sounds like the worst possible thing dor our country to do at this point in terms of the environment. it seems so obvious to me that this is a horrible, terrible decision. JUST SAY NO. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Madelyn Kaplin

04/15/2013

Madelyn Kaplin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I was present in , Texas when the State Department conducted its "public hearing" on the Keystone XL Pipeline before and I know what a farce the whole process is as the so-called hearing was run by a PR firm representing TransCanda. It is time that leadership in the State Department and in this Administration take charge and set things right. Stop the pipeline. Save the Earth (literally). Sincerely, Madolyn Crumpton

04/15/2013

Madolyn Crumpton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President, I voted for you and contributed to your campaign because I believed you when you promised to protect the environment. It is now time for you to act to stop cowering to BIG OIL and BIG GAS and stand up for Planet Earth and the people who are trying their best to live there. Sincerely, Madolyn Crumpton

04/15/2013

Madolyn Crumpton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, As an American citizen, I oppose this very dangerous project. 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. Please stop Keystone XL. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. decrease global warming pollution by approving Shell's plans to drill in the Arctic, giving away coal buried under federal lands so coal companies can turn around and sell it overseas, and by considering projects like the Keystone XL Pipeline. Don't do it!!!! The administration can't have it both ways. It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. The truth is that if this pipeline is approved, it's going to be even more difficult to save the climate. Like drilling for oil in the Arctic or allowing coal companies to dig up billions of tons of coal from federal lands and sell it overseas, new fossil fuel projects threaten to send our climate past a point of no return. Sincerely, Maile George

04/15/2013

Maile George

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Keystone Pipeline will put many Americas at risk. It endangers valuable ecosystems, and could leak into the Ogallala Aquifer, a source of drinking water for two million people. The corrosive quality of the tar sands makes a leak in the pipeline more likely than with conventional oil. Please, protect the people and ecosystems of America over the minimal profit the Keystone XL could bring. Sincerely, Mara Henk

04/15/2013

Mara Henk

Dear President Obama, Keystone is dangerous and dirty. Please help our planet and our health.
Sincerely, Marcia

04/15/2013

Marcia

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If the oil companies showed any interest whatsoever in being responsible about maintaining their pipelines and shutting down the spills promptly and cleaning up the spills completely, I would have many fewer problems with this. But they do not follow through on any of the above counts. And clean, unpolluted water is much more or a necessity than the few jobs they offer and the small amount of petroleum products that would actually stay in our country. Sincerely, Margaret Hutchinson

04/15/2013

Margaret Hutchinson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I voted for you because I believe you are a man who will serve the people of America. Please don't disappointment me and leave me in fear of my future and the future of my family. Sincerely, Margaret Miller

04/15/2013

Margaret Miller

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. President Obama-- It seems clear that oil companies will do and say anything to get what they want. Because they have effectively blocked other reasonable steps to put us on a more sustainable path of energy independence, it is up to you to do the one thing that you can do solely on your executive authority --say no to the Keystone XL pipeline. I favor market incentives to reflect the economic and climate costs of carbon-based energy. Unfortunately, that is not on the table, much to the disappointment of those of us who supported you with money and sweat. So do the right thing. Don't let your reputations be tarnished by oil spills 5, 10 and 20 years from now when you will be a respected senior statesman. Let Canada take the risk as well as the profit if it wants to develop tar sands. Sincerely, Margaret Pickett

04/15/2013

Margaret Pickett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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 demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't let the pressure from big oil and other fuel industries. Their goal is primarily increased income, with no thought for people needs. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline. We will not benefit as a nation. Thank you. Sincerely, Margaret S. & Robert S. Bates

04/15/2013

Margaret S. & Robert S. Bates

The U.S. State Department should honor its treaty with the Oglala Sioux Nation. The Sioux have voted not to risk their precious water with the Tar Sands diluted bitumen (dilbit) Keystone XL pipeline. Stand by your treaty, State Department. Reject the Keystone XL pipeline. It is not in the national interest to break our treaty with the Lakota Nation. Nature doesn't care how hard we tried. Nature cares how high the parts per million mount. ~HYPERLINK "<http://350.org>"350.org

04/15/2013

Margaret Torres

America's agricultural economy is set to undergo dramatic changes over the next three decades, as warmer temperatures devastate crops, according to a US government report. The draftHYPERLINK "<http://www.globalchange.gov/home>" US National Climate Assessment report predicts that a gradually warming climate and unpredictable severe weather, such as the drought that last year spread across two-thirds of the continental United States, will have serious consequences for farmers. Sincerely, Madge Torres

04/15/2013

Margaret Torres

Please don't approve this pipeline. Tar sands oil is nasty stuff and we don't need it. Thank you.

04/15/2013

Marge Koehler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Is it possible that "leasers" who are seemingly intelligent could be seriously considering the construction of yet another dirty pipeline?! Are we so desperate for fossil fuel that we will risk more spills of such a toxic and hazardous sludge? It is unthinkable that fuel is more important than clean drinking water and people's health!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Maria Albergato PhD

04/15/2013

Maria Albergato PhD

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Stand up and be brave, Mr. President. Find other alternatives. This is bad for us, it's obvious. Sincerely, Maria S.

04/15/2013

Maria S.

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I voted for you in faith that you would work to protect our planet, our country's lands, waters, air and wildlife. This pipeline is a huge disaster that stretches for miles and miles - nothing is worth the risks that it poses!
Sincerely, Maria Watkins

04/15/2013

Maria Watkins

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. When we think about what sort of planet we will leave our future, as we must, it becomes abundantly clear that our thirst for energy overcomes our concern for the future. This is a clash of needs that must simultaneously be satisfied. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Marianne Caston

04/15/2013

Marianne Caston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I know that you care deeply about what is happening to our country and its welfare. Building the Keystone XL Pipeline goes against all your concerns to preserve our planet. You know the dangers involved. Please do not allow the building of the Pipeline. Show your concern for our land, our health, and our future. Reject the Keystone XL Pipeling. Thank you for backing up your concern with action. Marie Laux Sincerely, Marie Laux

04/15/2013

Marie Laux

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. AND THERE'S THE MATTER OF WATER; MILLIONS UPON MILLIONS OF GALLONS OF WATER WILL BE USED IN THE PROCESSING OF TAR SANDS. THERE IS NOT JUST THE POSSIBLE POISONING OF WATER USED FOR CONSUMPTION AND FOR CROPS. TERRIBLE DROUGHT CONDITIONS ARE ALREADY IN PLACE IN MOST OF THE COUNTRY WITH NO END IN SIGHT FOR RELIEF. THEN THERE'S THE MATTER OF WHAT TO DO WITH ALL THAT WASTEWATER.... YES, THE WATER THAT'S NECESSARY FOR HUMAN LIFE WILL BE POISONED WITH NO PLACE TO GO WHILE HUMANS, ANIMALS, AND OUR FOOD SUPPLY WILL BE DEPRIVED OF THE VERY THING NEEDED FOR LIFE TO GO ON. THE GAS ITSELF CAN LEAK THROUGH THE GROUND INTO NEARBY WELLS WHICH IS A SAFETY HAZARD BECAUSE IT'S HIGHLY FLAMMABLE. THERE HAVE BEEN MORE THAN 1000 DOCUMENTED CASES OF CONTAMINATION NEAR DRILLING SITES THAT HAVE CAUSED HOUSES AND WELLS TO EXPLODE, CAUSING DEATHS, INJURIES AND LOSS OF PROPERTY. THE PRODUCTION OF THE FUEL EMITS LARGE QUANTITIES OF METHANE, WHICH IS 30 TIME MORE POTENT THAN CARBON DIOXIDE. DRILLING ALSO PRODUCES AIR POLLUTION AND RESIDENTS HAVE COMPLAINED OF UNEXPLAINED ILLNESS IN HUMANS AND ANIMALS. TESTING REVEALS HIGH LEVELS OF BENZENE.. [SEE THE HAZARDS OF BENZENE] IF THIS PIPELINE IS APPROVED WE'LL WITNESS A MAD RUSH TO DRILL EVERYWHERE. BE ASSURED THAT THE DEVELOPERS WILL TURN THE ENTIRE COUNTRY INTO A SUPER GIANT GAS FIELD . LASTLY, THERE'S THE JOB ISSUE; THE PIPELINE WILL PROVIDE JOBS FOR A FEW THOUSAND PEOPLE... AND ONLY FOR A LIMITED TIME. WHATS THE USE? PUT THE MONEY INTO WIND AND SOLAR , SOURCES OF ENERGY THAT WILL NEVER GO AWAY. PRESIDENT OBAMA, PLEASE JUST DO IT... REJECT, REJECT, REJECT. THANK YOU FOR LISTENING TO A CONCERNED , VERY WORRIED CITIZEN. MARIE MONAGHAN

04/15/2013

Marie Monaghan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. GAS - NATURAL GAS IS THE ANSWER! EVER HEAR OF T. BOONE PICKENS? I have been following his website for 3 YEARS! He has the ANSWER:) I LIKE YOU, BUT 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. THANKS for reading this:) Sincerely, Marilee Hilgendorf

04/15/2013

Marilee Hilgendorf

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My President, you tell us you want to work towards renewable, CLEAN energy sources. Please follow thru and do not approve this terrible attack on our Earth, and all living things. Thank you. Marilyn de Vito Sincerely, Marilyn de Vito

04/15/2013

Marilyn De Vito

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Marilyn Klein

04/15/2013

Marilyn Klein

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How can you possibly consider giving the go ahead for this pipeline. You have told us of the dangers of global warming and our need to get away from fossil fuels. I understand that this oil after being refined will be sold to China and India. This is just another way for Big Oil to make more money. It will not help anyone but them. say NO to this pipeline. Say YES to clean energy. Sincerely, Marilyn Swanson

04/15/2013

Marilyn Swanson

Apr 14, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, A meaningful assessment of the environmental effects of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline is needed. The review put forth by the U.S. State department fails to account for its immense climate and environmental impacts. In particular, the SEIS fails to: * account for the full life-cycle carbon pollution impacts of developing, transporting, refining and burning tar sands oil; * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat and its wildlife that will result by enabling further tar sands development in Canada; * 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. 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. Sincerely, Marina Chicurel

04/15/2013

Marina Chicurel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The Keystone XL pipeline cannot be approved. Doing so will push our climate past a point of no return. Please act to prevent this environmental disaster before it is too late. Massive action is needed to stop global warming. Sincerely, Marjorie Preston

04/15/2013

Marjorie Preston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I'm getting tired of having to harp over & over again about what should've been a no-brainer. I resent like hell that you played golf w/oil criminals after I busted my rear end getting to the climate rally in Feb. Quit being an Oreo cookie. Sincerely, Marjorie Steakley

04/15/2013

Marjorie Steakley

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You are both well aware of the recent accidents concerning oil pipelines and the increased risks to pipelines due to the heavier and more toxic tar sands oil. As a country, we need to take a stand that continuing on the same path of oil dependence and finding new sources of oil is not sustainable and creates further damage to our planet. We must put the health and welfare of current and "future" generations at the front of our decisions. Following the same path that we have been on for many years may be the least expensive, but it is not the right decision for the future of this country. Just like gun control, we need to think about the impact of our decisions on our children, their children, etc. In addition, from an economic perspective, continuing to rely on oil as our primary source of energy is not the solution. 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. We need to get our best minds on finding solutions to a problem that has long term implications. Economic problems come and go and create short term pain. Causing further damage to our planet has long term implications and is not something that we can fix once we go past the tipping point. This is not an easy problem to solve and is full of political risk. However, we need true leaders that are focused on the future for our citizens and planet, and are willing to take a stand. There have been many examples in our history of Presidents that have recognized a problem, taken a stance, set a direction and then rallied people to the cause. Please be one of those leaders and write your name in the history books. Sincerely, Mark & Barbara Nelson

04/15/2013

Mark & Barbara Nelson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. In addition to this, collection of natural gas needs to be mandated in North Dakota and the Bakken oil field. That infrastructure doesn't exist 'yet' as justification and allowance for burning off this gas is no excuse. Oil producers should be held accountable for all impacts to the environment that they create. Sincerely,
mark carson

04/15/2013

Mark Carson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I, like you, have two daughters and would like to leave them a better world than was left me. This pipeline seems contrary to that notion, so please stop this so we can leave a better place for our children. Sincerely,
Mark Davidson

04/15/2013

Mark Davidson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We had a lot of hope for you. It's your second term. It's your LAST term. You could do SO MANY things to make this country and this world a better place. Instead, you choose to hasten our demise, from allowing the middle class to go extinct, our environment to rot, and our standing among nations to plummet. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mark Doom

04/15/2013

Mark Doom

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I respectfully demand a robust clean-energy policy as well as climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mark Furst

04/15/2013

Mark Furst

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Your decision will affect the future of all life on this beautiful planet. Please do the right thing. Put the planet and its population first because no amount of oil money will be able to buy it back again. Sincerely, Mark Lynall

04/15/2013

Mark Lynall

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department How much of the environment is it acceptable to foul before our leadership stops enabling it? As someone (wise) once said: Those who don't learn the mistakes of the past are destined to repeat them". Please, stop this madness. Sincerely, Mark Masi

04/15/2013

Mark Masi

U.S. Department of State Attn: Genevieve Walker, NEPA Coordinator 2201 C Street NW, Room 2726 Washington, D.C. 20520 Dear Ms. Walker, Building the pipeline will increase energy security and reduce America's dependence on oil imports from outside North America. I am writing to urge you to conduct a thorough and complete analysis of the environmental risks posed by the Keystone XL pipeline before making a recommendation to Secretary of State Kerry and ultimately President Obama. Two recent tar sands spills in Arkansas and Minnesota are a reminder of the dangers pipelines pose when they are not maintained to existing regulations and accepted industry standards. 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. My review of existing documents indicates 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. A total of 56 surface water bodies are crossed, all are crucial drinking and irrigation water for many Americans. 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. I urge you to consider these things and make a decision based not only on national interests, but also the risks to our water supply. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Mark Olinger

04/15/2013

Mark Olinger

Dear Secretary Kerry: I am writing to respectfully urge that the Keystone XL pipeline not be approved. As a native Arkansan, who now lives in Texas, it is heartbreaking to see the news coverage of the pipeline spill in Mayflower, Ark., which occurred recently and which carried the same diluted bitumen that Keystone XL will carry if it is approved. The risk to our water, our wildlife, our air—in short, to our Mother Earth—is just too great. We should be promoting the energy sources of the 21st century—clean, renewable energy sources—not the dirty and dangerous fossil fuels of the end of the 19th century. I don't want to see what happened in Arkansas take place here in Texas, or anywhere else, for that matter. Please, please stand up to the powerful in order to protect the rights and the health of the powerless. And please remember the generations to come, who will have to live with the consequences of the decisions that are made today. Please deny approval of the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you. Sincerely yours, Lucy Petrucci

04/15/2013

Mark Terranella

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department As you announced several times, we live in a great time of green energy invention - right now allowing us to make cars that use compressed air to power the engine. This is the way our future should go. Tar sands create most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet - more than traditional petroleum. First, the Boreal forest's rich ecosystem must be ripped open to expose tar sands sludge. Then, otherworldly trucks dig up four tons of earth for every one barrel of tar sands sludge they extract. Next comes the resource-intensive process of using very hot water to separate the sludge from the sand and 'cleanse' the sludge of unwanted toxics. This creates prodigious quantities of water pollution. It also burns so much energy that the tar sands are Canada's fastest growing source of global warming pollution. The toxic water dumped into open pits by tar sands operations leaks at the rate of 11 million litres (3 million gallons) per day into the surrounding environment. These ponds are so polluted they kill birds that land on them. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from your administration. Let's please give back something to this planet - not only take away from it. Please, reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Marko Dullack

04/15/2013

Marko Dullack

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department THE SUN IS FREE.LET'S EXPLOIT THE HELL OUT OF THAT! Sincerely, Martin Barrett

04/15/2013

Martin Barrett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.. Mr. Obama, you are my president. Please do what is best for me and the other ordinary people in our country and around the world. Do what is best for your daughters and all our daughters. Reject this dangerous pipeline and spend the money on renewables and dont sell our coal to other countries. It does not matter who burns it on the planet. We all breathe the same air. Sincerely, Marty Shows

04/15/2013

Marty Shows

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The most obvious answer to whether or not to oppose the Keystone XL pipeline is pure logic: the disadvantages to our Country, it's citizens, and climate conditions FAR outweigh the questionable advantages. People in the U.S. would much rather live in, and see their children grow up in, a healthier Country rather than the kind of Country resulting from approval of the Keystone XL. There's only one right and moral way to go---OPPOSE THE KEYSTONE XL. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a neighborhood. This spill indicated 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. It is impossible to address climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress will be erased if we develop the tar sands and accept the Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mary Bedinger

04/15/2013

Mary Bedinger

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I have two immediate relatives in the oil business; I'm divorced from one, the other is my wonderful son. One has retired, having made his millions already. The second is working in CO and WY. Needless to say these family members oppose and argue against my personal views of the climate changes and the environmental changes that are inherently the result of oil, gas, coal mining, coal trains, and oil and natural gas pipelines. (And I am the lone Democrat in the family since my parents and daughter passed away) I have lived in (explo ration and drilling), in a small town in KY (gas transmission), and in WA (oil and gas exploration in Alaska and TX, and natural gas pipelines). Now I live in a rural area of WA. Our neighborhood is currently opposing a new natural gas pipeline, part of which will go in just across the road from my home. The last one blew up in 1997, destroying property but no lives, thank goodness. This new pipeline will be attached to the previous, and will travel across properties and down to a proposed natural gas plant that will deliver electricity to the WA area. Ho ever, they don't even need the electricity yet, so Williams is destroying our property values and safety so that they might make future money. And our community is fighting the miles of coal trains that will come from WY to be exported from our local port in Longview (and another futher N) to China (which will then return to use in the form of their coal infested air to the West Coast of the US). A year ago, I thought the Keystone project was dead. Here it is again, going thru the verdant and productive farmlands of mid-America, thru the land where my relatives farmed in NB and still farm in IA, potentially destroying aquifers. What will we do then? How much more do we need to destroy? Money is a big draw, and it's dangerous. But it's most dangerous to folks who will never benefit from it, and even more dangerous to the next generations who will have to figure out how to fix our folly. When does it stop? Our local climate has changed in the past 12 months. We now have cool, cloudy weather summers, cold winters with poor snows, and inadequate snow pack for our wells for this coming summer. We were feeling pretty lucky while we watched what the climate changes were doing to the rest of the country the past two years. Now it's our turn, here in the beautiful NW. Yes, I'm putting in a garden this year. But last year's vegie garden was poor because of inadequate sunshine and water (it didn't rain for the three summer months), and our wells were at their limits because of inadequate winter snow pack. This time, it will be growing on hope. And the coal trains, and the potential for explosions in natural gas lines will be added threats as the years go on. I feel so badly for the folks along the Keystone pipeline path. They are hard pressed to see a future for their children. Life is hard these days, and there is so much to fear just in walking out the front door of our homes. Why make it worse? Thank you for considering my response. Sincerely, Mary Collins Pre-printed response from Sierra: 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.
Sincerely, Mary Collins

04/15/2013

Mary Collins

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Why can't there be a pipeline to northern nebraska and then truck stuff south or west to seattle/portland/belllingham? This will minimize potential of environ.damage,create jobs in Nebraska and for truckers.This is compromise solution until we don't use this form of oil at all. Sincerely, Mary Hendrick

04/15/2013

Mary Hendrick

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The folks at Greenpeace have done a fine job detailing the fundamentals. But they have failed to include this part in their letter - "Decisions like the Keystone XL Pipeline will be what ultimately determines the President's legacy on climate change. Not a speech." Yet again, those who supported this administration find themselves scratching their heads and wondering, where is the man we voted for? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mary Holmes

04/15/2013

Mary Holmes

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. THINK about your daughters and THEIR children! What about a spill in their backyards?? PLEASE don't "compromise" on tar sands infrastructure, even tho it is very tough to stand firm. Thanks for being a real leader!

Sincerely, Mary Isaak

04/15/2013

Mary Isaak

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Live up to your campaign promises. Do not allow this stupid pipeline to ruin our beautiful country just to line the pockets of a very few corporate greed mongers. They don't have the technology to clean up their shoddy practices. Just look at Arkansas. The oil itself won't benefit us: it's going to other countries. Jobs are not being created for us: just short term. This is such a cruel and tragic project for our land and our people. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mary Jane Tytko

04/15/2013

Mary Jane Tytko

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please consider the long-term effects of this pipeline for our nation--the degradation of environment, the costs of clean-up, the health and safety issues. Is the short-term gain worth the long-term losses? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Mary Jones

04/15/2013

Mary Jones

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Yes, I understand it's hard to change. I realize that stopping construction of the Keystone XL pipeline when it's already partially built seems like a waste of resources -- but it's better than the alternative of letting it go through. Some argue that Canada will develop the tar sands anyway and transport the oil through some method that causes even more environmental damage. But WE have to do the right thing. We can hope that our commitment to change will inspire them as well. Sincerely, Mary Mertz

04/15/2013

Mary Mertz

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Doing the same thing, over and over again and expecting different results is the colloquial definition of insanity. 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? To approve such an action is patently insane. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. It's a perfect example of the hypocrisy that is a hallmark of the people we elected you to fight. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Mary Robbins Jones

04/15/2013

Mary Robbins Jones

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Let Canada build their own refineries! If this is supposed to be such a profitable project, let Canada keep their own sludge, pollution, profits, and supposed thousands of new jobs!! WE don't need it or want it!
Sincerely, Mary Rose Zogby

04/15/2013

Mary Rose Zogby

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. As a middle school Science teacher it is difficult to teach about caring for the planet when the politicians are working against that philosophy. If you, Mr. Obama, have promised these oil guys a deal please rethink it. Please make your legacy about saving our beautiful Earth for the future. Sincerely, Mary Ryan

04/15/2013

Mary Ryan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.I am appalled with the whole idea of the XL pipeline, especially when I read about the extremely bad pollution in Beijing and Shanghai where my American family lives. All this pipeline is going to do is make pollution much much worse globally and what affects one country affects us all---small planet indeed it is and it's our global responsibility to clean up our act not make it 10000 times worse with this horrendous pipeline. Stop it----stop it now! Sincerely, Mary Straub

04/15/2013

Mary Straub

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please do one of the best things possible for our environment and stop any further work on the Keystone XL.
Proceeding on this pipeline will endanger our children just as much as pointing automatic guns at them.
Sincerely, Mary Vermeulen

04/15/2013

Mary Vermeulen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You are a very intelligent person and I know I have no clue how hard it is to be The President of the most powerful nation in the world but I've always wanted to save the planet. From the age of 10 to now I have been all about healing the world. Humans have destroyed this earth beyond repair. There's no way for us to completely fix what we, as a species have done to the Earth but we can prevent future environmental disasters from happening and this is what the Keystone XL Pipeline is, a disaster. I am a very opinionated person but there is no denying that petroleum is completely and totally hazardous to the environment. To be blunt, if you allow this then I assume you are ready to mentally, emotionally and publicly take responsibility for all environmental damage, not to mention the countless animals and innocent creatures that will die or be severely mutated if there is an accident. Thank you. Sincerely,
Mason Slaughter

04/15/2013

Mason Slaughter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I hope you are a president that actually listens to the concerns of his people and makes decisions that reflect what they ask of you. Please do not allow this pipeline to go through. Sincerely, Matt Browning

04/15/2013

Matt Browning

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please, can we move towards renewable resources and give up our dependency of limited, environmental and health harming fossil fuels. Fossil fuels should be a part of history, like all fossils. Sincerely, Matthew Crane

04/15/2013

Matthew Crane

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Reject the pipeline for the sake of your children and mine! Sincerely, Matthew Cunningham

04/15/2013

Matthew Cunningham

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I am just now traveling home from documenting what happens when an economy digs itself deeper and deeper into dependence on fossils. It is not pretty. Not on the global level, and certainly not on the local. As the leader for by far the largest economy per capita, lead us into something that will keep America and the world running in the long term, not just for now, until we have depleted our resources and the earth is boiling. Sincerely, Mattias Lundblad

04/15/2013

Mattias Lundblad

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There are SO many potential disasters related to this ill-advised pipeline, and the spill in Arkansas shows just how badly things can go - and then Exxon has the gall to try to block anyone seeing their mess! And the LIES about all that oil making the U.S. more energy independent are just that - LIES - much or even most of that oil will be for export - hardly making the U.S. more energy independent, and just lining the pockets of Big Oil executives even more than they already are. BLOCK THIS PIPELINE! Sincerely, Mauro Montoya

04/15/2013

Mauro Montoya

I am writing to ask that our government do the right thing - for it's citizens, the country and the planet - by refusing to sign the Keystone XL pipeline extension. The people of this country do care, we are simply being drowned out by the lowest-common-denominator focus of the media and the money of big business. The oil that will be pumped through the keystone pipeline - Canadian tar sands oil - is pretty much the worst type of oil there is. It's the same toxic sludge that burst through people's homes in Arkansas a few weeks ago. 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. 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. So why would we ever do this to ourselves? By approving the pipeline Obama's administration will, in essence, be saying that it is for the destruction of Canada's fragile norther environment, for putting the lives (and property) of Americans in the path of the pipeline at risk of oil spill contamination, and for the dominance of fossil fuels in our energy future, at a time when the effects of climate change - drought, severe weather and flooding - are already becoming everyday realities. No one gains here but the oil industry and the companies with the contracts to build the pipeline itself. Are they really more important than American people? Megan Jones-Smith

04/15/2013

Megan Jones

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The fact that this is even being considered is ridiculous. We can't survive and flourish without the three "E's" The Environment, The Economy & Education. You may notice that the Environment comes first. That is because without a healthy Environment to live in the Economy means nothing. We all DIE. How is that so hard to understand? We all have family's and would like our children and grandchildren to have family's too. Stop profiting off the suffering and death of others. So much is done in the name of religion doesn't anyone realize Greed is a sin. This is truly a sad time for our country. I voted for you both please do not let us down. Sincerely, Melanie Gage

04/15/2013

Melanie Gage

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I implore you to necessitate to cessation of any further pipelines. We have enough oil. We need clean energy! We have the resources provided by Our Great Spirit!! Bless the World with Your Power to Be A True Leader! Protect the clean land that we have left to show our children what Truly Is Important. Thank YOU Aho Melisa Brady Utah U.S.A. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Melisa Brady

04/15/2013

Melisa Brady

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department STAND UP FOR THE PEOPLE OR THE PEOPLE WILL STAND UP TO YOU. IT REALLY IS THAT SIMPLE! I RALLIED FOR YOU BOTH TERMS.. DO NOT MAKE ME REGRET THAT!!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Melissa Carpenter

04/15/2013

Melissa Carpenter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please create policies that encourage clean sources of energy. This is one of the most important issues of our time, if not the most important. Thank you for your consideration Sincerely, Meryl Lowell

04/15/2013

Meryl Lowell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is the test that all of us have waited for. This is why we chose you and not the other candidates. We cannot reduce the impacts of climate change if this is allowed to proceed. Please do the right thing for the future of this country and deny the pipeline. Thank you. Sincerely, Michael Domin

04/15/2013

Michael Domin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I would say NO to the Canadian Company that is pushing for this. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Michael Frazier

04/15/2013

Michael Frazier

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. Oil companies will profit hundreds of billions of dollars over the next few decades, and millions of people will suffer, the people will pay taxes to remediate the problems caused by the oil companies greed, and the planet will be fatally damaged in the long run causing thousand of species to become extinct..... 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Michael Gary

04/15/2013

Michael Gary

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I don't see how you can acknowledge and combat global warming and yet approve the building of this pipeline. They are so clearly contradictory. I voted for you in part because of your stewardship of the environment. Don't let me down by abdicating your responsibility. Sincerely, Michael Goodman

04/15/2013

Michael Goodman

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood, more evidence 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 regarding a tar sands pipeline nearly 10 times the size of the Pegasus line that would bisect our country and run through one of our most important aquifers. It is insane to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Climate leadership from this administration must include the rejection of Keystone XL. Please make this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Sincerely, Michael Hughes

04/15/2013

Michael Hughes

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is hard to believe that this is the best idea we can come up with to attempt to respond to our current moment in history. Surely, we can be more imaginative. Thanks for all you are doing. Sincerely, Michael Mansfield

04/15/2013

Michael Mansfield

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's free money but it's not the way to go! Think about your kids lifetime and how you want it to be... Sincerely, Michael manzanares

04/15/2013

Michael Manzanares

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. This industry is poisoning the land and waters of NE Alberta, and its transport has resulted in numerous pipeline spills. Global warming will devastate our present world, UNLESS the planned pipelines and expansion are terminated/abandoned. We in the US already experience increased chronic illness due to pollution, and the larger sea animals/fish are full of toxic mercury and other poisons from fossil fuel burning. The aquifers of the Great Plains will be poisoned by Keystone XL pipeline spills. As you MAY know, pipeline spills are extremely COMMON events. THe health of our citizenry and of our entire planet and our future is at risk from Tar Sands development. THIS is where fosil fuel development must cease, to be replaced by lower consumption and by solar and wind sources of energy. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Michael McLaughlin

04/15/2013

Michael McLaughlin

Dear President Obama, The pipeline is a terrible idea. Not only do the economics not make sense, but it continues a way of thinking and acting that leads us into greater and greater social, economic and environmental dangers! Avaaz lays out a few concerns, listed below, but needless to say, the pipeline should be rejected! _The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous, dirty, and destructive. _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. _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. _For the National Interest and the future of our country and our planet, I urge you to reject this pipeline. -- Michael Starks

04/15/2013

Michael Starks

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is obvious to me that your answer will be Yes to the Oil Industry. And doubly obvious to me that you really have no idea what you are doing, or the answer would be a strong NO. Sincerely, Michaell Allen

04/15/2013

Michaell Allen

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Michele Mcferran

04/15/2013

Michele Mcferran

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. And the Arkansas spill was just a "small" one in comparison to what could happen! Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Let's put an emphasis on science in our schools - from Pre K to College and including the Vo Tech's and come up with cleaner alternative ways of making energy. It would be a win, win win! Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Michele Passseretti

04/15/2013

Michele Passseretti

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I have written you, again and again, in the hope I represent some of the mothers and fathers who are busy or slumbering. Please take BOLD action and lead the US to be the greatest nation in the world, leading in technological advancements towards a world which is habitable for our children, and hopefully grandchildren, towards a future we can prosper in with all human beings and animate beings. I truly respect your positions on many issues but can we have more ingenuity, creativity in this race to drastically alter climate havoc? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Michele Sauer

04/15/2013

Michele Sauer

04/15/2013

Michelle Epstein

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I do not believe the Keystone pipeline will benefit the US. I can't imagine having a pipeline over 1,000 miles long pumping dirty oil to our refineries in the South. Oil pipes leak consistently. Why can't we move ahead with technology instead of staying stuck in the fossil fuel age. We know they are a finite resource so let's move forward instead of sucking the last oil out of the earth. Sincerely, Michelle Hampton

04/15/2013

Michelle Hampton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There were, in 2012, 364 spills industry-wide. In just the last 4 months there have been 6 along pipeline routes that have emptied a considerable amount of nastiness into water sources. 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. So far the companies that have been responsible have managed to duck responsibility by using a number of tactics, most recently the imposition of what amounts to Martial Law by ExxonMobil in Mayflower, AR. There are too many things to go wrong in such a great distance of pipeline and too many precious ecosystems that will be affected. Please do NOT let this go forward! Sincerely, Michelle McElhaney

04/15/2013

Michelle McElhaney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The recent tar sands spill in Arkansas showed us all that liquified bitumen (also known as "tar sand oil") shows that this type of pipeline will never be safe. The high corrosion rates, high temperatures and pressures, all but guarantee that there will be more spills. More tar sand is more environmental disaster, just from spills. Not to mention impacts on climate change. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline immediately. Thank you Mike Ruth

04/15/2013

Mikchael Ruth

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 mighty piece of evidence that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier form of oil. The Arkansas spill highlighted the lack of preparedness on the part of the oil industry and our country 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. The administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency will be erased if we also develop the tar sands. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I expect climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Mike Reeves

04/15/2013

Mike Reeves

The Keystone XL Pipeline is dangerous, dirty, and destructive -- and the Supplemental 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. --- The pipeline isn't just bad for the United States. It's bad for Canada and it's bad for the whole planet. The United States needs to take a stand on this issue. The United States needs to be a leader in fighting global warming, climate change, and the irresponsible destruction of the earth's resources for profit - and without stewardship or concern for future generations. Corporate goals to generate shareholder profits should not have so much influence on how our government responds to this national crisis. Corporate shareholder profits do not run hand in hand with what is best for the country, the people, or the planet. The State Department needs to stand up to the powerful lobbyists and corporate owned politicians and take an intellectually honest look at the big picture - what is happening to our planet, and what is happening in Canada and not allow this pipeline to cross our border. We should not be a party to the rape of the planet, under any circumstances. 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 and Labrador and is home to the largest Caribou herd in the world. The George River Caribou herd. Numbering approximately 400,000 animals. 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 amount 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. In the North the Boreal is bordered by the Tundra. And just below that in the Yukon is an incredible valley. The Tombstone Valley. And the Tombstone Valley is home to the Porcupine caribou herd. Now you probably heard about the

Porcupine caribou herd in the context of it's breeding ground in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Well the wintering ground is also critical and it also is not protected and is potentially could be potentially exploited for gas and minerals rights. The western border of the Boreal and British Columbia is marked by mountains, and on the other side of those mountains is the greatest remaining temperate rainforest in the world, the Great Bear Rainforest. In the heart of the Boreal ecosystem is the Alberta Tar Sands. The largest oil reserves on the planet outside of Saudi Arabia. Trapped underneath the Boreal forest and wet lands of Northern Alberta are this vast reserves of this sticky tar like bitumen. And the mining and exploitation of that is creating a devastation on a scale that the planet has never seen before. No Tar Sands Mine has actually ever been denied approval. The other method of extraction is what is called In-Situ, and here massive amounts of water are super heated and pumped through the ground through this vast networks of pipelines, seismic lines, drill paths, compressor station. And this process is even more damaging in some ways than the mining. It impact and fragments a larger part of the wilderness where there is 90% 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 this In-Situ developments is at least as ecologically damaging as the mines. The oil produced from either method of extraction produces more greenhouse gas emissions than any other oil. This is one of the reasons why it's called the world's dirties oil. It's also one of the reasons why it is the largest and fastest growing single source of carbon in Canada. And it is also a reason why Canada is now number 3 in terms of producing carbon per person. The tailing ponds are the largest toxic contaminants on the planet. Tar Sands are the world's dirtiest oil. The tar sands consume more water than any other oil process. 3 to 5 barrels of water are taken, and returned into tailing ponds that make up the largest toxic entailment in the planet. So maybe we should stop calling them ponds. This massive toxic wasteland tailings ponds are built unlined and on the banks of the Athabasca River and the Athabasca River, which drains downstream to people who are finding toxins in the food chain. The toxins are in the food chain and this is causing cancer at rates up to 10 times of what they are in the rest of Canada. In spite of that, people have to eat this food in order to survive. The incredibly high price of flying food into this remote northern aboriginal community and the high rate of unemployment makes this an absolute necessity for survival. The Boreal Forest is also perhaps our best defense against global warming and climate change. The Boreal Forest sequesters more carbon than any other terrestrial ecosystem, and this is absolutely the key. So what we're doing is we're taking the most concentrated greenhouse gas sink -- twice as much greenhouse gasses are sequestered in the Boreal per acre than the tropical rainforest -- and we're destroying this carbon sink turning 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 reserve in the planet. This is one of the reasons why Canada, originally a climate change hero, is now threatening trade wars when folks talk about wanting to bring in positive legislation to limit the import of high carbon fuels of greenhouse gas emissions. Just 70 miles downstream is the worlds largest fresh water delta the Peace Athabasca Delta. The only one at the juncture of all 4 migratory fly way. This is a globally significant wet land, 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 critical habitat for a myriad of other species. But it too is being threatened by the massive amount of water being drawn from Athabasca which feeds this wetlands, and also the incredible toxic burden of the largest toxic unlined tailings ponds on the planet which are leeching in to the food chain for all the species downstream. The Keystone XL Pipeline would take Tar Sands raw down to the gulf coast punching a pipeline through the agricultural heart of

the United States and securing the contract with the dirtiest fuel in the world. The Great Bear Rainforest is generally considered to be the largest Coastal temperate rainforest ecosystem in the world. It is home to of the greatest density of species and some of the most iconic and threatened species on the planet.. When one of the Tar Sand Tankers carrying the dirtiest oil eventually hits a rock and goes down, we are going to have one of the worst ecological disasters this planet has ever seen. The world does not need anymore Tar Mines. The world does not need anymore pipelines to feed people's addiction to fossil fuel. And the world certainly does not need the largest toxic tailing ponds to grow and multiply and further threaten the down stream community. What we need instead is to act to ensure that Canada respects the massive amount of freshwater that it holds. We need to ensure that wetlands and forest that are our best and greatest and most critical defense against global warming are protected. And we need to make sure we are not releasing that carbon bomb into the atmosphere. What we do here is going to change our History. It's going to affect our chances of survival as a planet and will have a huge impact on our our children and their survival. Approval of this SEIS and the pipeline threatens the incredible Boreal Forest and the incredible opportunity to preserve our best defense against global warming. The Tar Sands could destroy the Athabasca Delta -- the largest and possibly greatest fresh water delta in the planet. It could destroy the Great Bear rainforest -- the largest temperate rain forest in the world. And it could have huge impact on the future of agricultural the heartland of North America. I urge the State Department to dissapprove the pipeline project.

04/15/2013

Mimi Newton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, Many Republicans like myself, support you because, unlike the Republicans, you care about the environment and think about the effect of creating jobs against the long term consequences of environmental disaster. Please do everything you can to stop the pipeline. Do not let the greed for fossil fuel be the cause of polluted water supplies in the future, Thank you. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mindy Meadows

04/15/2013

Mindy Meadows

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This is THE most important decision that you make in your administration. You cannot blame this one on the Republicans. In 50 years no one will remember the fiscal cliff or even Obamacare, but history will judge you on what you did or failed to do about the obvious emergency of global climate change. Reject Keystone XL and push hard for a revenue neutral carbon tax /rebate bill. Thank you for your attention.
Sincerely, Mindy Phypers

04/15/2013

Mindy Phypers

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. Obama, Please don't risk the lives and well-being of future American families by approving the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is hard for me to see any profit in choosing to invest in a fuel source that is so expensive and irretrevable from natural water sources. We need to move America into an energy revolution; the Keystone XL Pipeline is a choice to repeat our mistakes and a step backwards. Americans will never learn to seek alternative energy or low energy lifestyles if our leaders keep opting for fossil fuels. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Molly Alvarado

04/15/2013

Molly Alvarado

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department As the first president to mention climate change in your State of the Union address, it should be obvious that this is something you should reject. Please follow through with what you've said. 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.

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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Molly McLaughlin

04/15/2013

Molly McLaughlin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Your words regarding the shootings in Newtown, CT resonated with me. "Shame on us if we forget." I thank you for your actions in regards to strengthening gun controls. I believe the same approach must be used in addressing the Keystone XL Pipeline: Shame on us if we forget about Katrina, Irene, Sandy, raging wildfires, widespread drought and flooding. We must do all we can to minimize the affects of climate change! 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. 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. 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. Please show climate leadership and reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Monica Keady

04/15/2013

Monica Keady

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We worked hard to help elect you, President Obama, and donated hard-earned funds to both of your campaigns. ' We did so because we believed you were a supporter of action to create a more sustainable society in America, and would be a champion of environmental policies to aggressively protect our air, water, land, wildlife, and rapidly deteriorating climate. You have not yet proved to be this aggressive champion we had hoped for, and if you allow the disastrous Keystone pipeline project to be approved, you will forever ruin your reputation amongst your base of progressive supporters, and far worse, you will be aiding and abetting VAST ADDITIONAL HARM to our Planet's already degraded and fast declining environment and to our global climate!!!!!! Surely you MUST KNOW THIS! And surely, you are aware that it is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on this precious and threatened Earth! Though still not nearly enough, at least your administration's efforts to promote cleaner energy and more vehicle efficiency have been helpful, but that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be UTTERLY ERASED if you permit approval of Keystone XL Pipeline, and thus allow further development of the filthy tar sands!! Thankfully, 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. 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, therefore, demand climate leadership from your administration that we helped put in office, and that MUST begin with the PERMANENT rejection of Keystone XL!!! Sincerely, Monica Steensma

04/15/2013

Monica Steensma

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sir...many, many thanks for fighting THE GOOD FIGHT these last 4 years against this BLIGHT big oil is trying to pass off on ALL AMERICANS ! Faced with the HOUSE OF REPS. you have to deal with everyday..OMG..it's amazing you have done so well...BIG MONEY is hard to fight ! Sincerely, Morris Case

04/15/2013

Morris Case

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department My father, an executive in marine/soils engineering, rejected tar sands as a source of energy 40 years ago, speaking on this subject internationally. We now know he was absolutely right - .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.

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. 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 demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Mr. & Mrs. Marvin & Ann Zimmerman

04/15/2013

Mr. & Mrs. Marvin & Ann Zimmerman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You are under enormous pressure to make the economy fly. People are crying for jobs. But this is a moment of truth in human history: Are we going to do the right things to repair and preserve our environment and planet, the whole ecosystem, for generations to come, or will we let the short-term grab for profits, immediate gratification, win out? It may be uncomfortable for you, but you are the locus point of history. Instead of the vacuous call for "mapping the human brain," which may be interesting but is totally irrelevant to the problems facing us today, why not make a ten-year push for completely green and renewable energy, and the complete elimination of any dependence on fossil fuels? Kennedy did this with the race to the moon, but the impending environmental disaster makes the need for beating Russia in space look pale by comparison. BLOCK KEYSTONE XL!! It will not even do anything to prevent our dependence on foreign oil, as most of it will be shipped overseas. Make us proud, Mr. President! Stand up for something that matters! Sincerely, Muhammad Thompson

04/15/2013

Muhammad Thompson

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Myra Boime United States of America
This message was submitted via Avaaz at http://www.avaaz.org/en/no_tarsands_valdez/?reply. To respond, please e-mail reply+nokxl@Avaaz.org

04/15/2013

Myra Boime

04/15/2013

Name not available

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Pres. Obama, please follow through with your pledge to promote clean energy and deal with climate change in an conscientious manner. Your children, grandchildren, as well as mine, depend on it. Sincerely, Nana Royer

04/15/2013

Nana Royer

Dear President Obama, We are counting on your INTEGRITY to hold out against this almost unprecedeted threat to environmental quality, along with the terrible human and financial toll that such deterioration will involve. Approving this pipeline would be regressive, and we know that it would stand against your personal principles as well as ours. We stand behind you (and, as you have requested of the American people, we are doing our best to make sure you DO THE RIGHT THING! -- Nancy and Russell Block United States of America ____

04/15/2013

Nancy And Russell Block

Dear Secretary of State Kerry, The proposed Keystone XL pipeline would be an environmental disaster. I can't believe the Department of State's Draft SEIS found no environmental justification for denying a Presidential Permit for the pipeline. Pipeline spills are real, as shown by the March 29 spill in Mayflower, Arkansas -- not to mention the oil spill into a tributary of the Kalamazoo River in July 2010, which is still being cleaned up, nearly two years later. The ExxonMobil and Enbridges of the world can not be trusted even one iota to guard the safety of the drinking water, farmland, and wildlife habitat in the miles and miles of land through which their pipelines pass. The danger is real, and once a spill has occurred, it is hard to recover from it. That alone is enough reason to turn down the Keystone XL pipeline. I realize that the U.S. government is a difficult position with regard to Canada, our neighbor and ally. However, we must protect our own land, our own citizens, and the precious, fragile ecosystems without our national boundaries first and foremost. Please deny the Presidential Permit for the Keystone XL pipeline. Sincerely, Nancy Novitski

04/15/2013

Nancy N.

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please honor the campaign promises you have made regarding clean energy. Do not put the American people at risk from the transportation of this dirty stuff. The industry's record of spills and poor maintenance of these pipelines is terrible. I STRONGLY URGE you to keep your promises and say "NO" to the Keystone XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Nancy Nickerson

04/15/2013

Nancy Nickerson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you for taking action to protect America's environment and water resources, while fighting climate change. Preventing the Keystone XL will be a huge part of your environmental legacy. Sincerely, Nancy Riley

04/15/2013

Nancy Riley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Naomi Sobo

04/15/2013

Naomi Sobo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's clear from events in recent years that oil and gas companies are not able to prevent or effectively mitigate the impact of oil spills or gas explosions. The consequences to the environment are disastrous. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Natalie MacKnight

04/15/2013

Natalie Macknight

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Your two administrations have been disappointing to say the least. Opening public lands to harsh coal mining practices, killing hundreds of people through use of drone strikes - far more than the Bush administration! - and not taking a stand in regards to the Arkansas pipeline spill and massive environmental and health damage it's caused. 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. 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. 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 - in fact a target for terrorism. I demand LEADERSHIP from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Nathan Hart

04/15/2013

Nathan Hart

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You have conscientiously weighed the merits of this pipeline proposal with the dangers to the climate and environment which would be created. Safer methods of extracting fossil fuel need to be developed as well as utilizing alternate sources. The pipeline is a short term solution with devastating consequences. Thank you for your environmental concern. Sincerely, Neal Allen

04/15/2013

Neal Allen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Let's not ruin our country so that this oil can go to foreign countries. It's ludicrous. Stand up to big business and protect the US from harmful and dangerous practices. Sincerely, Neil and Karin Ralph

04/15/2013

Neil And Karin Ralph

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Time and time again, we allow ourselves to trust big oil, and time and time again, they show us that they can not be trusted. Do we have to suffer another catastrophic equipment failure to get the message? Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Neil Vigliotta

04/15/2013

Neil Vigliotta

04/15/2013

Nguyen Duc Kien

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We can not ignore the mounting evidence for global warming caused by greenhouse gases that fossil fuels, and especially tar sands, release into the atmosphere. Our climate demands that we do not approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, as well as our own environment and farmlands being destroyed by this catastrophe waiting to happen. Arkansas was only a small example of the monstrous damage this can cause. Stop this before it starts. Keep your promise to protect the climate. Sincerely, Nick Wagner

04/15/2013

Nick Wagner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department WE DON'T WANT THE KEYSTONE XL. RESPECT OUR WISHES AS AMERICANS AND THE LAND RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLE - SAY NO NOW AND FOREVER TO KEYSTONE XL!!!!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Nicole Mercier

04/15/2013

Nicole Mercier

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. We have lost a lot from all the construction as it is. All the Pollution already in the air. By adding this pipeline will be increasing CO2 level in the air and in the oceans. We take so much from this planet and never give it a second thought. This time with this pipeline and with our technology we were on a path to a Green Planet. If we add this we will lose our Planet. The only one we are blessed with having. At this rate are jobs more important or killing off so much more than that. Without all that land there are going to be no more tourism and that is going to be a lost of money. Adding the Pipeline we are going to loss jobs in the end rather than gain. Sincerely, Nicole Suydam

04/15/2013

Nicole Suydam

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Oh, and here's another tidbit for ya: You know that you will be blamed for anything and everything that goes wrong with the Keystone XL Pipeline should you approve it. You know this, right??? And I'm not talking just the next decade or two, I'm talking about the next couple of centuries. YOU, personally, will be blamed. I can guarantee you that people will say, "He could have stopped it, but he didn't." Is dirty campaign money worth it? When does doing the right thing trump the insane mantra of "too much is never enough?" I hope your conscience and common sense are the winners, for the sake of our planet and our environment. Sincerely, Nikki Heffner

04/15/2013

Nikki Heffner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department This is one of those defining issues that will change how I vote and feel about you, your party and government in general. A government that will ignore the danger to people and the earth and let a pipeline like this be built is a government that needs to resisted. I am a pacifist but outside of violence, any means to stop this pipeline needs to be take if we are going to survive. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Nikolaus Gruswitz

04/15/2013

Nikolaus Gruswitz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My husband and I have been traveling in the Southwest this winter and are heartened to see solar fields and wind generators. We are now moving in the right direction..... DON'T GIVE IN TO CORPORATIONS AND THEIR PROFITS. It is time that our government focuses on long term... SAFE solutions. We have the know-how. Please invest in our future! Sincerely, Nola Woodbury

04/15/2013

Nola Woodbury

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I RETIRED RECENTLY AFTER ALMOST 40 YEARS AS A REGISTERED NURSE, AND I AM CONCERNED ABOUT OUR HEALTH. YOUR ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENT TO FOSSIL FUELS IS KILLING US FASTER EVERY DAY. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.
Sincerely, Nora Roman

04/15/2013

Nora Roman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This pipeline is a horrible, short-sighted and unnecessary idea. It will result in spills, we know that. We need to continue investing in alternative energy sources. Please make sure you follow through on your pledge to Americans to stop these greedy, mega-corporate endeavors. Sincerely, Norma Wigutoff

04/15/2013

Norma Wigutoff

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. I encourage you to do the right thing for the people and the planet, and stop this pipeline. Sincerely, Oceanah D'Amore

04/15/2013

Oceanah D'amore

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's not worth it to every day ordinary people. The only ones who will prosper are corporations at the expense of the environment. STOP IT! Sincerely, Olaf Aalop

04/15/2013

Olaf Aalop

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. i find it very distressing that our country's leaders are ignoring common sense so that their pockets can grow richer from this pipeline, not only are the tar sands themselves dirty to extract from you want to then endanger some of the only remaining pristine land in america by running an oil pipeline through it, you can kid yourself all you want that building it will "create jobs" or "make us oil independent" but the only jobs created will be clean up for the mess created and only independence achieved will be the independence of oil companies from intelligent regulation, STOP LYING TO YOURSELF, YOU KNOW IT IS NOT GOOD FOR THE HEALTH OF OUR COUNTRY! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Olivia Holland

04/15/2013

Olivia Holland

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. They 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. Sincerely, Paige Geimer

04/15/2013

Paige Geimer

Dear State Department: Thank you for considering the following comments concerning the Keystone XL pipeline project. I look forward to receiving your notice stating that the State Department has received these comments. Sincerely, Paige Murphy-Young

I. Approving the Keystone XL will violate applicable law and Executive Order 13337. In considering whether or not the Keystone XL pipeline will serve the national interest, it is critical to insure that the project complies with all applicable laws. Executive Order 13337 does not confer any kind of executive exemption from any requirement of applicable law. Section 5. Nothing contained in this order shall be construed to affect the authority of any department or agency of the United States Government, or to supersede or replace the requirements established under any other provision of law, or to relieve a person from any requirement to obtain authorization from any other department or agency of the United States Government in compliance with applicable laws and regulations subject to the jurisdiction of that department or agency. A. NEPA requirements are not satisfied. Purpose and Need 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.) As recently as Saturday, April 13, Secretary of State John Kerry, during his visit to China announced: "The United States of America and the People's Republic of China recognize that the increasing dangers presented by climate change measured against the inadequacy of the global response requires a more focused and urgent initiative." 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.

Impact on Water Resources 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. In fact, the analysis of the Keystone Pipeline's likely impact on the nation's [already limited, already stressed] water resources was obsolete before the April 15, 2013 deadline for public comments. 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 size and reach of the March 29, 2013 Pegasus pipeline dilbit spill are still being evaluated. As of April 14, 2013, this Exxon pipeline near Mayflower, Arkansas has spilled between 5000 to 7000 barrels (84,000 gallons) of dilbit. The dilbit has already reached Lake Conway. 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.

II. The federal government has not demonstrated capacity or will to adequately regulate the Keystone XL project. 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.

III. The Secretary of State lacks the impartial, objective information legally necessary to evaluate the true environmental impact of the Keystone XL Project or to make a finding of the best interests of the United States of America. 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.

04/15/2013

Paige Murphy-young

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Petroleum from tar sands is dirtier than burning oil from conventional sources. All fossil fuels are non-renewable, and we as a nation need to set as a priority to move away from fossil fuels as an energy source. Please stand by your stated position to move to cleaner energy sources. Tar sands and the Keystone XL pipeline is the wrong path. Thank you. Sincerely, Pam Weller

04/15/2013

Pam Weller

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's quite simple. Accidents will happen. We don't need this pipeline to appease big oil. Spend the money it would cost on green energy initiative and technology and encourage consumers to be more aware of their carbon foot prints. WE NEED A MAJOR CONSCIOUSNESS SHIFT -- NOW!!! Sincerely, Pamela Butler

04/15/2013

Pamela Butler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. President Obama, I have voted for you twice over the last 5 years and I am not going to lie, you have been deeply disappointing! I beg you to keep some of your promises and start saving your name! Also, please keep your promise of closing one of the biggest hypocrisies in U.S. history, Guantanamo! Sincerely, Pamela Holschutt

04/15/2013

Pamela Holschutt

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. THERE IS NO REASON IN THE WORLD TO APPROVE THE MOST ENERGY INTENSIVE AND TOXIC PROJECT EVER BUILT IN AMERICA! DO THE MATH AND YOU WILL CALCULATE THAT KEYSTONE ALLOWS METHANE GASES INTO OUR ATMOSPHERE THAT WILL CHOKE US ALL TO DEATH WITH POLLUTION & HEAT THAT WILL MELT OUR PRECIOUS ICE IN ARCTIC AND BEYOND> PRAY FOR COURAGE TO DEMONSTRATE YOU LOVE GOD & OUR EARTH MORE THAN YOU LOVE MONEY AND POWER SECRETARY KERRY! PLEASE VISIT ARKANSAS AND SPEAK WITH THE RESIDENTS THAT HAVE JUST HAD THEIR LIVES AND PROPERTY DESTROYED BY THIS POISONOUS, HORRIFIC TAR SAND SPILL.

Sincerely, Ms. Pamela Lewis

04/15/2013

Pamela Lewis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. From Pam: We have far bigger things to invest in which will take much less land and habitat destruction. Despite how much pressure you have from financial big-shots, please don't let this happen and please urge these investors to make clean energy sources we can sell back to China and other large nations we seem to be trying to please. Sincerely, Pamela Steen

04/15/2013

Pamela Steen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The leaking of other pipelines (into the Yellowstone River last year & in Arkansas just recently) show that these pipelines are prone to corrosion & with such a large pipeline damage to the properties along this pipeline is very possible. So now we have damage to the environment in Canada as the oil is extracted &, if the pipeline goes through, to the U.S. property owners due to leaks. Let's put this pipeline not on the back-burner, but off the stove all together. Sincerely, Pamela Waterworth

04/15/2013

Pamela Waterworth

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please do not go down in history as the president who approved the Keystone pipeline -- and destroyed the environment! Sincerely, Pat Marriott

04/15/2013

Pat Marriott

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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! Please reject the Keystone XL! Thank you. Sincerely, Patricia Amazalorso

04/15/2013

Patricia Amazalorso

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, What are we doing to the world that supports us? We have been endangering ourselves for so long I wonder if the people "in charge" even realize how ludicrous these actions are- fracking, drilling, spilling. We risk everything to concentrate wealth for the few. I am disgusted and worn by what goes on but I will continue to express my concern and displeasure for as long as it takes to get some sense and honesty into policy. We have alternatives but do we invest in those. Certainly not enough. Get the money out of policy. How is it not a conflict of interest for anyone to vote on a measure that has direct impact on a donor. 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Patricia Conkel

04/15/2013

Patricia Conkel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I don't know the whole picture, but the only benefit of the pipeline that would even remotely be worth risking our environment would be job creation. Instead of letting the oil companies dictate the way we create jobs, let's, for example, find the money to put an assistant in every classroom. My suggestion would be to raise taxes, etc on the corporations to generate the funds - seems like someone else has had that idea! As an aside, if we can pipe oil all over creation and threaten our environment and private properties and town water supplies, why can't we create rain catchment systems in areas that get a lot of rain and pipe it to areas that need water or for emergency situations? No harm done, AND it would create jobs! I'm not meaning to sound disrespectful or sarcastic. I have the utmost respect for you and can't tell you how glad I was that you won a second term. I have plenty of money - I am in a fairly high tax bracket and I think I should contribute more than less fortunate people . But I try my best to do it through charitable donations, because I don't trust our government (although I do trust you) to put the taxes to good use. Thank you for being our President and the man you are. Our country needed you.
Sincerely, Patricia Crockett

04/15/2013

Patricia Crockett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I know you must be as interested as I am in protecting this earth because you have two amazing daughters. You can't be for the Keystone pipeline and this earth at the same time. Please protect us while protecting your daughters. Sincerely, Patricia Deller

04/15/2013

Patricia Deller

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. I have a friend recently deceased who knew you in Massachusetts. She was not at all impressed! Please show your intelligence and moral courage and push for the environmental review! Sincerely, Ms. Patricia Dentremont

04/15/2013

Patricia Dentremont

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, I hope this letter finds you well. I know that the issues of energy consumption are enormous, and interwoven with many other issues. But it seems clear that where human beings are involved, there will be error. So we have to ask ourselves how terrible the results of error may be, when (not if, but when) human goofs occur. Nuclear power is not a good "goof" risk. And currently, neither is oil. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I know it is not enough to say what won't work. Everyone on the planet has to commit to finding better, cleaner energy, and also using less energy. But in the meantime, we can't keep on repeating what is clearly too perilous. Thank you for reading this. Sincerely, Patricia Friedson

04/15/2013

Patricia Friedson

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. Since this oil is destined to be shipped overseas and this country will not benefit from it or have any control over the maintenance of the pipeline, why should we be allowing Canada to put our country at risk? Do you think maybe they know how dangerous it could be, and that is why they plan to put it where it won't endanger THEIR environment? 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. Sincerely, Ms. Patricia Gallenkamp

04/15/2013

Patricia Gallenkamp

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please put our health and well being before the interests of the Oil Companies. Please. It is our right to have clean water and environmental safety. Thank you. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Patricia Harris

04/15/2013

Patricia Harris

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please stand behind your words. If we are truly going to move forward with Earth friendly clean energy like Solar and Wind power, then lets take those steps and invest our time and money into becoming a safer, ecologically healthy country. We don't need billions of gallons of filthy oil polluting our air, ourselves, and our Earth. I weep for the Polar Bears, the birds and all animal life that suffer because of our stupid, greedy mistakes. Please do not let this happen. Sincerely, Patricia Hartt

04/15/2013

Patricia Hartt

-- "Everything will be all right in the end, and if it isn't all right, it isn't the end."... "Most things don't turn out as expected; but, you know, sometimes what happens instead is the good stuff."... from "The Best Exotic Marigold Hotel"

04/15/2013

Patricia Layden

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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 and that the oil companies cannot be trusted to police themselves or clean up the messes they have made and will surely make in the future. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you. Sincerely, Patricia Victour

04/15/2013

Patricia Victour

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The environmental disasters have already begun in Canada, the waste water from the process has made some lakes so toxic that animals who have gone in the water are dying. The destruction of the Boreal forest for the construction of the pipeline have dramatically reduced the number of woodland caribou. This is only the beginning. Consider that if this pipeline is allowed into the USA, it will leave a wake of destruction for oil that is being shipped to other countries. It is slated for export and all we will have is massive ecological death, a lose-lose proposition. Sincerely, Patricia Wilkinson

04/15/2013

Patricia Wilkinson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I might be more inclined to support this pipeline if there were guarantees the oil would be used domestically. But we all know this will be sold overseas. You are really a disappointment. Sincerely, Paul Brennan

04/15/2013

Paul Brennan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You are making a big mistake supporting the Keystone XL , and hiding the ramifications such as we see in Arkansas and other incidents are not going to keep us from knowing you have been part and parcel to the ongoing pollution of our planet with the dirtiest form of energy . You must move to supporting and subsidizing clean energy while we still have time to make a difference in climate change . You say to make change we must "make you" do it. I thought by supporting you we could make change but you have forsaken your promise . Apparently "Making YOU " needs to take a different tack .. If i knew what that was , I would pursue that . I do not have enough money to compete with those that buy your influence , so i must appeal to your civic mindedness . You were elected to represent the PEOPLE of the united states but you appear to be representing the bottom line of the corporations of the world that do not have the best interest of the nation in mind . Now is the time to make a stand , the question is who will you stand for ? Sincerely, Paul Henninger

04/15/2013

Paul Henninger

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We need to NOT use tar sands of all sources of oil we have available. Our environment is "our home." Why pollute our Earth so that oil companies can make more profit? It takes discipline to act appropriately. Lets show that discipline. Sincerely, Paul Hwoschisky

04/15/2013

Paul Hwoschisky

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It is certain that this pipe line will fail at some time. This is the right time to move away from traditional forms of energy. We keep saying we need to do this but continue to stumble and yield to special interest. The time is now to do the RIGHT thing, each and every time. Not next time. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Paul Takessian

04/15/2013

Paul Takessian

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The US is already a net exporter of refined gasoline and our demand will continue to decline under new fuel efficiency standards. It's time for the US to set the standard in the fight against global warming and environmental destruction tar sands would bring. Sincerely, Paul Watts

04/15/2013

Paul Watts

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands are not the solution, just a profiteering push to give Canada a way to dispose of a dirty fuel. I grew up in Nebraska, and know the value of the Ogallala Aquifer, and know that this will compromise this water source. The water is more valuable, and spills will happen. The fact that this was tried to be advanced with no nod to the Ogallala Aquifer just a few years back, means there is no concern for the environment, and public health. No new route solves this issue. Frankly, this is a dirty, crappy energy source, and we have alternatives. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Paula & Mike Evans

04/15/2013

Paula & Mike Evans

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Figures have just been released the show solar power is starting to become a viable alternate power source: 1) all the new industrial power generating capacity added last month was solar; 2) solar cells now produce more power than it takes to manufacture them; and 3) residential solar generation is increasing. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Paula Waterman

04/15/2013

Paula Waterman

Public comments should be PUBLIC! "We show that the oil sands industry releases the 13 elements considered priority pollutants (PPE) under the US Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Water Act, via air and water, to the Athabasca River and its watershed....Concentrations of mercury, nickel, and thallium in winter and all 13 PPE in summer were greater in tributaries with watersheds more disturbed by development than in less disturbed watersheds. In the Athabasca River during summer, concentrations of all PPE were greater near developed areas than upstream of development....Canada's or Alberta's guidelines for the protection of aquatic life were exceeded for seven PPE—cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel, silver, and zinc—in melted snow and/or water collected near or downstream of development." <http://www.pnas.org/content/107/37/16178.full.pdf>
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2013/apr/15/jeremy-grantham-population-china-climate>

Jeff Cobb

04/15/2013

Peaceful Jeff

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. We must set an example for all the world to see by standing against this unnecessary gouging we must demonstrate through our actions - that we are for the planet - not for the profits to be made by the few arrogant and selfish profiteers who want only to make money regardless of the effect it has on the people of the world and the planet. NO TO KEYSTONE XL AND THE TAR SANDS! Sincerely, Peggy O'Connell

04/15/2013

Peggy O'connell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Fuel Leaks cost USA a trillion dollars per year Every day in USA there are 18 spills losing about 34 million gallons if you estimate 10 dollars a gallon that's 340 million dollars a day lost by the energy industry. 1,241,000 million dollars every year lost or a trillion dollars. I doubt if the cost of fixing them would cost a million dollars now that is what I call really stupid. We need safer pipes which can self seal and catch any spillage which have sensing cables built in that are linked to satellites. Sorting out the leaks should be the number one priority how much did the BP disaster really cost? I doubt if that cost a trillion dollars? The people who are to blame are the politicians who approve the pipes without considering the costs. The stupidity is worse because instead of the industry working with people to cure this problem they are lying about it. Who can afford to waste a trillion dollars every year obviously USA can? What can you do with a trillion dollars every year. Sincerely, Peter Baxter

04/15/2013

Peter Baxter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Fight climate change . Please for my Grandchildren, and their Grandchildren, stop supporting carbon intensive energy and develop something that will take courage. A "moon shot" project to develop renewable energy.. We are out of time.. Sincerely, Peter Christensen

04/15/2013

Peter Christensen

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. GODDAMMIT HOW THE FUCK DID YOU TWO EVEN LET IT GET THIS FAR? SOLAR, WIND! WHY AREN'T WE USING THOSE? RENEWABLE, FREE, NO WARS! SHAPE UP OR EVERYTHING WILL DIE Sincerely, Peter Eckhardt

04/15/2013

Peter Eckhardt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Keystone XL = death. Death of lakes, rivers, streams and those landscapes that make America a great place to live in. Death of hope for a future where our children's children and so on are forced to know only a world that has been exploited and poisoned. Choose life. Choose life and all the exciting opportunities that could be explored by saying no to this toxic form of energy. Choose. Thank you, Peter Sincerely, Peter Huntington

04/15/2013

Peter Huntington

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This corrosive crude stinks of brimstone--poisonous hydrogen sulphide. It should be kept deep down, it won't mix with our biosphere. Investing or allowing any part of this boondoggle is irresponsible: It is a dead end, and we must about-face. It is past time for systemic change in managing carbon. Sincerely, Peter King

04/15/2013

Peter King

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Hello, Mr. President The environmental issues we are facing today, are the most critical issues the world has ever known. All other social or financial issues are meaningless to debate if we do not have a planet to stand and debate upon. There is no back-up planet. We must think about each action and the carbon foot print i may have. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Peter Van Eys

04/15/2013

Peter Van Eys

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It is nonsensical for you to speak about clean energy and approve this pipeline. Sincerely, Peter Van Roekens

04/15/2013

Peter Van Roekens

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 15th. April, 2013 It IS 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 "deleted" if it approves (which means You, Mr. President who has the ultimate authority in this case to say "No") the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. On behalf of my entire family I have written to you numerous times and this letter will be my last one before your decision on this outrageous KXL-pipeline. We expect and demand from you to say "No" to this totally irresponsibly conceived, greed driven, dirtiest of oils pipeline plan and we all hope that you have integrity left in you to just plainly reject it. 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. And after the recent Exxon 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 demand climate leadership from this administration., from You! And that begins with your rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Petra Gampper

04/15/2013

Petra Gampper

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department As a citizen, a mother and a grandmother, I appreciate all that you and your administration have tried to do (and are trying to do) to protect our environment and slow the effects of climate change. I encourage you to keep up the good work on laws that would reduce vehicle omissions and on programs to develop and expand sources of CLEAN renewable energy. At this point, I am EXTREMELY concerned about the possible disastrous effects on our environment that could be caused by the completion and use of the XL Pipeline. 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. Giving the go-ahead for a pipeline that would send a noxious SLUDGE through unreliable pipes underneath thousands of miles of our countryside and neighborhoods will be like giving children boxes of matches to play with. It is a BAD idea for both the present and for the future. 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. 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. I implore you to provide sane leadership on energy creation issues. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Phebe Watson

04/15/2013

Phebe Watson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. For the good of all citizens, and for the sake of adhering to your oath of office, you must stop this pipeline in its tracks and decommission all currently functioning tar sands pipelines. Your perplexing love and devotion to the fossil fuel and nuclear power industry, coupled with your unconscionable failure to follow through with your promise of a green jobs program and smart grid, have been a terrible betrayal to America and to the whole world! 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Philip Lefcourt

04/15/2013

Philip Lefcourt

Children in mayflower are getting sick from the spill. Until we have full knowledge of what is in the pipelines, no trade secrets or halibuton loopholes, we should postpone keystone xl until we can assess ACTUAL safety, bsed on full disclosure. Until phmsa has the knowledge , expertise and regulatory ability to prevent another kalamazoo, yellowstone or mayflower we should postpone keystone xl, in the interest of public safety. Martin luther king jr in his speech breaking the silence said that if americas soul was totally poisoned, That part of the autopsy must read vietnam. Substitute keystone xl for vietnam. Climate change is real. Keystone xl will promote it. The majority of the jobs created are temporary, the damage to the environment is permanent. Just as in vietnam, there are those who see the poisoning of land, air, and water and the endagerment of our agriculture as collateral damage. I would encourage you, mr kerry, not to go down "that shameful corridor of time reserved for those who posess power withou compassion, might without morality, strength without sight." Love the children. So no to keystone xl. Sincerely, paula molinary

04/15/2013

Pjcomo54

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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 than 0.1% of energy from solar.

Sincerely, Pradeep Gajjar

04/15/2013

Pradeep Gajjar

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. My suggestion, you would understand if you were a scientist, as I am. Stop Keystone, then ask the oil companies to give you the cost of Keystone to speed up our progress to clean energy. Thank you. Dr. R. Ronald Rau

04/15/2013

R. Ronald Rau

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, I strongly oppose plans by Enbridge Inc. to increase capacity of the Alberta Clipper tar sands oil pipeline from Alberta, Canada, to Superior, Wisconsin. 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 climate. 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.

Sincerely, Rachael Langley

04/15/2013

Rachael Langley

I am a citizen and I am commenting to say that I do not support the Keystone XL Pipeline under any circumstances. Natural Gas is a dirty fuel, extracted by dirty processes, and it is simply too dangerous to be worthwhile. We must move beyond the idea that fossil fuels are the answer. Thank you,
Rachael Patterson

04/15/2013

Rachael Patterson

Hello, I know a few people who would like to submit comments, but they have no email, or are opposed to using the internet. Is there a way for them to submit their comments? Please let me know ASAP. thank you so much! Rachel Kingsley

04/15/2013

Rachel Kingsley

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As much as our country monetarily benefits from massive extraction of natural gas, tar sands and trade of coal to Asian countries, we need to start thinking about the future - and investing in it heavily - or we will pay dearly for it in the near future. The Keystone Pipeline is business as usual, in the same hands of the people who are propelling this country and the world into an environmental catastrophe. This world will become less hospitable for us, but it will become downright deadly for millions of poor people around the world who will suffer first, and the most. We cannot afford to continue to extract fossil fuels at the rate we do, and to burn it away. We need to guard these precious resources, and use them for durable goods like building materials. Burning it now not only is a waste of these precious hydrocarbons now, but it exponentially exacerbates the problem of climate change. Please, leave us a legacy of a shifting tide - let it be your administration that provides the tipping point for our country to lead the world in energy efficiency, distributed energy, renewable energy, and environmental conservation. Sincerely, Rachel Larson

04/15/2013

Rachel Larson

Parts per million of carbon particles in the atmosphere is critical to live on this planet. Time for a campaign to sequester carbon not release it. We are approaching the point of total destruction and YOU HAVE TO stop KXL; stop propping oil and fighting wars about oil. Get your heads out of the sand. Rachel Lyn Rumson "What we want can happen naturally through acceptance and appreciation of what is, rather than having to override our natural rhythms and force the bloom. Paradox. So, love the state you're in, my friend." - Jim Lord

04/15/2013

Rachel Lyn Rumson

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands releases three times the carbon dioxide emissions as regular oil production. Our current atmospheric carbon dioxide level is 396.8 ppm. The upper safety limit is 350 ppm, which we are over. We are asking for disaster with our current carbon dioxide level. We do not need the Keystone XL pipeline pumping toxic tar sands across the United States, especially across the breadbasket. The pipeline would go through U.S. communities, six rivers and two aquifers. If the pipeline breaks, the environment is done for. It is very naive of the government to proclaim that the pipeline has no environmental impacts, when it obviously does. The Exxon Pegasus pipeline rupturing is a clear sign that tar sands should not be pumped through the United States. And the Keystone XL pipeline would be pumping ten times the about of tar sands across the U.S. as the Pegasus did. 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. Sincerely, Rachel Stone

04/15/2013

Rachel Stone

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Not being a US citizen myself, you might say I'm not directly concerned. Still, as a human being and a resident of Earth, I'm concerned that you might be doing your citizens a disservice... or lead the way towards a cleaner, healthier world. Sincerely, Raffaele Manzo

04/15/2013

Raffaele Manzo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I think it is important to demand adequate controls before the pipeline is approved and that should be part of the approval package. Sincerely, Ralph Hakim

04/15/2013

Ralph Hakim

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. mr president of the people. please take a look at the kalamazoo river oil spill in michigan. now the same company is going to run a pipeline nearly double the size of keystone xl into our great lakes a refinery will be built on lake superior barges will ship 13 million barrels a year all over wis,mi,ill,ind,ohio. just think the world's most vital freshwater source SLEEP WELL. funny canada don't want all this. Sincerely, Ralph Rider

04/15/2013

Ralph Rider

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Approving the XL Pipeline will only serve to prolong our dependence on fossil fuels and delay our move toward clean, renewable energy sources. All this pipeline will do is cut a risky, dangerous pathway across our country to refineries near port cities so the oil can be exported. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ralph Winter

04/15/2013

Ralph Winter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department My name is Ramona Teagarden. The issue of the pipeline is the most crucial in regards to global warming, we will not be able to prevent our planet's demise unless this project is stopped. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ramona Teagarden

04/15/2013

Ramona Teagarden

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I thought we lived in a democratic society. The sheer amount of vocal opposition to Keystone automatically disqualifies it. There is no "silent majority" out there in favor of it. Sincerely, Randy Best

04/15/2013

Randy Best

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please recognize, President Obama, that the tar sands oil is likely to stay in the ground and therefore not worsen greenhouse and congestion problems unless we allow construction of the Keystone Pipeline. <http://thinkinghighways.com/publications/issue/?issue=6471&view=true> 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Randy Salzman

04/15/2013

Randy Salzman

Please approve this pipeline, it is way over due.. Get-er-done... Ray C. Thomas

04/15/2013

Ray C Thomas

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a hard working responsible American from California I strongly oppose the continued construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, in fact I oppose the Keystone Pipeline in general, as a whole! I find it very disheartening that the people I vote for don't even represent my interests, but rather it seems, no it is a fact that this administration has ignored in large part everything we as Democrats voted you all in to office to do! If we cant even trust Democrats to act in the best interest of all Americans, most notably the ones without true voices, as in the people without the money, which is power and a voice in our society, then where are we to look for leadership? If the people, the regular people, continue to be ignored and trampled on, then it is the responsibility of the people to overthrow this government and put in place a government that is able to represent the people, not the Corporation(even if the courts think that corporations are people, we all know that are not; which just proves that point that we the people are not adequately represented in our current paradigm). It is with great regret, upon reflection, that I voted for both you Secretary Kerry and you President Obama. While it is true that you both may have been the lesser of two evils, you are still not the answer to any of our nations problems; because it is far to obvious that in fact you are in bed with and take orders from Big Banks and Big Corporations and the Military Industrial Complex. Why not take this opportunity to do something good, something that will actually make this country and this world a better place. Take a page from President Lincoln, or President Kennedy, or Dr. King or Gandhi. HELP US!!!! WE NEED IT!!! THE WORLD NEEDS IT!!! You can change the paradigm from the inside, I want to believe again... So with that said an issue you can address for the common good, not the good of the rich Corporations, Say no to Keystone XL!!! Do it for my children and yours. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Reagan Hicks

04/15/2013

Reagan Hicks

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If we can not get the stuff safely to the pump without dumping it all over the ground, are not able to successfully clean it up (especially from our water supply) as was shown by Exxon in Arkansas, than we should not be building new and higher pressure pipelines. We need to look for an alternative, and fast! Please do not support this old way of doing things. Please think ahead for future generations and support innovations and new technology through redirected tax breaks! Additionally, 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rebecca Klothen

04/15/2013

Rebecca Klothen

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. In President Obama's inaugural address, 2012 campaign, and 2008 victory speech, he promised to lead on climate. In his first major speech as Secretary of State, John Kerry echoed that promise, as did his predecessor, Secretary Clinton. If our government is going to keep those promises, it must start by rejecting tar sands pipelines, especially Keystone XL. It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Sincerely, Rebecca McNerney

04/15/2013

Rebecca Mcnerney

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. OMG! What is it going to take for you to realize that this project is bad for America? I live in Texas and the pipeline that has been put in did NOT create a single job here, all employees were brought in from somewhere else that had already been employed by the company, so where did that improve anything here? Please DO NOT let the oil and gas industry pressure you into signing something that is totally BAD for this country. Please look long and hard at the neighborhood in Arkansas that is battling a spill and the aftereffects that they will have to endure for years to come. Please make the tough decision and say NO to the pipeline. Sincerely, Rebecca Puckett

04/15/2013

Rebecca Puckett

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. A river of oil flowed through Arkansas. The Kalamazoo River was fouled with oil. The Gulf is one of the largest manmade disasters of all time! And these are just 3 of hundreds of spills, accidents, and acts of corporate malfeasance that has destroyed property values and disrupted AMERICAN CITIZENS LIVES AND WELL BEING! What is the common denominator???? All are 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Without this minimum level of transparency it all looks like a sham of back door dealings, cronyism, and pay back for political campaign donations. Sincerely, Renee Caputo

04/15/2013

Renee Caputo

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a Christian minister, my faith calls me to care for creation and to encourage others to do the same. The Christian faith also calls us to make decisions mindful of their effect on others. This is why I strongly oppose the Keystone XL and tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Thank you for having the moral courage to make the decisions necessary to care for creation and for future generations. Sincerely, Rev. Talitha Arnold

04/15/2013

Rev. Talitha Arnold

-- Dr Rex W Urich

04/15/2013

Rex Urich

Keystone Pipeline project could eliminate money spent on oil transported across open water. The project could also provide many jobs for at least the short term. I support the project as more environmentally friendly than tanker shipments and more economically friendly than purchasing oil from some countries. Rich Egeland

04/15/2013

Rich Egeland

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department What are you waiting for, Do the right thing now, Hope for the environment via climate change was the main reason I voted for you the second term, Don't let us down! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rich Marks

04/15/2013

Rich Marks

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Richard Brown

04/15/2013

Richard Brown

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I think the alternative is much better for the future we have to think clean energy , what future will we have for are children and this planet when all is lost with are climate , this is just a temporary fix what happens when this pipe line gets old and just think of the how much its going to cost to keep watch on this line 24/7 and constant repairs , Sincerely, Richard Doin

04/15/2013

Richard Doin

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Hey! Obama dude! What up? I am gonna tell u. This vote on Texas Tea. It is in the long run a Bad deal for the U.S. of A.. Besides the fact it will just make the BIG CATS, BIGGER CATS, and the shmucks of the world, even SMALLER SHMUCKS, in the big scheme of things, tells me that this is not a good thing for the country. It is entirely a good thing for Big Oil ! It will not be a good thing for the average citizen. What pipe are you smoking! What ever it is stop smokin it, because it is Clouding you mind as regards this very important decision. It is going to be a HORROR show when, not if, it will eventually leak. /A much more important decision would be creating an Auquaduct system thruout the U.S. of A... You and I both Know that the country is going to turn into a dust bowl again if there is another year like last year... What are you going to tell the farmers I'm sorry but BIG OIL is more important than your farms which give us many goods and services for the BENIFIT of the COUNTRY! We can't afford to bail you out and the banks too!. I ASK YOU, WHICH ONE IS MORE IMPORTANT....EATING OR TRYING TO SCRAPE THE OIL OFF THE LAND THAT USED TO BE GREEN, AND YELLOW, AND RED, AND PURPLE. When it comes down to decisions this big you should ask your girls what the best thing to do is, if they were choosing one or the other. They are the ones who will have to live here when the oil cos. go Were sorry for ruining a millions of acreage because our pipeline broke, we are seeking your help in cleaning up our mess, because we never conceived that it would be this bad...SO GO AHEAD AND ASK YOUR CHILDREN WHICH IS MORE IMPORTANT, EATING, AND CLEAN SOIL, OR OIL THAT THEY CAN'T EAT OR DRINK! HAVE A NICE DAY!! By the way WHAT HAS JACKIE ROBINSON SHOWN US ALL. DON'T GIVE IN TO THE MAN Sincerely,
richard mcfeters

04/15/2013

Richard Mcfeters

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.
Sincerely, Richard McGuinness

04/15/2013

Richard McGuinness

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Let's stop the immoral destruction of our environment. We are a country hell-bent on self destruction. The greed and corruption associated with the stubbornness not to change our way of life will destroy all of humanity as we know it today. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Richard Perras

04/15/2013

Richard Perras

Keystone is NOT in the national interest. Enough said. That's it. It should end the analysis. The Alberta tar sands contain DOUBLE all carbon ever emitted by man in history. To release this carbon is "game over" for the climate. 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. The ONLY thing the U.S. gets – we're left holding the environmental bag. Keystone is NOT in the national interest . It should be denied. But the corporate-tocracy that passes for governing these days will overrule this. I am so sickened by this. RICK HEISLER

04/15/2013

Rick Heisler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The KXL Pipeline is neither economically, nor environmentally a good idea; and it is not good for the people of the Plains States and Mississippi Valley. This is a dangerous short term solution that's not worth the risk. Please seek "21st century climate change/energy shortage solutions" for the country and planet. I am a practicing/licensed Civil Engineer. Sincerely, Rick Lakata

04/15/2013

Rick Lakata

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President Obama. SIR, It sure sucks to see our planet dying while special interest continuous to intimidate high ranking officials. Please stop the Pipe line so truckers can have jobs and at the same time hybrids can help electric make the transition to free energy alternatives". Saving The WORLD is to save us from death zones. Thank You for Enforcing The Laws that are logical and clean the air. Sincerely, Rigoberto Rojas

04/15/2013

Rigoberto Rojas

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. 1200 miles of pipeline is multiple disasters waiting to happen. The truth is that if this pipeline is approved, it's going to be even more difficult to save the climate. Like drilling for oil in the Arctic or allowing coal companies to dig up billions of tons of coal from federal lands and sell it overseas, new fossil fuel projects threaten to send our climate past a point of no return. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Robert Bosserman

04/15/2013

Robert Bosserman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department What do your daughters think about fossil fuels and climate disruption? 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 critically important, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if you approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and facilitate the further destruction of native lands in Canada and the increased export of tar sands. 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. 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. I desperately hope to see climate leadership from your administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Robert Dubrow

04/15/2013

Robert Dubrow

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The rejection of the Keystone Pipeline is a no-brainer, a logical and responsible decision. The "other side of the aisle" keeps pushing for all the wrong choices for all the wrong reasons, but the Keystone issue is not the proper one to demonstrate a willingness to compromise. When an ecological disaster occurs, and it will, you will be held responsible, not the Republicans who tried to force your hand. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Robert Findlay

04/15/2013

Robert Findlay

Apr 14, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, If the Canadians and the energy companies wish to sell the usable portion of this nasty substance, they can refine the sands and send lighter refined products which are safer to transport. if the Canadians think this is such a great idea, they can do the refining on their own territory. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Sincerely, Robert Goodell

04/15/2013

Robert Goodell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Do not approve the XL pipeline. Sincerely, Robert H Bushnell

04/15/2013

Robert H Bushnell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The risks involved with approving this environmental boondoggle are monumental and it would be irresponsible to gamble with the environment and those who would be impacted by the nearly certain degradation that will occur. Sincerely, Robert Lindberg

04/15/2013

Robert Lindberg

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please, President Obama - once and for all, let's end this talk of the Keystone Pipeline. It's dangerous, and its effects will be irreversible. Please, as our representative, vote against this now. Thank you, Robert Long 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Robert Long

04/15/2013

Robert Long

US State Department, I am in favor of the Keystone Pipeline. I believe it is in the best long term interest of the United States to build this pipeline. Robert P. Moser

04/15/2013

Robert Moser

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Robert Mueller

04/15/2013

Robert Mueller

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. A Sunoco pipeline next to Russell Creek broke; they all break, they have to break in time; the newspapers ran a little story about it and then forgot about it. Those people buy water in plastic bottles; americans just do not beleive that we can run out of our drinking water; they just do not beleive it. Sincerely, Robert Noyola

04/15/2013

Robert Noyola

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. ----- It has become all too apparent that the fossil fuel industries, particularly Big Oil & Gas, are not very good caretakers of the earth. Part of the problem is that Congress always manages to pass ineffective "toothless" legislation (if any at all). All too frequently, they are bought off by corporate lobbyists, who write the legislation for them. We supported you for CHANGE! Although it means a few jobs, this pipeline represents a huge danger to our environment. Veto the Keystone pipeline and don't permit Congress to cut Social Security and Medicare, at the expense of the poor and middle class. A founding OFA member. Sincerely, Robert Reed

04/15/2013

Robert Reed

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This is an environmental issue that is beyond the expertise of the State Department and more in the field of the Union of Concerned Scientists. A decision by the State Department is inherently a conflict of interest and a danger to the safety of our planet. Sincerely, Robert Rice

04/15/2013

Robert Rice

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 The expansion of pipelines carrying crude from tar sands mined at the expense of the life-sustaining qualities and powers which are God-given is extremely dangerous. Is is being promoted not because of any benefit for the people and animals living where the endangerment occurs, but for the greedy enrichment of corporations who will sell this oil and gas to China and other foreign consumers. This effort is being promoted ONLY by enemies of the people. If you are not one of these, then reform your decisions and STOP this rape of the earth. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Robert Trickey

04/15/2013

Robert Trickey

I oppose the Keystone pipeline. It does not benefit the United States. The oil to be transported is corrosive. High pressures must be used to transport it. Diluents which are environmentally harmful must be added to move it. The pipeline will age and eventually have to be removed. It will probably rupture before then making a mess. Oil tankers which transport oil across the seas are now double hulled. A pipeline should be double walled for equal protection in the United States. The cost to construct a truly safe pipeline is prohibitive. This oil is being transported already by alternative means, by rail and by barge. While such transport is not as profitable for the Canadian company there is more safety moving limited amounts by rail and barge. A spill using this means is already limited. Financing a pipeline should include the cost of removal of the pipeline. Including this cost probably makes the pipeline uneconomical. from Robert Charles Walker

04/15/2013

Robert Walker

From the submitted documentation, I am confident all issues have been addressed and the keystone pipeline project should be approved. I am in support. -- Robert Yoder

04/15/2013

Robert Yoder

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There is no such thing as a guarantee that a spill will not occur. The only guarantee is to halt construction of the pipeline. Wind, solar and hydro are the only energy sources that should be getting our money and attention. Keep moving in that direction. Sincerely, Roberta Jachym

04/15/2013

Roberta Jachym

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. 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. Sincerely, Robyn Blaisdell

04/15/2013

Robyn Blaisdell

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands are an environmental disaster. That oil is so filthy it will undo the modest advances the government has made in the face of massive campaign contributions to politicians from the oil industry. 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. I bet Canadians will be against it. Besides, after that dirty oil is refined, the oil companies will just export it. It will do nothing to lower gas prices or improve the supply for the U.S. Sincerely, Roderic Krapf

04/15/2013

Roderic Krapf

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, As a member of Greenpeace I will always stand on the side of keeping our world a safe and healthy place for all animals, that includes us, to flourish. Anytime we put perceived economic needs in front of the lives belonging to those of the future we are not only being selfish and greedy but we are being extremely short sided. We must never forget our responsibility to the stability of our environment. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Roger Atkins

04/15/2013

Roger Atkins

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. Serious oil spills are disturbingly frequent, as evidenced by the recent spill in Arkansas, and recently in both Montana and Michigan. The Government should be encouraging private enterprises to develop and market environmentally friendly energy sources. Approval of the XL pipeline is moving in the opposite direction--supporting a highly polluting energy source. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Rolland Graham

04/15/2013

Rolland Graham

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The environmental cost of this project so way exceeds any short or long term job creation, extra energy...I am shocked that this is still on the table. SAY NO. SHOW SOME INSPIRED LEADERSHIP. Sincerely, Ron Ennis

04/15/2013

Ron Ennis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department NO!!!! Permanent jobs__maybe 200. Distruption of the environment--permanent. Oil going to Asia--All of it. Ships carring the oil--Foreign registered. Pollution from pipe line leaks and processing---potentially a lot, all on American soil. WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS PICTURE? It is 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ron Kaminski

04/15/2013

Ron Kaminski

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Do not allow XL Keystone Pipeline Sincerely, Rory Colgan

04/15/2013

Rory Colgan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please do not allow the keystone pipe line to be built. Tar sand, probably the direst source of energy, has the potential to destroy our environment. Instead keep the momentum going to discover, improve and expand new sources of energy. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Rosalind Weis

04/15/2013

Rosalind Weis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please do not approve the Keystone XL Pipeline and develops the tar sands. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rosanne Couston

04/15/2013

Rosanne Couston

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. President, Voted for you both times, made calls, donated - believed, and still do, that you will do the right thing for your own daughters and all of our families that depend on fresh air to breath and clean water to drink. We've seen the spills, the big ones that are reported, and are also aware that there are many more, some "not significant" ??? enough to be reported by the media. We also know that the Gulf is NOT as "clean and wonderful" as the ads (produced and paid for by big oil) on TV. Well, the right thing is to veto the Keystone XL pipeline and NOT let this potential 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rosemarie Stepanik

04/15/2013

Rosemarie Stepanik

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. Please educate yourself about entire communities being poisoned and held hostage by those murderous companies. Yes murderous, entire communities are dying and the water is being poisoned. Drilling is being done on people's private properties in Colorado and other states where it is allowed. Previous administration have put in place Laws who protect the perpetrators and are practically untouchable. The victims are not allowed to talk because they are strapped by gag rules! This is outragous and should be stopped immediately! 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. And after the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas and at least ten other ones just very recently, along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear this pipeline will NEVER be safe. I demand climate leadership from this administration NOW. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rosemary Graham-Gardner

04/15/2013

Rosemary Graham-gardner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I voted for you twice, hoping you would fulfill your promises despite a uncooperative congress. Do what you and your constituents know is right for the environment and future generations. What have you got to lose? Be on the right side of history. Sincerely, Rowena Donelson

04/15/2013

Rowena Donelson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Unfortunately, it is obvious from the recent actions of the oil industry, that they will do everything to keep the public misinformed and fail to properly restore damaged environments without passing on the costs to the consumers while making record profits. Sincerely, Roxanne Leitner

04/15/2013

Roxanne Leitner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We don't need another dirty pipeline across our country. Why can't Canada build one across to their west coast. It would allow them to process "their" dirty oil instead of us refining it on our gulf coast. Sincerely, Russell Alcott

04/15/2013

Russell Alcott

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. This proposed pipeline is a disaster in the making. We don't need it. It is not going to be used to benefit us. Say no to this pipeline Sincerely, Mrs. Ruth Flemming

04/15/2013

Ruth Flemming

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Our world is the "Titanic", we are the crew, and you are the Captain. The crew sees the iceberg that is the Keystone XL, and are pleading with our Captain to avoid it. Please listen to us, avoid this disaster! Sincerely, Ruth Graser

04/15/2013

Ruth Graser

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I really cannot believe you have fallen for the hype promoting the Keystone XL pipeline. There is absolutely nothing in it to benefit the United States, and all I can envision for the future is trouble and disasters connected with it. Do you really want that to be the legacy of your presidency? 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.

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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Ruth Potter

04/15/2013

Ruth Potter

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If not now, WHEN? If not with this issue then, WHAT? I am a 25 year old American citizen who is trying to do all she can to decrease her impact on the environment but I won't be able to do it alone. I need your help with this particular initiative because it is bigger than you or me or my community. I think about my future and the future of my sister's children and fear envelops me. I encourage you to stand with me on this issue because our future depends on the decisions you make. Sincerely, Ruth Powell

04/15/2013

Ruth Powell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please reject this inefficient, poorly regulated and heavily polluting type of energy project. An "all of the above" approach should include careful considerations of benefits vs. risks as well as cost effectiveness. The Keystone XL Pipeline would only provide some energy through a very intensive course and process, create a handful of permanent jobs and make a few people richer. Other cleaner energy projects could also improve the economy and provide energy with far less negative impact. With so many emerging energy innovations, why not focus on more of those in the "all of the above" with legislation, tax breaks and funding? 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. Thank you for your time, and for your dedication and service to our country. Sincerely, Ruth Windham

04/15/2013

Ruth Windham

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I don't want my water putrified by the apathy of the keystone people. They will undoubtedly allow something bad to happen and then have their hand slapped in return. Don't allow this pipeline to come through Nebraska. Sincerely, Ryan Burger

04/15/2013

Ryan Burger

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Think about your children and having to explain why we have taken steps to further destroy their planet. It's not just about us. Do the right thing. Sincerely, Ryan McCall

04/15/2013

Ryan McCall

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't let them run pipes under our homes with such damaging potential that they have no obligation to disclose and little interest in taking appropriate responsibility for. Americans that will be placed at risk won't even benefit. Get this one right and the next one will be easier. XL is not necessary. Please do the right thing, now. Sincerely, Ryne Mitchell

04/15/2013

Ryne Mitchell

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. PLEASE STOP THIS. WE INTERRUPTED YOUR SPEECH IN FOR A REASON. With us was Thomas Poor Bear, VP of the Oglala Lakota Nation (counter-part to Joe Biden). After we were escorted out, no media followed us. Please do not let our actions be ignored. Know this: Future wars are going to be fought over water, not oil! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, S Sadler

04/15/2013

S Sadler

The State Department has still not decided whether to permit TransCanada to build the northern portion Keystone XL pipeline between Alberta, Canada, and Cushing, Oklahoma, allegedly to conduct further environmental impact studies. Now the State Department has erroneously and superficially declared that the Keystone XL pipeline would have no significant impact on the environment. Yet recently, a tar sands spill occurred in Arkansas as well as a spill in Minnesota. The Audubon Society states that the State Department has failed to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat, and its wildlife that will result through 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. Further environmental impact studies must truly consider the permanent damage that Keystone XL would exact on our planet. There is no doubt whatsoever that tar sands crude is a different product from conventional liquid crude oil and that, if the Keystone XL pipeline were to be permitted, it would devastate the entire environment of Planet Earth irreparably and forever. Tar sands crude is not the same as conventional crude oil for many reasons: ·It is retrieved by extractive mining, not drilling. ·Unlike conventional crude oil, it is not liquid; it is a viscous substance that requires diluent chemicals in order to dilute it into diluted bitumen (dilbit), chemicals such as benzene, which is carcinogenic, and toluene, which causes premature births. ·It requires extremely high pressure per square inch to force it through the pipelines. High pressure heats the pipes to about 150 degrees Fahrenheit, which makes the soil above unfit for growing crops. 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.) ·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. ·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. ·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. ·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. Tar sands is retrieved by extractive mining by first clear cutting thousands of acres of boreal forest. Therefore, entire forest ecologies are being forever devastated, including their waters, their flora and their fauna. Jim Hansen, well known NASA climatologist, writes in Rolling Stone, "GLOBAL warming isn't a prediction. It is happening. That is why I was so troubled to read a recent HYPERLINK "<http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2012/04/i-have-the-utmost-respect-for.html>" interview with President Obama in Rolling Stone in which he said that HYPERLINK

["Canada would exploit the HYPERLINK](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/canada/index.html?inline=nyt-geo)

["oil in its vast tar sands reserves "regardless of what we do."](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier)

If Canada proceeds and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate. 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. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and HYPERLINK

["coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk."](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/coal/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) If TransCanada is permitted to build its Keystone XL pipeline, it will exacerbate our already existing climate change and global warming. We simply cannot allow this to happen. Furthermore, the State Department must take into consideration all that TransCanada is already doing to East Texas – trashing through our forests and farms with tree-chewing equipment, bullying land owners by falsely claiming eminent domain, and hiring henchmen to arrest and abuse rightful and honest protesters. TransCanada is a foreign oil company, and their actions and behavior in the United States, especially Texas, is abominable. If they act so atrociously in Texas, I assure you that they will behave the same all along the northern path of the Keystone XL pipeline as well. The time has come to make your decision. The facts are clear. The Keystone XL pipeline would devastate our environment and cause great risk to human health. Further studies are not necessary. Please deny TransCanada the permit to build the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you. Jack Cooper

04/15/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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 their oil on the market. The jobs created do not warrant the danger of spills and environmental consequences. 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. Sincerely, Sally Trathen

04/15/2013

Sally Trathen

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. Just who's country does America belong to? Who takes priority here? Well I hope that it's us, AMERICAN CITIZENS, NOT FOREIGN BUSINESSES! We take priority! This is our country. If we say we don't want the pipeline then you should listen! Same goes with FRACKING. Get that company called Norse Energy Co. Outta New York. They are foreigners forcing FRACKING down our throats. I will fight FRACKING with all my might!!! It's upsetting that you, the president of the United States does nothing to protect citizens from environmental destruction which threatens public health and the wildlife. Instead you kiss the buttocks of the very people we are against, the foreign business bent on selling our land for their profit! This is despicable and disgusting. I could have sworn the first line in the constitution reads, "We the People", not we the corporations - corporations are not considered people. What blasphemy. Do your job and protect Americans! Stop giving a handout to damned corps like the Keystone Pipeline, FRACKING, offshore oil drilling, coal mining & nuclear power and start supporting Eco-friendly methods like solar and wind energy! While I'm at it, put wolves back on the endangered species list as well as bison, NOW!!! Stop beating around the bush and just do it. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, sam. bros

04/15/2013

Sam. bros

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department NO MORE OIL SPILLS!!! It is so careless it seems like they spill on purpose!!! Until they stop the spills and dangerous fracking- no more pipelines!!!! No more spills and no more water that lights on fire!!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Samantha Trosky

04/15/2013

Samantha Trosky

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Can we really care that little about the planet? That's what we're saying with the Keystone Pipeline. Let us stop this insanity for the sake of our planet, our children, our flora and fauna, our Spirit of Life. Let us bring sanity to this planet. Let us bring love to this planet. Let us care for our Mother Earth, who is already on life support. Let us not kill Mother Earth for our need, our greed. LET US HAVE A CREED OF CARE FOR WHAT GOD HAS GIVEN US. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Sandee Kosmo

04/15/2013

Sandee Kosmo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please do not turn your back on the environment and destroy what we have left. Pressure to produce fuel will not be relieved by doing more of what we have already done. Its not a democratic move to look only into the short-term solution for our problems, we must invest in our future to provide an inhabitable planet for our children. How do you want to be remembered? 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sandie Bello

04/15/2013

Sandie Bello

The pipeline MUST happen. If it does not, we will be forever in the Middle East's control. We need to be independent and this is an excellent way to make this happen. There is nothing more risky in this world than having to depend on the very life of our existence (oil) from countries that are at war constantly and have no respect for human life, laws or liberty. There are risks involved, sure...but nothing riskier than oil dependence! Sandra Parrott

04/15/2013

Sandie Parrott

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The oil companies have shown over and over that they will have disasterous spills and that they are unable to make the pipelines safe. If you consider the damage to the environment and the overall cost of oil energy, it is a bad deal. Don't worry about the jobs; work to create those jobs in the renewable energies industry. It's a no brainer. Sincerely, Sandra Lombardi

04/15/2013

Sandra Lombardi

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If the tar sands and the proposed XL pipeline are safe, what about Arkansas and other spill occurrences? And why and how did the company whose line broke, demand a NO fly zone? We could see that any aerial photos could show exactly what a disaster the break was! It is clear to most of the population in the US that the XL Pipeline will never be safe. We, along with most of the people in the US, demand climate leadership from you and your administration, and specifically the total and complete rejection of the XL pipeline. Do the right thing, and prove to us that you were and are worthy of the vote we gave you in both elections! 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. 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. We look carefully to see what happens. Your vote and the Congressional vote could mar the democratic party in untold ways, if you do not reject the XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Sandy and Dana Yudovin

04/15/2013

Sandy And Dana Yudovin

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Let's be clear, its not just game over for the climate if the Keystone XL pipeline is approved. Its game over for living "easily" on this planet. Surviveability is at stake when we put that much carbon into the air and water. We already have too much carbon where it doesn't belong. And we don't know if we can reverse this in time to prevent severe climate disruption. Why do this so that a few people can make outrageous profits without much in the way of oversight and damages paid to those harmed? It makes no sense because its a horrible idea. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Sandy Easter

04/15/2013

Sandy Easter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please show that you have the courage and vision to be a great president. If you look at Williston, ND, and Mayflower, KS, you must know that the Keystone XL pipeline is unacceptable. Please say NO. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sarah Hearon

04/15/2013

Sarah Hearon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You must keep your climate promise, you can't approve the pipeline. It's that simple. This could be a "game over" decision, experts agree. Do not approve. Please do not approve! PS let's work on getting BP out of Lake Michigan too. That is my life's commitment before they destroy it like they did the Gulf! THANK YOU!

Sincerely, Sarah Kozel

04/15/2013

Sarah Kozel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I shouldn't even have to ask you to do this. Please declare that you will reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. If it becomes a reality, our future will slip away. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Saran Kirschbaum

04/15/2013

Saran Kirschbaum

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You have both spoken on behalf of the environment and the urgent need to address the enormous threat of climate change to our planet and people. To make a difference will take more than words and encouragement for change. It will take bold actions including blocking the Keystone XL pipeline. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration'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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. Leadership on this issue has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please reject the pipeline. 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.

Sincerely, Scott Andrews

04/15/2013

Scott Andrews

Dear President Obama, How about investing in the United States's electric grid first so we can use clean energy throughout this great country of ours!! -- Scott Marcus United States of America
This message was submitted via Avaaz at http://www.avaaz.org/en/no_tar_sands_valdez/?reply. To respond, please e-mail reply+nokxl@Avaaz.org

04/15/2013

Scott Marcus

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. We are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuel on the planet. Tar sands are the most inefficient source of fossil fuel available and must be kept in the ground if we are to stop CO2 levels in the atmosphere at anything close to a safe range for global warming. Stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. Please show climate leadership from this administration, It will be your legacy. 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. Sincerely, Scott Vlaun

04/15/2013

Scott Vlaun

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The Keystone XL pipeline is a disgrace. The paltry number of jobs created in no way outweighs the short and long term environmental damage this pipeline will cause. The oil from this pipeline is basically the bottom of the hydrocarbon food chain. If you're raring to sign something, how about looking into legislation around energy efficiency. I'm sure there's something worth while floating around the Senate/House that you can throw your weight behind and help them push through. Sean Campbell Sincerely, Sean Campbell

04/15/2013

Sean Campbell

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department ouch, I am still wincing about Kobe being out Sir, this pipeline is like resurrecting an old dinosaur...please do not enact the Keystone pipeline....we are all so entrenched in our fossil fuels it is crazy and until we begin to wean ourselves, all our actions will be like peeing in the wind...President Carter had the right alternative energy source ideas back in the 70s only to suffer scorn, rebuke and to be voted out...then came Reagan and the big money gravy train returned....Sir, we know you are under a lot of pressure, but it is obvious that the old carbon fuel path is nearly obsolete as well as messy and expensive...surely we can explore other areas of energy....please do not be swayed by all the suits, let's begin anew....let's say "no" to this behemoth pipeline of avarice and temporary solution, let's more actively seek and use wind and sun and ethanol..... no pipeline, please....thank you, Sir Sincerely, Sean Hennessey

04/15/2013

Sean Hennessey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department YOU MUST NOT ALLOW THIS KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE - THEY HAVE NO IDEA HOW TO CLEAN THIS HORRID NEW TYPE OF OIL WHEN IT SPILLS..IT IS GOING BACK TO THE EARTH FROM WHENCE IT CAME. PLEASE KEEP YOUR PROMISE AND STOP THIS PROJECT DEAD IN IT'S TRACK. WE ARE COUNTING ON YOU! THANK YOU. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Selma Cooper

04/15/2013

Selma Cooper

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department There is NOTHING in this deal for us! We take a HUGE environmental risk, Canada makes money, and the refined oil will be shipped overseas. NO long-term jobs created, just a few temporary construction jobs. And it will not decrease the cost of gas or oil here in the U.S. a single penny. This is lose-lose. And another environmental disaster waiting to happen. And we, the taxpayers, will be left footing the bill. Again. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Shambie Cooper

04/15/2013

Shambie Cooper

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This corporation with billions in profits has obviously done little to improve their technology involving cleaning up these poisonous spills. These lands are now uninhabitable. We don't need more of this!

Sincerely, Sharon Crockett

04/15/2013

Sharon Crockett

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please do not approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. Do not blight the environment or decrease your commitment to alternative energy sources such as electricity to power our vehicles and other daily needs. Thank you.

Sincerely, Sharon Davis

04/15/2013

Sharon Davis

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a OFA volunteer and donor, I hope that our faith in your discernment has not been in vain. We can all see quite clearly what a leak of these pipelines can do. Do the right thing, for our future, and those who follow after us. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Sharon Donovan

04/15/2013

Sharon Donovan

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The break in the Tar Sabds Oil pipeline in Arkansas is just a precursor to what will happen if this Keystone project is allowed to go on. TSO is impossible to remove from water- there is an aquifer that supplies water to several states right under where the pipeline will go. That is insanity. This TSO is for China anyway! Why should we take this HUGE environmental risk for a few part time jobs?! JUST SAY NO TO BIG MONEY!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Sharon Larson

04/15/2013

Sharon Larson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I cannot imagine that you will allow this to go through, knowing about all the potential harm it will do to the environment, water supplies, land values, and knowing that it will only pollute America and will not even be used in this country. We have the technology to use renewable clean, green energy. This should stop now, before it is too late. Sharon Switzer

04/15/2013

Sharon Switzer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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 elected you again for a reason, we put our trust in you to do what you and I know is needed to be done. The XL Pipeline is extremely bad for the earth, and everything living on the earth. You said we need to move toward clean energy, and the XL Pipeline is not remotely in that direction. It will cause more great harm to the earth. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sharon Wilson

04/15/2013

Sharon Wilson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. As a nurse, I see how the human responds to everything to which it is exposed. Many of these responses results in poor health. Decisions that are made today will affect our and other species for seven generations. Please consider the long term consequences when making your decisions. Sincerely, Shawn Collins

04/15/2013

Shawn Collins

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Over One Million Americans: Have protested and clearly stated, that the Keystone energy Pipeline is Not in Americas Best Interests! The People have spoken, and since we still have a Government that Is For the People, and By the People, It is your Duty to Abide by the Will of the People! The People, say NO KEYSTONE XL Pipeline !!! Sincerely, Shawn Sargent

04/15/2013

Shawn Sargent

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mrs. Shereen Khalil

04/15/2013

Shereen Khalil

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We take very seriously this opportunity to speak up in support of Saving Our Planet by rejecting this pending approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline. President Obama has "the weight of the World" upon his shoulders. He should know he is not alone for we the people are carrying deep concerns regarding caring for this planet, our present home and the home of generations to come. 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. 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. 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 demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Shirley and Jim Chapman

04/15/2013

Shirley And Jim Chapman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. I live in New Mexico in the middle of Natural gas and oil fields and the destruction to our land, air and water is immense and forever. Our water smells like rotten eggs. Our many aquafors are destroyed. We are ruining human needs like water for a short term answer to our greed. Tar Sand Oil is MUCH dirtier and destructive to our land and water and air. We need to focus on other ways to supply fuel. THIS IS NOT THE ANSWER!! Come to middle America and see what is happening already. This will speed up the destruction and in the long run will not be what we need. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, shirley holmberg

04/15/2013

Shirley Holmberg

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department WHEN I VOTED FOR YOU THE FIRST TIME, I HAD HIGH HOPES THAT YOU WOULD BE THE VOICE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE. BUT YOU HAVE MADE TOO MANY DECISIONS THAT FEEL LIKE SHADES OF CHOICES MADE BY BUSH AND REPUBLICANS!!!!!! IT IS TIME TO GET AWAY FROM CHOICES THAT HARM THE ENVIRONMENT. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Shirley Keenum

04/15/2013

Shirley Keenum

Dear President Obama, I did not vote for you in this recent election because I was not sure that you would have the conviction to stand up in front of our great nation and say, "Climate change ends, here and now, for future generations." Please, I beg you, prove me wrong. You and I both know that America has the power to set the leading example in this fight for the prosperity of our children. Thank you. --
Sidney Katz

04/15/2013

Sidney Katz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. On behalf of the American public, a disinterested study must be conducted before any permitting process goes forward.
Sincerely, Skip Wenz

04/15/2013

Skip Wenz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Coal is not good for our future. We have much better solutions and technologies that can create jobs and support communities and it's time to get smart! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sofia Jamison

04/15/2013

Sofia Jamison

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. This pipeline will never be safe. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sol Anshien

04/15/2013

Sol Anshien

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department One question, in addition to the facts below, how can the US allow this pipeline across our beautiful country so that Canada can sell this to the foreign countries. We can use it and it is so corrosive that pipes are more likely to fail. Go ahead, make a stink and reject this project. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Remember, the pro-development, anti-climate (and anti Obama) people will never change... really, so make a stand. Reject this plan. Sincerely, Soleil Develle

04/15/2013

Soleil Develle

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. I hope you're not living in a bubble, and are aware of what's happened in Arkansas - there is no safe way to transport such toxic chemicals long distances without spillage or accident. To think otherwise is hubris; * connect the dots regarding carbon emissions and climate change. To burn all oil available to us is not sound economics, it is short term greed masquerading as such. Investment in renewables will bring greater returns without pushing us over the brink of environmental disaster. Before any decision is made, a thorough and transparent review of the Keystone XL pipeline is needed to ensure that your communities, wildlife habitat, waterways, and our climate, are protected. Sincerely, Sophie Galleymore Bird

04/15/2013

Sophie Galleymore Bird

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please Mister the President, do you think realy than today people are happier because they change their, car, computer each moment ? No, i don't think so. We need to live better with nature, animals... if we preserve theirs areas. Humans destroyed it to have always more, to chasing after happiness, wellness but everybody is sadness and desesperate about life because the nature and its inhabitants are destroy Thank you very much to have I "imagine" read my writing. You can change the world. I now USA since a long time ago its changing in the bad way. Sincerely, Sophie Jacquet

04/15/2013

Sophie Jacquet

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department spills can't happen and pigs fly... valdez, the gulf, etc, didn't happen...BTW converting to natural gas is an orders of magnitude better investment than keystone;; stanley seigler (DEM) 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Stanley Seigler

04/15/2013

Stanley Seigler

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. This pipeline will be a lose-lose-lose for the ecosystems and communities and the whole planet. Is is critical you do NOT allow this to happen. I beg you on behalf of my children's children's children. Please say NO. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Starr Sheppard-Decker

04/15/2013

Starr Sheppard-decker

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How are you going to explain your actions to your grandchildren, history will not be kind to you given your support of environmental unsound practices. We have the answers, now we need the will power and that starts with you. Sincerely, Stephanie Eisenberg

04/15/2013

Stephanie Eisenberg

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Keystone XL pipeline is a disaster waiting to happen, as happened in Arkansas!! I could go on with a message about why not to do it, but you already know the reasons, it's just up to you be reasonable. Luckily, you're both very smart and sometimes reasonable people. I realize that you don't always act like it because you're politicians, but please, think about this one, and be a decent human being and not a politician!!! It's a terrible idea for 100,982,874,000 reasons!!! Sincerely, Stephanie Hillman Sincerely, Stephanie Hillman

04/15/2013

Stephanie Hillman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Opposition to this pipeline is a matter of principle for me. The principle is to honor, uphold, and act on behalf of common sense. 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 2) the usurpation of valuable land from its sundry owners through eminent domain 3) the consequential upheaval of many more than 35 individual lives existing in their constitutionally empowered pursuit of life and happiness 4) the continued diminution and subordination of the general populace's long-term and short term welfare to an excessively powerful and negligent industry. This common sense is rooted in and stimulated by a lifetime or century's worth of indefensible and manmade oil spills (Ten Largest Offshore Oil Spills in the U.S. | Infoplease.com) on this mainland as well as on other continents and in seas, oceans, and rivers around the world. For the sake of common sense, decency and the dignity of learning from our mistakes, it is high time to say NO to the mindless habit of inevitably incurring more of the same abhorrent consequences of transporting oil and of uncovering it. Therefore, it is time to say "NO." Don't you agree ? Sincerely, Stephanie Spahr

04/15/2013

Stephanie Spahr

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Sterling C Keeley

04/15/2013

Sterling C Keeley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The Keystone XL pipeline is a bad idea. It puts at risk the "breadbasket" of the free world. Do we really want to go down in history as the generation that destroyed the largest food producing region that mankind has known? It is NOT worth the risk. Put the pipeline and the refineries somewhere else. Sincerely, Steve D

04/15/2013

Steve D

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am opposed to the Keystone pipeline for two reasons. One is the greater than normal 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. The second reason is the impact on the climate this will cause due to the amount of carbon dioxide absorbed by the atmosphere when this amount of oil is burned. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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.

Sincerely, Steve Eisenberg

04/15/2013

Steve Eisenberg

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Is it really a good idea to undermine the future of our children and grandchildren for a few billion dollars at present time? Surely a bit of money and a few jobs most of which are temporary could not be that important. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, steve kent

04/15/2013

Steve Kent

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I strongly disagree with drilling for oil in the arctic it is environmentally a hazard, along with pipelines traveling across the U.S. We should not have to put up with this because big business wants to make a profit. America should focus more on solar, wind, and Hydroelectricity; all safer for the environment. I voted for Obama i don't want to regret my vote by allowing another George Bush in office. You are supposed to represent the people not business and the people don't want pipelines or drilling in the arctic, we want clean energy for our environment and our children's children; and not to mention clean energy is a new trend and to be on top of it will fuel the economy better and past trends like oil which won't last much longer. Sincerely, Steve Puliti

04/15/2013

Steve Puliti

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You are what is wrong and destroying the potential of America. Instead of progress and excellence, the natural next step for American 1st World Leadership -- going cheap, profitizing externalities, ecocide and damage control are where you've directed American business interests to lay. Fix our broken system, initial costs and solutions, engineering jobs and progress are where we need to invest, not padding the pockets of the few. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Steve Weiss

04/15/2013

Steve Weiss

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. You know that and also that the Keystone pipeline will bring the worst kind of oil out of the ground, with its own bad effects and on top of that risk land and homes and agriculture all along its pathway. 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. 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. I am hopeful Canada will finally act to reduce this source as well reducing the need for that pipeline. You can do it now, nothing to lose, and all the world and future to gain.

Thank you. Sincerely, Steve Zlotkin

04/15/2013

Steve Zlotkin

Hi, I wanted to express my concern over the proposed keystone pipeline. I truly believe that the evidence points to the facts that shipping tar sands oil though the US has the potential of ecological disaster that makes this project untenable, in my opinion. Thank you for reading my email. Sincerely, Steve Sheldon

04/15/2013

Steven Sheldon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If you roll over to Big Oil you will go down in History as one of our most corrupted Presidents ever- If you OK that line you will be making the greatest mistake of your career and will be responsible for turning our Mid-West into A toxic wasteland. I have worked in the Oil Field since 1967 as A Pipe Inspector-I practically lost every thing that I own as A Whistle Blower against British Petroleum in Alaska and you know what- I would do it again, because no amount of fame and fortune will bring back the environmental destruction caused by A major Oil spill....By convincing BP that the 36", 3,600 PSI, hundreds of miles of Gas line, I can safely say my actions may well have saved that entire region from being blown to smithereens... You know in your heart what the right thing to do here. And you also know what these fraudulent "Free Trade Agreements" will do for America-They will essentially "Privatize" our Legal system so that the Big Oil Vultures and Big Pharma can walk all over us. Life is not that long- Please, go down in History as A man whose Humanity could not be bought and sold- Make the Legacy of Barack Obama as that of Martin Luther King... Thank You Mr. President, Stuart Rodney Sneed/ Mrs. Angie Sneed

04/15/2013

Stuart Sneed

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Don't betray your constituents, or your children and your children's children, by letting this go through. Sincerely, Su Friedrich

04/15/2013

Su Friedrich

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I urge you to continue your efforts to help the environment by rejecting the Keystone XL Pipeline. Costly leaks are inevitable with damaging environmental results. Our already polluted land doesn't need another big health risk. Thank you.
Sincerely, Sue Chavel

04/15/2013

Sue Chavel

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department HAVE YOU SEEN A BEFORE AND AFTER PICTURE OF AN AREA WHERE THE TAR SANDS HAVE BEEN MINED? The USA should not contribute in anyway to that damage! Please, no pipeline to help this environmental disaster. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sue Cole

04/15/2013

Sue Cole

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I'm appalled at what we do to give us Americans energy! We rape our own lands at the expense of our children and the future generations! We have to spend more time on clean energy and less time on making disasters we can't clean up! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Summer Boger

04/15/2013

Summer Boger

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The tar sands are a disaster, from start to finish. Not only are they absolutely toxic for the climate, the mining process destroys the pristine Boreal Forest and threatens Canadian First Nations. Because the tar sands are so heavy and corrosive, the export pipelines are more likely to spill than conventional pipelines [2] -- we saw this just days ago when rivers of oil poured through Arkansas backyards where children usually play. Two other spills happened that same week in Canada and Texas, and the first Keystone pipeline spilled 12 times in its first year alone. The 2010 Michigan tar sands spill, which sickened children and killed family pets, still hasn't been fully cleaned up. [3] 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. (see Sierra Club for footnote references) Can tar sands spills in the environment really ever be "cleaned -up" or do the spills forever leave the land and water soiled! It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Susan Agee

04/15/2013

Susan Agee

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I have voted for you both in past years (Secretary Kerry in 2004; President Obama in 2008 and 2012). With those votes, I have placed all my hope and trust in you to achieve our common goals. President Obama, I placed all my hope and trust in you to work to create jobs and increase innovation, and to work for environmental justice in an age of climate crisis. I am imploring you Please, please do not betray us this trust! Please do not let the temptation of big money divert you from common sense, from doing the right thing, from doing your best. Please use the wonderful intellect and heart that God gave you and act responsibly. I implore you to REJECT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE, and say YES to putting that money, time and energy into creating CLEAN and SAFE ENERGY SOLUTIONS and creating more GREEN JOBS FOR OUR COUNTRY !! There is indisputable evidence that the tar sands pipelines are ticking time bombs. Over time, the moving sand simply erodes them away from the inside out, and then they leak with catastrophic results. The impact on people's lives and property, on the environment, and on wildlife and their habitats is devastating and heartbreaking. The ongoing impact on climate change is keeping us on track for an environmental Armageddon, if we don't do something about it. Would any of us be able to look our children in the eye and tell them that big oil money is more important than preventing all that, or that it's more important to be a "good boy" and do the bidding of the big money corporations in order to ensure a more cushy retirement from the White House? In the name of God, who is watching us; in the name of our children and their children; on behalf of the future of this beautiful country and planet; and on behalf of the majority of Americans who join me in this request, I am begging you PLEASE REJECT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE!! Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Susan Bozso

04/15/2013

Susan Bozso

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department When we speak to climate and energy supply 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. Sir the choices YOU make will effect not only us but our children and grandchildren. Please act in all of our well being not the corporate's . thank you for your consideration. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Susan Bradfield

04/15/2013

Susan Bradfield

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please, President Obama, honor your promise to help stop climate change, protect our environment, our wildlife, our rivers and streams, forests and wetlands, fields, our wells and ground water, and a healthy and happy future for our children. A street running full of tar sands oil represents no future at all. And that spill will be the first of many if that pipeline is approved. And I still very much resent the taking of land belonging to American citizens to benefit a foreign company and a foreign company even if it is Canada. Over the last few years Canada's record on environmental issues is dismal. For love of our country, PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THAT PIPELINE!! Sincerely, Susan Ebershoff-Coles

04/15/2013

Susan Ebershoff-coles

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight global warming while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Your administration's environmental legacy already includes letting BP get away with destroying the Gulf of Mexico and vastly expanding dangerous hydraulic fracturing for natural gas with no regard for the enormous hazards it poses. How much worse are you planning to make it? 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. After the recent tar sands spill in Arkansas--where reporters are being threatened with arrest for trying to do their jobs and the fossil fuel industry's victims are STILL unable to return to their homes--along with hundreds of other incidents over the last few years, it's clear (at least, it's clear in the real world, outside Planet Washington) that this pipeline will NEVER be safe--BY DESIGN. I demand climate leadership from this administration. That could begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. Or you could stick to your established environmental and energy policy of "Drill, baby, drill! I want to show the American people that I have ZERO concern for their best interests!" That's pretty much what I expect from someone who thinks he can "sell" us on the theft of our hard-earned Social Security benefits. Sincerely, Susan Hathaway

04/15/2013

Susan Hathaway

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The pipeline will not provide energy self-sufficiency for the USA. As soon as the fuel flows it will be sold to the highest bidders. Take your head out of the sand and be realistic about the capitalist greed that is ruining democracy and the earth. Your job is to protect this and coming generations from rapacious corporations. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Susan Johnson

04/15/2013

Susan Johnson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please be a leader for my voice than no one hears. Save our planet. Let the living beings that inhabit our earth win not big business. Trust that the right way will lead us forward to a better sustainable technology. May God be your witness in Truth, Beauty and Goodness. May God give you the courage to rise up.
Sincerely, Susan Julien

04/15/2013

Susan Julien

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. Please use your powers to do what those of us who voted for you asked you to do and that was to spark debate about America's energy problem and begin NEW, CREATIVE plans that will not harm our planet. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Susan Mach

04/15/2013

Susan Mach

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS. IT IS A MISTAKE TO DO IT NOW OR IN THE FUTURE. WE DON'T NEED TO TEAR UP OUR LAND TO LAY THIS DASTARDLY PIPELINE. PLEASE DON'T DO THIS!!! Sincerely, Susan Moor

04/15/2013

Susan Moor

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department How many oil/petroleum environmental disasters do there need to be before powerful decision-makers stop permitting private companies to undertake massive and massively dangerous projects? 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. Sincerely, Susan Mullaney

04/15/2013

Susan Mullaney

Secretary Kerry, As a smart, progressive, pacifist liberal, you cannot approve the Keystone XL pipeline. In case you have temporarily forgotten or abandoned your principles, please take 20 minutes to watch Naomi Klein's plea (to all of us) to stop our arrogant assault on this weary earth:
http://www.ted.com/talks/naomi_klein_addicted_to_risk.html Susan Overton

04/15/2013

Susan Overton

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. How many spills will it take before you finally stand up for the environment, which you've been promising all along? And when will you wake up to the fact that the only thing that matters to these insanely greedy and careless corporations is their profit? And when occasionally required to pay fines for the damage (often irreparable) they've caused, including murder, its no more than a penny on the dollar, if that.
SHAME ON YOU FOR COLLUDING WITH THEM! Sincerely, Susan Strelec

04/15/2013

Susan Strelec

The State Department has still not decided whether to permit TransCanada to build the northern portion Keystone XL pipeline between Alberta, Canada, and Cushing, Oklahoma, allegedly to conduct further environmental impact studies. Now the State Department has erroneously and superficially declared that the Keystone XL pipeline would have no significant impact on the environment. Yet recently, a tar sands spill occurred in Arkansas as well as a spill in Minnesota. The Audubon Society states that the State Department has failed to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat, and its wildlife that will result through 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 Further environmental impact studies must truly consider the permanent damage that Keystone XL would exact on our planet. There is no doubt whatsoever that tar sands crude is a different product from conventional liquid crude oil and that, if the Keystone XL pipeline were to be permitted, it would devastate the entire environment of Planet Earth irreparably and forever. Tar sands crude is not the same as conventional crude oil for many reasons: . It is retrieved by extractive mining, not drilling. . Unlike conventional crude oil, it is not liquid; it is a viscous substance that requires diluent chemicals in order to dilute it into diluted bitumen (dilbit), chemicals such as benzene, which is carcinogenic, and toluene, which causes premature births. . It requires extremely high pressure per square inch to force it through the pipelines. High pressure heats the pipes to about 150 degrees Fahrenheit, which makes the soil above unfit for growing crops. 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.) . 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. . 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. . 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. . 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. Tar sands is retrieved by extractive mining by first clear cutting thousands of acres of boreal forest. Therefore, entire forest ecologies are being forever devastated, including their waters, their flora and their fauna. Jim Hansen, well known NASA climatologist, writes in Rolling Stone, "GLOBAL warming isn't a prediction. It is happening. That is why I was so troubled to read a recent HYPERLINK "<http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2012/04/i-have-the-utmost-respect-for.html>" interview with President Obama in Rolling Stone in which he said

that HYPERLINK

"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/canada/index.html?inline=nyt-geo>" Canada would exploit the HYPERLINK
"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier>" oil in its vast tar sands reserves "regardless of what we do." javascript:pop_me_up2('http://www.nytimes.com/imagepages/2012/05/10/opinion/0510OPEDselman.html','0510OPEDselman_html','width=390,height=630,scrollbars=yes,toolbars=no,resizable=yes') If Canada proceeds and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate. 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. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and HYPERLINK
"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/coal/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier>" coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk." If TransCanada is permitted to build its Keystone XL pipeline, it will exacerbate our already existing climate change and global warming. We simply cannot allow this to happen. Furthermore, the State Department must take into consideration all that TransCanada is already doing to Texas – trashing through our forests and farms with tree-chewing equipment, bullying land owners by falsely claiming eminent domain, and hiring henchmen to arrest and abuse rightful and honest protesters. TransCanada is a foreign oil company, and their actions and behavior in the United States, especially Texas, is abominable. If they act so atrociously in Texas, I assure you that they will behave the same all along the northern path of the Keystone XL pipeline as well. The time has come to make your decision. The facts are clear. The Keystone XL pipeline would devastate our environment and cause great risk to human health. Further studies are not necessary. Please deny TransCanada the permit to build the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you.

04/15/2013

Susan T Cooper

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. FOR EVERY PERSON WHO SENDS A LETTER LIKE THIS, THERE ARE HUNDREDS WHO ARE UNAWARE OF THE SERIOUS AND IMMINENT DANGER POSED BY THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRIES. BY NOT REPORTING THIS IN THE MEDIA I SUGGEST THIS IS A DELIBERATE "MEDIA BLACKOUT". THE ONLY VIABLE "MEDIA" AVAILABLE TO "THE PEOPLE" IS THE INTERNET, BUT MANY PEOPLE ARE SO BUSY TRYING TO KEEP THE WOLF FROM THE DOOR THEY DON'T HAVE TIME OR ENERGY TO RESPOND. WHO IS THE WOLF ??? WHY,,, THE WALL STREET BANKERS !!! THEY ARE THE ONES WHO DEVALUED OUR COUNTRY TO THE POINT THAT BIG OIL CAN MOVE IN TO "SAVE" US FROM THOSE TERRORIST FOREIGN OIL COUNTRIES. WELL I SUGGEST THE TERRORISTS ARE "BIG OIL" !!! I FURTHER SUGGEST IT IS TREASON TO ALLOW THIS RAPING OF OUR PLANET TO CONTINUE. Sincerely, Susanne Patzold

04/15/2013

Susanne Patzold

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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 . More importantly global warming will affect as many as 9 billion people during the coming century. The negatives of this project compare with the positives like an elephant with a flea. Please don't be bullied into this agreement. British Columbia is doing a better job of standing up to their neighbors than we are. Sincerely, Suzanne Levine

04/15/2013

Suzanne Levine

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Suzy Goldberg

04/15/2013

Suzy Goldberg

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear Mr. Obama, I am so, so excited that you have a chance to help this country in a second term. That is what I hoped for and worked for, because I believe that you genuinely care about people and the environment. You have done many things already that have made me proud and that help us become a better place and better people. But now, here is this Keystone XL Pipeline. It is an important decision with many important players, all talking your ears off. Ultimately though, what does ANYTHING matter if our house , our home, the earth, becomes so dirty and unlivable that our children will not be able to fulfill their dreams? I have a 15 yr. old and a 19 yr. old. They are scared. They know that already we have many changes in our environment that we can either not turn back or only with real commitment (and sacrificing convenience). And we, the adults, don't seem to care. We just keep on doing the same things, now knowingly and willingly and they are no longer mistakes, they are conscious choices to ruin our planet. FOR THEM. Because you and I won't be around to live through what will happen. I believe you and I do not have the right to do that TO THEM. Our children. The Obama administration is undermining its own efforts to decrease global warming pollution by approving Shell's plans to drill in the Arctic, giving away coal buried under federal lands so coal companies can turn around and sell it overseas, and by considering projects like the Keystone XL Pipeline. You can't have it both ways. It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. The truth is that if this pipeline is approved, it's going to be even more difficult to save the climate, new fossil fuel projects threaten to send our climate past a point of no return. We are already seeing the effects in the form of extreme weather. And things will only get better if we take action immediately. The time is now and it starts with rejecting this pipeline. Thank you for supporting our children! Sincerely, Sybelle van Erven

04/15/2013

Sybelle Van Erven

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department As a third grade teacher , I am personally responsible for the welfare of my 24 students. As a mother of two, it is my responsibility to teach my children what is morally and ethically correct. It is wrong to drill and further reduce the resources of our earth while simultaneously destroying our climate. Please stand up for those of us who care to make this world a sustainable, peaceful place. It is 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Sylvia Correa

04/15/2013

Sylvia Correa

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. 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? And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. PLEASE HALT IT, NOW. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. Sincerely, T Carroll

04/15/2013

T Carroll

The State Department has still not decided whether to permit TransCanada to build the northern portion Keystone XL pipeline between Alberta, Canada, and Cushing, Oklahoma, allegedly to conduct further environmental impact studies. Now the State Department has erroneously and superficially declared that the Keystone XL pipeline would have no significant impact on the environment. Yet recently, a tar sands spill occurred in Arkansas as well as a spill in Minnesota. The Audubon Society states that the State Department has failed to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat, and its wildlife that will result through 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 Further environmental impact studies must truly consider the permanent damage that Keystone XL would exact on our planet. There is no doubt whatsoever that tar sands crude is a different product from conventional liquid crude oil and that, if the Keystone XL pipeline were to be permitted, it would devastate the entire environment of Planet Earth irreparably and forever. Tar sands crude is not the same as conventional crude oil for many reasons: . It is retrieved by extractive mining, not drilling. . Unlike conventional crude oil, it is not liquid; it is a viscous substance that requires diluent chemicals in order to dilute it into diluted bitumen (dilbit), chemicals such as benzene, which is carcinogenic, and toluene, which causes premature births. . It requires extremely high pressure per square inch to force it through the pipelines. High pressure heats the pipes to about 150 degrees Fahrenheit, which makes the soil above unfit for growing crops. 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.) . 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. . 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. . 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. . 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. Tar sands is retrieved by extractive mining by first clear cutting thousands of acres of boreal forest. Therefore, entire forest ecologies are being forever devastated, including their waters, their flora and their fauna. Jim Hansen, well known NASA climatologist, writes in Rolling Stone, "GLOBAL warming isn't a prediction. It is happening. That is why I was so troubled to read a recent HYPERLINK "<http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2012/04/i-have-the-utmost-respect-for.html>" interview with President Obama in Rolling Stone in which he said

that HYPERLINK

"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/canada/index.html?inline=nyt-geo>" Canada would exploit the HYPERLINK
"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier>" oil in its vast tar sands reserves "regardless of what we do." If Canada proceeds and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate. 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. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and HYPERLINK
"<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/coal/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier>" coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk." If TransCanada is permitted to build its Keystone XL pipeline, it will exacerbate our already existing climate change and global warming. We simply cannot allow this to happen. Furthermore, the State Department must take into consideration all that TransCanada is already doing to Texas – trashing through our forests and farms with tree-chewing equipment, bullying land owners by falsely claiming eminent domain, and hiring henchmen to arrest and abuse rightful and honest protesters. TransCanada is a foreign oil company, and their actions and behavior in the United States, especially Texas, is abominable. If they act so atrociously in Texas, I assure you that they will behave the same all along the northern path of the Keystone XL pipeline as well. The time has come to make your decision. The facts are clear. The Keystone XL pipeline would devastate our environment and cause great risk to human health. Further studies are not necessary. Please deny TransCanada the permit to build the northern portion of the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you.

04/15/2013

Tahma Metz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. KEEP THE DIRTY CANADIAN oil, pipeline, refineries and exporting port in Canada. We don't want any more U.S. soil and air polluted than we now have. EPA has been in bed with oil and other big pollution producers except in the Gulf under Obama. Tamie & Eric Goranson

04/15/2013

Tamie Goranson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If Keystone XL Pipeline is approved, there will be more accidents, and eventually our whole environment will be degraded even more. We need much more emphasis on development of sustainable energy and protecting the earth. The environment is more important than the economy. We cannot eat or drink or breathe money. I am so happy that you are our President, but I have been disappointed in your willingness to compromise with the dark side on a few issues, especially when it comes to the environment. Please listen to the people who voted you in and reject the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Sincerely, Tammy Kimmelman

04/15/2013

Tammy Kimmelman

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 (nor is Canada) 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 even consider 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. The Canadian Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, is maintaining his own family's oil money, while bullying members of his government to turn a blind eye to the damage he is doing. He is catering to China's energy and environmental needs - he has already sold off Canadian resources to China without public consultation, thereby committing treason. He has threatened to send the oil to China if the U.S. rejects the pipeline. But Canadians can't seem to stop him - maybe YOU can. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Teresa Hyatt

04/15/2013

Teresa Hyatt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL..... LEARN FROM THE SPILL IN ARKANSAS!!!! AND Keystone wil be WORST!!!!....This is a HORRIBLE ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN!!!! DONT LET GREED DESTROY OUR ENVIRONMENT,OUR LAND,OUR WILDLIFE!!!!!! SHOW YOUR LEADERSHIP NOW!!!!!! NO KEYSTONE EVER!!!!!! Sincerely, Teresa Royer

04/15/2013

Teresa Royer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department President Obama, Please do not bend to the whims of "Big Oil and Big Business" !. You would not allow a drug cartel just because it brought "jobs" to the area. This is that same horrible thing and needs to give way to the development of good and clean energy so that your children and grandchildren and mine will have a prosperous life on a clean planet. Please keep your word and reject the Keystone XL Pipeline! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Terri Voitik

04/15/2013

Terri Voitik

Apr 15, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, I strongly oppose plans by Enbridge Inc. to increase capacity of the Alberta Clipper tar sands oil pipeline from Alberta, Canada, to Superior, Wisconsin. 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 climate. 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.
Sincerely, Terry & Dave Johns

04/15/2013

Terry & Dave Johns - Bessey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I hope you understand that the tar sand , though refined in the U.S., is then intended to be shipped overseas.This will not create any energy independence for us, but rather fill the pockets of oil companies. How did they get off STARTING this pipeline before the entire length had been approved?? It smells. Sincerely, Terry Zenner

04/15/2013

Terry Zenner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please Mr. President, do something that shows some foresight beyond this generation. Please do something consistent with the rhetoric you spewed to win office. Please do something to show you're not a puppet for big business. Sincerely, Thad Camlin

04/15/2013

Thad Camlin

I think that it is very important for us to remember that our care for the environment has impacts for years to come. I am writing to state that I think the keystone pipeline does not represent the environmental moves that we want to make as a nation. We want to be moving away from fossil fuel use, not finding ways to continue to increase our fossil fuel use. The dangers of such a pipeline are also manifold. Thank you. Thandiwe Gobledale -- Thandiwe Gobledale

04/15/2013

Thandiwe Gobledale

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Dr. Thelma Shtasel

04/15/2013

Thelma Shtasel

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. How many more oil spills do we need to pollute our world? When do we say ENOUGH? When do we take a stand? Please protect our environment & our country. Sincerely, Theresa Grube

04/15/2013

Theresa Grube

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 at all 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. The United States is a world leader in so many ways. Why do we continue to invest--and risk so very much--in these short-sighted and environmentally devastating methods? Sincerely, Theresa Nagy

04/15/2013

Theresa Nagy

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department When does reality come to play ? Accidents happen. When will there be a real accounting of the costs associated with fossil fuels? When you factor the lost revenue from the damage, the land that is occupied. Then you factor in the health costs, subsidizing the companies, and the clean up costs after an accident. Time lost by congress and their staff for dealing with lobbyist. Lost revenue from other industries because of the environmental damage. Reality is much more costly than the fantasy world everyone seems to live in. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Thomas Gannon

04/15/2013

Thomas Gannon

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Tar Sands are the worst of all possible fuel-sources, Mr. President. And shipping and processing them 1700 miles away will spell the end of the viability of electric cars re-charged with solar--thermally derived electricity. 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. Develop natural gas but say no to Keystone XL as well as saying No to mountain-top removal coal-mining, and Arctic Drilling and the Pebble Mine. But don't stick to "all of the above" -- that would deprive the electric-car industry of the economies of scale it needs to compete with dirty-fuel vehicles!

Sincerely, Thomas Kuna-Jacob

04/15/2013

Thomas Kuna-jacob

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You know that the Keystone XL Pipeline is the wrong thing to do now do the right thing and reject the Keystone XL. Sincerely, Thomas Miceli

04/15/2013

Thomas Miceli

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department XL Pipeline 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? The potential for a BP type Spill on the land, instead of in the water, is REAL! I would aver that nothing will prove more precisely the old Maxim: "What goes around, comes around" than the fact that what, we have, allowed to be Sprayed on our Crops, SPILLED ONTO OUR LAND -including the run-off from crops, Spewed into our Air, Buried in our Soil or Dumped into our waters, will soon be seen, smelt and tasted, in that order, as it comes back at us out of our spigots. Count on it! The potential for the survival of our environment is directly proportional to the, insatiable, sociopathic GREED of the "Special Interests" and their carte blanche to continue to Pollute, Deceive and then continue to Pollute. We are our Environment's Keeper! If not us, WHO? Certainly not those who are Profiting from its Destruction! And I can't emphasize "Destruction" enough! No mention has been made as to how much water it will take to process 2Tons of Tar Sands. However, it is estimated that it takes Two(2) Tons of Tar Sands to produce just One(1) Barrel (32 Gallons) of Oil. You do the math: Producing an estimated 9,000 Barrels per Day X 2 Tons = Sub Surface Disaster. Just envision the void this would leave in the sub-surface after 12 months! A void that would require the tremendous re-establishing of the equilibrium in the sub-surface! ETHICAL INDUSTRIES AGREE: SAFETY RULES & REGULATIONS IGNORED = Disastrous Consequences ASSURED Sincerely, Thomas Nass

04/15/2013

Thomas Nass

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We don't need this pipeline. It is going to be used for export and profit for already rich oil companies. Leave the oil where it is, worse case scenario is that it remains there for future use. You have allowed the oil companies enough leeway to explore new resources and prices just keep going up. Put a tariff on oil and natural gas exports, a big one. Then the oil would stay here because there would be less of a monetary incentive for the greedy to profit from exploiting precious resources. Sincerely, Thomas Stoddard

04/15/2013

Thomas Stoddard

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The probability for an environmental disaster to occur is too high! We need to be investing in Green technologies that won't continue to destroy our natural environment. Sincerely, Timothy Alstrum

04/15/2013

Timothy Alstrum

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Stop supporting oil companies!!!! WE NEED GREEN ENERGY AND THAT IS THE ONLY KIND OF ENERGY THE GOVT SHOULD BE SUPPORTING WITH OUR TAX DOLLARS!!!! Sincerely, Tina Mizhir

04/15/2013

Tina Mizhir

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you OK this pipeline, you are no better than the Republicans that don't care if our planet is destroyed. I'm so sick of politicians. I had such high hopes for you. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Tina Morrison

04/15/2013

Tina Morrison

Attached is a letter from Senator Gardenhire regarding the Keystone XL pipeline. Thank you, Rita Redmond Executive Secretary to Sen. Todd Gardenhire

04/15/2013

Todd Gardenhire

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We can not afford to trust a pipeline with proven bad record that will deliver environmentally dangerous product, only to have the oil companies sell all of that oil to China for profit. There are too many lies and far too many dangers to go ahead with Keystone XL. Sincerely, Todd Hildebrandt

04/15/2013

Todd Hildebrandt

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, The State Department report is making the same type of claim the NRA makes against your gun control plans. If not the pipeline, then it will happen some other worse way is akin to the NRA claim that gun control only means criminals will find another way. You knew better than to accept that argument and listened to your supporters. Listen to us now. I have donated to your campaign and worked to get you elected and re-elected. Please think about the people that this carbon will kill and the hundreds of millions of climate refugees that climate change from this carbon bomb will bring. Your children will pay a very high price if you do not stand firm and reject this pipeline. You must stand for the future because no one else can. You have read the reports. You know what is coming. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We have faith in you Mr. President. For the sake of coming generations, for the sake of your daughters and grandchildren to come, you must act on what you know to be true. You must stop the madness and stop this pipeline. Sincerely, Tom Asprey

04/15/2013

Tom Asprey

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. However, if this resource is going to be developed in Canada I personally would love to see the our country move to terminate the Keystone Project in favor of building new "state of the art" refineries in North Dakota and Montana to refine the product for "domestic distribution only"; the Cornerstone Project. This would mean real long term jobs, true energy independence by taking us away of the risky suppliers of the Middle East. Removing us from the world market would lower oil prices globally. But more than anything, if we don't try to keep this resource here it will go aboard where it will be consumed by cars and factories with horrible emission standards. This will cause the effects of Global Warming to increase. Please stop all of the risks of Keystone Pipeline. We know if it makes it to the Gulf Coast refineries it will be exported to the worst consumers 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 economic 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. Sincerely, Tom Brawley

04/15/2013

Tom Brawley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's bad enough that we keep uping the export of coal to countries that will greatly degrade our atmosphere and continue warming theh planet, greed is so powerful. Keystone is another example of the same thing. For the sake of my kids and grandkids I implore you to reverse course on both!!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Tom Keenan

04/15/2013

Tom Keenan

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. I ALSO THINK THAT IF A PIPELINE IS CONSTRUCTED TAKING THE ENVIRONMENT INTO CONSIDERATION THE OIL SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR EXPORT. WE SHOULD USE THE OIL FOR DOMESTIC NEEDS AND TO GUARANTEE US BEING NOT ENERGY DEPENDANT ON THE MIDDLE EAST. THIS WOULD ALLOW US MANY MORE YEARS OF A STABLE OIL INPUT AS WE PROCEED TO CLEANER FUELS.

Sincerely, Mr. Tom Kreuser

04/15/2013

Tom Kreuser

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Barack, you know in your heart and soul what the best decision is for people and the environment: stop unnecessary massive environmental damage - there are better alternatives. You are the Lorax, you have the power, you have a voice. "Unless" you do what you know is right, the destruction that ruins all of us will continue now and in the future. Even Dr. Seuss, an author of children's books, could anticipate this greed and devastation...and see the solution: DO SOMETHING. The earth and humans will be better off for your courage. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Tonia Kittelson

04/15/2013

Tonia Kittelson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. CONSERVATION is the solution, NOT destroying the planet.....!!!! MOST vehicles commute with only the driver inside... there are far, far too many other examples to list. Point being, there are EFFECTIVE, SIMPLE no-brainer solutions IMMEDIATELY available!!!!!!! Sincerely, Topper Smith

04/15/2013

Topper Smith

Apr 15, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, As a member of Physicians for Social Responsibility, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Tracy Cole

04/15/2013

Tracy Cole

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The Arkansas spill is one of the most disgusting displays of corporate irresponsibility in this decade! Defining the bituminous slurry as NOT has allowed Exxon to largely circumvent its fiscal duty to the people of Arkansas! Sincerely, Troy Younts

04/15/2013

Troy Younts

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We cannot continue like this. We will have no more house to live in and we cannot move to another planet. Please, please let this pipeline not happen. there is everything at stake. Sincerely, Trudi Thomas

04/15/2013

Trudi Thomas

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department If you actually look at the pipeline, i.e., what it is and who it is for, and what its effect will be, it is a no-brainer and you will reject it. If you don't care about the people and the future, you will approve it. Eagerly awaiting your decision. Sincerely, Truman O., Jr. Price

04/15/2013

Truman O., Jr. Price

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Oil companies appear to be ill-prepared to deal with disasters. For them, it is about profits and not about the welfare of our children, grandchildren, and their children. We only have one planet to leave them. Let's preserve it for their sake, if not ours. Sincerely, Valerie Etter

04/15/2013

Valerie Etter

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department STOP NOW!!! Put all this time, energy, money, and innovation to BETTER USE. We need to get off oil. We can do it. Clean, sustainable, renewable. This is what will keep this country great. Come on...think about it. Sincerely, Valerie Zachary

04/15/2013

Valerie Zachary

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Am very seriously opposed to this pipeline. Please support efforts to reduce our oil/carbon burning and increase renewable energy sources, instead of continuing to increase the oil-flow. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Vernon Crouch

04/15/2013

Vernon Crouch

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr Obama kill the bill and stop compromising our future, the hope of real change that I had in you will depend on this important desition, thank you and Lord bless you! Sincerely, Vic Vargas

04/15/2013

Vic Vargas

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Once again, the citizens are monetarily and environmentally responsible for any "accidents" that occur. We bear ALL the risk, while the industry bears NONE of it. We are also forced to support the "dark age" of carbon- intensive fossil fuel industry. Sincerely, Vicki Bynum

04/15/2013

Vicki Bynum

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please be consistent in implementing your climate policy. If we are going to have a habitable planet, we must not build the Keystone pipeline. Once we have a spill or contamination, it is much more difficult to clean it up than prevent it in the first place. We need to take the lead in curtailing carbon emissions-not enable them. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Vicki Leidner

04/15/2013

Vicki Leidner

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, Your kids are about the same age as my grandkids. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline for them and for all future generations. Thank you, Vicki Meyer. Sincerely, Vicki Meyer

04/15/2013

Vicki Meyer

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I supported you as did mostly environmentally minded Americans in the last two elections. Keep our environment a top priority. The Keystone XL Pipeline is not the way. Sincerely, Vicki Vlasnik

04/15/2013

Vicki Vlasnik

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Vickie Lepore

04/15/2013

Vickie Lepore

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is time to concentrate on clean and dependable energy. There is no reasonable excuse to support the Keystone XL pipeline. The damage to the environment, both air and land is not justified. Sincerely, Victoria English

04/15/2013

Victoria English

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better. It's not. Sincerely, Victoria Jofery

04/15/2013

Victoria Jofery

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. President Obama, it seems like every time you come in public speeches you tend to say that the "time to act is now." You said that you were going to advocate for nature and for preserving our planet, however after almost 5 years in office I haven't seen much happen. I urge you to keep your word, and please REJECT the Pipeline that means DEATH to our beloved ecosystem! Thank you! Sincerely, Victoria Melgarejo

04/15/2013

Victoria Melgarejo

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The time of using fossil fuels for energy has passed. All such action now is redundant, environmentally damaging, and is a short cut that will cost the future -- our children and our childrens' children much too dearly. We need to invest our energies on alternative sources. Sincerely, Victoria Miller

04/15/2013

Victoria Miller

Apr 15, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, Why on earth do we let this keep happening????? First we had the EXXON Valdez, going aground in Alaska, spilling millions of barrels of crude oil (all crude is highly toxic!), which destroyed our Alaskan waters and shore, while also killing tens of thousands of fish, birds, and mammals. Also killing many thousands of our Alaskan jobs for a very long time. Then, in 2011, the EXXON folks spilled a few thousand barrels of crude oil into our Yellowstone River, according to their own estimate, killing more fish and ruining a beautiful waterway into our Yellowstone Park. They just finally paid the \$1.7MIL fine. Then, of course, there was the huge EXXON Gulf of Mexico waters explosion disaster, destroying many thousands of our citizens' livelihood for years, ruining the beaches from Florida through the gulf coast and Mexico, and again killed tens of thousands of birds, mammals, and fish. Now there is a major EXXON spill in Mayflower, Arkansas after their Pegasus pipeline sprung a leak while bringing heavy Canadian crude from Canada to Texas. This pipeline carries 90,000 barrels (!) a day of heavy toxic crude oil! Also this same week, a train carrying EXXON Canadian crude oil derailed in Mayflower, Minnesota, spilling 15,000 gallons of crude oil. This spill caused the EPA to categorize the spill as a "major spill" and 22 families had to evacuate!! And, of course, EXXON is now working hard to get our U.S. State Dept, EPA, Congress, and President to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, which would bring Canada's crude oil sands all the way down to our Gulf Coast for processing. This pipeline is so huge it will carry 800,000 barrels per day. Several months ago, an environmental group went down to view the Keystone XL pipe sections which are sitting along the roads awaiting the gov't approval to be buried. The group walked through many of the huge sections (remember these huge pipes would carry 800,000 barrels of caustic tar sands oil a day!) and were shocked by what they saw as they walked through the sections. They saw daylight coming through many holes along the seams of each section!!!! IF DAYLIGHT CAN COME IN, CAN'T OIL LEAK OUT THOSE SAME HOLES? Sincerely, Mrs. Virginia Lindsey

04/15/2013

Virginia Lindsey

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. It is said that the definition of insanity is repeating the same action over and over again, and expecting a different outcome. It is time to stop the insanity. Sincerely, Virginia Rietz

04/15/2013

Virginia Rietz

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. REJECTING KEYSTONE IS A NO-BRAINER!!!! AFTER ALL THE SPILLS AND OTHER OIL DISASTERS IN THE NEWS RECENTLY, WE SURE DON'T NEED THE CHANCE (CERTAINTY!) THAT MORE WILL HAPPEN IF THIS PIPELINE IS BUILT!!!! Sincerely, Walt Kleine

04/15/2013

Walt Kleine

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. At 86, I won't be around much longer but if the pipeline is built, given the corrosive nature of tar sands in pipes, US is heading for a future disaster. The pipeline is all about "big money" for "big oil". The huge refinery in Texas that would receive the oil will export it. Why else a refinery on the coastline? And think about the abuse of eminent domain in multiple states as states and Canada allow the pipeline to be build over private land. Sincerely, Walter Hales

04/15/2013

Walter Hales

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department For me this is an important issue. The environment has already be compromised by the way this tar sand oil has been extracted. Please do not allow it to be shipped thru the U.S. where it could cause even more damage to areas we need to stay clean. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Wanda McCaa

04/15/2013

Wanda McCaa

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I find it hard to fathom that new and environmentally threatening sources of fossil fuels are being supported by those who are aware of the scientific facts about global warming and its consequences for the life of our planet. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Wayne Conner

04/15/2013

Wayne Conner

Apr 14, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Keystone XL is NOT in the interests of the people, and you are our paid, democratically-elected representatives. Please do your duty and represent US, and not the interests of a few short-sighted business people! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Wendy and Alexander Czopp

04/15/2013

Wendy And Alexander Czopp

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please do not give in to the pressure that these big companies put on you. We are depending on you that you will help protect our environment. Sincerely, Wendy Lucka

04/15/2013

Wendy Lucka

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I've written to you about this matter previously. My position on the matter has not changed. Again, I ask you to please consider the reports of Canadian citizens who have witnessed first-hand the environmental devastation caused by the oil extraction method at the source of this project. For many other reasons, the Keystone XL Pipeline idea is crazy, but the first-hand views of folks who live in the vicinity of tar sand extraction sites is a good starting point. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Wendy Woods

04/15/2013

Wendy Woods

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

===== OPEN LETTER TO
PRESIDENT OBAMA, Dear President Obama, With all due respect. You have turned into a wolf in sheep's clothing. You support Corporations that care more for profit than the health and safety of American Citizens. And now you are going to cut my Social Security and my Medicare after I have been paying into it all my life. Oh my god. Again Mr. President, with all due respect, WHAT IN THE HELL IS WRONG WITH YOU??!! Sincerely, West Smith

04/15/2013

West Smith

Please reject the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL northern segment. Water flows south in the middle of America, South in the rivers. South in the great Ogallala aquifer. All the way south from the Canadian border there is not a wheat or corn field, cow, pig or person whose water supply isn't dwindling. Texans aquifers are lower and more polluted than they were 50 years. Our reservoirs are down in spite of winter and spring rains. We need every drop the Dakotas, Montana, Nebraska can trickle down to the Gulf through us. Tar sands pipelines have bad spill records in the U.S already. Tar sands sink in rivers. Sink into aquifers. Foul water for decades. Texans are thirsty. Don't foul water upstream. We can't drink dilbit. Can you or a Keystone executive? It is better to be oil poor than to die of thirst.

Thank you for your attention

Willa Kulhavy

04/15/2013

Willa Kulhavy

Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama, Today I read about Canada pulling out of the UN meeting regarding drought and Dust Bowlification. What happened to Canada? I've always thought of them as great neighbors. Now they seem more and more myopic. Why do we want to cooperate with their desire to pipe Tar Sands oil down to our Gulf coast refineries? I just don't get it. It seems like it would be so easy to say NO on so many grounds: 1. morally, it makes no sense to encourage the development of such a dirty source of oil, given the almost universal agreement that the world needs to reduce its carbon emissions; 2. economically it represents no real advantage to US; 3. energy security is not improved as the oil is not destined for US consumption (plus see #1 - why do we want to consume tar sands oil? I do not want tar sands oil as part of the mix of energy used by my state of Washington and I am part of a group trying to find a way for WA to get completely weaned from any tar sands oil). I know the decision ultimately rests with President Obama. Secretary Kerry, I hope you will have the courage to direct the State Department to review the Keystone draft environmental impact statement using analysts who have no ties to Canadian Oil companies. I thought the March 1st DEIS was a real slap in the face to the ordinary citizen who is attempting to reduce carbon footprints by changing our lightbulbs and riding the bus and biking to work, etc. How can you ask individual citizens to reduce their carbon footprints and at the same time fail to admit the impact of another oil pipeline? By the way, I saw that Climate News won a Pulitzer today for their series on oil pipelines and their environmental impacts. President Obama - I want you to know I have written you some angry letters over the last few weeks, as I am feeling so frustrated that the Keystone pipeline is even being considered. But I still respect you. I still believe in you. I don't understand why you are being so cautious about exercising your power to reject Keystone, but I think you must have some larger strategy that I can't figure out how to lead us into serious Climate Change responses. I saw today that US and China have announced a new partnership in this regard. That seems hopeful. Anyway, I am a voter who still appreciates your work for all of us. And I want you to know that I truly believe Keystone, as a symbol of climate clarity and moral integrity is SO IMPORTANT to reject. I beg you to look at it from the grassroots point of view. And if you can't, then I beg you to look us all in the eye and really explain why we had to say YES to one more dirty oil project that offers us no economic relief, no energy security and no progress toward alternative energy systems taking root in our way of life. Thank you for this opportunity to express my comments. Willene Jaqua McRae

04/15/2013

Willene Jaqua McRae

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The XL pipeline should not be built. It will be a setback to this country's transition away from fossil fuels. Sincerely, william brainerd

04/15/2013

William Brainerd

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I write to oppose Keystone XL pipeline. Sundry particular issues concern me, e.g. the threat to the viability of the Oglala aquifer, the pass-through nature of the pipeline (end product use in other countries), the corrosive nature of the tar sand product, or the extreme degradation to the northern Alberta region. 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 dependence 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. Lastly, I request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other such comments, be made public in the interest of informed public debate on these issues. Thank you. Sincerely, William Curley

04/15/2013

William Curley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It's impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Burning dirty tar sands oil will raise global temperature levels beyond the point of no return. 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 dirty tar sands. The State Department environmental impact report on the Keystone XL was written by TransCanada hacks who should be jailed, along with those at the State Department who are responsible for allowing corrupt and fascist oil industry personnel to write the environmental impact statement. This whole process has been a travesty and is further evidence that our democracy has been twisted into a corrupt and fascist corporatocracy. Fortunately, environmental momentum in Canada means that other new dirty tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, and stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. 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. The people of this country demand climate leadership from this administration. It is time for this administration to walk its talk and STOP being a tool of Wall Street banksters, the energy mafias and other corporate criminals. Reject corporatocracy with an emphatic rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, William Davis

04/15/2013

William Davis

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Mr. President, I am sure you want to be recognized as one of the great Presidents in OUR history, however, I am sure you realize that will not happen by approving "kxl" or messing with OUR "Social Security"!!! Please do not sellout to the greedy, corrupt, treasonous " corporate entity", make this World a better place President Obama!! Sincerely, William Fike

04/15/2013

William Fike

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The misguided Americans who oppose us on this issue will never be won over by reason, which gives us the freedom to act responsibly when it comes to our environment and energy future, as the Democratic party will never get their votes anyway. With that in mind: 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. 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. 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. I respectfully request climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, William Grueneberg

04/15/2013

William Grueneberg

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We already have far more fossil fuel in "proven reserves" than will be required to destroy the possibility of human beings living on earth. We elected you to make this world better and you have failed, Dramatically, in doing this. I have been a lifelong Democrat but it is unlikely I will ever vote for or give a dime to another Democrat. Power corrupts, you are living proof of this. Fracking is the most destructive (environmentally) process ever discovered. This crude is full of solid elements that make spills absolutely uncleanable and moving toxic substances around fools no one. You are going to be the end of the Democratic Party, I hope you are proud of yourself. I have known two Presidents personally and know well the pressures involved but you have to be kidding. Sincerely, William Harwood

04/15/2013

William Harwood

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- WILLIAM HEEHAARD

04/15/2013

William Heehaard

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.Having worked in the Alaskan oil fields for years, I can personally attest to the filth of the entire operation. The cover up more the they clean up. Thank you. Sincerely, William Ledbetter

04/15/2013

William Ledbetter

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Huge risks and costs, suffering and death resulted last summer from climate change brought about by burning fossil fuels. These risks and costs were assumed by the human race, and they had no choice in the matter. In the United States, two of many 2012 calamities stand out: our nation's severe drought, estimated at \$77 billion, and the 100 deaths and \$70 billion in damage caused by Hurricane Sandy. Not a dime of the enormous cost of those disasters was assumed by the subsidized fossil fuel industry. It effectively "externalized" those costs while proceeding to make record profits. And it did this while lobbying for more infrastructure, such as the XL Pipeline, that will only ensure continued dependence on fossil fuels. Mr. President and Secretary Kerry, how can passing on such atrocious risks and costs to humans--living and yet to be born--possibly be rationalized as moral? Sincerely, William Nolan

04/15/2013

William Nolan

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please REJECT the Keystone XL. It will damage our environment and Canada's nature. We do not need this ugly and climate damaging tar sand oil. We need renewable, clean and sustainable energy sources. Recently, 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, William Obenour

04/15/2013

William Obenour

Apr 15, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. In spite of Exxon-Mobil's efforts to prevent the public from seeing firsthand the devastation their dangerous practices have wrought, we all see what greed over sanity can do to us. Renewable energy is where it is at, and the XL pipeline is definitely not that. Sincerely, William Pierce

04/15/2013

William Pierce

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please think about the worst case scenario. We cannot clean up an aquafir. Mankind, especially in the last 100 years has made many mistakes. We constantly overrate our knowledge and intelligence. It costs lives. Sincerely, William Simonsma

04/15/2013

William Simonsma

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I am very concerned about this planet's near term future, much less its long term prospects for keeping an atmosphere that allows life. Without major efforts by an admittedly greed-driven human populous, the earth's atmosphere may well soon resemble that of Mars. It is not possible 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, William White

04/15/2013

William White

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department My first and most major concern, is that none of the companies are willing to pay any REAL damages, when major damages occur. Slipshod is a good word for what seems to go frequently wrong! Look how long Exxon and BP have gone before making good on damages, ---- Really damages that will NEVER truly be resolved. Also, what corporation exhibited the largest profit this year.....Yes, it was a Oil Company again. It just doesn't work that way for the private citizen does it? 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Willis Patterson

04/15/2013

Willis Patterson

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department It really is a death sentence for all living things when something happens and it was not gonna happen in 300 years,then it happens as the fraking wells turning towns into cancer and disease bringing once in a 1000 years wrinkle can remove lives with no recourse or protection for nobody except the dammed oil co,s bottom line and screw the little people, especially if they are not white citizens! STOP THE LIES. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Winston Mctague

04/15/2013

Winston Mctague

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department One would think we are back in the time when we were sending scrap metal abroad to Japan and suddenly stopped, causing Japan to determine us unreliable as a supplier and causing its military to look elsewhere "in the neighborhood". - Hence WWII in the Pacific! Whilst not exactly comparable, are we not again "contributing" to a disaster - albeit, an environmental one instead of a war? Will not these importing nations become "restive" if we again "deprive" them of any "easy" raw material? Shipping coal and oil abroad is just such a wrong thing to do whilst we, at home, are trying to improve the Earth's climate. It is 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Yvonne & Ted Lappas, Jr.

04/15/2013

Yvonne & Ted Lappas, Jr.

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The only good thing about this oil spill in Arkansas, is that it's making it clearer to many what the dangers of the Keystone Pipeline are. Exxon has always been more interested in profits than in people and their attempts to keep the media out of the neighborhood highlights their lack of trustworthiness. The Pipeline is not worth the risks. We can't keep destroying our lives and land like this... Sincerely, Yvonne Baab

04/15/2013

Yvonne Baab

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Please don't consider allowing the Keystone XL Pipeline to be built. This will be a an ecological disaster. Game over ,as some scientists say. This is wrong for the environment, the animals and plants, and our air. We may not recover from this. Look at the history of previous accidents or spills. We can not let this happen. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Yvonne Marley

04/15/2013

Yvonne Marley

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, it's time for you to stand firm and do the right thing by rejecting the Keystone Pipeline. Our planet's survival depends on your action. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Do it for your daughters and your granddaughters. Do it for the wildlife. Do it for the beauty of our planet. Do the right thing, Mr. President. Sincerely, Yvonne Sanchez

04/15/2013

Yvonne Sanchez

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. A thought for a philosophic/burecratic mind. If waterways, a vitally important enviromental key to us all, had the same legal rights that a cooperation has,do you think there would even be a queef of a thought as to what the right thing to do is? Expect civil unrest if you do not man up and make the right choice. I predict.
Sincerely, Zachary Cross

04/15/2013

Zachary Cross

Dear Sir or Madam, A fossil fuel-based economy is not in the long-term best interests of our country's economy or security. Disruptions to the climate caused by greenhouse gas emissions are wreaking havoc and putting more of our coastline underwater each year. Reject the pipeline. Thank you, Zach Youngerman

04/15/2013

Zachary Reuben Youngerman

Apr 15, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Please President Obama, stand behind your belief of protecting our environment, artic animals, and all the villages in that area. Do not allow this pipeline. Instead we need to encourage gas efficient cars, and alternative energy. Put a hold on it!! Thank You for standing up to the Senate and the Coal Industry and its lobbyists. Sincerely, Zena Verros

04/15/2013

Zena Verros

To: U.S. State Department From: Aaron Birk Regarding: Comment on Keystone XL Pipeline email: keystonecomments@state.gov Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Aaron Birk

04/16/2013

Aaron Birk

To: U.S. State Department Regarding: Comment on Keystone XL Pipeline email:
keystonecomments@state.gov Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Aaron Birk

04/16/2013

Aaron Birk

To: U.S. State Department From: Aaron Birk Regarding: Comment on Keystone XL Pipeline email: keystonecomments@state.gov Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Aaron Birk

04/16/2013

Aaron Birk

To: U.S. State Department Regarding: Comment on Keystone XL Pipeline email:

keystonecomments@state.gov Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Aaron Birk

04/16/2013

Aaron Birk

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a supporter of this Administration and recent MBA graduate, I consider action to address climate change as one of the highest priorities - greater than any other economic issue. The jobs gain from this pipeline is not persuasive or significant. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Aaron Israel

04/16/2013

Aaron Israel

Please see the attached letter in support of the Keystone XL pipeline from Georgia State Representative Tom McCall. He serves as Chairman of the House Agriculture & Consumer Affairs Committee, and as a member of the House Natural Resources and Environment Committee. If it's necessary to reach out to his office, please contact: Pat Harris

04/16/2013

Adam Waldeck

A G April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker:
I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, A G

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

A G April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker:
I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, A G

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

A G April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker:
I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, A G

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

A G April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker:
I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, A G

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

A G April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker: I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, A G

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Andrew Graves April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker: I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, Andrew Graves

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. OUR INVESTMENT SHOULD BE IN RENEWABLE AND SUSTAINABLE SOURCES OF ENERGY, NOT LIFE-DESTROYING, AIR AND WATER POLLUTING FOSSIL FUELS, ESPECIALLY THOSE AS DIRTY AS TAR SANDS CRUDE. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Al Benford

04/16/2013

Al Benford

I think you need to pay more attention to the numbers. This fuel can't help but to have a negative effect on climate. Let's redirect our resources to clean energy - start weeding out the really detrimental stuff, like this Canadian oil. Al Swansen

04/16/2013

Al Swansen

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. I was extremely disappointed that your administration participated in a coverup of that environmental disaster by issuing a no-fly zone through the FAA! I did not vote for that! Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Alan Walker

04/16/2013

Alan Walker

I am writing because the Keystone XL is not in our LONGTERM national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Alana Kenagy

04/16/2013

Alana Kenagy

Dear State Department. I completely oppose the proposed Keystone Pipeline. I think extracting fuel from tar sands is destructive and other alternatives should be exhausted prior to even considering it. With an increase in wind/solar/geothermal/natural gas technology, we should invest our time and money on those options than anything else. The destruction of natural habitat at the expense of increased oil production is too great. We cannot exploit natural resources as though its supply is infinite and without human cost. Stop this proposal and lets move on to more sensible solutions. Alek Bartrosouf

04/16/2013

Alek Bartrosouf

To whom it may concern: I wish for you to stop the construction of the northern and southern halves of the Keystone Pipeline. Continuing with such a project will destroy our environment, and with that, will destroy communities all around. We should be focusing our energy on alternatives to fossil fuels, not destroying whatever we have left. Thank you for your time, and I hope you have a wonderful day! -Alexandra Lae Student

04/16/2013

Alex Lae

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Just because Exxon mobile is the number 1 company on the fortune 500 list, and just because they earned 41.6 billion in profits in 2012, does not mean that they get to do whatever they want. The fact is, we need to stop polluting our environment. You don't have to worry about re-election anymore, you don't have to listen to big oil for political reasons anymore. So please Mr. President, do what you know is right. Thank you, Alexander Hoffman
Sincerely, Alexander Hoffman

04/16/2013

Alexander Hoffman

The State Department's initial "impact" report on the proposed Keystone XL pipeline was deeply flawed. Its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact [pitifully] underestimates the true effects to be expected should this project go forward. The .350.org group now reports on a new analysis that finds this pipeline will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year, an astounding figure comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. This project must NOT be approved! Respectfully, Alice M. Evans, Ph.D.

04/16/2013

Alice M. Evans Ph.d.

Spent part of my career working for Union Oil Research in , CA. Learned about first stage recovery when pressure pushes oil to the surface; second stage when pumps are required; tertiary recovery requires chemical surfactants, steam flooding and other techniques. Each advancing stage signals the run up to peak production and the fall off after peak. Oil from tar sands confirms we are long past peak recovery and overdue for transition to renewable sources of energy. Allen DeForrest

04/16/2013

Allen DeForrest

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- alyssa holler United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Alyssa Holler

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Create AMERICAN jobs by investing in green technology that we develop here on American soil and install with American workers. Invest in clean energy that will leave our children a shot at the kind of life we have lived (I am 47), don't doom them stress and suffering for greed. This is a NO BRAINER. Guns, immigration and gay marriage won't mean squat if we don't have a decent place to live. Sincerely, Amy Powers

04/16/2013

Amy Powers

"More people in U.S. work in green energy than in petroleum industry," said Whitehouse. "I know," he added, "because I've beenHYPERLINK "<http://www.politifact.com/rhode-island/statements/2012/nov/30/sheldon-whitehouse/sen-sheldon-whitehouse-says-more-people-us-work-gr/>"Politifact'd on it and it's true!""-- from an article by Lucia Graves in HuffGreen 4/16/2013

Green jobs are good for the economy and good for our environment! Americans should be able to be proud of what they do during the day and be able to sleep soundly at night knowing they are working for the good of the planet. If more green jobs is our goal, why would we even consider more dirty oil jobs for our future? Please stop the Keystone XL pipeline so we can begin moving this country in the right direction. Sincerely, Amy Waters

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

This pipeline is a Koch brothers scheme to save themselves 2 Billion a year so their Texas refinery can process the bitumen gunk from Canada instead of Venezuela at a savings of \$35 a barrel for them and them alone. As usual, what's good for the Koch brothers is bad for America; they should be prosecuted for crimes against humanity for the damage they've done so far and for what the coming horrors of climate change are going to do to all of us. Please reject this pipeline the people behind it. Sincerely, Amy Waters

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Dear State Department Representative: A new report released today – the most comprehensive study of Keystone's climate impacts yet – shows that the pipeline would carry 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, equal to 51 coal plants worth of carbon. Put another way: 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. Despite all this, the Draft SEIS says that the pipeline would have negligible climate impacts. That's just plain wrong! Try again! Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Erik N. Anderson

04/16/2013 Anderson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please say no to the Keystone pipeline! The potential damage to the environment is too great. The oil companies have proven they can not ensure integrity in the process. Exxon has been criminally negligent and needs to be held accountable. This is your chance to make a lasting impact and create a legacy for your daughters. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Andrea West

04/16/2013

Andrea West

Dear State Department officials, I am appalled to see this week that reputable scientific study of the actual carbon impact of the Keystone XL pipeline project finds the pipeline would carry 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. The NRDC in particular are not hacks. They are scientists, and we need to listen to what they say. Even if only because the numbers vary so shockingly from those of pipeline proponents, attention must be paid. This re-assessment is credible. It warrants, at a minimum, a fresh look at those environmental impact statements already submitted to date. This re-assessment is alarming. It's absolutely wrong to add as much new carbon impact to the USA as one-fourth of all the cars in our nation! The issues of environmental degradation in Canada, physical risks along the pipeline route, and "dirty" end products being burned in America are bad enough. But such divergent estimates of CO₂ impact amply compel a pause on the whole project while reviewing more critically the initial estimates. Those of us who thought the Keystone project was probably necessary, and probably tolerable, seem to have been wrong. Let's admit that we need to look closer - and probably to redouble instead our greener, safer alternatives. Thank you for listening. - Andy von Salis

04/16/2013

Andy Von Salis

I am writing because I believe that the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. I believe that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Angelica Volterra

04/16/2013

Angelica Volterra

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar Sands oil is TOO dangerous, on so many levels. Last month, the broken pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas which spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood, is but a harbinger of things to come, should the US move forward with the Keystone XL pipeline. How can we possibly allow a much larger tar sands pipeline to run through one of our most important aquifers? At a time when we've seen horrendous droughts in the region? Second, but more importantly, we cannot hide from the fact that tar sands oil produces much, much more carbon dioxide than even other conventional fuel sources. It's ridiculous to cater to the giant oil corporations on this. WE the PEOPLE don't want, don't need, won't accept these dirty fuels. Especially when so much safer alternatives exist. Why aren't we investing this kind of money in solar? People can lie and say it's hard but the truth is, installing a couple of panels on each house or even just on the roofs of businesses and factories, is far easier than creating a pipeline which is really a ticking time bomb. The time has come for TRUE leadership. Will you be the ones to lead us to safer energy? Please? For my son and your children and grandchildren. Do it for THEM. NOT for short term gain. Thank you!

Sincerely, Anita Welych

04/16/2013

Anita Welych

What happened to smart and progressive American innovation? Keystone XL is retrograded innovation.
Anja Sieger

04/16/2013

Anja Sieger

The Keystone XL pipeline should be rejected for both its local and its world climate impacts. Despite the confident assurances of the oil companies, spills happen all the time and devastate local ecosystems and towns. Just a few weeks ago Oklahoma suffered a spill which killed wildlife, ruined a lake and forced people from their homes. These seriously disruptive economic, ecological and human impacts don't get factored in when a pipeline is being sold as "good for the economy," because we are told they will not happen; but they do. On the macro level, all the reputable science reports that the tar sands projects and the proposed pipeline's impact are absolutely unsupportable by the earth's atmosphere. Tar sands require too much wasted energy simply to extract and refine, and then are too dangerous to transport. Let's focus on wind and solar for our national interest instead of causing irreparable damage. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline proposal. Anna Isozaki

04/16/2013

Anna Isozaki

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Mr. President and Secretary Kerry; I am a Master Gardener in , Illinois. I learned to garden when I learned to walk. My Dad would make a narrow trench with his hoe and allow me to put the bean seeds or onion sets in that row. Soon I noticed they grew and it wasn't long before I could eat them. Caring for growing plants from Marigolds to trees has become a life long fascination. Those of us who garden CARE about a lot of things. We care about the food we eat, the soil in which it grows. We care about the landscape around our homes and the birds and the bees and the butterflies who come to visit. We care about our city parks and tree lined streets, the creeks and our beautiful Illinois River Valley. . . about the farmlands surrounding , IL and we care especially about Starved Rock State Park visited by two million people annually. It is now threatened with a sand mine at its east entrance by Mississippi Sand LLC. This sand is to be used for "fracking" which is a dangerous process using thousands of gallons of water, UNDISCLOSED CHEMICALS, and sand. Man cannot live very long without water. We cannot eat sand or drink oil. PLEASE ABANDON THIS FRACKING PROCESS AND THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE. for the health of our citizens and the climate changes we are experiencing everywhere across the planet. It is time to rethink this process . When man learns to harness the energy of the wind, the sun, the waves and gravity he will no longer need to rape mother earth of her finite resources and in the process destroy her beauty. Thank you for listening. Peace, Anna Mattes 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Anna Mattes

04/16/2013

Anna Mattes

The State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was extremely flawed in its assessment of the pipeline's climate impact. However, with a new report that fully analyzed the carbon footprint of the pipeline determined that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year, equivalent to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. Clearly, this leads us to understand that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor will it be in the planet's best interest. You are urged to reject the pipeline. Anne Bodin

04/16/2013

Anne Bodin

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This should not be a difficult decision for you based on the factual evidence. You CAN just say no. Be the leader that humanity and our planet need. Sincerely, Anne Craig

04/16/2013

Anne Craig

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I do not understand why you still want this dangerous pipeline!!!! Please think of the safety of our water supply and reject this time bomb of an idea!!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Anne Settanni

04/16/2013

Anne Settanni

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. STOP THE INSANITY! Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Annemarie Prairie

04/16/2013

Annemarie Prairie

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Agricultural acreage would also be threatened. In this era of climate change, we need to keep food production land as pristine as possible without threat of oil contamination. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Annette Rau

04/16/2013

Annette Rau

I am writing to voice my opposition to the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. From the environmental damage caused by production in Canada, to the habitat destruction caused by pipeline construction, to the potential for catastrophic environmental damage in the United States, I am opposed to this project as a whole. As a small farmer, I know how far even minor damage can spread. From an economic perspective, I am also opposed to the project on several levels, from unethical forecasts of jobs to be created to the enabling of global dependence on an unsustainable energy source. I am also a small business owner (off-farm) and know full well what problems the recession has caused. But this is NOT the way to solve any of those problems. Thank you, Annie Grieshop

04/16/2013

Annie Grieshop

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is unconscionable to allow any more pipelines with the pitiful track record they have for safety and care for their fellow man. It is unAmerican and immoral to allow these oil barons to squelch reporting of these accidents, also. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Antoinette Ten Brink

04/16/2013

Antoinette Ten Brink

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If this pipeline is to supply the United States with fuel, why is it designed to transport the oil to Texas and out of the United States? Sincerely, Anton Grambihler

04/16/2013

Anton Grambihler

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I have said so before, but now I will say it again: NO to the Keystone XL! And I did not need Mayflower, Arkansas streets awash in tar sand oil to convince me, howsoever true that demonstration is to form. Exxon Valdez anyone? Sincerely, Arden Hander

04/16/2013

Arden Hander

I urge you to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. The State Department's initial report on the pipeline was gravely flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. A new report that accounts for the entire 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 51 coal-fired power plants. That means that the pipeline is a major threat to our national interest and to the planet's biota. Arlene Gemmill

04/16/2013

Arlene Gemmill

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, I worry about potential pipeline ruptures and spills in sensitive areas, and the wholesale destruction of the environment where the tar sands are extracted. Please give great attention to these matters as you make your important decisions. Sincerely, Mr. Arten Avakian

04/16/2013

Arten Avakian

Please stop the pipeline. I'm a young woman with a life ahead of me. I want to do everything in my power to create a healthy world because it is my children's world. I can see the destruction unfolding and the implications of this pipeline. Ashley Espedal

04/16/2013

Ashley Espedal

04/16/2013

Bandy, Taylor M

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Also, we ought to hold Germany and the Township of Hempstead us as models to emulate and surpass. Lastly, Mr. Kerry and President Obama, if you think of your children's future I find it hard to believe that you would not attack climate change with the same all out effort that we put forth during World War II. When I look at Fracking, Tar Sands, and all the huge corporate/private jets carrying just two or three passengers, and being written off against taxes by the very wealthy who own them, all I can do is shake my head in disgust at our government's total inaction, in dealing with what will be a horrendous problem for my grand children and yours. Sincerely, Barbara Gurney

04/16/2013

Barbara Gurney

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. How many times must we citizens write you and be ignored? There is too much at stake to allow this pipeline. It's gone from a projected to provide 100 thousand jobs down to about 20 thousand, and now I hear it's about 10 thousand. Is that really worth the risks this could take? Destroying aquifers, destroying our farm belt, spills that no technology can clean up, profits that go to oil companies regardless of the damage they do, climate change enhancement, "GAME OVER"!!!! I know the majority of the country thinks this is a good idea, but you know that in the long run, they're wrong, and you can take a strong stand for the future of us and our country and our planet. My God, I hope you do the right thing. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Barbara Nadel

04/16/2013

Barbara Nadel

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL is a "pipe dream" about a pipeline. Your so-called "facts" are a myth that will endanger many people living in the designated area. PLUS the airborne CO₂ fumes will further the deterioration of our breathing space. How CAN you allow this kind of danger to our nation and its people continue? "Think outside of the \$\$\$ box", PLEASE!

Barbara naughton

04/16/2013

Barbara Naughton

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Spilled oil kills many things that can NEVER come back. We can learn to live without oil but I don't think we can learn to live without more and more living species. Please give us the chance to learn to live without oil and keep more of the earth alive..

Sincerely, Barbara Noon

04/16/2013

Barbara Noon

To whom it may concern, I would like to comment about the danger to global warming due to the Keystone project. It's our children's future that we should consider, not how to make more money. Please consider this. Sincerely, Barbara Spotswood

04/16/2013

Barbara Spotswood

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a Democrat and an environmentalist, I am deeply concerned about the KXL Pipeline. It seems to me that there could have been divine intervention with the Mayflower, AR oil spill, as it shows a small disaster compared to what damage the KXL could do.. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Keep in mind that the pollution and damage the KXL will do and even worse, could do, is irreversible! Sincerely, Barbara Steigman

04/16/2013

Barbara Steigman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. In March 2013 we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. Clearly, we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. How then can 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? Moreover, it is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. The administration's significant advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency will be for naught if we also develop the tar sands. Stopping the Keystone XL will be a big step against toxic tar sands oil. Simply put, climate leadership from this administration requires its rejection. 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. Sincerely, Barry Taylor

04/16/2013

Barry Taylor

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Looking at the pictures of that spill in Mayflower is terrible--just spilling out in the neighborhood and heading for a drain. Oh my gosh! Who would want that in their neighborhood? Totally unacceptable. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Beth Dannhardt

04/16/2013

Beth Dannhardt

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Why would we, in good conscience, support a project which will perpetuate our dependence on oil, pollute our country for someone else's dirty oil transport, and support the sale of this commodity overseas where pollution controls are less than ours or even non-existent?? Thank you for your attention. Sincerely, Betty J Van Wicklen

04/16/2013

Betty J Van Wicklen

Please approve the Keystone Pipeline project. As a business owner/manager in Mo ntana, I feel this pipeline is in the best interests of the US Citizens. It will add jobs to our local economy, and will stabilize our rural economy by the increasing the tax base in our county. This is especially critical as our rural areas continue to lose population and strive to keep up infrastructure such as schools and roads. Betty Stone

04/16/2013

Betty Stone

I unilaterally oppose the Keystone XL. We are better people than to do this. Beverly Magley

04/16/2013

Beverly Magley

Pro-oil consultants for the State Department have issued a draft Environmental Impact Statement which claims the Keystone XL Pipeline will not have a significant impact on the environment and the climate. Tar Sands is one of the dirtiest fuels on earth and the pipeline will carry this crude from Alberta, Canada to Texas to be refined. The pipeline will pass over important aquifers and put much of the heartland at risk of spill. Say NO to Keystone pipeline!!!!

04/16/2013

Bill & Kay

Pro-oil consultants for the State Department have issued a draft Environmental Impact Statement which claims the Keystone XL Pipeline will not have a significant impact on the environment and the climate. This is not TRUE!!!! Tar Sands is one of the dirtiest fuels on earth and the pipeline will carry this crude from Alberta, Canada to Texas to be refined. The pipeline will pass over important aquifers and put much of the heartland at risk of spill STOP the Keystone pipeline...say NO NO NO!!! Bill Griffith

04/16/2013

Bill Griffith

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. So what does it mean? Three things come to mind immediately. 1) no oil company is willing or prepared to pay what it takes to get a thorough and complete clean up done because they are not good corporate citizens; 2) No pipeline is safe from the corrosive nature of the tar sands processed oil; 3) No remediation plan has adequate front door cost projections and litigation, and therefore time, must ensue to get the inadequate job done. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Bill Roseberry

04/16/2013

Bill Roseberry

Dear Secretary Kerry, My name is Robert Ellis, and I am a marine biologist and PhD Candidate. I consider myself a staunch environmentalist and someone who practices what I preach - I have given up portions of my diet (meat) and lifestyle (flying often) in order to do my part to combat climate change. However, I understand that at the end of the day, these are my personal choices, and they do not stand to affect the world as a whole. You sir, have another kind of choice. Your choice can and will affect the entire planet, and every human being that exists on this Earth as well as every one that will ever exist. You have in front of you a choice that will represent either a resounding victory for the well-subsidized oil companies or take the first real steps toward a sustainable future that the Obama administration has ever made. This choice will affect how you are written about in the history books, and whether people look at you as a champion of the climate, or a hypocrite who talked a big game until it was actually time to choose. Sir, I encourage you to choose wisely, with the future in mind. Middle America needs jobs, but there is no future for America by prioritizing the short term in this decision. Encouraging the exploitation of tar sands by building a new pipeline through the heart of America is a decision with dire long-term consequences for our ecosystem and the future of our planet. Instead, you have the opportunity to make a different choice - one for a future with a green economy that allows us to pursue alternatives to oil. There is enough carbon in the reserves of the fossil fuel company to ensure a widespread climate disaster over the next century. There is also enough human ingenuity in American minds to prevent this from happening. The USA has 5% of the world's population yet uses over 20% of the world's energy. I would suggest therefore, that we consider that we have 100% responsibility for our own actions, and that we make the right choice. Secretary Kerry, Please make the right choice - Say no to Keystone XL. Sincerely, Robert D. Ellis

04/16/2013

Bob Ellis

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The spill in Arkansas was a fortunate event because it illustrated how fragile our environment is as well as showing the havoc a spill wreaks. Why has Exxon tried to 'contain' the publicity surrounding the spill? The company which, by the way, paid no taxes this past April 15, now attempts to control reporting on the spill. Why are they afraid? Do they not want us to realize the long term impact of spills? Keystone XL and the procedure to extract oil (fracking) are too costly for our environment and only serve to delay serious attempts at developing alternative, cleaner energy sources. I feel so strongly about this issue that, if you do permit the pipeline, I am willing to be civilly disobedient to halt its progress. I have been a strong political supporter in the past with cash donations, canvassing and phone banking to further the ideals of the Democratic Party. If the pipeline goes through, I will have to rethink my support. Sincerely, Bonnie Pedraza

04/16/2013

Bonnie Pedraza

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The people know what is better for their environment than the greedy corporate oil companies who just want the oil to sell off to the highest bidder and don't care who they hurt or what they kill or damage so long as they're getting paid. Sincerely, Brandace Myrtue

04/16/2013

Brandace Myrtue

The pipeline is not in our national interest. Bottom line. Not to mention that it is completely false that the pipeline will not have an impact on the climate crisis. No to the Keystone XL pipeline! Brandon Long

04/16/2013

Brandon Long

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled 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. Thank you for your consideration of my concerns. Sincerely, Brenda Krepps

04/16/2013

Brenda Krepps

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Mr. President Please say no to this massive mistake. It is your legacy that is at stake. NO ON THE TAR SANDS PIPELINE! Thank you, Brendan Smith

04/16/2013

Brendan Smith

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. AND WHY ARE WE BEING SUBJECTED TO THIS KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE? ASK ANY CANADIAN AND THEY WILL TELL YOU ITS THE LAST THING THEY WANT IN THEIR COUNTRY. GUESS WHO'S PICKING UP THIS DIRTY TAB? THE ENERGY COMPANIES ARE LEADING THIS DOWN THIS LOST CAUSE FOR PROFIT AND NOTHING MORE. WE, THE PEOPLE WILL PAY THE ULTIMATE PRICE, HERE IN THE U.S. AND ABROAD. WE NEED YOUR SOLID BACK BONE ON THIS MR. OBAMA. THIS IS MORE THAN POLITICS, ITS OUR FUTURE THAT IS AT STAKE. I SUPPORTED YOU IN YOUR ELECTION AND ITS NOW YOUR TURN TO SUPPORT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. ***THIS IS BEING ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF HISTORY, SIR.*** THANK YOU. Sincerely, Brian Abbott

04/16/2013

Brian Abbott

Time and again, the data the state dept. releases in regards to the Keystone XL pipeline has been false. Placating the public with euphemistic numbers. First it was inflated job creation, during the election cycle. Now, it is a claim that this pipeline's dirty oil and the mega industry of chemically extracting it will not affect climate change. Extracting and putting into circulation the fossil fuel 38 million cars would use cannot be emitted into our atmosphere with no results. No way. More lies. I urge you to reject this pipeline. For once please look beyond short term profit, to the health of the planet we ALL live on.

Brianna algrabeli

04/16/2013

Brianna Algrabeli

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, 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. 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. 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. The president delivered some inspiring words on climate action during his inaugural speech, but it's his decision on Keystone XL that will determine his climate legacy. If approved, as the USA's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, Keystone XL 'will mean game over for the climate.' Thank you. -- Britta Voss

04/16/2013

Britta Voss

Our planet cannot afford the keystone pipeline! The installation of the pipeline will mean the gruesome demise of the planet that we know and love. Stop the pipeline for the sake of your children and your children's children. They will have to live through the results of the pipeline. Brooke Goddard

04/16/2013

Brooke Goddard

We encourage you to make a speedy decision and approval of the keystone XL pipeline. For Montana, it is all about jobs and access to markets. With the onramp that is planned for Baker MT, the ability to move Bakken crude to market is another option rather than rail and will help reduce the cost of transportation. For our labor force, the construction of the pipeline will put a substantial number of Montanans to work. The wages they receive turn about 2.3 times before they leave the area, so there are many secondary effects in addition to the primary employment directly on the pipeline. We need this project to move forward quickly. Sincerely, Bruce MacIntyre

04/16/2013

Bruce MacIntyre

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.
PLEASE DO WHAT YOU PROMISED ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND OPPOSE THE KEYSTONE XL PROPOSAL ONCE AND FOR ALL! Sincerely, Mrs. Sharon K. Perkins Bruce Perkins

04/16/2013

Bruce Perkins

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Fact: We cannot prevent climate change if we cannot say no to projects like the Keystone Pipeline. Proponents of the Keystone Pipeline are correct to note that stopping its construction will not halt global warming. And the project does offer some virtues including job creation and increased energy security. But an inversion of this statement is also true. If we cannot agree to say no to projects that will entrench the use of fossil fuel energy -- even if they offer some short-term benefits -- we cannot hope to prevent global warming. Stopping the Keystone Pipeline, therefore, is important because it signals a willingness to make difficult decisions in the present that will have significant benefits in the future. At the end of the day, we do not want more oil for its own sake -- we want it for the things it does for us. American consumers want convenient personal transport and warm homes, not oil. Politicians want to achieve energy security and less dependence on hostile governments. These goals can be achieved with less oil, and at less cost, through conservation. Rather than building the Keystone Pipeline, we will be better served by trimming the fat from our current energy system. Sincerely, Buffy Hake

04/16/2013

Buffy Hake

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If we destroy our planet there will be no need for politicians. Make a stand for the survival of us all. Sincerely, C C Ryans

04/16/2013

C C Ryans

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Carl Oberlin

04/16/2013

Carl Oberlin

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I'm now opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline after witnessing the horrific spill that just happened in Arkansas. I don't trust that there will be any oversight with this pipeline, either by the companies that are installing it or our government. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL.

Sincerely, Carla Beck

04/16/2013

Carla Beck

Why the U.S. State Department should not support the Keystone XL(KXL) pipeline. 1. In reading about all the possible negative effects of such a pipeline, all are presently occurring with the Exxon Mobil pipeline rupture in Arkansas. If any rupture were to occur in the KXL infrastructure, and contaminants were to enter the Ogallala Aquifer, it would be disastrous. If contaminants were to get into surface water resources, there is a possibility that the Missouri River drainage would be compromised. 2. The economic gain for the U.S. economy is minimal (limited timeframe of construction phase) while the economic and environmental disaster of future problems with the pipeline to the United States is immeasurable. 3. Safety, security, health, and economy all weigh toward caution. Please do no harm. 4. Emphasis in the United States should be on renewable energy development rather than on a resource that is limited. 5. Since the pipeline is going to the Gulf Coast, it can be inferred that oil will go into the export market (outside of the U.S.) Please, do not approve the Keystone XL pipeline project. Thank you. Carla Heister

04/16/2013

Carla Heister

Apr 16, 2013 Secretary John Kerry Dear Secretary Kerry, I feel compelled to raise my voice in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Mr. Carmen Dello Buono

04/16/2013

Carmen Dello Buono

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Please, President Obama, stand up to the pressure that these companies and individuals are exerting to get the XL pipeline deal sealed. I can't seem to get any representation out of my state senators but I think that you want to do the right thing. Turn this nasty project down once and for all. Thank you very much, Sincerely, Carol Covert

04/16/2013

Carol Covert

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. How can you/we possibly justify supporting this industry when signs of climate change are everywhere now? Please don't wreak more CO2 on the atmosphere. LEAD us in a sustainable, livable direction, energy-wise. Please. Sincerely, Carol Hamilton

04/16/2013

Carol Hamilton

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Murphy's Law is the law of the oil pipelines. If it can happen ii will. Why are we so stupid as to assume any different? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Carol Schooley

04/16/2013

Carol Schooley

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am from Michigan though I have been living in Maine for 40 years. My family back in Michigan thinks all is well on the Kalamazoo River, but that is not everyone's opinion. We will not change our "addiction" to oil unless we are forced to. Please do everything in your power to reject the Keystone pipeline. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Carol Scribner

04/16/2013

Carol Scribner

The State Department's conclusion that the Keystone Pipeline will cause no significant environmental distress. To stand by this conclusion is misguided and wrong. Will no one of its many employees challenge such a reckless and destructive falsehood? Are all of you unprincipled and cowardly? Are all of you complicit? Carol Tansey

04/16/2013

Carol Tansey

Dear Secretary Kerry, This is my second submission regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline. It has come to my attention that the first round of comments have been, essentially, ignored. According to information provided to me by the organization 350.org, 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. This means, in terms of climate change, that the pipeline is not only not in the planet's best interest, but is also not in our national best interest. Therefore, in light of this new information, I once again urge you to reject the pipeline. Thank you for your time and faithful representation, Carol B.

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This planet will survive human beings - it has survived much worse. What we are doing is making it difficult, if not impossible, for PEOPLE to survive on this planet. Since there is no "Planet B" we need to stop fooling ourselves and start looking to the future - OUR future. If our government, like the owners and officers of large corporations, continue to be blinded by GREED, we will continue to cut our future survival shorter and shorter in the name of egregious profits TODAY. Show some backbone. Stop greed from stealing our future. Sincerely, Carolyn Allen

04/16/2013

Carolyn Allen

CO2 is far from the Pipeline's only impact. There's overwhelming evidence that the oil and pipeline companies are either unable or unwilling to prevent spills; so we're facing the specter of toxic oil components repeatedly strewn across the farms, homes, rivers, and everything else in our heartland, with the pipeline owners not taking full responsibility for compensation and for clean-up, which probably isn't even possible. And this is in addition to the damage to lands, wildlife and First Nation communities in the areas of the tar sands. Carolyn Pomeroy

04/16/2013

Carolyn Pomeroy

No amount of wealth, status, "jobs", would be worth the devastation to our climate, to our planet, that so experts predict. Clear your minds and look at the hard cold data on this. Look at the earth quake in Dallas (that had no seismic shift before), look at leaks and what they left behind. This pipeline is a death sentence for more than you could ever know and it must not happen. Listen to citizens! Chad Wood

04/16/2013

Chad Wood

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The loss of vast stretches of Boreal forest as a habitat for birds would be a devastating blow. The permanent nature of this climate buster is cause for extreme protest and concern. We must not build it Sincerely, Charles Alexander

04/16/2013

Charles Alexander

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Why has ExxonMobil blocked information flow? Because pictures are worth a thousand words and leave little to be said. A no fly zone? Who's running this nation, the government or Exxon/Mobil and other international corps protecting their major stockholders. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Charles Hailey

04/16/2013

Charles Hailey

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We do not need to continue to develop new sources of fossil fuels. Many European countries have leapt ahead of us to develop clean energy sources. We need to do the same. We are experiencing increasingly impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada needs to be supported; stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step in favor of this movement. I expect climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Charles Robert Horsburgh Jr., MD, MUS

04/16/2013

Charles Horsburgh

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Do not need tar sands energy! Sincerely, Charles Tibbits

04/16/2013

Charles Tibbits

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There is no way to greenwash this: you have heard from the climate scientists, from numerous environmental organizations, and from even more concerned citizens. We insist that the State Department's report downplaying the effects of tar sands oil on our climate is a bare-faced lie. We insist that you listen to the science, and demand that you keep your promises. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Charlotte Fremaux

04/16/2013

Charlotte Fremaux

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I voted for you twice. You owe me and millions of other voters who put you in power and who trust you to protect us. Please stop this insanity! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Chris McCarty

04/16/2013

Chris Mccarty

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, We are years away from having an ice-free Arctic Ocean at the end of summer. That is, from then on, the Arctic will only have thin, less-than-one year-old ice. The climate scientists and researchers who have been right about how fast the Arctic sea ice is melting are the ones to listen to most carefully. We have very little time to get greenhouse gases down and to cool the Arctic by careful, controlled, democratically approved methods.

<http://www.dailykos.com/story/2012/08/13/1119768/-New-CryoSat-2-Confirms-Catastrophic-Loss-of-Arctic-Sea-Ice-Volume> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2012/08/28/arctic-sea-ice-just-hit-a-record-low-heres-why-it-matters/> It is completely unacceptable to consider adding more carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases via last-ditch extreme dirty energy projects such as the Alberta Tar Sands development. The Keystone XL pipeline breathes more life into this monster, which is poisoning the region around it, and would represent the largest "carbon bomb" in history. If all available (using the estimate of a former Shell CEO) Alberta Tar Sands reserves are burned, we would release an amount of CO₂ equal to that from all fossil fuels burned so far throughout human history. But this would be within a few decades. Please see James Hansen's interview at <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/08/29/idUS257590805720110829> and the graphic at http://www.saxifrages.org/eco/go24h/Carbon_bomb_You_decide Chris Young

04/16/2013

Chris Young

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Christie Canfield

04/16/2013

Christie Canfield

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. AND WHY WAS A NO-FLY ZONE ALLOWED? WHY AIDE THE OIL COMPANY IN COVERING UP THEIR MESD? Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Christine Carroll

04/16/2013

Christine Carroll

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Christine Doan

04/16/2013

Christine Doan

Don't reject the pipeline! Get it built. We need more petroleum energy to stay competitive in the world market. Natural gas is one of the most efficient forms of energy, as is petroleum. Global warming is a myth. That's why the enviro-fascists have changed the term to "climate change." Build Keystone!

Christine Silk

04/16/2013

Christine Silk

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Additionally I should note I find it disturbing the Exxon is allowed to control the media near the site of the above-mentioned oil spill. We elected you Mr. President to represent us, not large corporations.

Sincerely, Christofer Larason

04/16/2013

Christofer Larason

April 16, 13 Dear Secretary of State Kerry, I'm writing you in the hope that you'll wield your new position for the good of the planet, and be a more active agent of positive change regarding environmental issues that your predecessor. You have the opportunity to reverse her lukewarm record, and the perfect next step would be denying the permit for the KXL export pipeline. The projected pipeline "job creation" numbers have been grossly inflated--even TransCanada's own top executives have admitted that. Lies about why tar sands oil needs piped to the gulf, saying it's for the American market when it's really for foreign export, have been debunked. The threat it poses to the Ogallala Aquifer, even after adjusting the route, is still substantial and can't be ignored. And the threat it poses to our future, by throwing the doors open wide for the tar sands market, has been outlined extensively by some of the world's leading climate scientists--we've been warned of the inevitable dangers. THERE IS NOT A SINGLE GOOD REASON TO BUILD THE KXL EXPORT PIPELINE. And there a dozen good reasons not to. But you need no better reason than simply this: denying the KXL's permit is the right thing to do as a steward of Mother Earth. I currently live in _____ but grew up in the Sandhills of Nebraska. The Ogallala Aquifer is right at the surface where I grew up, exposed to the sky, fed by the creeks and lakes and rainwater of that region. The newest pipeline route still passes over waterways that breach the aquifer, still passes directly over parts of the aquifer, still puts that giant freshwater resource in harm's way. The KXL export pipeline threatens the livelihood of my family in Nebraska, threatens their neighbors, threatens the wildlife and livestock, the farms and ranches, threatens all that make the Sandhills their home. It's easy, living in Chicago or D.C. or New York City or anywhere else removed from rural America, easy to forget that even though there isn't a huge concentration of people in a place like Nebraska, it's as _____ much our responsibility to care for and maintain as our local park or national monuments. Having grown up there, I venture to say that the Sandhills are as beautiful as any Grand Canyon or Blue Ridge Mountains, as any Michigan beach or Lincoln Memorial. The Ogallala Aquifer sustains a swath of America where much of our food is grown and raised, a backbone of the American economy that our brothers and sisters that live there rely on. We shouldn't allow ANYTHING to jeopardize the Ogallala Aquifer or the Sandhills, and anyone who threatens their safety should be considered a threat to national security. You will NOT be doing everything you can to combat the threat of climate change if you approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. We're beginning to see in Mayflower, AR what a disaster spilled bitumen makes of lakes and yards and lives, and you know as well as I that it's only the tip of the iceberg. We must keep a spill from happening near the Ogallala Aquifer. All eyes are on you right now as you make this critical choice about America's future and your environmental legacy as Secretary of State. Thank you for your time, sir. Warmest regards,
Christopher Gotschall

04/16/2013

Christopher

The Keystone XL will effect the climate. To believe otherwise is assuring that our grandchildren live in a world which is much hotter and unstable weather wise. There is also the problem of acidification of the oceans. A new report found that the pipeline 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. This Keystone XL pipeline is not in our national interest. Reject the pipeline. Cindy Cole

04/16/2013

Cindy Cole

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. You both will be remembered, perhaps not now, but later for rejecting TAR SANS OIL and the PIPELINE!!! Climate Change is real and Canadian oil is the worst. IT will not help our unemployment problem, nor will it get gas prices lower. It is pure BIG OIL wanting to make more\$\$\$\$\$ and not caring about the oil spill in AR. and other spills which may occur later. PLEASE VETO TAR SANDS OIL AND THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE.Q Sincerely, Claire Casey

04/16/2013

Claire Casey

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. The TIME is NOW to make the changes we need in the amount of greenhouse gases we emit. Global Warming's Terrifying New Math <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-20120719> The Fossil Fuel Resistance <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-fossil-fuel-resistance-20130411/+1> We need extensive conservation and energy efficiency measures at all levels of business and government to reduce our energy use and thereby reduce our carbon emissions. Read Carbon Free and Nuclear Free: A Roadmap for US energy policy. online for free!!
<http://carbonfreenuclearfree.org/> We need 80% reduction ASAP. Each of us needs to take personal responsibility for our carbon load. check your carbon load here
http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/ind_calculator.html Change ALL your light bulbs to LED's! Turn lights off that are not being used! Plug appliances into power strips and REALLY shut them OFF. TV, DVD, Stereo, Computer... Turn up the AC. Use a fan. It's the humidity that feels warm. Turn down the heat. and Insulate, Insulate, Insulate and air seal too. Replace with Energy Star appliances-washer, fridge, dishwasher. Hang clothes out to dry. They smell better and last longer. Install solar thermal hot water collectors. Feel the sun's rays. Take 5 min showers. no baths unless you share. Reduce electrical demand then Install solar PV. Setup a water collection system with rain gutters. use to water the garden and lawn. Grow vegetables for food. organically, in the lawn. Share seeds and plants and veggies with your family and friends Join a CSA or shop at farmer's markets. Reduce first, reuse second and recycle everything. Stop buying anything in plastic packaging. Reuse plastic bags again and again and again and again. Buy used always, share always, lend and borrow. Insulate, insulate, air seal and insulate again. Don't buy from overseas. Use cloth bags and carry with you every day and reuse again. Start a cloth bag exchange. Start a ride share, car pool. Start riding your bicycle. Drive like gas is \$8 or \$18/ gal. What would you do different? Do it now. Eat locally grown, locally processed. locally sold. Reduce Meat consumption, once a day, once a week. Eat only grass fed beef, truly free range chickens, no rbgh. Drive 55mph. Gentle on the gas pedal. Walk, ride a bike to shop, work, play. Don't fly.really, don't. Take the train. or walk, or bike, or don't go. and Insulate, insulate, air seal and insulate again, really Then smell the flowers, walk the dog and talk with your neighbors. We are down to 3 kwhr per day. The national average is 29kwhr/day. Where are you? Check your electric bill. Do a few of these things and check your next months bill. It really doesn't take much to reduce!! and then there is Nature Bats Last <http://guymcpherson.com/> Sincerely, Claire Chang

04/16/2013

Claire Chang

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. The TIME is NOW to make the changes we need in the amount of greenhouse gases we emit. Global Warming's Terrifying New Math

<http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-20120719> The Fossil Fuel Resistance <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-fossil-fuel-resistance-20130411/+1> We need extensive conservation and energy efficiency measures at all levels of business and government to reduce our energy use and thereby reduce our carbon emissions. Read Carbon Free and Nuclear Free: A Roadmap for US energy policy. online for free!! <http://carbonfreenuclearfree.org/> We need 80% reduction ASAP. Each of us needs to take personal responsibility for our carbon load. check your carbon load here http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/ind_calculator.html Change ALL your light bulbs to LED's! Turn lights off that are not being used! Plug appliances into power strips and REALLY shut them OFF. TV, DVD, Stereo, Computer... Turn up the AC. Use a fan. It's the humidity that feels warm. Turn down the heat. and Insulate, Insulate, Insulate and air seal too. Replace with Energy Star appliances-washer, fridge, dishwasher. Hang clothes out to dry. They smell better and last longer. Install solar thermal hot water collectors. Feel the sun's rays. Take 5 min showers. no baths unless you share. Reduce electrical demand then Install solar PV. Setup a water collection system with rain gutters. use to water the garden and lawn. Grow vegetables for food. organically, in the lawn. Share seeds and plants and veggies with your family and friends Join a CSA or shop at farmer's markets. Reduce first, reuse second and recycle everything. Stop buying anything in plastic packaging. Reuse plastic bags again and again and again and again. Buy used always, share always, lend and borrow. Insulate, insulate, air seal and insulate again. Don't buy from overseas. Use cloth bags and carry with you every day and reuse again. Start a cloth bag exchange. Start a ride share, car pool. Start riding your bicycle. Drive like gas is \$8 or \$18/ gal. What would you do different? Do it now. Eat locally grown, locally processed. locally sold. Reduce Meat consumption, once a day, once a week. Eat only grass fed beef, truly free range chickens, no rbgh. Drive 55mph. Gentle on the gas pedal. Walk, ride a bike to shop, work, play. Don't fly.really, don't. Take the train. or walk, or bike, or don't go. and Insulate, insulate, air seal and insulate again, really Then smell the flowers, walk the dog and talk with your neighbors. We are down to 3 kwhr per day. The national average is 29kwhr/day. Where are you? Check your electric bill. Do a few of these things and check your next months bill. It really doesn't take much to reduce!! and then there is Nature Bats Last <http://guymcpherson.com/> 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Claire Chang

04/16/2013

Claire Chang

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I don't write in support of the idea of carbon emissions as dangerous, but rather the pollution (true pollution) of the process of extracting tar sands and the fact there is no refinement worth mentioning done in Canada (bad for the economy and in the case of spills). The rest of the auto message from the petition creators follows, but my personal reason is above. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Clare Kuehn

04/16/2013

Clare Kuehn

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Certain corporations continue to put us at risk because of their unpreparedness to take safety and proper procedures into account. Why do we continue to allow them to break rules? I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Clarence Morey

04/16/2013

Clarence Morey

I am writing in STRONG suppor of the Keystone/XL pipeline. I'm sure it will be 1000x safer than these nimby's think it will be. We'd never have built anything more complex than a mud hut if they were in charge. -C Cliff

04/16/2013

Cliff

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I think the time has come to take a stand against big oil in favor of a more friendly form of energy. I propose that you deny the permit to allow the Keystone extension and utilize your position to push the development of alternative energy sources including wind, solar and geothermal as well as the transformation of transportation to use something other than internal combustion engines. This pipeline will undoubtedly increase the use of tar sands in the production of petroleum products and increase the strain on our ecosystems by adding to the threats of global warming. It will also increase the risk of destroying important US aquifers which provide potable water to large numbers of people. Even if the oil is developed into fuel via another route, the message sent by denying the pipeline will be a large victory for those individuals who think our earth is more important than the short term gain of tar sand oil technology. It is time to move in another direction and begin to develop other resources. Sincerely, clifford file

04/16/2013

Clifford File

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, let's end the XL Pipeline right now. We have been lucky that the spills we have seen lately have been relatively small to what could happen if XL is built and used. It just isn't worth it. The oil companies pay, what for them is a small fine, grin and keep damaging our ecology. We, the people, end up making all the sacrifices. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Clyde Summerell

04/16/2013

Clyde Summerell

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. ExxonMobil and BP Oil have proved they don't have a clue how to protect the environment or clean up the disasters they create here and around the world. Shell Oil guaranteed they could drill the Arctic and immediately had two rigs malfunction. The Bush/Cheney rule allowed these same companies to dictate our energy policies and you, Mr. President, have done little to change the path we still follow. It now appears that Canada will be dictating the use of tar sands oil unless you and Secretary Kerry take a stand against it. Now is the time for real support of our environment over support of dirty fossil fuel multi-nationals. Please reject the insanity of Keystone XL. Please put America on the path of truly clean, sustainable energy and ask these dirty energy companies to switch gears, using some of their huge, huge, huge profits to go green. We switched our manufacturing infrastructure during the crisis that was WWII, we HAVE to do it with energy now! The planet is depending on us. Sincerely, Colleen Isbell

04/16/2013

Colleen Isbell

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please consider our responsibility to our children & to future generations when you make this decision, rather than short-term profits for the oil industry. We don't need this pipeline - we need renewable energy. An "all-of-the-above" approach to energy is irresponsible & keeps us on the path toward extreme weather, rising oceans, flooded coastlines, droughts, pollution and food insecurity. Rejecting the pipeline is the only moral choice before us.
Sincerely, Connie Roser-Renouf

04/16/2013

Connie Roser-Renouf

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department What is wrong with you? You're a president, not a hooker. Quit bending over for these oil companies. Sincerely, Connor Gerow

04/16/2013

Connor Gerow

reality is a place we all must occupy. when you endorse facts that are truly unreal like saying this pipeline will only have minimal impacts on climate change and will provide long term jobs it makes me truly doubt your reasoning process. the state department is suffering from serious cognitive dissonance. we've all seen this before. and were all waiting for the wmds. makes ya think some one with a lot of leverage is pulling for a deal that is not in the public's best interest. Corey Hucks

04/16/2013

Corey Hucks

It's time we direct our full attention to developing renewable sources of energy and avoiding fossil fuel sources of power that will make the world a worse place to live. Please say NO to the Keystone pipeline. Curt Lamb

04/16/2013

Curt Lamb

Climate change is the issue. I understand that even something as big as Keystone is "small" relative to the global problem. But it is clearly a step in the exact wrong direction. Stopping Keystone will help -- it will delay and defer tar sands development -- perhaps long enough so that this mistake can be avoided permanently. If not now, when? Dan Kirshner

04/16/2013

Dan Kirshner

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Daniel Eddinger United States of America

04/16/2013

Daniel Eddinger

Dear State Department Representative, I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). - - The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. - - 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. - - TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. - - 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. - - 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. - - 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. - - The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. - - Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer. - - During TransCanada's initial claims regarding its Presidential permit, it noted that it would create from 20,000 to tens of thousands of jobs. This has not occurred even fractionally in - - According to the SEIS, only 35 permanent jobs would be created and 15 temporary jobs for pipeline inspection, repair and maintenance would result as a part of this pipeline's approval. - - 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. - - 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. - - Tar sands crude constituents are highly corrosive, acidic and easily ignitable, even by the spark of a tool. - - 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. - - 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. For all the above reasons I ask that the State Department reject the permit for the Keystone XL Pipeline. Thanks for your attention to this matter. Daniel Harrison

04/16/2013

Daniel Harrison

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The health of my environment in the United States is far, far, far, more important to me than large corporate profits and a "drop-in-the-bucket" of oil. We desperately need to put ALL of our human-energy and financial-resources into GREEN renewable energy sources in this country. Sincerely, Daniel Stevens

04/16/2013

Daniel Stevens

Carbon, carbon, carbon, carbon, carbon. That's what will be flowing by the incredible barrelful after barrelful though the KXL pipeline. The climate impacts will be tremendous. The KXL pipeline is not in our best interest, and should not be approved. Daniel Weise

04/16/2013

Daniel Weise

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, After learning about the Keystone XL in one of my classes at University, I am appalled by the fact that it is still even an idea in people's minds. Think about how many innocent people, including some of my family that lives in the South, will possibly have unsanitary drinking water. Many of these places already have this issue. There is no little benefit or high enough cost to cover this issue. Please think again. Sincerely, Ms. Danielle Gaede

04/16/2013

Danielle Gaede

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Dave & Meg Gilbert

04/16/2013

Dave & Meg Gilbert

To Whom It May Concern, I write today in opposition to the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. Simply put, the United States of America does not receive enough benefit from this pipeline to counter the environmental damage that can be expected with a pipeline of this size and type. Since 1986, ProPublica reports that there have been over HYPERLINK

"<http://projects.propublica.org/pipelines/>" 7,750 "significant incidents" on American pipelines causing billions of dollars in damages and hundreds of fatalities. The most recent pipeline spill is still being cleaned up in an Arkansas neighborhood as I write. And if you believe climate scientists, the burning of tar sands oil will have catastrophic effects on the planet. For those risks, what does the United States get in return? A few temporary construction jobs? This is not a pipeline to bring more oil and cheaper energy to the United States. This is a pipeline THROUGH the United States, built to bring dirty Canadian oil to foreign shores after a pit stop in the Gulf. The risks are all ours, but the benefits are not. I urge you to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. -- David M. Burris

04/16/2013

Dave Burris

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. This pipeline does not serve the U.S. national interest. It should be rejected. Dave L

04/16/2013

Dave L

An article published today on the Huffington Post: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/16/state-department-keystone-report_n_3092865.html?ir=Green&utm_campaign=041613&utm_medium=email&utm_source=Alert-green&utm_content=FullStory

WASHINGTON -- The State Department has drastically underestimated the damage the Keystone XL pipeline will do to the global climate, according to new research released Tuesday. The report, authored by a coalition of environmental groups, uses industry figures to estimate that the pipeline will carry and emit at least an 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent each year -- an estimate far greater than the amount determined by the State Department in its draft Environmental Impact Statement. The State Department found the pipeline will have virtually no impact on climate change, arguing the emissions in question will be released regardless of the Keystone XL pipeline. "Basing analysis on the assumption that oil use will continue as currently planned is accepting climate disaster," said the HYPERLINK "<http://big.assets.huffingtonpost.com/KXLReport.pdf>" report's lead author, Steve Kretzmann of Oil Change International. "Acceptance of this climate disaster is simply morally wrong. It cannot and will not go unchallenged." The State Department did not return an email requesting comment. The environmental groups that released the report have made stopping the pipeline's construction the centerpiece of their advocacy; Oil Change International, Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, 350.org and Friends of the Earth are among the organizations involved. "Whether or not that crude would have been burned anyway is a separate question, involving a variety of economic assumptions, none of which are as robust as our understanding of atmospheric physics," the report says, indicating that if the oil was not transported by the pipeline, it likely would be transported another way. "The science of climate change and human caused climate change in particular has become clear over the past several years and yet the crystal clear implications of this for policy are being ignored by government," said NASA scientist-turned-climate activist James Hansen. "The principal scientific fact is that we cannot burn all of the fossil fuels without creating unacceptable consequences for young people, future generations, and Mother Nature." We must LEVERAGE this moment to both REJECT the KXL pipeline AND make SERIOUS policy commitments towards a clean energy future (and away from oil and coal at wartime speed)! The scientific community is sounding the alarm, and has been for several years. I have studied the climate crisis, possible solutions and business & investing for 25+ years and submit to you this: follow this advice and you (and the Prez and Congress) will unleash the greatest economic EXPANSION in American history! Thanks, Dave Sillman

04/16/2013

Dave Sillman

Instead of putting all that money and effort into something that is going to make our pollution problems worse, put it towards renewable energy. I'm a big fan of bio fuels. I run it all my cars. Dave Stoltz

04/16/2013

Dave Stoltz

Get off fossil fuels. Get ahead of the curve! David

04/16/2013

David

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This pipeline would be nothing but an environmental disaster for both the United States and Canada. It would do nothing to lower fuel costs but would be a huge windfall for big business. Say no to the Keystone pipeline Sincerely, David & Becky Olson

04/16/2013

David & Becky Olson

We want an Earth that continues to be friendly to life. That means bacteria, mushrooms, earthworms, coral reefs, birds, fish, snakes, mosses, oaks, humans and all the millions of species that contribute to the glorious web of life. Ocean acidification from global warming is killing marine creatures with calcium based skeletons. We are seeing the death of diversity. PLEASE FOR THE SAKE OF FUTURE CHILDREN VETO THIS DISASTROUS PIPELINE. David & Elizabeth Waldorf

04/16/2013

David & Elizabeth Waldorf

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Below is the prepared message that I completely agree with, but I wanted to add something first: The tar sands are terrible for the environment, and what is right for the environment, and whatever we can do to preserve the natural world, is what is right for this country. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, David Berlin

04/16/2013

David Berlin

The Keystone Draft SEIS Violates NEPA Guidance By NOT Considering ALL Predictable Actions by Others

Page 5.1-1 states: 5.1 NO ACTION ALTERNATIVES Council on Environmental Quality guidance (1981) states that if denial of a Proposed Action would result in predictable actions by others, the consequences of adopting the No Action Alternative should be considered in the EIS. In this case, given the Government of Canada's (and Alberta) stated commitment to develop the oil sands, the global crude oil market dynamics, the economic modeling done as part of the Final EIS, and the examples of market responses over the past few years regarding crude oil transport in North America, it remains likely that if the proposed Project did not proceed, producers of Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin (WCSB) and Bakken crude oil production would continue to utilize alternative transport infrastructure to accommodate increasing production of WCSB and Bakken crude oils. Given the persistent high cost of liquid petroleum-based motor fuels, aka gasoline and diesel fuel, in the United States, it is reasonable to assume that a predictable action of American consumers would be to seek to use less expensive motor fuels. Unfortunately, American consumers have not been able to do this in the past because of market barriers created by the supply-side Oil Oligopoly led by the OPEC Cartel and lack of affordable alternative fuel motor fuels. This market failure has been sustained by the inability of the US Congress to enact a rational oil policy that benefits American consumers rather than oil suppliers; in other words failure to enact policy that would break OPEC market power over American consumers. However, motor fuel markets have changed significantly over the past four years. American consumers now have the ability to purchase affordable natural gas and electric vehicles in many sizes and types, light-duty, heavy-duty, sedans and trucks, vocational and over-the-road. These vehicles are capable of using two types of motor fuel that are NOT derived from oil --- natural gas and electricity – and that significantly reduce the cost of mobility. American consumers are highly motivated to purchase these vehicles because the cost of natural gas and electric motor fuels is significantly lower than the cost of liquid petroleum-derived motor fuels. But American consumers are cautious; they need to be assured that these non-petroleum motor fuel actually work; that markets will NOT be distorted by monopolies and oligopolies --- or inept political posturing that favors suppliers over consumers. It is NOT in the National Interest to continue policies that support the supply-side Oil Oligopoly lead by OPEC and punish American consumers. But that is exactly what this Draft SEIS has done. This document assumes that liquid petroleum motor fuels are the ONLY motor fuels available to American and global consumers; it assumes that consumers of motor fuels should not benefit from free market competition. It assumes that American consumers should have no choice but to buy liquid petroleum motor fuels at prices set by OPEC. These assumptions are totally out of touch with current market reality. AGL Resources is currently selling CNG motor fuels for \$0.99/gge in , Georgia. Diesel prices are about \$4/dge. Electricity powers a plug-in hybrid at a cost of \$0.03/mile; compared to \$0.20 or more for gasoline. Why are the PRODUCT SUBSTITUTION alternatives not included in the market analysis in this SEIS? The Draft SEIS violates NEPA policy by assuming that the Canadian government will develop their oil sand resources regardless of the fact that non-petroleum motor fuels are now available to consumers at substantially lower prices than current oil prices. In fact, natural gas and electric motor fuels are less expensive than the cost of producing Canadian oil. The assumption that this oil will be produced at the same rate and in the same quantities regardless of action taken by the United States is totally without merit. Using past market behavior to project future market prices ignores fundamental shifts in automotive technology that have been stimulated by recent CAFÉ policy. It also ignores the surge in supply and ready availability of electric and natural gas motor fuels that not only offer consumers a smaller carbon footprint, but do so at a lower cost. The alternative analysis further violates NEPA guidance by assuming that oil producers will find alternative methods to ship the same

quantities of oil to global markets regardless of American demand for oil or the approval of this pipeline. The SEIS does not consider that the price of oil might go down because of market competition from cheaper non-petroleum motor fuels. The assumptions in the market analysis do not withstand the test of real competition in motor fuel markets. Competition from different types of motor fuel, aka liquid petroleum-based motor fuels, natural gas motor fuels, and electric motor fuels, that are not controlled by the OPEC led Oil Oligopoly, must be considered. This SEIS totally ignores the fact that non-petroleum alternative motor fuels, specifically natural gas and electricity, are currently available in great abundance throughout North America at commodity prices that range between four and six times lower than the commodity price of oil. \$4/MMBtu natural gas is equivalent to \$0.50/dge diesel fuel at a time when diesel fuel prices are around \$4/dge. Furthermore the SEIS ignores the FACT that automotive and truck manufacturers are capable of using existing technology to mass produce both natural gas trucks and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles in large quantities; quantities that will significantly reduce the only major barrier to widespread deployment --- high first cost. Vehicle owners will save \$1/gge to \$2/gge by converting to CNG or LNG; paybacks for trucks are less than 2 years. This SEIS ignores the simple fact that investments in natural gas vehicle fuel stations generate rates of return above 20%; sufficiently high to stimulate rapid deployment of fuel stations to serve both captive fleets and the retail consumer. This SEIS ignores a fundamental tenet of market economics – product substitution. Cheap natural gas, cheap electricity and mass production of affordable natural gas and electric vehicles blows the market analysis contained in this SEIS out the window. American consumers are sick of being manipulated by the OPEC led supply-side Oil Oligopoly. Approval of this pipeline project will do nothing, absolutely nothing, to break OPEC market power. It will merely ensure continued total dependency on liquid petroleum-based motor fuels. The alternative that has NOT been considered, the alternative that will break OPEC market power, is NOT even mentioned in this document. That alternative is PRODUCT SUBSTITUTION --- replacement of expensive, high carbon liquid petroleum motor fuels with inexpensive, low carbon gaseous motor fuels and electricity. These two motor fuels have the potential to break OPEC market power over American consumers. These cleaner motor fuels are not only lower cost, lower carbon motor fuels; they are scalable. It is feasible to make millions of these vehicles and thousands of fuel stations / infrastructure needed to fuel these vehicles widely available quite rapidly – in a matter of a couple years, well within the timelines assumed for this pipeline. However, market demand for these lower cost, lower carbon alternative motor fuels is badly distorted by the market power of the OPEC Cartel. This is a classic case of market failure, market failure created in part by failed American policy, that is ignored by this SEIS. Approval of this Keystone pipeline will simply protect the OPEC led Oil Oligopoly from fair, free market competition; it will make it much harder for American consumers to have the opportunity to choose to purchase non-petroleum motor fuels. Approval of this pipeline does NOT serve the National Interest because it will continue to allow OPEC, and multinational oil marketers, to manipulate American oil markets in ways that repress competition from non-petroleum motor fuels. It will make it easier for the Oil Oligopoly to keep oil prices artificially high and divert investment away from cleaner, cheaper alternative motor fuel project. Approval of this pipeline will merely continue policy that denies American consumers the power to choose non-petroleum motor fuels. Dr. David Greene (ORNL, CARB, 2112) has given presentations that clearly demonstrate that the market power of OPEC is harming the American economy --- and the economic recovery. OPEC is responsible for the high and highly volatile cost of refined gasoline and diesel motor fuels in the United States. High oil prices were a major contributing factor to the market crash and subsequent recession in 2007 and 2008. Furthermore, Dr. Greene has argued that the ONLY way to break OPEC market power is for the United States to significantly reduce

demand for liquid petroleum motor fuels. Increasing supplies of oil will do little to break OPEC market power as American demand for oil is too high for increased American oil production to replace. The solution is to reduce demand with FUEL SUBSTITUTION by natural gas and electric motor fuels, combined with the fuel efficiency standards enacted by USEPA / NHTSA. Taken together, lower prices and CAFÉ policies have the potential to reduce American demand for oil sufficiently to break OPEC market power. Empowering American consumers to buy low carbon electric and natural gas motor fuels at lower cost than Canadian oil is a real alternative to this project. Product substitution should be considered a pragmatic, practical alternative to construction of this pipeline and protection of the OPEC led Oil Oligopoly. Presidential approval of this pipeline will undercut market demand for all forms of non-petroleum motor fuels by sending a signal that will discourage consumers from seeking real substitutions and discourage manufacturers from mass producing affordable natural gas and electric vehicles. Approval of this pipeline will continue status quo policies that deny American consumers the opportunity to use their purchasing power to break the OPEC Cartel. It is NOT in the national interest for the United States to continue to be held hostage to the market power of the OPEC led Oil Oligopoly. David E. Bruderly PE

04/16/2013

David E. Bruderly

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You've read all the boilerplate arguments. As an educated citizen of planet earth and devoted advocate of our country's future, it's my heartfelt plea that you oppose Keystone XL and the tar sands. The heart neither walks a centrist line nor beats at the behest of big oil. You know what's right and you've talked about asserting leadership on environmental issues. Please put your words into action, now. Sincerely, David Garelick

04/16/2013

David Garelick

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Mayflower, Arkansas pipeline mess is absolute proof that Exxon Mobil, like Shell is unable to protect us from these disasters that happen, not out in some remote area, right in residential neighborhoods, which will be permanently scarred as a result. I will do everything in my power to prevent that damn pipeline from coming through MY backyard! Stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I demand leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, David Goldberg

04/16/2013

David Goldberg

I strongly support the Keystone XL pipeline. David Kessler

04/16/2013

David Kessler

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. Stopping Keystone XL will be a big step against the tar sands. 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. Sincerely, David Lyman

04/16/2013

David Lyman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Mayflower, Arkansas is not the only reason for you to kill the XL pipeline. But that in of itself should be enough. I called for you. I knocked for you. I gave you money. I voted for you. You should have stopped this travesty already. The survival of all of us could rely on you doing the right thing. I am tired of waiting for you to stop this. Do IT! Sincerely, David Puskala

04/16/2013

David Puskala

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Keystone Pipeline has got to be STOPPED! We don't need spills occurring in the beautiful Midwestern U.S.A. Especially since once the oil gets to the Gulf, 60% (that's SIXTY PERCENT) of it's going to be shipped to Asia and other foreign countries, say those in charge, so that they can burn it and wreck the air, then have the smoke and pollution drift back here. Totally inane! Let's use the money INSTEAD to increase the use of alternative fuels, which is inevitable anyway, according to all the experts. Let's quit horsing around and do it NOW! Why delay what we're going to HAVE to do someday anyway?! Ridiculous... 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, David Scheer

04/16/2013

David Scheer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. To allow this pipeline to bisect our country would not only be a bad idea, it would be a disaster, or rather, a disaster every time it broke down and spewed toxins into neighborhoods. Don't do this. -DS 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, David Shelton

04/16/2013

David Shelton

Why don't you just admit that there's been a payoff, from Keystone XL backers to politicians. The pipeline is not safe. It will not greatly benefit the local economies of the states it passes through, and will, in all likelihood, cause considerable environmental damage. So, just admit it. You took a bribe (oh, I mean, campaign contributions) from Keystone's backers. And you wonder why Congress has the lowest confidence ratings in years. David Zeeman

04/16/2013

David Zeeman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We need to think of the children of this world and what we will leave to them. With that in your hearts this decision is much easier to make. Sincerely, Davies Nagel

04/16/2013

Davies Nagel

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We need to think of the children of this world and what we will leave to them. With that in your hearts this decision is much easier to make. Sincerely, Davies Nagel

04/16/2013

Davies Nagel

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I went to see the oil-coated beavers at our local wildlife rehabilitation. They suffered chemical burns, inside and out, from the oil which escaped a broken Chevron pipeline just north of my town. Oil spilled into marshes and threatened an important freshwater impound. There was another pipeline break in , just to the south of us, where the oil ran through a residential area, into a creek, filled the large ponds at a park, and covered many waterfowl with black tar. These were just "little" breaks. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Debra Marin

04/16/2013

Debra Marin

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month saw tar sands pipeline in Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into residential neighborhood. This spill is yet another proof 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 tar sands pipeline nearly 10 times the size of Pegasus line to bisect our country and run through one of our most important aquifers. Also, this month we've seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- further indication that we're experiencing increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and must change course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been critical, but much of that progress -- and credit that comes with it -- will be erased if we also develop tar sands. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer guaranteed, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed work against tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, that has to begin with rejection of Keystone XL. I also request that this comment on draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Sincerely, Den Mark Wicher

04/16/2013

Den Mark Wicher

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As long as we as a nation keep approving and moving forward with energy sources that are detrimental to the environment, what incentive is there to make changes? Please say no to Keystone XL and support more positive energy development instead. Sincerely, Denise Bohart Brown

04/16/2013

Denise Bohart Brown

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Enough of this! Do the right thing! Shut down this potentially devastating, last-ditch effort of the oil industry to suck every last drop of oil out of our planet! STOP IT NOW!!!!!!! Sincerely, Desdra Dawning

04/16/2013

Desdra Dawning

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Thank you both for all you do. So much doesn't make sense about the pipeline--water is far too important a commodity to risk this pipeline even if we do not give thought to climate change. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Diane Smith

04/16/2013

Diane Smith

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Sirs, I vote a gigantic NO to the Keystone XL and the tar sands. You know as well I do that there will be problems with the pipeline. It's a disaster that can be averted by you saying/voting NO, NO, NO!!!!!! I don't want the pipeline, animals don't want the pipeline, every single square inch of the earth that disgusting pipeline travels over doesn't want the pipeline. PLEASE just say NO. I will never stop writing to share my concerns with legislators... but sometimes I feel as though I am dealing with people who ride the short bus. No offense!! I just don't understand how anyone besides the oil companies and others who will benefit financially can even consider this pipeline. I get so tired of begging for help for the environment and animals and no to GMO food... and any other issues that I feel strongly about. It just seems like common sense not to run a stupid pipeline that could be an ecological disaster for our country. I will pray that you make the correct decision and say/vote no. Thank you for your time, Diane Smith 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Diane Smith

04/16/2013

Diane Smith

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Basically, I think we need to be doing everything in our power to help the environment. These pipelines only hurt because they are prone to spills. Seems there is no such thing as a small spill! Thanks for listening. Diane Stone Sincerely, Diane Stone

04/16/2013

Diane Stone

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. Keystone XL is another pipeline spill waiting to happen. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Dika Eckersley

04/16/2013

Dika Eckersley

The State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was written by fossil fuel lobbyists. KXL is not in our national interest, nor in the interest of the world. We must leave fossil fuels in the ground; we must move on to sustainable energy, pronto. Don La Porte

04/16/2013

Don

I am writing to urge that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline be rejected. With global temperatures rising, polar ice caps melting, and weather becoming more severe, it becomes clearer every day that we are paying a high price for our fossil-fuel consumption. The Keystone XL pipeline would benefit a foreign corporation while adding a relatively small number of American jobs, and it would represent a big investment in the energy production of the past. The United States needs to invest in the energy production of the future, which will be cleaner and safer and will take us away from the brink of major climate-related disruption. It is simply not in the interest of the United States to allow this pipeline to be built through our territory, and I urge the president and the State Department to say no. Don parker-burgard

04/16/2013

Don Parker-Burgard

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The oil spill in Mayflower Arkansas though horrible for residents provided just a small measure of the kinds of long term devastation that will be unleashed by the Keystone XL pipeline. Please take a stand against this headlong suicidal march to a planet that will be barely livable! Stand up for clean energy and a hopeful future for our precious progeny! Say NO to the Keystone Pipeline. Thank you for your devoted and thoughtful public service Sincerely, Donald Morrill

04/16/2013

Donald Morrill

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL stated that the pipeline would have a minimum impact on the climate. Yet a new report finds the impact would be the equivalent of 51 coal plants worth of carbon, comparable to the carbon dioxide emissions from more than 37 million cars. That's not a minimum impact, nor is the risk of a leak "minimum", as we have already seen. I strongly believe the proposal for the Keystone pipeline should be rejected. Donna McDonald

04/16/2013

Donna Mcdonald

Leave our planet for us to enjoy-- donna moldovan United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Donna Moldovan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Donna Williams

04/16/2013

Donna Williams

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The boiler plate information is below. This paragraph is from the heart. We dont need this pipeline. We cant trust the oil companies - instead of regret and honesty, we get no-fly zones? Instead of admitting that accidents can happen and taking unprofitable steps to minimize the odds and consequences of a spill, we are told there will be no problems. Please dont let this go through. Especially dont let it go anywhere near important aquifers and natural wildlife preserves. And while I am writing, why not put some money into thorium reactors - much safer and much more beneficial in the long run... Back to the boilerplate... 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Douglas Bank

04/16/2013

Douglas Bank

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There is no government oversight of oil and gas pipelines. The oil companies are supposed to check for leaks but they fire pipeline inspectors that find leaks and hide them as long as they can. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Douglas Gerleman

04/16/2013

Douglas Gerleman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Until the spill in Arkansas, I thought that the potential for disastrous leaks was exaggerated and had no opposition to the line. Now I believe that the new line should be put off until there is unequivocal proof that it will be engineered well enough to avoid such instances.
Sincerely, Douglas Hay

04/16/2013

Douglas Hay

Passing this pipeline is immoral, inexcusable--it's "game over" for global warming. Don't do it. I don't want to spend my life paying for your mistake. Do your damn job. Douglas Miller

04/16/2013

Douglas Miller

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Recently, a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. The spill is yet another indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirty, heavy, toxic form of oil. We cannot allow a tar sands pipeline nearly 10 times the size of the Pegasus line to cross our country and run through one of our most important aquifers. It makes no sense to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of your Administration's advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency will be erased if we develop the tar sands. Climate leadership from your administration begins with REJECTION of Keystone XL. Thank you. Sincerely,
Douglas Morse

04/16/2013

Douglas Morse

State Department's initial report on Keystone XL which claims minimal impact on climate is Beyond Science i.e. B.S. For this and many other reasons the pipeline permit should be rejected. Dr. Tom Poulson

04/16/2013

Dr. Tom Poulson

Look at how much technological spin-off the somewhat brief Apollo Missions gave us. So far only President Carter reacted to the fossil fuel beast correctly. Mr. President, please put the solar panels back on the White House. Dwaine Laughlin

04/16/2013

Dwaine Laughlin

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The Millennium Pipeline LLC is already building a massive infrastructure in my beautiful town. Since they have been there they have done nothing but cause chaos in a solely agricultural neighborhood. Construction running some days from 6am to 10pm, Sunday through Sunday. The Compressor Station will be within 650 feet from the closest residence and 1450 feet from mine. Although they claim that natural gas is clean energy, the process by which they develop the natural gas is not clean. The emissions are toxic and we are located in Minisink Valley where all the air will settle in our soil and water. This will contaminate our wells, farms and livestock. Needless to say that lately the record for stations exploding and pipelines erupting, has not been great. Our towns are not equipped to handle this type of industry. We only have a Volunteer Fire Department. Please review these comments and also consider changes to the way FERC operates. Sincerely, Edna Rodriguez

04/16/2013

Edna Rodriguez

I am very surprised to hear that the Keystone Pipeline was given a "pass" by the State Department, when it is going to facilitate a huge increase in oil consumption!. We need to invest in the future - that means renewable energy - and investing instead in this fossil fuel will actually create fewer jobs than wind or solar industry (per dollar invested). Please think of our grandchildren! Edward Davis

04/16/2013

Edward Davis

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please stop the madness. We should not even be discussing the Keystone pipeline. There are better alternatives for our future and those are what we should be focused on. You know all of the reasons the Keystone XL pipeline should not be pursued. You know all the reasons tar sands should be stopped. And I am sure you know all the excuses made up to press on with both. But we all know in our hearts that this is wrong. Fabulously wrong. Please make the right decision. Sincerely, Edward Morrison

04/16/2013

Edward Morrison

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Edward S Dolan United States of America

04/16/2013

Edward S Dolan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The capture of this oil is already destroying acres and acres of boreal forest and pristine lakes in Canada. Soon there will be no pristine places left on earth. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Eileen Wilwers

04/16/2013

Eileen Wilwers

Cameron Carter April 16, 2013 The Honorable John Kerry Dear Secretary of State Kerry: April 16, 2013 Keystone XL EIS Project P.O. Box 96503-98500 Washington, D.C. 20090-6503 Dear Mr. Secretary: In response to request for comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline project, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce submits its remarks in favor of the project's approval. The Indiana Chamber is the state's largest broad-based business advocacy and information organization, representing nearly 5,000 member companies that employ 800,000 Hoosier workers. Indiana and the U.S.'s economies are dependent upon reliable energy. Indiana has long been a leader in the energy and transportation industries. Low cost reliable sources of energy are critical to Indiana's large and small business. Virtually every manufacturing process uses petroleum products as lubricants, parts, molds or finished products. The Indiana Chamber has many members that are involved in the development of new and innovative energy processes and exciting technologies. Yet, we will continue to need new sources of petroleum. World demand for oil is projected to grow rapidly, with the largest increase coming from China, India and other developing nations. The Energy Information Agency predicts that the world will need an additional 64mmb per day by 2030. The U.S. and Canada enjoy the largest trading partnership across the longest peaceful border in the world. Sourcing more of our energy from a friendly, democratic and North American neighbor will help reduce our reliance on energy resources from less stable areas of the world. Canada sends more than 99% of its oil exports to the U.S. !! the bulk of which goes to Midwestern refineries for processing. Oil from Canada is mainly transmitted to these refineries and other locations in the U.S. through oil pipelines. These pipelines have operated successfully for decades and are the safest, most reliable way to transport crude oil. The Keystone XL project has already undergone intense and exhaustive environmental scrutiny. The new pipeline will offer the latest, most technologically-sound engineering, construction and monitoring. Separately, the U.S. and Indiana need the new jobs that will be created if the Keystone project is approved. The latest Canadian Energy Research Institute study projects that employment in the U.S. (direct, indirect or induced) as a result of new oil sands investments is expected to grow from 21,000 jobs in 2010 to 465,000 jobs in 2035. This type of employment includes new and preserved jobs, and also consists of full- and part-time jobs. For Indiana alone, this is projected to translate to \$575 million and 6,500 jobs. Other countries are looking out for their energy futures. The U.S. needs to as well. So for all the reasons outlined, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce supports the Keystone XL Pipeline project. Thank you for your time and review of these comments. Sincerely, Kevin M. Brinegar Sincerely Cameron Carter

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Cameron Carter April 16, 2013 The Honorable John Kerry Dear Secretary of State Kerry: April 16, 2013 Keystone XL EIS Project P.O. Box 96503-98500 Washington, D.C. 20090-6503 Dear Mr. Secretary: In response to request for comments on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline project, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce submits its remarks in favor of the project's approval. The Indiana Chamber is the state's largest broad-based business advocacy and information organization, representing nearly 5,000 member companies that employ 800,000 Hoosier workers. Indiana and the U.S.'s economies are dependent upon reliable energy. Indiana has long been a leader in the energy and transportation industries. Low cost reliable sources of energy are critical to Indiana's large and small business. Virtually every manufacturing process uses petroleum products as lubricants, parts, molds or finished products. The Indiana Chamber has many members that are involved in the development of new and innovative energy processes and exciting technologies. Yet, we will continue to need new sources of petroleum. World demand for oil is projected to grow rapidly, with the largest increase coming from China, India and other developing nations. The Energy Information Agency predicts that the world will need an additional 64mmb per day by 2030. The U.S. and Canada enjoy the largest trading partnership across the longest peaceful border in the world. Sourcing more of our energy from a friendly, democratic and North American neighbor will help reduce our reliance on energy resources from less stable areas of the world. Canada sends more than 99% of its oil exports to the U.S. !! the bulk of which goes to Midwestern refineries for processing. Oil from Canada is mainly transmitted to these refineries and other locations in the U.S. through oil pipelines. These pipelines have operated successfully for decades and are the safest, most reliable way to transport crude oil. The Keystone XL project has already undergone intense and exhaustive environmental scrutiny. The new pipeline will offer the latest, most technologically-sound engineering, construction and monitoring. Separately, the U.S. and Indiana need the new jobs that will be created if the Keystone project is approved. The latest Canadian Energy Research Institute study projects that employment in the U.S. (direct, indirect or induced) as a result of new oil sands investments is expected to grow from 21,000 jobs in 2010 to 465,000 jobs in 2035. This type of employment includes new and preserved jobs, and also consists of full- and part-time jobs. For Indiana alone, this is projected to translate to \$575 million and 6,500 jobs. Other countries are looking out for their energy futures. The U.S. needs to as well. So for all the reasons outlined, the Indiana Chamber of Commerce supports the Keystone XL Pipeline project. Thank you for your time and review of these comments. Sincerely, Kevin M. Brinegar President and CEO Indiana Chamber of Commerce Sincerely Cameron Carter

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Living in South Dakota I see acres and acres of nothing---Why is Congress not making use of the wind provided us for free...The Wind Turbine may be ugly and loud but can save the taxpayers so much money....Big Oil have their hands in too many pockets.....Please do what is good for the earth for once and not ruin our water for good by using and making affordable Wind Turbines...Got a better idea ??? Please let the American people hear it and let us have a voice! Until then do not endanger our water buy drilling for uranium or ANY pipeline....We do have rights! Sincerely, Elaine Everhart

04/16/2013

Elaine Everhart

Was it Chico Marx who said "don't believe what you see, but believe what I tell you." It is the recent report that gives an o.k. to the proposed Keystone pipeline, saying it's safe and don't worry about it -- but then, guess what happened--the event in Mayflower Arkansas. To me, the coincidence of these two events tells me, what is obvious to any thinking person--that the state department is not looking out for the welfare of people and the future of the planet but is beholden to special interests. A very sad state of affairs for our democracy. Eleanor Kirby

04/16/2013

Eleanor Kirby

A new report (at http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Cooking_the_Books_FINAL-SCREEN.pdf) from a group of reliable environmental organizations fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the Keystone XL pipeline and finds 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. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Eleanor Saunders

04/16/2013

Eleanor Saunders

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was total crap. Help us decrease the US's dependence on oil by decreasing use. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Elise Rothman d'Hauthuille

04/16/2013

Elise Rothman D'hauthuille

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I put in 60 hours a week as a team leader for your campaign. I fought for you. Now it is time for you to fight for the planet! Sincerely, Elizabeth Meyer

04/16/2013

Elizabeth Meyer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please don't allow the Keystone pipeline to be created. I will ride my bicycle, walk, use public transport to save energy. I would rather pay more at the pump than pay for enviornmental clean-up. (Nothing comes for free). Thanks for listening and thanks for the work your'e doing. Sincerely, Ellen Colwell

04/16/2013

Ellen Colwell

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The KXL pipeline is an insult to Native people and a scar on the environment. Precious water is wasted and contaminated when used to extract the bitumen from the soil. In the 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Ellen Kenney

04/16/2013

Ellen Kenney

The State Department claim that the Keystone XL pipeline would have no effect on the climate is a shameful lie. We are not stupid and we are not asleep. 37.7 MILLION cars worth of carbon dioxide is NOT negligible. The government and corporate propaganda is not going over with us. We the people want a planet WE can live on! We will fight and protest and peacefully break the law if we have to to stop this outrage. Ellen Schousboe

04/16/2013

Ellen Schousboe

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. AND THIS RISK IS FOR OIL THAT IS MOVING THROUGH AND OUT OF OUR COUNTRY AND IS NOT GOING TO INCREASE OUR OWN SUPPLY!!! 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. 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. Sincerely, Dr. Ellen Silon

04/16/2013

Ellen Silon

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I know I'm just a teenager. For all I know, this comment will get lost in the hundreds of thousands that I'm sure (whoever you are) have received. I'm honestly filling out this form on a lark, procrastinating. But the fact that I chose to fill this out instead of watching television or watching videos on Youtube or chatting on Facebook really says something about me, and maybe even the rest of my generation. We are passionate about things we believe in! And one thing I truly believe in is the preservation of our gorgeous state. Far from pristine, America (and the rest of Earth, for that matter) has scars showing the crimes we have committed against it. And while I agree that we need to bring our energy consumption back home, an expansion of this Pipeline is not the answer! It's wonderful that so many people can stand behind the idea, but it is very easy to promote something if you will not be alive to see the repercussions! Rather, it is my generation, and our children, that will have to fix the mess that was created, So, please, take proactive action today and stop the damages that we are making to this one, wild, and precious planet. Sincerely, Emily Guinan

04/16/2013

Emily Guinan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 85,000 gallons of tar sands crude ran through the streets of Mayflower, Arkansas recently. This pipe line of Exxon Mobile is a disaster waiting to happen. This is a preview of what will happen if you approve the Keystone XL pipeline down from Canada. You said in your speech to the nation when newly elected to a second term that you were making climate change and the environment one of your priorities. Please don't let the tar sands pipeline be built. We don't need any more disasterous oil spills, especially of crude which is especially dirty and can be a serious threat to the environment and to our streams and rivers and ground water. Sincerely, Emily Kimball

04/16/2013

Emily Kimball

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department You guys are smarter than most, that's why you have risen to power in a democratic society as elected officials. That means that you understand the effects of extracting the bitumen from the Athabasca tar sands, including the effects on the wildlife, the ecosystem, and the people living there. It means you should also know that this diluted material will be transported for many miles across US lands, to be destined for refineries in Louisiana, where it will be exported. This of course means that our lands will be subject to the risks and none of the benefits of this material, which in reality are few. Yes, the world economy is dependent on oil. But this is not just any oil - it is the most expensive and damaging to the environment to extract - it is dangerous when it is leaked, and it is not adding to our own energy security. It would be one thing if we had no other choices for energy, but we do, and you know this. Show us how smart you really are and take the country in a new direction away from fossil fuels by saying "NO" to this dangerous and damaging pipeline, and say "YES" to a renewed focus on clean energy and the lasting jobs that will come from it. Thanks for being so smart. Sincerely, Eric Broadbent

04/16/2013

Eric Broadbent

We must stop burning fossil fuel to prevent human extinction. The Canadian tar sands must remain in the ground. The US must not be party to the pipeline or any other effort to mine this filthy fuel. Eric Schreiber

04/16/2013

Eric Schreiber

Climate change is the defining issue of our time. If we do not take every possible measure to prevent global warming, our children and grandchildren will pay the price. Stop this short-sighted pipeline. We have the power to shape the future for the better. Eric Wood

04/16/2013

Eric Wood

Do you think that we are idiots? Erick Heroux

04/16/2013

Erick Heroux

this is a blatantly obvious BOONDOGGLE in the classic and purest sense. (please see below) Benefitting a few for the very shortest run - the construction phase. Destroying cultures, towns, cities, environments for the longest run immediately and permanently. This form of behavior for so called energy production is a blatant lie as it is GROSSLY inefficient - using far more embodied energy than it can EVER produce. *boon-dog-gle /'bo?on?däg?l/ Noun Work or activity that is wasteful or pointless but gives the appearance of having value.* Verb Waste money or time on such projects. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. erika doering

04/16/2013

Erika Doering

This Pipeline is the end of the possibility for a bright future. Public polling is very democratic of you, but you need to act as a leader and display the proper foresight and action to really get something done. Reject the pipeline. Reject it now. Lead this nation. That is why i voted for you. -- Evan Bell

04/16/2013

Evan Bell

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This is a short-sighted and undefensible plan, with potentially long-term catastrophic results. We already KNOW that the continued development of fossil fuels will destroy our ability to continue to live on this planet. Those who would sacrifice the future of our species, and many others, for the sake of immediate and short-term gains, should be removed from office and barred from ever having the fate of our planet in their hands again. Sincerely, Eve Ilse

04/16/2013

Eve Ilse

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, 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. 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. 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. The president delivered some inspiring words on climate action during his inaugural speech, but it's his decision on Keystone XL that will determine his climate legacy. If approved, as the USA's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, Keystone XL 'will mean game over for the climate.' Thank you. -- Eve Lifson

04/16/2013

Eve Lifson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Those poor folks in Arkansas didn't even know this pipeline had been there for 60 some years. Their homes were built right on top of some of the line. Thanks Exxon, again, for yet another spill. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Don't let us down on this issue. Tar sands oil is the dirtiest that there is & our country doesn't need yet another spill/leak from faulty pipelines. Sincerely, Frances Davis

04/16/2013

Frances Davis

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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, higher 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. Unless Keystone XL can provide a 100% guarantee there will be no pipeline spills or face millions of dollars in fines as well as the total cost of cleanup, we should not give them permission to build the pipeline. I 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.

Sincerely, Frank Lord

04/16/2013

Frank Lord

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We have sufficient evidence that this is very low quality oil with very high risks of transport and environmental impact. The pipeline is not in the best interests of either the American People or the environment. Please reject the pipeline construction. Sincerely, Fred Ehlert

04/16/2013

Fred Ehlert

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Secretary Kerry, I write in FAVOR of the climate, and in OPPOSITION to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Gail Noon

04/16/2013

Gail Marie Noon

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Again, I say that if the people of Canada didn't want this pipeline to travel through their country either going east or west, then Why would we the people of this great country want it either. PLEASE, PLEASE, vote NO against the Keystone pipeline traveling through the United States with the potential of spills that could affect the people, the animals or the environment of this great country. Be strong and vote NO. Sincerely, Gail Rains

04/16/2013

Gail Rains

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL is not responding to the reality of climate change. Evidence shows that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Courage is required but it is necessary to face facts, educate the American population, and move quicker to fix this dire problem. Sincerely, Gale Germain Galegermain

04/16/2013

Galegermain

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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
PRESIDENT OBAMA PLEASE STOP THIS CANADIAN PIPELINE. YOU HAVE IT MADE NOW. WE REELECTED YIUU BECAUSE WE BELIEVE YOU CARE ABOUT OUR LIVES. THESE TAR SANDS ARE CREATING A NATURAL DISASTER IN CANADA PLEASE STOP I. IF YOU LET THEM BUILD IT THEN YOU DON' T CARE EITHER. WHEN ARE WE GOING TO STOP RAPING THE EARTH AND GO WITH THE FLOW. REWRITE HISTORY AND CARE. THANK YOU Sincerely, Gary & Marilyn morris

04/16/2013

Gary & Marilyn Morris

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Mr. President, I strongly urge you to resist caving in to the corporate lobby that is pushing you towards allowing the Keystone XL pipeline. Don't allow this monstrous thing happen. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Gene Parsons

04/16/2013

Gene Parsons

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Stupid is as stupid does recently seen in this tar sands pipeline spill. How bout we quit this shit and let these folks alone. I wonder whon invited these anuses into our towns. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, George Quinn
Nancy Monaghan

04/16/2013

George Quinn Nancy Monaghan

I am writing because we must not continue the construction and authorization of the Keystone XL pipeline. The initial report from the State Department on the impacts on climate change from the pipeline was superficial and incorrect in its analysis. I am including significant information that needs to be accounted for in a new report, "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." (350.org) We have too many examples of spills, rising CO₂ levels, health impacts, environmental damage, the list goes on, of potential ramifications if the Keystone XL pipeline is completed and utilized. How can poor decision making, greed, and corruption possibly weigh more the the future for our children and grandchildren? I urge you to stand up for what is right, what is intelligent decision making, what is in the best interests of our nation and this planet. Reject the pipeline. Geri Stout

04/16/2013

Geri Stout

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. If even a fraction of the money being spent on the drilling and fracking efforts were put toward research into renewable fuels, we would be miles ahead of the rest of the world instead of lagging behind. We have to look forward and not allow those who have a vested interest in keeping us dependant on fossil fuels to determine our energy future. Sincerely, Gina Dahlstrom-Osburn

04/16/2013

Gina Dahlstrom-osburn

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. After the Mayflower, Arkansas spill we should definitely scrap any thought of building the Keystone XL pipeline. What disasters that could cause! Do we really want massive oil spills in our towns, our aquifers polluted and our climate be even more threatened than it already is? Give us climate leadership instead of always giving in to big oil! 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. Sincerely, Gisela Ray

04/16/2013

Gisela Ray

The Keystone XL pipeline will increase the production of the dirtiest oil. We need to cut CO2, but this will increase it. It won't even create many jobs. Clean energy creates many more jobs. Please stop the pipeline. Glen Ecklund

04/16/2013

Glen Ecklund

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If you know anything about climate change and global warming, you know this is the right thing to do. If you know very little about it, shame on you. Get busy and read. Once you do, you will know that we must fight to end global warming or millions of us in the next 11 years will die or be seriously harmed by the continued burning of fossil fuels that will continue to wreck of normal weather patterns and produce extreme droughts, severe blizzards and rising sea levels. Man, this is real. Reject the pipeline. Sincerely, Glenn Lambert

04/16/2013

Glenn Lambert

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please, please reject Keystone XL. . Sincerely, Gloria Peck

04/16/2013

Gloria Peck

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

*****Wow, these "corporate people" really have a lot of rights: they can take away Freedom of the Press, and Freedom of Assembly. They pretty much disrespected the 4th Amendment...with the people of Mayflower NOT being "secure in their persons, houses and effects.. historically .it's like that George 3rd British invasion with that oil going every where!*****I think Exxon has kind of misread (and you are not paying attention to Amendment 8.. No excessive bail..(like when has anyone arrested them?), nor any cruel and unusual punishments be inflicted. well, ruining people's land , houses, air and water is a pretty big thing. BIG fines, BIG clean up that Exxon pays for sounds right...yeah, i know THEY would think that's excessive...too bad. WHEN is the government going to stand up for the planet?***** Sincerely,
Gloriana Casey

04/16/2013

Gloriana Casey

I am writing to state that the 350.org information that they spew out is off base: They say the pipe line with create CO2 output. The pipeline creates NO CO2! The cars that burn the fuel do create CO2 but they are going to create that CO2 regardless of the pipeline. Given that type of flawed reasoning, I say, 'GO PIPELINE. I am in favor of it....and to 350.org. stop reporting false/illogical data. We need the oil!
Gordon Dean

04/16/2013

Gordon Dean

"THERE IS A CLIMATE IMPACT FROM BURNING 830,000 BARRELS PER DAY OF ANY CRUDE THAT CANNOT BE IGNORED. THIS IS A MATTER OF PHYSICS, AND NOT SUBJECT TO DEBATE." -- KEYSTONE XL IS A DIRTY DISASTER THAT SHOULD IN NO WAY BE ENCOURAGED. Greg Archbald

04/16/2013

Greg Archbald

The State Department's analysis of the Keystone XL pipeline's climate impact in its initial report is deeply flawed. A new report concludes the line 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. That means that the pipeline is not in either our national or the Earth's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Greg Chester

04/16/2013

Greg Chester

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, an tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. The welders have done shoddy work and the oil and diluent are by nature too dangerous to transport by pipelines. The Arkansas spill highlights the fragility of the system and its danger to the aquifers. The tar sands rapidly wear out the pipes and the welds while the benzene in the diluent can seep through the tiniest crack. This is a bad combination. The question becomes not if it will leak, but when, where, and how much? The follow on questions become how much damage, and how injurious to our generation and our future generations? We must stop this pipeline before it does its damage. Let us show our wisdom to our future generations. Sincerely, Greg Chester

04/16/2013

Greg Chester

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar Sands Oil is irresponsible and needs to be stopped. If the Canadians care that little for their country then we should not let them ship it through ours. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Greg Hamby

04/16/2013

Greg Hamby

The environmental impact of the KeystoneXL pipeline and the Albertan Tar Sands is too great to allow.
You must deny this pipeline. Grif Rosser

04/16/2013

Grif Rosser

A new report states that the Keystone XL pipeline 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. That is unacceptable. This pipeline would be the wrong move for the U.S. and the world. It would move us away from reducing our astronomical carbon emissions and lock us into a deadly dependence on dirty tar sands oil. Hannah Baxter

04/16/2013

Hannah Baxter

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Using tar sands adds more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere than other types of fossil fuel. We must cut, not add to, those emissions. The Keystone XL line is proposed to cut through environmentally sensitive areas. There seems to be no good reason to allow this pipeline. 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. Sincerely, Harriet Stone

04/16/2013

Harriet Stone

It has been proven time and time again that oil pipelines are dangerous and can cause great damage to the ecosystem. Not only has this particular pipeline already been shown to be prone to spills because of shoddy welding (<http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/shoddy-weld-on-kxl/>), but we already suffer over 6,500 oil spills, leaks, fires, or explosions a year (http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-18563_162-20053283.html). These spills can be disastrous for the surrounding area, and are often cleaned up improperly, including a recent spill which Exxon tried to clean up with paper towels (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ugrkBFLkjM>). Please do not allow this pipeline to be built, it has the capacity to be far to damaging to our land and people. -Hayley Stewart

04/16/2013

Hayley Stewart

It has been proven time and time again that oil pipelines are dangerous and can cause great damage to the ecosystem. Not only has this particular pipeline already been shown to be prone to spills because of shoddy welding (<http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/shoddy-weld-on-kxl/>), but we already suffer over 6,500 oil spills, leaks, fires, or explosions a year (http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-18563_162-20053283.html). These spills can be disastrous for the surrounding area, and are often cleaned up improperly, including a recent spill which Exxon tried to clean up with paper towels (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ugrkBFLkjM>). Please do not allow this pipeline to be built, it has the capacity to be far to damaging to our land and people. -Hayley Stewart

04/16/2013

Hayley Stewart

The Keystone XL pipeline is not in the best interest of the American people. Oil prices are not solely based on supply. The common man will not receive any benefits from the pipeline. However the common man could suffer greatly. Human kind was given domain of the earth as it's caretakers. As human kind deteriorates morally the earth does physically. Things we have done cannot be undone. This is all we have. When the earth is gone, where do we go? I urge you to reject the pipeline. Doing what's right is never easy. Please, do what's right and reject the Keystone XL pipeline. Heather Boyce

04/16/2013

Heather Boyce

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. How many spills does it take to convince U.S. decision-makers that the Keystone XL pipeline must not be allowed to invade the U.S. mid-section? The whole world needs to get off fossil fuels and develop green energy to combat climate change that just keeps getting more and more harmful to the environment of all living things. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Helen Curtis

04/16/2013

Helen Curtis

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama, With all due respect, how could the two of you let the hucksters who are promoting the dirty tar sands mess convince two discerning and intelligent men to let this environmental catastrophe become the messy, polluting disaster on the ground that this country has seen in ages? We, in Pennsylvania, are expecting the worst possible disasters that will arise from Keystone XL if it continues to develop and spread in our state. We are expecting the worst environmental nightmare. First we had to deal with fracking, and now this! We have known seen for ourselves the disaster as it unfolds, and it looks like the work of the devil. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Helen Santiago

04/16/2013

Helen Santiago

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Mr. President, Mr. Secretary; What follows this is an informative email that was written by the Sierra Club. I agree entirely with the content of that message, but I wanted to make sure to include a personal perspective in this email as well. I have utmost faith in our nation. We have put Americans on the moon, sent them to the bottom of the ocean, and accomplished amazing feats of science. We can find a way to make renewable energy sources, like wind and solar, work, if we just put the time and effort towards that goal. Thank you for your time. I know you will make what you believe to be the right decision for the nation; I hope that the thousands of us who object to the Pipeline will be able to sway your opinion. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Helen White

04/16/2013

Helen White

The State Department's report on Keystone XL is JUNK SCIENCE. The proposed pipeline is not in our national interest. Rejecting the pipeline is the right thing to do. Thank you. Henry Frank

04/16/2013

Henry Frank

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, 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. 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. 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. The president delivered some inspiring words on climate action during his inaugural speech, but it's his decision on Keystone XL that will determine his climate legacy. If approved, as the USA's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, Keystone XL 'will mean game over for the climate.' Thank you. -- Henry Gates

04/16/2013

Henry Gates

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Come on President Obama, it's time for a payback to those environmentalists who had such high hopes that you would be our hope for the future, cleaning up the messes the last two administrations had started. I am one of those environmentalists who voted for you and think that of all the times for you to come through it is now. To Say No to the XL Pipeline. Sincerely, Henry Lagergren

04/16/2013

Henry Lagergren

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. Besides that, you know very well that increasing earth changes, sinkholes, stretching land masses, and the New Madrid fault making this pipeline suicidal for the inhabitants along the pipeline. And that's not to mention the sure destruction of the Ogallala Reservoir which provides water from South Dakota to Texas. Approval of this pipeline is a treasonous act! That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Herschel Dosier

04/16/2013

Herschel Dosier

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 pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Ineke Deruyter

04/16/2013

Ineke Deruyter

Here's a link that will change your life. There are some changes you'd like to make aren't there?

04/16/2013

E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Sir or Madame - This public comment is sent to the US State Department prior to the April 22, 2013 cut-off. My opinion is the Keystone XL Pipeline proposal has a much larger negative impact on people, the economy and the environment than the positive impacts propounded by Keystone XL Pipeline supporters, inside and outside the State Department. The Keystone XL Pipeline is an issue that must be dealt with and that adverse impacts, the cumulative impacts and irrevocable commitment of resources are not going away with any approval planned by the State Department. Pro-oil consultants whose wages are paid by the fossil fuel industry sign off on papers printed on US State Department letterhead, using little-known executive and administrative orders without going through any legally-mandated approval process. The State Department's claim their draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Keystone XL Pipeline will not have a significant impact on the people, the environment and the climate is a sham, and was written by these exact same fossil fuel industry blow-hards. Tar Sands extraction, transportation and refinement is the dirtiest fuel production on an increasingly-polluted planet earth, and is 100% foreseeable under a Peak Oil scenario. The planned Keystone XL Pipeline will carry tar sand crude in a hot, pressurized hazardous slurry of bitumen from Alberta, Canada to Texas to be refined. The pipeline as planned passes over critical, threatened and endangered aquifers whose fresh water is necessary for millions of human beings and agricultural communities. This proposed State Department action puts the entire US breadbasket at risk of a highly toxic spill of hot, pressurized hazardous tar sands slurry bitumen. President Barak Obama should fully reject the State Department fossil fuel-financed environmental review, and order that only State Department public servants who acknowledge the status of the science on climate change be allowed to draft an EIR. It is necessary to allow significant protections of all the parties, represented and unrepresented, who face critical, threatening or endangering changes in their daily lives created by the Keystone XL Pipeline, in order for the President to fulfill his promise to address climate change. I am deeply disappointed that the 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 whitewash the very real and disastrous effects of climate-wrecking projects like the Keystone XL. I order you to reject the State Department's review and direct Secretary of State Kerry to undertake a comprehensive analysis which protects critical, endangered, threatened communities, habitats and environments, as promised by President Obama. Your new review should include studies of the cumulative climate impacts of planned tar sands development in North America, a study of the petro-chemical refinery pollution produced in human sacrifice zones in the United States, and acknowledge the grave risk tar sands bitumen pipelines are in our communities, which already have had toxic pipeline spill residential evacuations. Your review must acknowledge the financial analysts and the oil executives desperate for a positive Keystone XL decision from the State Department have already crossed the line into illegal corruption of US and Canadian political machinery to create a market to drive tar sands development throughout North America. Jack Neff

04/16/2013

Jack Neff

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilling nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil - and counting - from broken pipes into the streets in a residential neighborhood where people walk and children play. Again, the information is minimized. Oil industries are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirty, expensive and toxic form of oil. The Arkansas spill highlights numerous unanswered questions that must be addressed. The U.S. government would be seriously negligent to 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. The focus now is on LESS OIL, NOT MORE. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. Sincerely, Jacqueline Lefler

04/16/2013

Jacqueline Lefler

Dear Secretary John Kerry and President Barack Obama, I am sending this letter on behalf of my family especially for my children. There are many negative issues around the continued development of the Canadian oil sands. You already know them -- from the killing a vast forests, to the contamination of terrestrial, aquatic, and atmospheric ecosystems which we all depend on. 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. 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? It makes no sense and it supports no legacy. We don't need this extra risk and liability in our and our children's futures, Mr. Secretary and Mr. President. The coming challenges already present enough of a test on their own. Meet us on this so we can continue our problem solving partnership, together. Think of the children! Signed, Jake, Anabelle, Maxwell DeCoste and Anna Marie Kennedy

04/16/2013

Jake Decoste

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I've lived in Louisiana my whole life, in an area known as "Cancer Alley." There's a reason it's called that. It's because nearly everything connected to the oilfield is poisonous. Yes, I've made a good living due to the oilfield. I've also had prostate cancer and asbestosis of the lungs. And we've been taxed to the point of illness but never get any of the benefits of oil and gas taxation. No one else seems to want to do the refining work or the drilling. There's a reason for that. It destroys. Ship it to California or Florida or the northeast where no one wants their area dirtied and destroyed. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, James Cobb

04/16/2013

James Cobb

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Is it not time to make a commitment to the environment over sheer corporate greed? We must finally become true and good stewards of the land at last. If the USA does not set the standard? Then who? It is incumbent on you President Obama and you Secretary Kerry to set the example that we are the leaders in saving the environment and will stand by humanity over dollars. We must not waste our most important elements: /clean air and fresh water, both being jeopardized with the folly if you allow this to proceed. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, James Holliday

04/16/2013

James Holliday

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Come on. This pipeline is an unneeded disaster waiting to happen. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, James Ruston

04/16/2013

James Ruston

Dear President Obama, Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline and send a signal to America and the world that you are serious about addressing climate change. Sincerely, James Vandeventer

04/16/2013

James Vandeventer

Esteemed Legislators, A new report calculates the carbon footprint of the pipeline 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. The pipeline is NOT in our national interest. PLEASE don't screw the future planet for our children. And grandchildren. Reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Jamie Hogan

04/16/2013

Jamie Hogan

Dear Mssrs. Obama and Kerry, I would urge you to have the courage to take a stand for the environment if you had to win an election. Because you don't have to win an election, I fail to see any reason, absent a lack of sincere commitment to clean energy, why you would approve KXL. Please -- in 100 years, even 50, even 20 -- the one thing you will be remembered for is how you dealt with the climate crisis. You will not be remembered for the handful of temporary jobs that this pipeline creates. Please, have principle. The argument that this oil will anyway be tapped and transported through some other poor soul's back yard is repellent. Perhaps if you take the first step, others will follow. That is how leaders think. That is how leaders lead. Please, stand up. Thank you. -- Jamie Vander Salm

04/16/2013

Jamie Vander Salm

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Our country should be a major leader to the rest of the world in providing innovative and leading edge technology for future energy consumption, the opposite of what Keystone XL represents. The environment does not need one more oil disaster of any kind! Sincerely, Jan Maltzan

04/16/2013

Jan Maltzan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas can spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood, it could happen anywhere along the line. 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. CLEAN UNCONTAMINATED WATER is a right of every citizen in our country. I believe you are the executives whose job it is to protect our water from untrustworthy corporations, and their CEO's who are not considerate of the harm they cause. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Please consider the impacts of pipeline spills, as if they might happen in your own neighborhood. I hate to remind you but I will, that oil companies don't have a great record for truth-telling. If we put our faith and financial backing into sustainable energy sources like solar, wind, geothermal and water, you'll find people will support you because you're saving the earth for their children and grandchildren. PLEASE REJECT the Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Jane Birdsong

04/16/2013

Jane Birdsong

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. What kind of insanity is making us think we can continue to use fossil fuels without life threatening and planet destroying consequences? And how can any HUMAN being justify it in the face of the many, substantiated reports showing that the use of the fuels for our energy needs is unnecessary? Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline break in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. This spill not an isolated incident and is another indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. The Arkansas spill highlights that there are many unanswered questions that must be addressed, especially 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. Then this month, there have been record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States and in the past ten years, more record temperatures have been reached than in any other ten year period in history. This is just another indication that we are experiencing increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jane Fasullo

04/16/2013

Jane Fasullo

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear Mr President and Secretary Kerry, I support you both and have since 2008, but I feel the fracking and pipelines will effect the next 7 Generations, that include our children and our grandchildren and beyond. This is "messing" with our lifeline, Mother Earth and the effects are way beyond any scientific finding can even imagine. There is no money, no corporation that can ever put our Sacred Land and Earth back together. I stopped using plastic bags in Dec. of 2009, because I don't want my child to live on a landfill, but now the stakes are much higher. I worry about my child not having clean water or a safe place to breath and live. Please reject Keystone XL. Your children and grandchildren and those beyond and those who care about the condition and abuse to the Earth will thank you! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jane Walsh

04/16/2013

Jane Walsh

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. MY FEELING ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE IS THAT I'M ON THE TITANIC SEEING THE ICEBERG AHEAD AND NO ONE IS DOING ANYTHING. OR THAT I'M HEARING THE SOUND OF NIAGARA FALLS AROUND THE BEND WHILE THE ON THE BARGE THE PARTY CONTINUES. UNTIL SOMEONE IN POWER TAKES ACTION, PEOPLE JUST DON'T BELIEVE IT CAN BE TRUE. YOUR BOLD ACTION COULD BE THE WAKE UP CALL WE NEED!
Sincerely, Janet Lawson

04/16/2013

Janet Lawson

I am 80 yrs old. Climate change won't affect me more than is already does. But I have 11 young grandchildren. 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. Do you really want to be the one that fills our beautiful country with pollution of all kinds -- just for money? That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. In whose interest is it? I urge you to reject the pipeline. Janet Nolan

04/16/2013

Janet Nolan

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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 thus facilitates the development of Canada's tar sands. 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 further development of the tar sands. 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. I respectfully demand honest climate leadership from this administration. This is not a time for "all of the above." Rejection of Keystone XL may be very difficult politically, especially given the administration's approval of the southern leg, but everyone is counting on you to do the right thing. Where there are pipelines, there will be spills, and the slight adjustment in the proposed route, does not remove the dangers it will pose for our water, the Ogallala aquifer and for all the land this unnecessary pipeline would cross. This is a very big opportunity to say to the world at large that the best thing for all of us is to leave the huge deposit of carbon in the tar sands ... where it belongs ... safely sequestered, undeveloped, and in the ground. I have been a fan of yours, a supporter, a contributor and a participant in your campaigns ever since I read your first book. I think we are so lucky to have someone so compassionate, intelligent and accomplished in the White House. I just don't think I will ever be able to understand how you could possibly think that the construction of this pipeline would be in our nation's best interest! Please, give it a true and honest environmental review yourself, one uninfluenced by what the leaders of Canada might want, uninfluenced by the so-called environmental review at the State Department, which was out-sourced to people with ties to the companies who would benefit by construction of the pipeline, and one completely uninfluenced by what the fossil fuel industry would want. We are all depending on you! Bon courage! Thank you!

Sincerely, Janie Penn

04/16/2013

Janie Penn

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There are both known and unknown causes of oil that has been discovered in various areas of the United States. While it is our hope that these occurrences are truly unexplained, there is much that we can do to quell those that are already threatening areas here in the United States. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Janine Metoyer

04/16/2013

Janine Metoyer

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department My God!! How many more oil spills and sloppy (criminal?) oversight do you need to see before you realize what a super bad idea this pipe line is. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Janis Fensch

04/16/2013

Janis Fensch

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department The environment is suffering because of global warming, fueled by our consumption of oil. We need a environment with as little natural disaster as possible. Burning the oil from the tar sands will push CO2 emissions to the point of no return: enough heat will be trapped to melt the polar ice caps. Stop the madness. The interest of oil barones can't come before the welfare of people. End speculation in the oil market. Keystone XL Pipeline will not make it easier for people to pay for oil or gas. It will not generate enough jobs to feed the poor. We can generate jobs through renewbal resources and alternative sources of energy. Germany does it. We have too, as well. The pipeline will not make us more secure. We will continue to meddle in the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America to secure oil, trapping on the human rights of peope to get crude out the ground to turn a profit. The greed of ExxonMobil, BP, Shell, Chevron, and the rest of the oil giants has no bounds. Stop the Keystone XL Pipeline. Think about the world your daughters might live in. Do they need an ever warming planet with scarce resources like water and food? Sincerely, Jason Matherne

04/16/2013

Jason Matherne

To whom it may concern, "The Salvation of the State is Watchfulness in the Citizen." --Hartley Burr Alexander's quote chiseled above the North entrance to Nebraska's capitol. As a Nebraska resident and a proud U.S. citizen, I take those words to heart. It is for that reason that I am writing yet another comment regarding the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. Living in Nebraska, I have a bigger stake in what happens with this pipeline than most. I see no benefits. All risk, no reward for Nebraska and the United States. From the beginning, we've known that Keystone XL would be a climate disaster. Some of us took James Hansen's words seriously when he said that exploiting the tar sands would mean "essentially game over" for the climate. But today, a new report shows that it could be worse than we thought. The report -- the most comprehensive study of Keystone's climate impacts yet -- 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. The draft SEIS doesn't even bother to mention this. For that reason alone, it should be rejected.

Permitting this pipeline is the wrong message to send to a world that needs to take carbon pollution and climate change seriously. The facts are the facts. We must believe the science, it's all we have and all that can save us. My family and I feel that it is not in our country's interest to build this pipeline. The SEIS also doesn't take into account pipeline leaks. It's clear to just about everyone that pipelines leak. It's not an issue of if, but when. We've seen what this can do in Michigan and Arkansas. It's a man made disaster, and it's not in Nebraska's interest to risk our land and water for the profits of a foreign oil company. Fact: The Koch brothers have a financial stake in Keystone XL and their right-wing groups like AFP are working side by side with labor union LIUNA to push this risky pipeline. Fact: 100% of the steel TransCanada is using was produced outside of the United States and only 50% of this foreign-made steel was rolled and coated in the United States. Fact: Building the Keystone XL will directly impact the expansion of tar sands, and in turn speed up climate change. 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. The Keystone XL Pipeline is not in the best interest of the United States or Nebraska. Please REJECT the permit for the Keystone Pipeline and force oil companies to update current infrastructure! Thank you, Jason Miller, Julie Pelton, and Jack Miller

04/16/2013

Jason Miller

Keystone XL is a phenomenally misguided approach to squeezing out the last bit of hydrocarbon energy available. IT is far more responsible and intelligent and caring to invest in solar, wind and hydroelectric. We do not want to risk pipeline breaks, increase carbon emissions or destroy the environment through extraction industries. Please remove Keystone XL consideration. Jay Ruby

04/16/2013

Jay Ruby

April 16, 2013 Comments regarding the SDEIS for the Keystone XL Pipeline. These comments pertain to Section 3.14 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS A detailed reading of the cumulative impacts from the construction and operation of the proposed Project reveal serious problems. The following are taken from Keystone's own reports and description of impacts the Keystone Pipeline will add to pipelines already in operation or proposed. The proposed route includes over 25 areas where existing or proposed natural gas or oil pipelines come within 2 miles of each other. Soil erosion and loss of topsoil during construction and operation could create short or long term soil compaction and permanent increases in proportion of large rocks in soil. Permanent soil contamination from spills could also be expected. Possible long term effects to surface and groundwater during construction. Wet Lands could need regeneration periods of 20 to 50 years or more to accommodate tree species, permanent conversion of forested wet land vegetation types. A few wetlands would be permanently filled or drained and would require compensatory mitigation. Construction would result in some permanent loss of forested and scrub-shrub vegetation, some increase in native grassland sagebrush and fragmentation. Sagebrush vegetation removal could require 20 - 50 years to become reestablished leading to long term cumulative impacts. Construction and operation will result in future project needs to minimize erosions, revegetation, site stabilization, and control of noxious weeds.

TransCanada reports paying Ducks Unlimited \$1,000,000 to quiet their opposition to the pipeline. The money went toward a conservation program important to Ducks Unlimited. Keystone reports that wildlife and habitat have been seriously impacted by past projects leading to mortality and reduced breeding from stress, reduced feeding due to noise and human activity, reduced survival, changes in habit, prey, or forage. They expect their operations to contribute to those. Fisheries - Large scale cumulative impacts post construction could be expected. Species likely to be disturbed or altered include the black-tailed prairie dog colonies, black-tailed ferret, greater sage-grouse, and Sprague's pipit, and American burying beetle. Socioeconomics - limited employment and income benefits because of a very small, relatively few permanent operations staff and some local project expenditures. Environmental Justice - environmental justice analysis area based on a 4 mile width of pipeline indicates additional demands on medical services in areas that are currently underserved.

Cultural resources - impacts include damage or destruction of historic properties that can't be avoided, invasion of the integrity of historic properties significant historic features, change of character of property's use, changes to physical appearances. Keystone states the high temperatures needed to operate the pipeline will mean negative impacts on aquatic ecosystems and water quality. Pipeline temperatures in arid lands are likely to increase wildfires. Decreased stream flow, increased water removal and competition from non-native species are likely to affect river ecosystems in arid lands. Keystone sums up potential cumulative impacts as minor or negligible. These are impacts that need to be taken seriously. Paying off Ducks Unlimited with a worthwhile project does nothing to protect the fisheries along the actual pipeline route. The fact that the amount of payoff was \$1,000,000 should raise red flags. That kind of payoff is not for "minor" effects. The impacts that would result from arid lands need to be taken seriously. This part of the country has been experiencing significant droughts and already suffered massive wildfires. The increase in water and land temperatures from the pipeline is an immense risk to take. Keystone needs to identify specific historic lands and features. They need to be up front especially about native populations who have historically suffered from the taking of their lands in the name of "what's best for the country". They are a minority whose voice needs to be recognized and heard. Taking of destroying their lands is an example of environmental injustice. Keystone has failed to prove that the cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline are minimal and their report raises more questions than it answers. Judith Allen

West

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Mr. President and Senator Kerry, it is time to make decisions that will protect our land now and in the future. Conservation should be the most important action for your to promote all over this land. We need to conserve all our resources immediately, including water. Sincerely, Jean Coulton

04/16/2013

Jean Coulton

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jeanene Bergeron

04/16/2013

Jeanene Bergeron

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please care for our country and its human and animal and plant inhabitants instead of oil company money. YOU KNOW this is bad. Have some courage and care! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jeannine Laverty

04/16/2013

Jeannine Laverty

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands oil from Canada via the Keystone XL pipeline sounds more like quick profit rather than long-term reflection on what is good for this nation/and the world's climate. Transferring tar sands oil across the U.S to export most of it does not seem the best way to manage our energy resources. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Jeff Shivnen

04/16/2013

Jeff Shivnen

Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Jena Laske

04/16/2013

Jena Laske

Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are not collateral. We are not livestock. We are not commodities. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Jena Laske

04/16/2013

Jena Laske

Peer-reviewed scientific research and open-minded and transparent discussion of that research is as much a hallmark of a democratic society as is free speech in newspapers. Thus when respected research reports that the Keystone XL pipeline 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 plant that means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Jenise and Les Porter

04/16/2013

Jenise And Les Porter

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please read the following message and think big picture, 10-50 years down the road. Please think about the present and the future. Think about families, children, environmental impact, wildlife, natural resources and the importance of protecting our beautiful lands and people: 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Jennafer Elias-Reed

04/16/2013

Jennafer Elias-reed

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The biggest problem with this is the potential for a disasterous spill and it continues reliance on fossil fuels. We do not need more investing in fossil fuels or nuclear, we need renewable and sustainable energy sources. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Jennifer Gilpin

04/16/2013

Jennifer Gilpin

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. For a MULTIPLICITY of reasons...the exploitation of the tar sands for the short term benefit of a few and the long term degradation of the this place a unique place as are so many upon this...the only planet we can now call home and live upon and share among ourselves for the near and foreseeable future...is an abomination. Keep these places and things as they are, until...should that EVER happen...we should know what our using them will mean....and we can use them wisely and well. Thanks... Sincerely, Jerry Donaldson

04/16/2013

Jerry Donaldson

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Beautiful President, please, please, please do ALL you can to not allow the Keystone XL Pipeline. IT IS ESSENTIAL. Your administation's rejection of such an EXTREMELY UNCLEAN AND DANGEROUS project is truly, truly essential to the well-being of this planet we all share. As you know, humans do not and should not eat money. Very obviously, sir, what is MOST IMPORTANT is that everyone be sensible and true to life, true to this BEAUTIFUL, BEAUTIFUL planet EARTH. Sincerely, Jillaine Huggard

04/16/2013

Jillaine Huggard

Attached is a pdf file of my comment.

04/16/2013

Jim Hare

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. With so much that has been, and can be, accomplished with respect to alternative energies and clean domestic natural gas, even considering this level of support for Canadian tar sands petroleum is absurd. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I respectfully ask for true and comprehensive climate leadership and stewardship from this administration, and that it start with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. To have it any other way, is just entirely inappropriate.

Sincerely, Jim Jameson

04/16/2013

Jim Jameson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. PLEASE - STOP THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE AND ALL OTHERS LIKE IT, N O W, ONCE AND FOR ALL, FOR THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF AMERICAN CITIZENS AND THE CONTINENTAL ENVIRONMENT!! N O T FOR THE PROFITS OF EITHER CANADIAN OR AMERICAN BIG OIL COMPANIES. FOR SHAME. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, JL Keith

04/16/2013

JL Keith

I am writing because I am a young person on planet earth. In the future there will be more young people on the planet earth. Being a young person and enjoying this beautiful world I've been blessed with is truly invaluable, and I would never want that opportunity to be taken away from another young person. The keystone pipeline would carry the equivalent of 37.7 million cars on the road in tar sands oil. I live in Oregon, that amount of oil is more than cars on the road in my state, Washington, California, New York, Michigan, and Florida combined! You are trying to tell me this has no environmental impact? Please. For the sake of future generations and young people like me do not allow the keystone pipeline to be built. Lets think beyond the dollar and into the future for once. It's worth it. Joachim Jacobs

04/16/2013

Joachim Jacobs

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Why is it so hard for you to stop it??? And why can't you publicize the BAD things about it???? Enough already! I am fed up with most of the news only covering what "they" say is good about it! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Not enough info has hit the press about the fact that most of the jobs touted are short term at low pay! Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Joan Cook

04/16/2013

Joan Cook

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Specifications for tar sands pipelines must be FAR more stringent, with many back-ups and many safeguards in place. Yes, this will increase the cost. And yes, that is ok. We must protect our communities and our environment. I agree with the following message... 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Joan Hall

04/16/2013

Joan Hall

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We cannot continue as we have in regard to the supremacy of Big Oil. You are well aware that it is having terrible effects on our environment and endangering our aquifers and that climate change is being exacerbated by the continued reliance on petroleum products. So, please, DO THE RIGHT THING. THE PEOPLE ARE BEHIND YOU TO DO THE RIGHT THING. DON'T LET US DOWN! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Joan Taves

04/16/2013

Joan Taves

Please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. As James Hansen states, the pipeline would mean "essentially game over" for the climate. The pipeline would carry and emit the equivalent of the yearly tailpipe emissions of almost 38 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. The State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. Our nation and our planet cannot afford to allow this pipeline to be further developed -- we must reject it, and focus instead on alternative energy projects. I urge you to fight against the strong influence of the oil industry and other short sighted political and economic influences. Please put the interests of our planet and future generations of species first and foremost, and reject the pipeline. Thank you very much. Joanna Sharf

04/16/2013

Joanna Sharf

Please consider the latest report on the Keystone pipeline that found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. This in addition to other negative impacts means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Think of the next generation; we're at a point of no return. Joanne Dearcopp

04/16/2013

Joanne Dearcopp

Please consider the latest report on the Keystone pipeline that found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. This in addition to other negative impacts means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Think of the next generation; we're at a point of no return. Joanne Dearcopp

04/16/2013

Joanne Dearcopp

Petroleum is one of the worst contaminants we humans have discovered. 1) When it is extracted from deep in the earth, it contaminates the ground at its source. 2) When it is shipped or piped or trucked to refineries, there are huge risks that it will leak onto the surface, and create health hazards for all life on its route. 3) Once it arrives at the refineries hundreds of miles away, it also contaminates the surface. As it is refined, it contaminates the air and water surrounding the refinery. 4) After it is refined into gasoline and other products, it continues to contaminate the air we all breathe, and the protective ozone layer. Petroleum should remain under the earth's surface, where it belongs, and where it cannot hurt humans and other forms of life. Instead, let's use the energy sources that do not rob us of our health and life: the sun, the wind, the waves, the air, etc., etc., etc. Joby McClendon

04/16/2013

Joby McClendon

I believe allowing this Keystone XL folly to progress will signal the tipping point, yes possibly the point of no return for our fragile climate. Let Canada stew in their oily sands. Joe Preston

04/16/2013

Joe Preston

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. THE CARBON BASED ENERGY INDUSTRY IS SELLING US A BILL OF GOODS THAT IS BAD FOR EVERYONE. THEIR ONLY INTEREST IS THE IN THE OUTRAGEOUS PROFITS THEY CAN MAKE. THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE IS BAD FOR AMERICA AND THE EARTH. REJECT THIS PLAN! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Joel & Lucinda Wingard

04/16/2013

Joel & Lucinda Wingard

I'm an organic farmer in California. While I'm far away from the proposed pipeline (Keystone XL) I am very frightened at the prospect of it being built. I do not believe it is in the 'national interest' because it puts far too much carbon into the atmosphere. It locks us to dirty energy through this massive infrastructure, when we should send an important signal to the world that some energy sources should NOT be exploited. Not when the world of renewables energy is showing much opportunity for scaling up. We can't fight climate change this way. Show some backbone, please!
Respectfully. Joey W. Smith

04/16/2013

Joey W. Smith

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Now is the time to be advised by science, not economics. Science will provide a guide for the long-term future whereas economics is typically very short-term and wrong for the long-term. It is absolutely necessary that we take long-term positions for decisions regarding our one Earth environment. Global climate change is a reality and is caused by burning of fossil fuels. Fossil fuels must decline in use as quickly as possible. Those that we must use, must be as efficient as possible. That means we cannot afford to use fuels derived from tar sands. Period! The next logical conclusion is that construction of the Keystone XL pipeline would promote use of the most inefficient, dirtiest forms of fossil fuels. Therefore, that pipeline must not be built. 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. Do not obscure the truth of the whole story facts to make the pipeline look like a good necessity; it is not. Instead, make a strong decision to move the nation forward based on science and a strong clean-energy economy. Sincerely, John Brauner

04/16/2013

John Brauner

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar Sands Extraction and transport via pipelines, trains or trucks means additional huge amounts of carbon pollution, more climate changing man made greenhouse gases, more chemical pollution of our environments, more costly clean ups, and more oil addiction we don't need. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, John Castillo

04/16/2013

John Castillo

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. To add to all that, the oil that flows down that pipeline will do nothing to add to US energy independence. All of it will be sent overseas after being refined and most of the pollution dumped on US soils and in US air, while the refined product and profits flow overseas. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, John Clary

04/16/2013

John Clary

I want the pipeline. It is good for this country and for the world. The other people on this site are wingnuts! John Culbertson

04/16/2013

John Culbertson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We need more renewable energy and less fossil fuel. Less us put our money on the winning horse. Right now Germany is showing the way. Sincerely, John Frantz

04/16/2013

John Frantz

The Keystone XL pipeline is a critical component of North America's energy infrastructure. Not only will it help the region move toward energy independence, it will enable us to move huge volumes of crude oil safely, cleanly and efficiently. President Obama recently approved the lower portion of Keystone XL, without these same unrealistic claims from the opposition. Despite the rhetoric, Keystone XL has nothing to do with pipeline safety, and everything to do with the inconvenient fact that the world is not running out of oil. In fact, world reserves keep increasing and that's simply bad news for some. What is bad news for all of us is that this desperately needed economic advancement is being held hostage by a small vocal minority who does not understand global economic policy, logistics, and pipeline safety. When moving millions of barrels of crude oil daily through 55,000 miles of trunk pipelines, accidents will occasionally happen. But the answer isn't to stop building pipelines but to build newer and safer ones, such as the proposed Keystone XL. The pipeline that ruptured in Arkansas was almost 70 years old. And when a spill occurs, repair and cleanup are relatively easy. By comparison, when a freight train hauling crude oil in tank cars jumps the rails, the damage can be devastating. The same week of the Arkansas pipeline break, a Canadian Pacific Railway train carrying crude to Chicago derailed in western Minnesota spilling about 15,000 gallons close to a built-up area. Railroad-related oil spills numbered 112 between 2010 and 2012 compared to a total of 10 the previous three years. When compared to trucking, pipeline transportation is a staggering 16 times safer than rail, and 189 times safer than trucks when comparing freight tons shipped. To take it a step further, according to USDOT statistics, pipelines are 451 times safer than rail on a per-mile basis. The disparity between pipeline and highways becomes even starker, with pipelines a full 29,280 times safer on a per-mile basis. Decades of use have proved that pipelines overall are overwhelmingly safe and reliable. Annually transporting 11.5 Billion barrels they are 99.999952% safe. Don't let the rhetoric and politics determine the safety and prosperity of our future. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline. John Lesnick, Jr.

04/16/2013

John Lesnick, Jr.

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Do not fear union backlash stopping Keystone XL! Get a great 10 minute video of the Mayflower spill so people can see how bad tar sand "oil" really is.. AND show a video of First Nations protests against similar pipelines on their BC & Alberta homelands. Sincerely, John McGuire

04/16/2013

John McGuire

Dear Nebraska Representative: I would like to take this opportunity to respectfully request refusal to allow the Keystone pipeline to be built in Nebraska. As a resident of , Texas I'm very aware of the arguments on both sides and have worked diligently to understand each point of view. My conclusion is that 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. Rather than quote oft used statistics that only confuse and distract from major issues mentioned above, I'm appealing to your sense of the "right' thing to do for your citizens. I'll be happy to elaborate if you contact me. Respectfully John Rath

04/16/2013

John Rath

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. And, we saw the way Exxon has bullied local authorities with Soviet-style tactics to cover the incident up. It is time for the Obama Administration to stop catering to radical right-wing, short-term thinking and do what is right for the nation's and the world's long-term health! 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. If we don't get climate leadership from this administration NOW, with the rejection of Keystone XL, all the focus on renewables will be too little, too late. GAME OVER, as they say. And, as a nation, we will be sending the message to the world community that George W. Bush had the right idea when he said we all might as well just adapt to climate change as inevitable. 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. Sincerely, John Wells

04/16/2013

John Wells

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There is nothing safe about this mess. And the only people who will benefit are oil companies while We the People will continue to suffer from disastrous "spills" like the one in Arkansas. So start protecting us Mr. President. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Jon Hayenga

04/16/2013

Jon Hayenga

Approving the XL pipeline would be a giant and ruinous step backward. It is a filthy, energy intensive extraction process of extraction that is already ruining land, water and livelihoods in Canada. The pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline.

Joseph Gilday

04/16/2013

Joseph Gilday

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. We are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. And why should we even try? It is time to leave the rest of the fossil fuels in the ground, apply severe restrictions on energy use, and use the technology we already have to provide energy with solar and wind power. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I want climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Joy Schroeder

04/16/2013

Joy Schroeder

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I am very concerned about the Administration's position on this pipeline, given that a big part of my support thus far has been based on the assumption that we would quickly move away from devastating decisions such as the decision to allow this pipeline to be constructed. Do not allow this to happen. Sincerely, Joyce Fukui Grandy

04/16/2013

Joyce Fukui Grandy

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, It is the duty and responsibility of Government to take the welfare of the public and the devastating impact on the environment that tar sands will cause. How can we leave this terrible state of affairs to future generations. It is totally unacceptable that we do not accept that what we are doing is destroying our ecosystem and life support system, we cannot keep ignoring the true facts! 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. Sincerely, Mrs. Joyce Murray

04/16/2013

Joyce Murray

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. YOU CAN'T AGREE TO ALLOWING TAR SANDS--THERE WILL BE DISASTERS AS WE HAVE WITNESSED ALREADY! ONCE THE DAMAGE IS DONE, LIVES ARE LOST, THE ENVIRONMENT IS DESTROYED... FOREVER!! GREED IS DESTROYING OUR WORLD! YOU ARE EMPOWERED AND HAVE BEEN ELECTED TO PROTECT AND SAFEGUARD OUR WORLD AND THE PEOPLE AND CREATURES THAT LIVE IN IT! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Judith Mueller

04/16/2013

Judith Mueller

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Also, add to the SPILL list, tar sands spill in a river in Michigan still not completely cleaned up after several years!! The oil companies DON'T have clean up technology when they have a spill. What's wrong with this picture?? Profits, only consideration!!!! Sincerely, Judy Andrews

04/16/2013

Judy Andrews

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I do not think that this is good for our country. It seems we are being very short-sighted--all people can think of is the jobs and temporary nature of the gains. If there is a major spill (and there will be), we may not be able to drink the water and have permanent problems with things like birth defects, cancers, etc. If it is such a good idea to have the tar soil oil, then Canada needs to have their own refineries and have their own ports to ship things from. With global warming this will probably work well for them. Thanks for listening! Sincerely, Judy Dusseault

04/16/2013

Judy Dusseault

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. No to Keystone XL Pipeline, and No to tar sands oil! You have both lost your minds if you think either of these is safe. They are not. Please stop pandering to corporate special interests and the big oil companies, and do what the people want. I listened to your campaign speeches, both of you. I heard you say you care about the natural environment. Now I am waiting to find out if those were just words to get our vote, or if you really meant what you said. I am waiting for real leadership from both of you. President Obama, you have no right whatsoever to compare yourself to Lincoln or Franklin Roosevelt if you say yes to either of these horrendous propositions. I voted for you in both elections, part of that 39% of the Alabama vote, and sent your campaign hundreds of dollars. I am starting to wonder if this wasn't a mistake! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Julia Carter

04/16/2013

Julia Carter

I am writing to alert you to a new report on the carbon footprint of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline. It is important to read this report, which shows very different finding than the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL on the pipeline's climate impact. The new report, issued today, April 16th, finds that the true impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline is that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year. That is comparable to 51 coal-fired power plants. The report is called: "Cooking the Books: The True Climate Impact of Keystone XL" and you can find it at: priceofoil.org/2013/04/16/cooking-the-books-the-true-climate-impact-of-keystone-xl/ Given this impact on the climate, the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Julia Isaacs

04/16/2013

Julia Isaacs

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It's time to show our commitment to fighting climate change by getting away from dirty energy. No to Keystone Pipeline. There are very few jobs for US citizens and only profits for big oil and oil spills for the rest of us. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Julie Kutz

04/16/2013

Julie Kutz

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I was raised in a Republican household in the 1960's and when I registered to vote at 18, I registered as a Republican. As I got older, I remember telling my dad that I wasn't sure I agreed with what the party stood for. He said, "Well, Hon, you have to vote your conscience". I changed my party affiliation around that same time, and have voted Democratic ever since, mainly because I believed most Democrats believed in protecting the environment. I hope I was right, and I hope that hasn't changed. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Julie Reichard

04/16/2013

Julie Reichard

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. I also request that this comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, be made public! Sincerely, Karen and Robert O'Brien

04/16/2013

Karen And Robert O'Brien

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. This letter to the editor of the Sioux City Journal was written by the chair of the Northwest Iowa Sierra Club, Dr. Jim Redmond. It appeared in the Sioux City Journal on April 14. April 14, 2013 7:00 pm Jim Redmond(7) CommentsExploiting of Alberta's tar sands is not worth the financial and safety gamble. Corporate interests, not national interest, lie behind the proposed XL pipeline. Having been subjected over the last six months to a media blanket of advertising by oil and gas interests, the American public must look behind the corporate claims, evaluate the risks, and vote to reject the Keystone XL pipeline. Submit comments by April 22 to the State Department. No need exists to envision future impacts from tar sands oil spills. Major spills are occurring with awesome regularity. Exxon must be totally disgraced: On Good Friday, March 29, their Pegasus tar sands pipeline ruptured in Arkansas, spilling 84,000 gallons. Only three days before, on Tuesday, March 26, the Department of Transportation slapped them with a \$1.7 million fine for pipeline safety violations that led to the 2011 Yellowstone River spill during heavy flooding. Then the most damning discovery: Exxon and others pumping tar sands oil do not pay into the U.S. Oil Spill Fund because an old loophole declares bitumen, the scientific name of tar sands oil, is not oil. On the other hand, when denying that bitumen is more corrosive, the operators claim diluted bitumen (dilbit) is no different than conventional oil. The pipeline companies ignore the differences between conventional crude and corrosive dilbit. Why would they try to pump tar sands crude through an overheated, overpressurized, 60-year-old pipeline if they were not operating under the engineering illusion there was no difference. National attention is focused on cleanup of the most recent tar sands spill. Arkansas citizens are concerned about oil pollution reaching Lake Conway and Lake Maumelle watershed, risking the water supply of central Arkansas. A tar sands crude oil spill challenges veteran spill responders. Toxic solvents like benzene evaporate, leaving behind the heavy bitumen that sinks in water. No wonder that Enbridge (Canada's largest pipeline company) spent almost a billion dollars and three years cleaning up the Kalamazoo River spill of 2010, but we still have 38 miles of tar sands-contaminated river. Citizens of the Missouri River basin are asking tough questions about spills because we recognize that the XL proposed route dissects the Missouri River basin. The new route sidesteps the Sand Hills, but remains a threat above the Ogallala Aquifer. As troubling is the threat to the Missouri River and Lake Sakakawea. 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. Dr. John Stansbury of the University of Nebraska's Water Center identifies eight to nine 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. As our nation decides on whether to slow down or speed up the strip mining of the boreal forests of Alberta, we believe the evidence supports a rejection of this resource development. Anyone who has seen pictures of the absolute degradation of the natural landscape in Canada recognizes it as an industrial holocaust. Our species eliminates all other species in that region. Job claims turn out to be bogus. At one point the U.S. Chamber of Commerce claimed 250,000 jobs would be created by XL. 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. Contrary to promises of lower prices at the pump, the Keystone XL will increase the price of gas. Big Oil wants to move cheap tar sands crude to refineries on the Gulf Coast in order to command international prices for their product. The majority of the refined product will be exported from a tax-free zone. In recent years, Alberta Crude is priced \$30 or \$40 less a barrel than oil sold by OPEC. Big Oil plans to profit from export, not lower domestic prices. Of course the biggest risk the TransCanada Corporation presents Americans is to undercut their role in the international campaign

against climate change. If we were to continue exploiting one of the largest carbon sinks on the planet, Alberta tar sands, there would be no scientific or moral basis for our global leadership. Jim Redmond, of , is Sierra Club Northwest Iowa Group executive committee chairman. Sincerely, Karen Heidman

04/16/2013

Karen Heidman

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We have enough to clean up in our country without added to the destruction of Mother Earth with tar sands. Please listen to people who have experienced the after effects of this destruction. Sincerely, Karen J. Hartman

04/16/2013

Karen J. Hartman, Sfp

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. This pipeline is a disaster in the making. Considering the length of the pipe, the fact that a foreign country is trying to bully us into accepting it and that the American People don't want it, I say NO. Sincerely, Karen Jones

04/16/2013

Karen Jones

I live where, fortunately, the effects of climate change have not yet severely impacted us. But we are feeling it nonetheless, with rising sea levels causing serious erosion of our famous coastline, more extreme weather events damaging our roads, bridges, and buildings, increased incidence of lyme disease as deer ticks move further north, warmer winters that affect our winter sports tourism, earlier spring runoff that is not available when farmers start to plant, etc, etc. I'm sure if you take a look around wherever you live, you will see changes as well. How can you possibly say that extracting and burning all that tar sands oil will have only a negligible effect on climate?? Please reject this pipeline! We have to find another way. Karen Marysdaughter

04/16/2013

Karen Marysdaughter

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. In light of Michigan and now Arkansas, it is clear that a decision to pipe and pump tar sands crude via Keystone XL is yet another environmental disaster waiting to happen - on a massive scale. Please do not allow this project to continue forward! I stand with and behind both of you against the pressures I know you must face in making that critical decision.

Sincerely, Karen Oates

04/16/2013

Karen Oates

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Please stop things like this from happening. We have jumped the gun, so to speak about so many things. Things that are dangerous to us and the planet we live on. Please take action now to stop fracking! Sincerely, Karen Potts

04/16/2013

Karen Potts

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. My name is Kate Levine and I am a passionate advocate for the protection of our environment. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. Exxon is so powerful it has managed to cover up the magnitude of the environmental destruction caused by the spill. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Kate Levine

04/16/2013

Kate Levine

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The ghastly sight of tar sands crude pouring out of a pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas is just one more indication that transporting tarsand cured, a toxic form of oil, much less ten times that amount, across the entire US just to satisfy the oil refinery businesses in Texas, is the WRONG THING TO DO. Climate change is upon us: record-breaking temperatures this month. We must stop investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet just because we have used up the easier, cleaner stuff. No, we must stop using oil and switch to conservation, solar and wind. Stopping Keystone XL is essential for the US to achieve reductions in climate-changing CO2 emissions. DRAW THE LINE IN THE SAND: NO TAR SANDS THROUGH KEYSTONE XL. 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. Sincerely, Katherine Stewart

04/16/2013

Katherine Stewart

Apr 16, 2013 Ms. Genevieve Walker 2201 C Street NW., Room 2726 Washington, DC 20520 Dear Ms. Walker, 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. In light of two recent spills of this same heavy tar sands oil in Minnesota and Arkansas, pursuing this pipeline seems ill advised. Building the Keystone XL pipeline can only lead to more environmental destruction along its route, damaging habitat, water supplies, and fouling our wildlife. In particular, the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) fails to: * examine the massive impacts to the boreal forest, its habitat, and its wildlife that will result through 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. 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. If any pipe line from Canada is built, it should be to bring WATER not tar sands to the U.S. The drought in the west is severe and likely will get worse before it gets better. Please preserve our environment. Do not approve the tar sands pipeline. Sincerely, Mrs. Kathleen Boulle

04/16/2013

Kathleen Boulle

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I know this is a tough decision, and maybe not a popular one with companies that may line and threaten political coffers, but I believe to reject this pipeline is a critical must for the future of our American Environment. If countries like Germany can produce at least 50% of their power from alternative forms of energy, why can't our companies shift their strategies a bit, provide training and jobs, and convert to new forms of energy that will more cleanly supply our great country with energy to meet its needs now and in the future? I don't get the resistance to something better for us all! Sincerely,
Kathleen Engberg

04/16/2013

Kathleen Engberg

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Reject Keystone XL Dear Secretary Kerry and President Obama, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Kathleen Massanari

04/16/2013

Kathleen Massanari

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. A pipeline disaster has just occurred in Arkansas. Tar sands oil has been released into a residential neighborhood with results that are causing damage to the environment of this neighborhood, the health of the residents has been compromised and it seems that the Exxon oil company does not have adequate technology or knowhow to clean up this spill.residential neighborhood. This spill is clear 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Kathleen Nolan

04/16/2013

Kathleen Nolan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Recently, 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. The Arkansas spill also highlighted the use of this 65 year old pipeline to carry a heavier flow of far more corrosive oil under the houses of unaware residents. This is irresponsible and likely to occur again when the necessary maintenance is not done on something that cannot be seen and accounted for. How much farmland and water will allow to be destroyed for the profit of a few companies who will sell the oil overseas and off shore their money there as well? Where is the will of the majority of the American people and obligation to not destroy God's creation in this matter? Severe and unstable weather events are demonstrating the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and the need to alter our course immediately. In Kansas, we have move up and entire growing season and artic ice is melting much faster than expected. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Kathleen Outlaw

04/16/2013

Kathleen Outlaw

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please, Mr. President and Secretary Kerry, use this historic moment to change the course of energy history in this country. We know the horrible price we pay for big oil and coal. It's time to start a new chapter in American history. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Kathleen Rollins

04/16/2013

Kathleen Rollins

The State Department's initial report on Keystone XL is wrong about the pipeline's climate impact. In order to mine and pipe the tar sands, plus process the crude into usable fuel the pipeline would produce 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. We need less carbon, much less carbon, going into the atmosphere. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Kay S Stewart

04/16/2013

Kay S Stewart

Unless the consensus opinion, one formed from dozens of studies all of which suggest that climate change resulting from the Alberta tar sands extraction and facilitated by the Keystone XL pipeline, is entirely flawed and only the State Department assessment is accurate, then Keystone should be blocked. Even if there is an element of doubt on that consensus opinion, prudence suggests Keystone should be blocked. Even if the numbers of "jobs created" by Keystone is correct, that number is immaterial to the US economy and Keystone XL should be blocked. Even if there is a scintilla of doubt that climate change is induced by human activity (burning hydrocarbons chief amongst them), then prudence again suggests Keystone should be blocked. In fact, there is only one constituency that will benefit from Keystone XL and that is the petro-carbon industry. Does this administration want to leave this as its legacy; approving Keystone XL? Keith Comess MD

04/16/2013

Keith Comess MD

PLEASE STOP THE TAR SANDS PIPELINE! IT IS A DISGUSTING, OBVIOUS THREAT TO PEOPLE, THE PLANET, AND OUR NATIONAL SANITY.

04/16/2013

Ken Lauter

PLEASE STOP THE TAR SANDS PIPELINE! IT IS A DISGUSTING, OBVIOUS THREAT TO PEOPLE, THE PLANET, AND OUR NATIONAL SANITY.

04/16/2013

Ken Lauter

Hello Ms. Walker, I've already bothered you on the phone twice, so hope I'm not exceeding my reasonably allotted "time slice": Two quick follow-ons to our prior conversations, if I may: 1... As per prior, current deadline for KeystoneXL comment submission is Mon 22 April 2013. Can I assume that means comments will be accepted at HYPERLINK

["mailto:keystonecomments@state.gov"](mailto:keystonecomments@state.gov) keystonecomments@state.gov THRU the END of 22 April, Eastern Daylight Time ?? Trying to do some additional research before finalizing my comments; + just had a major winter storm over the weekend and got "diverted" (got 21 inches of new snow over the weekend (where is that "global warming" stuff when you need it)). 2... See from news reports that the Sierra Club and etc. are pushing to get KeystoneXL comment period extended from 45 days to 120 days. Any comment you can make, on chances comment extension will be granted ?? SIDEBAR, for the record: I hope the 22 April comment deadline stands; i.e.: NO extension. KeystoneXL may be the most-studied pipeline project in history; time to move (before our (so far) patient Canadian friends get tired of waiting, sign long-term delivery contracts with China, and build Northern Gateway Pipeline to Kitimat, BC). Cordially, Ken Sletten =====

04/16/2013

Ken Sletten

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. Canadians wouldn't allow a pipeline to be built to their west coast. So, why should we take the risk? Most of the jobs created will be temporary. So why should we take the risk? It seems that the refined oil won't even benefit Americans. It will benefit "Big Oil." So why should we take the risk? 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL . Sincerely, Kenneth Levine

04/16/2013

Kenneth Levine

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

PS: The oil industry insists that this Keystone pipeline is safe, but theirs are empty words. The Keystone pipeline WILL fail; it's not a question of IF, but WHEN. Moreover, when it does fail (like the Arkansas pipeline did), it will contaminate a vast aquifer that supplies water to the center of our country. Why do we insist on living in the past, with fossil fuels that we know are responsible for growing environmental problems? We've got to move forward with renewable and sustainable solutions to our energy needs. Sincerely, Kenneth W Johnson

04/16/2013

Kenneth W Johnson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I ask that the building of the Keystone XL for the piping of tar sands crude oil be blocked permanently. The corrosive dirty burning tar sands fuel will be another burden for the reduction of carbon intensive fuel to be dealt with. With all the yet to be developed potential of the North Dakota field it seems any tar sands from Canada is not needed. Sincerely, Kent Matheny

04/16/2013

Kent Matheny

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. There has not been sufficient proof that the transport of Canadian resources to US shipping facilities to facilitate movement to other nations has any positive impact on US energy needs. Sincerely, Kevin Hanlon

04/16/2013

Kevin Hanlon

Apr 16, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, President Obama: Sir, I have but one comment to add to this message. Mayflower, Arkansas. How much more of that damage do you want to foist upon our nation sir? Please consider the following points. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Sincerely, Kevin Nelson

04/16/2013

Kevin Nelson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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 JUST ONE MORE indication that we are NOT prepared to transport or clean up this much dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. It's a horrible form of crude as you well know. The Arkansas spill also highlighted many, many 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. The Keystone pipeline will be a very nasty mistake for America and must not be allowed to go forward. It's a lose-lose situation no matter how one looks at it when you look at the true facts. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and true need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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 certainly be erased if we also develop the tar sands. The entire process of obtaining tar sands oil is incredibly destructive to the environment in every single way I can think of, it's despicable and horrific at best!!! Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I DEMAND, millions of people demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the total rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Thank you. Sincerely, Kim Young

04/16/2013

Kim Young

I am writing to ask that you reject the building of the Keystone pipeline. This pipeline will carry 181,000,000 metric tons of carbon equivalents per year - an absolutely huge amount. ALL of the carbon in that pipeline will be emitted into the atmosphere as it is being burned for energy. We cannot continue to pour CO₂ into the atmosphere - we are already warming the earth to an unacceptable degree - if we continue on this road, we may not be able to turn this climate change around. Please stop this pipeline, and stop the equivalent of the emissions from 38,000,000 cars from pouring out into our environment. Kim Erickson A concerned citizen

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. This is enough. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline.

Sincerely, Kristen Russo

04/16/2013

Kristen Russo

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. 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. We are not being good stewards of our environmental heritage. We have a magnificent, beautiful country, and we are allowing special interests to destroy and despoil that heritage and the futures of our children virtually unchallenged. I demand that it stop and that accountability for these "accidents" and failures be immediate and punitive. Sincerely, Kristin Erman

04/16/2013

Kristin Erman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The Tar Sands oil spill which occurred in Arkansas last month should serve as a warning of the dangers of building another pipe line to carry this particularly dirty kind of oil. Please consider the environment and the future of our country and the rest of the world and do everything you can to limit production and transport of tar sands oil. Thank you. Sincerely, Lalah Kline

04/16/2013

Lalah Kline

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. As I understand it, most of this oil will be placed on ships for foreign delivery. Transport the oil to Vancouver if the Canadians want to sell it overseas. Sincerely, Lamar Neville

04/16/2013

Lamar Neville

The tarsand energy is not the clean energy independence that we need. We need to invest in the future, with cleaner and less greenhouse intense energy sources. Lawrence Emerson

04/16/2013

Larry

Spend all that money on solar and wind. I dare you. Laura Lynn Walsh

04/16/2013

Laura Lynn Walsh

I am writing in protest of the Keystone pipeline. It is time to move away from oil. It is time to invest in renewable energy....alternative sustainable energy options. Stand up and do the right thing! Laurie Adams

04/16/2013

Laurie Adams

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Furthermore, an activist sneaked into a preparation area for pipeline construction and took pictures from the insides of some of the welds in the pipes with light showing through. How safe would that be? Sincerely, Laurie Countryman

04/16/2013

Laurie Countryman

Please don't do this very bad thing. Look at Arkansas and what just happened there. We have other safer alternatives...solar, wind these are never going to run out or pollute our planet. Nukes have LOTS of cancer causing waste that we have no safe way of disposing off. There is always a better way. Listen to the people that live in the path of this pipeline...they don't want it or take the risk of something like in Arkansas happening. Just once hear the peoples voices and the oil industry's voice, money and empty promises.

04/16/2013

Leann Wanex

I am writing to urge you to reject the keystone XL pipeline extension. The analysis was clearly faulty (not surprising given that it was done by oil energy insiders). It will have a huge impact on global warming. I urge you to reject it and move towards renewable energy. Lesley Beatty

04/16/2013

Lesley Beatty

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. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I find it hard to believe that MY government is supporting this project ! I urge you to reject the pipeline, as I have in the past. I do not want to leave this for my children and their children to have to deal with ! Leslie Frelich

04/16/2013

Leslie Frelich

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. How much more poisoning of our neighbors' yards and our country's wildlife do we have to tolerate? You have the power. Do something about it! Sincerely, Leslie Kappes

04/16/2013

Leslie Kappes

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Keystone XL will only deliver a handful of jobs. I know jobs are important but you know what fast-growing industry is also creating jobs? Clean energy. I know Solyndra was a little bit of a disaster but trust me on this, investing in fossil fuels is going to get us nowhere fast. You guys need to reject Keystone and turn around and invest in clean energy like solar, wind, and geothermal, that's the way to create jobs without any risk of oil spills or global climate disruption. Do the right thing! Sincerely, Libby Egan

04/16/2013

Libby Egan

We don't have enough money now to take care of the people in our country, education, health, infrastructure, etc. We still have not helped all of the people hurt by Katrina much less hurt by the other storms to hit our people, The gulf will not ever be the same from the carelessness of BP and BP promised that they would never pollute our gulf or ocean for that matter. Why should we trust the Keystone. The Canadians don't. We can't afford what they will do to our country. NO KEYSTONE PIPELINE, PLEASE. PROTECT US FROM ANOTHER DISASTER AND EXPERIENCE HAS TAUGHT US THERE WILL BE ONE IF THE PIPELINE IS PUT THROUGH! Lida Lee Prchal

04/16/2013

Lida Lee Prchal

A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the Keystone XL 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. This project will not result in any significant economic stimulation for the United States either. The profits will go to a few companies in Canada & the US but will not amount to a significant amount of new jobs for Americans. It is for these reasons that the Keystone XL Pipeline project is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. The only responsible thing to do for America & Americans is to reject the Keystone XL Pipeline project. Lilyan Barrett

04/16/2013

Lilyan Barrett

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- linda fadem United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Linda Fadem

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- linda fadem United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Linda Fadem

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There's got to be a better way. Hey, there is a better way. Let us not fall to the pressures of corporate lobbying and money and do the right thing. Thank you for your clear thinking on so many issues. Thank you. Sincerely, Linda Frey

04/16/2013

Linda Frey

I strongly urge you to reject the Keystone Pipeline because, simply put, it does not support the long-term survival of the human species and the planet. The pipeline, while possibly providing some benefits to a few for a limited number of years, would come at a huge cost to the Earth and future generations. It profoundly and blatantly does not consider the state of scientific knowledge of climate science and global warming. The pipeline is projected to contribute significantly to an already disturbing imbalance in our global ecosystem. And it carries risks of leakage, pollution, and further environmental damage. The pipeline, practically and symbolically, supports our old mindset of exploitation of natural resources and disregard for the well-being of future generations. This arrogant, ignorant mindset is dangerous and immoral. We as Americans and the Obama Administration in particular have a responsibility to the world community to lead based on sound science. This starts with rejection of a massive pipeline project based on dirty fossil fuels that drain and pollute the Earth. We must listen to the consensus of scientists who have been sounding an alarm for several decades about climate change and educate ourselves about basic ecology and sustainability. We must act sensibly, intelligently, and with a profound sense of responsibility. We must have the courage to reject old habits and powerful influences and forge a new path based on a deeper understanding of the natural world. And we must invest in innovations and technologies that bring the Earth back into balance. President Obama talks about an "all of the above" strategy toward energy policy. This strategy may have worked 50 years ago when we had time and when we did not have huge economic and technological forces pushing the planet so far out of balance. We cannot ignore the basic scientific facts of climate change anymore. We are out of time. It is up to us now and it is up to President Obama to lead. He has the power to reject the pipeline and lead us to a new era of sustainability. If we disregard this responsibility at this key juncture in our lifetime, future generations will look back at us with great animosity because we failed to act when we had the chance. Linda Hart

04/16/2013

Linda Hart

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. With all respect please reject this giveaway to the fossil fuel industry! We all want a future for our kids and grand-kids and minds better than mine believe this project dooms us all. Sincerely, Linda Huff

04/16/2013

Linda Huff

I'm writing in the hope that the State Department will give serious consideration to the contents of the report just released today about the true carbon impact of the Keystone XL pipeline. It demonstrates how misleading the State Department's initial report was in suggesting that the climate impact of the pipeline would be minimal. The new report estimates that at least 181 million metric tons of CO₂e will be produced each year, comparable to the emissions produced by some 37 million cars. It makes dishearteningly little sense to work toward increasing automobile gas mileage only to have that progress, crucial for so many, wiped out for the financial benefit of so few. Nor does it make sense, considering the logistical and business realities of oil production and transport, to say that the oil will be pumped out at the same pace whether or not the Keystone XL pipeline is built. TransCanada wants this pipeline for a reason, and that reason clearly has little to do with a desire to serve America's national interest or the planet's best interests. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Linda Sanders

04/16/2013

Linda Sanders

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please don't allow this to pass. Time and time again we've seen the destruction. Please end it now. Also, how does a company get a no-fly zone over Mayflower, AR? The public should be aware of the dangers pipelines pose. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Lisa Cary

04/16/2013

Lisa Cary

The recent Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the Keystone XL pipeline severely underestimates the harm this project would do to the climate and to the lives of future generations. The Keystone XL would carry tar sands, not crude oil, from Canada to Texas. Tar sands oil production emits 82% more greenhouse gases than conventional oil production, according to an Environmental Protection Agency report. NASA's leading climate scientist, Dr. James Hansen, said that tar sands development would mean "game over" for efforts to control climate change. The Keystone XL is an export pipeline that would neither lower gas prices nor create many permanent jobs, in spite of the industry's claims. As a resident I am concerned about the impact of rising sea levels on our bay front communities, as well as about increasing drought and water shortage in California as temperatures rise. If President Obama is serious about fighting climate change, he must reject the Keystone XL project. The United States should be the leader in finding ways to reduce fossil fuel consumption, not lead in finding ways to burn new, more carbon-intensive fossil fuels. I urge Secretary of State Kerry to work with President Obama to reject the Keystone XL pipeline project and to shift the focus away from fossil fuels toward renewable energy sources. Sincerely, Lisa Evans

04/16/2013

Lisa Evans

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The recent tar sands pipeline spill in Mayflower, Arkansas is an indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. This 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. Though I understand the appeal of "develop every approach", it is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Lisa Jean Hoefner

04/16/2013

Lisa Jean Hoefner

I am writing to urge the State Department to stop the Keystone XL pipeline. We need to move away from these carbon-intensive fuels; not allow for more investment and infrastructure. I'd understand it if I was writing to the Bush State Department. But you are led by President Obama and Secretary Kerry. And you don't even have to be reelected. It would be a terrible mistake to give the pipeline the go-ahead. Climate change is one of the greatest threats ever faced by humankind. As the largest per capita contributors to GHG emissions, we need to make decisions that are on the side of reversing climate change, not accelerating it. Thank you for your consideration. Lisa Shulock

04/16/2013

Lisa Shulock

As the world becomes increasingly aware not only of how destructive American energy policies are but that the US govt knowingly, intentionally and despite all warnings foisted additional damage to the planet from the tar sands, what will people think of us? How will our children ever be safe from the wrath of people trying to survive these disasters? We will be pariahs. Lise Van Susteren

04/16/2013

Lise Van Susteren

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Liz Wright

04/16/2013

Liz Wright

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. I strongly urge you to reject the pipeline in favor of supporting wind and solar energy alternatives and more research. surely we have can use our technological advancements to move forward in taking responsibility for our planet and its limited non renewable resources. Wake up! Do the right thing please for so many reasons for the future of America and the earth. please stop the Keystone XL pipline.

04/16/2013

E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a volunteer on both of your presidential campaigns and a contributor to all of your Federal campaigns including Sec Kerry's Senate campaigns, I implore you to stop the Keystone Pipeline. Our climate change is bad enough whether drought, floods, severe storms etc. Do we have to desecrate the rest of the environment too? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Lois Kennedy

04/16/2013

Lois Kennedy

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Loretta Bates

04/16/2013

Loretta Bates

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I also am writing to implore you to protect the environment (clean air and water for starters) and the quality of life of American citizens by opposing the Keystone XL pipeline. Sincerely, Louise Fabrykiewicz

04/16/2013

Louise Fabrykiewicz

FYI – comments for the record. This email is UNCLASSIFIED. From: Pascual, Carlos Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 5:53 PM To: Taylor, William B; Cekuta, Robert F; Jones, Kerri-Ann Cc: ENR_StaffAssistants Subject: RE: EPRINC Comments on State Dept Draft Keystone XL EIS Bill – this should go through OES. CP Carlos Pascual Special Envoy and Coordinator International Energy Affairs Energy Resources Bureau U.S. Department of State From: Taylor, William B Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 4:02 PM To: Pascual, Carlos; Cekuta, Robert F Cc: ENR_StaffAssistants Subject: RE: EPRINC Comments on State Dept Draft Keystone XL EIS Many thanks, Gina. Bob, I'd be interested in your thoughts. This email is UNCLASSIFIED. From: Amos, Gina F On Behalf Of Pascual, Carlos Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 4:01 PM To: Taylor, William B; Cekuta, Robert F Cc: ENR_StaffAssistants Subject: RE: EPRINC Comments on State Dept Draft Keystone XL EIS Ambassador Taylor: Has Carlos responded to your email? Yes, we will handle. Copying PDAS Cekuta, main POC in our office for KXL. Gina Gina Amos | Personal Assistant to Carlos Pascual ENR/FO 4428 From: Taylor, William B Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 2:00 PM To: Pascual, Carlos Subject: FW: EPRINC Comments on State Dept Draft Keystone XL EIS Do you handle this? This email is UNCLASSIFIED. From: Lucian Pugliaresi Sent: Saturday, April 13, 2013 6:33 PM To: Taylor, William B Subject: EPRINC Comments on State Dept Draft Keystone XL EIS FYI, Lou Lucian Pugliaresi President Energy Policy Research Foundation, Inc.

04/16/2013

Lucian Pugliaresi

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. The most important issue for the future of our children is global warming. I ask that this nation take leadership in the world now to acknowledge this and begin plans for extending green energy sources. 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. Sincerely, Lucille Brothers

04/16/2013

Lucille Brothers

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This administration has stood silent on climate change long enough. Now that climate change is accepted as it should be, show us that you are willing and able to put your money where your mouth is. We are hoping that you are still able to run this country, to take back the power from big oil and big money. Sincerely, Lucretia Fairchild

04/16/2013

Lucretia Fairchild

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Obama how dare you threaten US communities and our environment to make Trans Canada or any corporation richer. How dare you put corporate profits before the health of our environment and US citizens? Remember this you and your family breathe the same air and live on the same planet as the rest of us. What will your children do and where will they go when the ground is too polluted to sustain us and the air is unbeatable? Sincerely, Luna Woden

04/16/2013

Luna Woden

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. This message was created by the Sierra Club and while I could change the words a bit to personalize it, it also highlights the points that I myself consider to be important. Additionally, in southern California right now, marine biologists are seeing over a thousand sick and dying baby sea lions washing ashore, and the only reason they can come up with for this first-time phenomenon is that their normal food sources are not available and they are unable to nourish themselves in the way they have done in this area for centuries. This is directly related to climate change. Please stop incentivizing the consumption of fossil fuels! Please stop ignoring all the warning signs that this course of action is WRONG. Sincerely, Lynn Nebus

04/16/2013

Lynn Nebus

Dear State Dept., Please don't endorse the XL Pipeline. It isn't good for this country-- I don't understand the motives of a government department in facing down the scientists-- just to make big business in Canada and Louisiana happy? So few jobs for us. Please don't do it. Lynn Witherington

04/16/2013

Lynn Witherington

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed. In fact, we cannot afford the true costs of this pipeline. What it carries is too dirty to clean up and it keeps us focussed on a fuel source we must move away from NOW. I urge you to stop plans for the XL pipeline. Lynne Hadley

04/16/2013

Lynne Hadley

We are writing to urge the State Department to reject the Keystone Pipeline. The new report on this pipeline is overwhelmingly negative on its environmental impact and should be an eye opener to halt this project immediately. We cannot continue to ignore the adverse consequences that this project would have. 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. M. Katy and Bob Meyers

04/16/2013

M Katy Meyers

Dear President Obama, This is so messed up and you know it. -- madeline dipaola United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Madeline Dipaola

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Please do your best to stop Keystone and the tar sands. Our climate can't take much more damage at the hands of humankind. We have to stop ruining the planet and save it instead. As good stewards of Mother Earth it is our duty to protect Her ecosystems and all life on Earth. I am confident you will do the right thing and save our planet from further destruction at the hands of wicked profit seekers. Thank you. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Manuel Gurule

04/16/2013

Manuel Gurule

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. You people are absolute fuckin' idiots.....but we are even bigger idiots for letting it slide through all this time...you will destroy this planet and all for a new shiny car and a fat bank account...God's keepin' an eye on you few that control all this....I got a feelin' that you'll be up to your necks in tar for eternity.....comforting feeling, huh? Sincerely, Marc Mallen

04/16/2013

Marc Mallen

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Hurry up and reject Keystone XL! Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill 85,000 gallons of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. The American people re demanding climate leadership from this administration. That has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. I also request that this comment and all other comments be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Sincerely, Marcy Matasick

04/16/2013

Marcy Matasick

Dear State Department, Obama Administration, or anyone who will listen and act in good conscience: In May, I will be celebrating my graduation from college and the beginning of life in the real world and all those other sopping-with-sentiment phrases about becoming an adult and leaving the nest and forging your own path. I'm writing to you today because it's really hard to visualize a long and happy future in a world in which global climate change makes the very landscape on which we live an unknown variable. Continuing to ignore the scientific fact of climate change and peak oil in our national policy makes my generation's future wildly uncertain and, frankly, frightening. I believe that building the Keystone XL Pipeline, which will spew the equivalent of 9 million cars-worth of emissions into our already irreparable atmosphere and commit our country to non-renewable, dirty energy for the next decade, is a terrible choice for the United States to make. Not only will it have the potential--indeed, the likelihood--of poisoning farm land and fresh water along its route, it will continue to tie the United States' energy needs to fossil fuels, which are so clearly a resource of the past, at the exact moment when the country ought to be developing new and innovative clean energy alternatives. The Keystone XL Pipeline is not an investment in my generation's future--it is a deep harm to it, and a near-sighted, ill-advised, and callous one at that. As politicians and lawmakers theoretically tasked with the safekeeping and well-being of American citizens, do you truly believe that it is in the best interest of all of your children to keep the United States dependent on dwindling supplies of oil or to contribute to the climate change that has caused such devastating weather patterns in the past few years? Please--for my generation and my generation's future, say no to the Keystone XL Pipeline. Thank you.

Margaret Barthel

04/16/2013

Margaret Barthel

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department I stayed out of this discussion for months because I wanted to inform myself as much as possible regarding the pros and cons. I am no longer on the fence. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Margaret Eisenberger

04/16/2013

Margaret Eisenberger

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Approving the KXL will cause a chain reaction leading to more and more use of tar sands oil: if the pipeline is built, the argument will be, "we spent all this money building this pipeline, so now we HAVE to develop (more) tar sands to make the original investment pay off" If tar sands oil is to be developed, let it be shipped by rail, a safer and more reversible transport method. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I expect climate leadership from this administration, and that MUST begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Margaret Helming

04/16/2013

Margaret Helming

To: John Kerry, Secretary of State Please Mr. Secretary, Permit the Keystone Pipeline to be built! Ask the Holy Spirit for guidance to do the right thing. You will be forever grateful if you follow His will, here and in eternity. Margaret Talbot

04/16/2013

Margaret Talbot

Please do not approve the Keystone pipeline. I know there are all kinds of political and economic aspects to it, but none of that will matter when there is a rupture and much of the country has contaminated water. Not to mention the wildlife that will be affected. It's just not worth it for a few jobs. Thank you.

04/16/2013

Marge Koehler

Please do not approve the Keystone pipeline. I know there are all kinds of political and economic aspects to it, but none of that will matter when there is a rupture and much of the country has contaminated water. Not to mention the wildlife that will be affected. It's just not worth it for a few jobs. Thank you.

04/16/2013

Marge Koehler

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please see the opinion piece by professor Homer-Dixon in the NY Times April 1, 2013. He makes a very compelling case for why this project is bad for the environment AND bad for democracy. He concludes the article as follows: Mr. Obama must do what's best for America. But stopping Keystone XL would be a major step toward stopping large-scale environmental destruction, the distortion of Canada's economy and the erosion of its democracy. Thomas Homer-Dixon, who teaches global governance at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, is the author of "The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity and the Renewal of Civilization." How many environmental disasters do we have to suffer before we come to our senses? We must protect our well-being and safety and health. This pipeline is a clear threat to our safety and our environment and it needs to be stopped in its tracks. Sincerely, Margie Esola

04/16/2013

Margie Esola

I have noticed the frequency of oil spills from pipelines recently. If the care the oil companies are taking while they await new opportunities to expand their markets is SO CARELESS, what are we to expect from their professionalism and inspection of the running pipelines once they get a full clearance to operate? At the Arkansas spill, one oil company work was reported to have said, "It is not our responsibility to maintain and inspect the pipeline". Well, I ask, whose responsibility is it to maintain and inspect so that oil is not dumped into housing developments and people's basements? This "I want the profits but I don't want the responsibility" is not helping Big Oil's case before the American People. We want to be safe from oil spills. Marguerite Val Tara King

04/16/2013

Marguerite Val Tara King

One of President Obama's top environmental achievements has been improved fuel efficiency standards. These standards were put in place because cars and the CO₂ they produce have significant environmental impact. Specifically, vehicle emissions are a huge contributor to global climate change. So if the administration believes legislating the efficiency of said cars is important because of significant environmental impacts, how can the impact of a pipeline with emissions equivalent to 38 million cars possibly be "negligible"? The State Department's report is blatantly incorrect. It's a deception of the American people. Actually giving Keystone the go-ahead would be an absolute betrayal of the citizens of this country and our common right to an environment that can sustain us. Reject Keystone. Mari McClelland

04/16/2013

Mari McClelland

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As the spills over the past month prove, we do not currently have the technology or the political or corporate will to ensure that an accident won't happen and that the environment will not be negatively affected. We do not need more disasters. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Marian Meyers

04/16/2013

Marian Meyers

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Sincerely, Marie Driscoll

04/16/2013

Marie Driscoll

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I urge our elected leaders to stand up to the greed of big business and the need to dangle jobs and improved standards of living as their bait and oppose the Keystone XL pipeline. We have already seen time and again the environmental damage in pristine areas that takes decades from which to recover as a result of oil and gas operations. 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. Stand up and say NO to the Keystone SL pipeline. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Marie Johansen

04/16/2013

Marie Johansen

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I wish I had the magic words that would set your minds to reject the plan for the Keystone XL pipeline which would bring more problems for our health and the health of our climate. I know that I am but one little voice crying out to you to listen to us and not to give in to Big Business. There is so much evidence in front of our eyes that not standing in opposition to this Keystone XL pipeline and tar sands will open us to more damage to our wonderful country. In my own state "fracing" is running wild with no control. My heart hurts for Wisconsin and the communities which will effort of Big Business to fill its pockets without consideration of "little guy". Please oppose this Keystone XL pipeline. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Marilouise Durkin

04/16/2013

Marilouise Durkin

I haven't written before on the Keystone XL pipe line but the new report that equates this pipeline's greenhouse gas effects with 51 coal fired plants finally moves me to take this step. 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. Marilyn D. McNabb

04/16/2013

Marilyn D. McNabb

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is time for climate leadership from this administration to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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.

Sincerely, Marjorie Parkis

04/16/2013

Marjorie Parkis

Please wake up!!! A child at the age of five, when given the information that is widely known to all of us, would not approve such a mindless, greedy endeavor. It is quite simple now, approve this toxic death trap to fill the pockets of delusional non-thinkers and watch the possibility of a future burn up like their concern for the well-being of all mankind. Turn this down and at least give humans a bit of a chance to breathe clean air, drink fresh water and maybe grow food that could sustain a civilization. Use your heart and look at a child. Your decision will now be very simple. Wake up!!! Mark Anderson

04/16/2013

Mark Anderson

I am writing because the Keystone pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Mark Catoe

04/16/2013

Mark Catoe

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Why is your government staff even thinking about renegeing on your original decision to not allow the Keystone XL pipeline? I voted for you because I thought you would do your best to protect our environment. I worked for 33 years as a fish biologist with the State of Washington. I handled all the environmental permits required to do for in our precious salmon and trout streams. One of the most frustrating experience is to have to deal with oil spills into these streams - the place where most of the oil spills end up (either indirectly from a burst pipeline on land or directly when they burst beneath the bed of a stream. Why should all of the American citizens living along the XL route be expected to suffer all the consequences of oil spills for a product that gives them no economic benefit???? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Mark Schuller

04/16/2013

Mark Schuller

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I'm disgusted. ***** 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Marlen Beach

04/16/2013

Marlen Beach

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. There is no way to stop these things from happening apparently - there has to be a better way. We have brilliant minds - get them moving. Thank you, Sincerely, Marsha Hentzel

04/16/2013

Marsha Hentzel

Apr 16, 2013 Secretary of State John Kerry Dear Secretary of State Kerry, I urge you to reject TransCanada's risky Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. This dirty pipeline poses a threat to the environment, our climate, and American families. 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. 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. 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. 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. I was encouraged by your recent words on the dangers of global climate change. By rejecting the tar sands pipeline you can go a long way toward reducing those dangers. Sincerely, Martha Kline

04/16/2013

Martha Kline

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Dear President Obama, you made a solemn promise in your State of the Union address to take steps to protect the environment. You have it in your power to show the world that these were not just empty words and that you are indeed serious about tackling pollution and climate change problems. Your children and grandchildren will respect you and be grateful for it, as will millions of children and grandchildren in the US, Canada and around the world. Sincerely, Martin Karcher

04/16/2013

Martin Karcher

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department We don't need this type of oil...if you can call it that. There is way too much refining required for viability. PLEASE RECONSIDER....NO KEYSTONE!!! Sincerely, Mary Goetz

04/16/2013

Mary Goetz

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Don't give in on this. Thank you. Sincerely, Mary Jane Stout

04/16/2013

Mary Jane Stout

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. With the commitment you have made to solving the climate crisis in your inaugural address, now is the time to take bold action and stand firm on opposing the Keystone XL pipeline. The tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spilled nearly 10,000 barrels of crude into a residential area. Given the age of the pipeline, it is appalling to think that those who constructed the pipeline many years ago had no plan for dealing with a spill. When the only solution to the spill is to soak up the oil with paper towels it begs the question of how we would deal with a spill from a pipeline that is 10 times the size. Before we embark on building any additional pipelines, we must be prepared for the impact spills will have on our citizens and communities. We have not yet cleaned up from the spill along the Kalamazoo River nearly 3 years ago. It is unconscionable that we even consider the construction of the KXL pipeline that will run along aquifers that are the only source of clean water for local communities. The process of extracting oil from the tar sands uses more energy than it produces, causing the earth to warm at an even greater rate than it already is. If we are to have any chance of avoiding more extreme weather events like Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy, we MUST put a stop to this practice immediately. We can't afford the loss of life, homes and livelihoods nor can we afford the costs of restoring property. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Mary Jenny

04/16/2013

Mary Jenny

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to oppose permitting of the Keystone XL pipeline. The underlying assumption of the EIS is that the tar sands oil is going to be developed whether the pipeline is approved or not, and we strongly reject that assumption as near-sighted, selfish, and mind-bogglingly destructive. It's inconceivable that the richest and most powerful country the world has ever known could fail to take leadership on carbon emissions, the greatest challenge we will ever face. We can no longer accept an assumption that every last drop of oil will be developed, no matter the costs to climate stability and the concomitant effects on natural and human systems worldwide. It's time for the strength and imagination to state that some carbon must stay in the ground if we are to have a livable planet into the future. 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. It's time for the US government to do the latter. Sincerely, Mary Sealing

04/16/2013

Mary M Sealing

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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.

Sincerely, Mary McMackin

04/16/2013

Mary McMackin

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to oppose permitting of the Keystone XL pipeline. The underlying assumption of the EIS is that the tar sands oil is going to be developed whether the pipeline is approved or not, and we strongly reject that assumption as near-sighted, selfish, and mind-bogglingly destructive. It's inconceivable that the richest and most powerful country the world has ever known could fail to take leadership on carbon emissions, the greatest challenge we will ever face. We can no longer accept an assumption that every last drop of oil will be developed, no matter the costs to climate stability and the concomitant effects on natural and human systems worldwide. It's time for the strength and imagination to state that some carbon must stay in the ground if we are to have a livable planet into the future. 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. It's time for the US government to do the latter. Sincerely, Mary Sealing

04/16/2013

Mary Sealing

Apr 16, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, Keystone is an horrific project; in the wake of the Exxon spill in Arkansas it is astonishing that this proposal is even under consideration. And as global warming accelerates, it's essential that we dramatically reduce energy consumption and switch to renewables. Keystone would be a devastating blow, and I ask that you block it permanently. Sincerely, Mary A. Van Kerrebroek

04/16/2013

Mary Van Kerrebroek

Dear Sir/Madam, 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. 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. The United States Government should be focused on expanding renewable energy, eliminating tax incentives for companies investing in non-renewable energy sources, and acknowledging that GHG emissions, both historical and future, will have the greatest impact on all of civilization SINCE THE DAWN OF AGRICULTURE. Best regards, Mathew Lachesnez-Heude

04/16/2013

Mathew Lachesnez-Heude

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You know the arguments. Sustainability comes first. What's the equation for sustainability? Social + Economic + Environmental variables must all be considered. There is no sustainable economy without balancing this equation. Keystone XL is the anti-thesis of sustainability. Do not bow to the dollars. We can do better for our energy future. Stop Keystone XL.
"We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children." Matt O'Reilly

Sincerely, Matt O'Reilly

04/16/2013

Matt O'Reilly

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. A new report fully accounting 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! Hello? That's equivalent to the tailpipe emissions of over 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. In fact, the pipeline is dangerous, destructive, and another attempt to enrich a few powerful interests at the expense of the whole rest of the world. That is wrong, wrong, wrong. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Matt Maguire

04/16/2013

Matt Maguire

Please do not build this pipeline. It will destroy this beautiful country. This oil is going to other countries and will not help Americans. Thanks.

04/16/2013

Matthew Hooker

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Reading the words that follow, written by the Sierra Club staff, I can only add that I am upset that much much more isn't being done to ween our country off oil. Our air and water and our entire planet can't take pollution like this, and our country needs to be a leader in this area, not a straggler. I concur with the paragraphs below and only hope that you help us make this country a clean and healthy one, so that my two kids can grow up and create their lives free of the numerous negative consequences of oil and its production. (See below for Sierra Club info) 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Matthew Smith

04/16/2013

Matthew Smith

I've recently been to enough public hearings to know that the message I'm writing will be clouded and obscured by other interests before it even gets the attention of any inquisitive eyes. I, like many others fighting for a sustainable future, know that you have made up your mind before you even considered the facts that are brought before you. I'm hopeful that writing this will be more than another message in a bottle. How many have you received? I used to wonder, how many messages does it take? The good news is that there are many good people out there, that now, are doing more than taking time from their schedules to write messages like this. People are now knocking on their neighbor's door, sharing this information, creating connections. People are now organizing. This pipeline project has been studied and analyzed by a few groups. The facts are out there, and while the numbers are tainted and contradicting, our message is clear. We do not agree with the State Department's acceptance of the continuance of the pipeline project. Will you, fellow inhabitant of this world, agree with us? Will you stand up against this senseless, destructive project with us?

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Not only is the issue climate change, but also preservation of the integrity of the environment. I consider the earth pristine--even where it has become naturally despoiled. Nature's own path of degradation has benefits for the areas that have become degraded. It is all too easy for man to cause damage to the earth; we have witnessed so many instances of this. And the earth will not heal itself under these conditions. It will take centuries for the environment to repair itself, if repair is possible. Putting a pipeline across enormous territory is a reckless act; one that can have immediate and irreparable consequences. We can't create more of this earth. We are stewards of it, and we need to seriously respect our responsibilities as stewards. Please join me in rejecting the Keystone XL. Let's put the financial resources that would be invested in it towards clean energy infrastructure, instead. Sincerely, Mel Mackler

04/16/2013

Mel Mackler

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Besides potentially harming our environment and water supplies, the pipeline fuels will not be used in our country. We are a pass through to the gulf where it will be shipped to foreign countries while contaminating our country. Sincerely, Melanie Deville

04/16/2013

Melanie Deville

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 Keystone Pipeline XL once built will have no effect on climate change IF nothing ever flows through it. Building the pipeline itself has no major effect. And it would seem that is all you analyzed in your environmental review. How can you say that providing an export opportunity for this toxic oil has no effect? And the climate effects of producing this oil in Alberta is hardly a small effect. Production will likely increase if Keystone makes it easier for Canada to export oil to China. This pipeline will provide few benefits for anyone in the U.S. Are you folks oblivious to the impacts of climate change on this planet? Do you have any climate change experts (not Michael Crichton) on your analysis panel? Please reject this pipeline. Leave the oil in the ground for future use, perhaps in a more environmentally sound manner. Leave it as a future source for raw materials for the production of the many items that are made from plastic that is derived from oil. Encourage China to develop alternative energy, instead of providing them ready access to this source of polluting, and climate changing oil. Thank you. Melanie Miller

04/16/2013

Melanie Miller

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. 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. I love my home and 4 generations of my family have lived here. The farmers here feed the world. The rivers and streams feed into the Mississippi Delta, the large aquifer that supports most of the nation. Please protect it like it deserves or it will be damaged beyond repair. Sincerely, Melissa Kaegel

04/16/2013

Melissa Kaegel

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. I also respectfully ask you sir, to remember those individuals that are having their land taken away through eminent domaine. I believe in you President Obama and I feel you are doing your best to lead our beautiful country in the right direction with a balance of clean environmental objectives as well as having healthy economies and resources. I voted for you because I believe you when you say you are working to help the middle class. I am in that middle class. I have a college degree (obviously not in writing!). I work hard and love my job working with people with disabilities. I see people struggle everyday. I see the pride they have in their homes regardless if they have a small apartment or come from a sprawling family ranch. Having to give up part of their home is difficult. It is devastating having to give it up and know there is a possibility it will be ruined and not for the good of our country, but towards the greed of a company in another country. I am not convinced the benefits from this pipeline outweigh the risks to the people and the land of this wonderful country. I pray that you are not as well.

Sincerely, Melissa Martin-Schwarz

04/16/2013

Melissa Martin-Schwarz

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I really, really don't want to see approval of that damned dirty pipeline. Please take a look at this graphic: <http://www.desmogblog.com/2013/04/11/infographic-13-oil-spills-30-days-dirty-business-moving-oil> We need to concentrate on renewable energy sources and leave what little oil is left in the ground - in the ground! Petroleum is necessary for so many other things its a shame to waste it on automobiles and other forms of transportation and heating, not to mention plastics, the scourge of the oceans. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Merry Wright

04/16/2013

Merry Wright

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We don't need Keystone XL to deliver more oil across our Country. With very little to gain and a lot to lose why is this still on the table. Sweep it off!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Michael Frazier

04/16/2013

Michael Frazier

The State Department's report on Keystone XL is very wrong. The carbon footprint of the pipeline found that it will exceed 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent yearly. That is equal to emissions from almost 38 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. The pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Michael Hevron

04/16/2013

Michael Hevron

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I think it is clear that tar sands oil pipelines are a huge environmental disaster waiting to happen. Why would we invest time and money to create this pipeline when there are many areas to explore in energy production like wind or Solar power, or Thorium nuclear reactors, which I believe they are working on in India. We can not let the hurting economy let these people bully America by threatening us with an ultimatum like "let us hurt the environment or we'll hurt your economy" like they are doing. Stand up to these bullies, that's why we elected you. Sincerely, Michael Johnston

04/16/2013

Michael Johnston

Dear State Department - I FULLY SUPPORT BUILDING the KEYSTONE PIPELINE !!! Not building the pipeline would be idiotic - weaning our addiction to Middle East and Venezuelan OIL is IN the BEST interest of the US... The oil will be produced and sent to China anyway. - Having the US / North America becoming Energy independence clearly out weigh ANY PERCEIVED environmental impact - The flawed study sighted on this site is awful ---- First TAR sands are NOT frac'd but mined - after the lie - how can anyone believe anything in the biased study.. Have some REAL facts before commenting.. Mike Dilli

04/16/2013

Mike Dilli

Keystone XL pipeline will seriously harm efforts to combat climate change. The short term benefits are not worth the long term costs. Keystone XL pipeline should not be built. Mike Linvill

04/16/2013

Mike Linvill

I bought an American made tesla electric car specifically to avoid needing more filthy oil from around the globe. Tar sands "fuel" is the absolute worst fuel I can imagine. The XL can lead to nothing but disasters for years to come. Please use common sense and reject this idiotic project. Mike vinciquerra

04/16/2013

Mike Vinciquerra

I am opposed to the Ketstone XL pipeline. Climate change needs to be dealt with. Bringing this toxic oil to market dose not contribute to the effort to reverse climate change. Mike White

04/16/2013

Mike White

I am incorporating a report that was issued today, ("Cooking the Books: The True Climate Impact of Keystone XL" Oil Change International Oil Change International with input and review by the Natural Resources Defense Council, HYPERLINK "<http://350.org/>" 350.org, Environment America, National Wildlife Federation, Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club and Greenpeace. April 16th, 2013. HYPERLINK "<http://act.350.org/go/3001?t=6&akid=3007.858560.cZiolb>" priceofoil.org/2013/04/16/cooking-the-books-the-true-climate-impact-of-keystone-xl/), by this reference into this comment. 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. 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.

04/16/2013

Mimi Newton

Hello, I strongly urge you to reject the pipeline on economic, ethical, and human rights grounds. It will destroy areas of important lands, poison communities, and damage the climate beyond repair. Please, for the sake of Americans everywhere, dont fall prey to the monied industries lobbying for this, and do your job- protect the public! morgan catalina

04/16/2013

Morgan Catalina

The longer we delay decarbonizing our economy, the harder it will be. The time to do this was decades ago, but having failed to act then, the next best time is NOW. Every investment in non-sustainable energy now is capital that is not available for the transition to a sustainable energy future...a transition that will challenge us under the best of circumstances (which is why we perpetually put it off). The decision before us now is Keystone XL. Please say NO and send the message to investors to invest instead in a sustainable energy economy that won't create climate chaos. Mr. Gerry L Todd

04/16/2013

Mr. Gerry L Todd

PLEASE! DO NOT ALLOW THE KEYSTONE TO MOVE FORWARD! IT IS AN ENVIRONMENTAL DISASTER IN THE MAKING. THE USA SHOULD BE LEADING THE CHARGE IN THE EFFORTS TO STOP DESTROYING OUR PLANET- AND YOU ARE IN A POSITION TO BE THAT LEADER! The pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Barbara A. Cline

04/16/2013

Ms Barbara Barbara A. Cline Aia

A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the XL 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. That means that the pipeline is the wrong way to go. How much courage does the State Department actually have? Our future is in your hands -- especially the future of my grandchildren. Ms. Nancy Brandt

04/16/2013

Ms. Nancy Brandt

Attn: Genevieve Walker U.S. Dept. of State Rom 2726, 2021 C. Street. NW Washington, DC 20520 Attn: Comments Regarding Keystone XL SEIS northern segment Dear State Department Representative, I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). -- The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. -- 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. - TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. \- 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. -- 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. -- 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. -- The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. -- Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer. -- During TransCanada's initial claims regarding its Presidential permit, it noted that it would create from 20,000 to tens of thousands of jobs. This has not occurred even fractionally in -- According to the SEIS, only 35 permanent jobs would be created and 15 temporary jobs for pipeline inspection, repair and maintenance would result as a part of this pipeline's approval. -- 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. -- 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. -- Tar sands crude constituents are highly corrosive, acidic and easily ignitable, even by the spark of a tool. -- 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. -- 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. -- 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. -- 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. -- TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline product is meant for export. 60% of the oil refined on the gulf coast is already destined for export.

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. The draft review is dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. It concedes the climate-altering impacts of tar sands oil, but claims they need not be considered. It also fails to adequately consider the risks of tar sands oil spills along the pipeline route. In fact, producing tar sands oil causes far more global warming pollution than regular crude oil production, and its chemical properties increase the likelihood of leaks and spills, but neither of these environmental threats was properly addressed in the draft review. This pipeline would transport a river of the most destructive oil on the planet straight through America's heartland to the Gulf Coast for export. Not only would it threaten communities along its pathway, but would drive more climate change which endangers us all. I call on you to revise your department's review. 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. 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. Sincerely, Ms. Myra Delay

04/16/2013

Myra Delay

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Dear President Obama, this second term is your best chance to realize your election promises. Please make part of your legacy the rejection of Keystone XL, in support of the environment! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Nada Ballator

04/16/2013

Nada Ballator

I am writing because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed. You in the State Department know the true impact of what the Keystone XL will carry. It is the enormous financial gain for Canadians with interest in the pipeline and those in Texas with a financial interest in those huge new refineries waiting for what the pipeline will disgorge. Who has the political courage to tell us the truth? That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. *Muriel and Roger Willey

04/16/2013

Name*muriel And Roger Willey

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. If you let this pipeline go through, any spill or environmental disaster will be on your shoulders and conscience. You will be the one to sign the permission to let this dirty oil come through our country and pollute our environment. You will be the one who allows this dirty oil to flow through our land and be refined in our refineries, and get into the cars and motors that pollute our air and cause more global warming. It will be on your back if this goes through and harms us all. Do you really want to have this burden on your soul? Let's do clean energy- you will sleep better at night knowing that you have truly made this world a cleaner place to live and breath in. Sincerely, Nan Corliss

04/16/2013

Nan Corliss

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department To date, this administration has done woefully little to protect our environment, and wildlife. Perhaps if extracting tar sands and fracking was done with non lethal chemicals, properly and full disclosure we might be onto something. However, that is not happening as extraction entities now have the perfect solution for getting rid of toxic chemicals, liquids and mystery substances with impunity. The most important resource(s) we have on this planet are not fuels. It IS potable water, and land that is not contaminated with poisons and toxins that leech into our food sources, along with breathable, clean air. We are failing on all these points. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. These fuels are useless to us if everything that keeps us alive has been contaminated. Sincerely, Nan Towle

04/16/2013

Nan Towle

A new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the KXL 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. Don't doom us! The pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Nancy Bilheimer

04/16/2013

Nancy Bilheimer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. What legacy are you leaving for the children and the grand children? What will history say of you? Are you the one who allowed destruction of their world beyond redemption or are you the one man who decided to stop the evil being done to our planet? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Nancy Bryant

04/16/2013

Nancy Bryant

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I know I've written before--this is important to me and I think to the whole country. 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. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. Please show climate leadership, which begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Thank you for considering our future instead of the short-term economic gains from the Keystone XL. Sincerely, Nancy Vandenberg

04/16/2013

Nancy Vandenberg

4/17/13 Please register my official "NO" to the Keystone XL running through the length of this country, placing all in its way with the danger of exploding pipelines spilling the dirtiest oil that's left in the earth all over other ecosystems including water supplies - polluting and poisoning and killing. No clean up can get things back the way they were. We've already had quite a few of these spills in which there seems to be a real effort by the corporate powers to cover up as much as possible. Our national media is not reporting much about them. "NO" to the Keystone XL which requires dangerous fracking practices and is already turning parts of Canada and the U.S. into scenes from Hell, leaving many communities with unsafe water supplies. Public agencies that are supposed to protect the water and the citizens are not paying any attention to these issues. Why would we do this? The only reason is for corporate profits. "NO" to the carbon dioxide and other gases that will be liberated and spilled into our atmosphere, ensuring that global warming will continue only at a faster pace until we have gone past the tipping point and we are on a downward spiral. And why are we doing all this when we won't even be using this dirty oil here in this country but exporting it? And we know who will keep the profits - none will stay in this country to benefit our citizens, or will be used to clean up the messes that are made along the way. When will our government start looking out for our natural resources, for the 99% of us who live with dwindling safe resources, and for the future of our children. It is way past time to close the door on a carbon future and make a belated but big push to develop sustainable fuel for our future. The reports issued so far have been funded by those who want to protect their "fossil fuel" wealth and keep the \$\$\$ coming in. These profits will then most likely be placed in off shore accounts. So "NO", "NO" "NO" to the Keystone XL -- Listen to the citizens of this country instead of the corporations. Or listen to the scientists who are trying to speak truth to power. Nancy Wagner

04/16/2013

Nancy Wagner

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. If you truly care about climate change and its inevitable effects on this country and more importantly on this world, then you MUST deny this pipeline. Stop talking about the change you're going to bring, and do something about it. Give up greedy, profit-hunger initiatives and please help to create a world that our children and grandchildren can survive in happily. Sincerely, Nathaniel Crockett

04/16/2013

Nathaniel Crockett

You need to draw a line in the sand on this pipeline. It's not about marginal economic gains and marginal environmental losses. It's about sending a message that the Keystone way of development, the tar sands way of development, the dirty way of development is a relic of the past, and has no place in this century's America. You can make a new, cleaner, stronger energy system a reality - stand up and stop this pipeline. Neil Stenhouse

04/16/2013

Neil Stenhouse

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. I oppose the Keystone pipeline, and as good national policy, I think that we, as a country, should oppose it as well. Nicholas Judson

04/16/2013

Nicholas Judson

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department As an Environmental Engineering student, I know without a shadow of doubt that the Keystone XL is a major disaster waiting to happen should it be built. 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. Additionally, 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Nicholas Yonezawa

04/16/2013

Nicholas Yonezawa

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is my understanding that the tar sands sludge, pushed through the Keystone pipeline that will transect the midsection of the United States of America from border to border, will be plastics grade and not used to create energy but, instead, eventually, will use energy in the form of more transport in ships to foreign lands and to being processed into plastic goods. I could say, Let Canada build its own pipeline to the Pacific. It's closer. I wouldn't want that either. Rather the US Midwest than the pristine features of Canada despoiled. Better train transport in either case, using existing rails or new parallels. Better still, forget the tar sands. The money wasted on building such a pipeline and its branches, the further cost of maintenance and emergency leak fixes (tar sand sludge grinds away at the inside of the pipes and will cause weakness in the pipe walls over time and inevitably cause pressure weakness and breakage anywhere/somewhere along its routes. Money could be spent to create a culture of clean energy, where ALL ideas for alternative energies be funded and explored rigorously to find the one or two that can sustain us for a long time . It's obvious to me that one day we will run out of extractable energy, as we are told of oil, hence the tar sands and natural gas fracking, last ditch attempts to avoid the inevitable--no extractable energy, unless a device is invented to extract carbon and methane from the air for planetary use. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Nick Walsh

04/16/2013

Nick Walsh

Positive change and a brighter future are preceded only by the most thoughtful and meticulous decision making. I am proud to say that this quality is flaunted regularly by the Obama administration. I urge you to continue this trend by observing the facts confirmed by 350.org and that, even when such facts are shaded by some doubt, the most conservative action is the smartest. Stop the KXL. No economic incentive is worth this much damage. Nicolas Gomez

04/16/2013

Nicolas Gomez

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE IS NOTHING BUT BAD IDEA ALL THE WAY DOWN THE LINE.....THIS PROJECT IS BEING FORCED DOWN OUR THROATS BY BIG OIL----THE CANADIANS DIDN'T WANT IT & WE DON'T WANT IT!!! PIPED DIRECTLY OVER THE OGALLALA AQUIFER? ARE YOU KIDDING? ARE YOU REALLY KIDDING??? OBAMA, IS THIS WHAT YOU WANT YOUR LEGACY TO BE? Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Nicole Beck

04/16/2013

Nicole Beck

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands are so dirty I can't believe we would consider this project. Instead, let's invest this effort into known methods of reducing energy use and alternative fuel to wean ourselves from a disappearing resource. We are operating like blind fools. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Nicole Kemeny

04/16/2013

Nicole Kemeny

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Secretary Kerry, you were my senator, and I know you are a man of deep convictions. You are now, more than ever, in a position as Secretary of State to open our president's eyes. To allow the truth to be seen. I've followed you and supported you since the Vietnam days, when you too were idealistic and not so entrenched in politics that you could still believe good, fair minded decisions and personal integrity were possible in the world of money and politics. My children are that age now. They still believe that we can have a better world - My son is fighting for that, like you did. And I have never stopped. All it takes is a few brave men and women. Leaders who will stand up for what they know deep down is the right thing to do - and not cave in to these multinational companies who care nothing for anything. They are literally destroying all that is precious to us. Polluting our water, destroying our earth. And the majority of us don't see this. But you do. I know you do. There will be tremendous backlash- but we need to change direction and we can't wait any longer. People will get used to it and see that it's not only the right thing to do - but the only real choice we have. Whom ever has the guts to take the stand against the Keystone XL pipeline, and the continued exploration and production of fossil fuel, including fracking, will be no less than the savior of this earth. It will start us moving in a direction of hope. To those that complain about lost jobs - we'll have more than enough jobs in the renewable, green energy industry. AND most importantly, we'll have a future. Please don't censor us. In your own words..."We are here to ask, and we are here to ask vehemently, where are the leaders of our country" Please help us. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Nicole Schildcrout

04/16/2013

Nicole Schildcrout

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands, fracking, and other desperate fuel procurement techniques will give only short term benefits while creating long term environmental problems. Look ahead to the longer term of our earth's future rather than to the next election! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Nina Evans

04/16/2013

Nina Evans

Dear President Obama, [WRITE YOUR COMMENT HERE] -- Nina Flateng United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Nina Flateng

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Please look at the footage and ask yourself how would you feel if that river of oil were passing in front of your house where your kids want to go out and play. I realize that "Big oil" has "Big" money to influence decisions in Washington, but lets be real for a moment, what good is all the money in the world if your water supply becomes destroyed and you and your fellow citizens are living in the shit produced from these companies!!! Keep up with the solar and wind incentives...how much clearer and cleaner of a solution could their be!!!! Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Noel Reinhardt

04/16/2013

Noel Reinhardt

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr. President, you know that James Hanson, Head of NASA's Goddard Center said, to paraphrase, If the Keystone Pipeline is built, GAME OVER! Why are you giving into the Republicans wrong-minded ideas (inc chained CPI)!!! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
norma marshall

04/16/2013

Norma Marshall

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The oil companies obviously don't worry about cleaning up their messes. And besides that, it is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Routing Keystone XL tar sands oil through our U.S. communities is a BAD idea!! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, P J Carter

04/16/2013

P J Carter

I am submitting my comments opposing the keystone pipeline. The US should not be a party to the environmental destruction caused by tar sands development. Canada needs to be exposed for their greed and disregard. Forests are being leveled, wildlife populations are being dislocated and thousands of migratory birds are being poisoned. Not to mention what the carbon emissions of the processing as well as the burning of this oil is doing to the climate. Tar sands oil production is a filthy operation and the toxic tailing ponds can be seen from space. As an American I do not support the idea of multinational companies polluting our land and water for their own personal gain by pumping noxious oil and chemicals through a pipeline that will be casually monitored at best and woefully neglected at worst. The minuscule amount of temporary jobs is not worth the risk. I urge the State Dept and John Kerry, whose environmental record is commendable, to reject the pipeline proposal and stand firm against any criticism of that position. Sincerely Angela Parks

04/16/2013

Parks, Angela

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. It would, quite simply, be unconscionable to approve the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline! PLEASE take care of our land, our people, our wildlife, our water, our whole planet and say NO to the Keystone XL pipeline! Thank you! Sincerely, Patricia Amazalorso

04/16/2013

Patricia Amazalorso

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The technology to clean up tar sand oil does not exist. Do not allow any more tar sand materials to come through this country until Keystone and other companies can guarantee 100% cleanup and decontamination. Sincerely, Patricia Woolston

04/16/2013

Patricia Woolston

Dear Sir or Madame, I know that you have been receiving many comments regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline approval. Lots of people on both sides of the issue quote statistics to try to state their case for why the pipeline is either right or wrong. You know these numbers already, you don't need me to remind you of them. You've waded through the impact studies, had lobbyists plead with you, and seen protests across the country against the pipeline. I'm sure you're overwhelmed with information and likely still unsure whether or not approval of the pipeline is in the best interest of the country. I urge you to step away from the numbers and the lobbyists and the protests for a moment. Look back and see how people's energy perspective has changed throughout history. We always tend to do what is most efficient based on our current worldview. HYPERLINK

"http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Control_of_fire_by_early_humans" 125,000 years ago we began to burn wood extensively for cooking food and for warmth. It was our only option at the time. HYPERLINK
"http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_coal_mining" 253 years ago coal, became the fuel of the industrial revolution powering steam engines and blast furnaces and replacing wood as a heating and cooking fuel. Not only was it more energy dense than wood but it burned cleaner and hotter.

HYPERLINK "<http://www.apga.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3329>" 192 years ago we started using natural gas mainly for light, but also for heat, and cooking. Natural gas was easier to transport than coal (piped vs. hauled) and burned remarkably cleaner. HYPERLINK

"http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_petroleum" 154 years ago the first commercial oil well in the United States started production and we began using oil for almost everything we rely on today. Plastics, chemicals, medications, transportation, cooking, lighting, heat, etc. There was an apparently limitless amount of petroleum in the ground and it seemed to have an infinite number of uses with no harmful side effects. However, after 154 years of increasing petroleum use I think it is safe that we can all agree on three things: 1. New petroleum is not being created. 2. We have used the majority of the petroleum available to us. 3. Petroleum has had a significant negative impact on the environment. We have other sources of energy that are cleaner, more efficient, and renewable. You know that this is true. Everyone in the world knows that this is true. So please put politics aside and do what makes sense. Do not approve this pipeline. It is time for our worldview to change once again. Sincerely,

Patrick Meehan

04/16/2013

Patrick Meehan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I have always believed in you. I know that you have to give and take in your position, but I hope that you will not disappoint the country by saying it is OK for the very rich to pollute our lands and cause illness for our citizens. I want our country to recover, but if we keep funding the very rich, there will be a revolution and I will be part of it. Make us all proud, sir. Sincerely, Paula Wood

04/16/2013

Paula Wood

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I have always believed in you. I know that you have to give and take in your position, but I hope that you will not disappoint the country by saying it is OK for the very rich to pollute our lands and cause illness for our citizens. I want our country to recover, but if we keep funding the very rich, there will be a revolution and I will be part of it. Make us all proud, sir. Sincerely, Paula Wood

04/16/2013

Paula Wood

State dept, Please stop the XL pipeline. It encourages our co2 use and the destabilization of the planet. Which means famine, war, refugees,etc. keep your eye on the 50 to 100 year plan. The XL pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline.

04/16/2013

E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Tar sands pipeline are just too risky. Why in the world would you allow one to cross so much of our beautiful country when the dirty oil will not even be utilized in the U.S.? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Peggy Ford

04/16/2013

Peggy Ford

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. While many Americans have been fixated on the nightmare of the tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas the real horror was happening far away in Canada. Responsible nations and responsible leaders of nations should be doing everything in their power to stand in opposition to tar sands development. I'm afraid the Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum nation of Republicrats is only doing everything in their power to approve Keystone XL and finding political cover for their short sighted decision. While it is easy to cynically speak the language of climate change during elections, it is apparently a lot harder to make a stand when an actual action is required. It is, in fact, impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Peter Black

04/16/2013

Peter Black

Apr 16, 2013 Secretary of State John Kerry Dear Secretary of State Kerry, I urge you to reject TransCanada's risky Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. This and Fracking BOTH! This dirty pipeline poses a threat to the environment, our climate, and American families. 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. 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. 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. 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. And I submit that "Fracking" is also a terrible idea - just wait until CA gets the Big Earthquake as a result of that! Sincerely, Peter Haberly

04/16/2013

Peter Haberly

Personal Honesty and Civic Honesty must be preserved. The toll to our climate at home as well as the world's climate makes this a decision fraught with consequences and almost all of them bad for the citizens of the United States. Some will argue the benefits of lessening dependence on foreign oil, but the direct impact on the climate demands a refusal to go forward with this proposal. If this pipeline is allowed it marks a grim day in the body politic of this nation. It will demonstrate once again the power of the special interests and their quest for profits, rather than the welfare of our country. Peter Mahanna

04/16/2013

Peter Mahanna

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. To consider approving this is in direct opposition to all of your campaign promises. Do not do it! Sincerely, Peter Van Roekens

04/16/2013

Peter Van Roekens

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department All the corporate rhetoric claiming the Alberta Tars Sands oil will just be burned anyway if we don't build the Keystone XL pipeline not only misses the point about the disastrous amount of CO2 it will put in the atmosphere but is also designed to frame the narrative that the pipeline's approval is inevitable. Nonsense. If the U.S. really wants to take the lead on combatting climate change, disallowing the Keystone Pipeline will send a clear and reverberant message to the world community that the future of energy production in the U.S. and beyond is NOT in fossil fuels, especially filthy ones like the Alberta Tar Sands. Others will invariably follow and say NO to fossil fuels and NO to Alberta Tar Sands. The extraction, refinement and burning of Alberta Tar Sands oil is the epitome of addictive desperation. Saying NO to the Keystone Pipeline, and NO to Alberta Tar Sands is the first and most essential step towards turning the tide towards a renewable, sustainable energy future. Make no mistake. There will not be any more opportunities to do the right thing if the Alberta Tar Sands are exploited to even a portion of their capacity. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely,
Philip Johnston

04/16/2013

Philip Johnston

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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! Sincerely, Phyllis Ann Maples Cole

04/16/2013

Phyllis Ann Maples Cole

Please listen to the thousands of people who oppose building the Keystone XL Pipeline. The report -- the most comprehensive study of Keystone's climate impacts yet -- 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 means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline.

Phyllis Frus

04/16/2013

Phyllis Frus

Hello, it is so obvious that politics is in command at the State Department, and not science. If a pipeline carries at least least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year, how can it possible have "negligible" climate impacts? Our atmosphere is already so polluted, and yet you want to put MORE carbon into it? We need to put all of our money and energy into CLEAN energy, not the dirty energy that is tar sands. Wake up and realize that you can rally Americans behind a clean energy future, but only if you actually say NO to dirty energy. Phyllis Hasbrouck

04/16/2013

Phyllis Hasbrouck

Greetings, I have recently wrote to my state senator, Bill Nelson, to convey my concern over the Keystone XL pipeline. He responded and told me about a public comment I can submit this to for the State Department. I am against the Keystone XL pipeline. My concerns are that there are no real benefits to us consumers and citizens. The 20,000 promised jobs are only temporary from everything I'm reading and very little are shown to be permanent positions. From the last two major oil spills, I have no confidence in the companies cleaning up any spills with this pipeline. They have proven incapable in doing a quick and precise job in cleanup. I'm also angry at their efforts to cover up what was going on to save face. Lastly, this only furthers our dependence on fossil fuels. I am for alternative sources of energy and wish to slow down and stop any further negative climate changes at all possible. Please consider my concerns when you make your decision. Roger Prouse Jr

04/16/2013

R P

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, 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. 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. 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. The president delivered some inspiring words on climate action during his inaugural speech, but it's his decision on Keystone XL that will determine his climate legacy. If approved, as the USA's top climate scientist James Hansen has explained, Keystone XL 'will mean game over for the climate.' Thank you. -- Rachel Gordon

04/16/2013

Rachel Gordon

Hello, Please add my name to the list of those who oppose this project. Keystone pipeline is the worst idea ever. Thank you, Rachel Kingsley

04/16/2013

Rachel Kingsley

04/16/2013

Rachel Kingsley

Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to submit my comments recommending that our country not proceed with developing the Keystone XL pipeline. At this point in our nation's technological development, it would make more long term sense if any energy investments we make are directed to alternative energies. To continue allocating public monies towards technologies nearing the end of their productive lifecycles is foolish. Continuing to extract from increasingly difficult locations oil that takes increasing amounts of energy to turn into a useful form has reached the point where it is unnecessary and foolhardy. While the energy used to extract and refine oil has decreased versus the energy obtained from the refined product, technological advances in solar and wind technologies have made them viable alternatives. In some cases, they are already more cost effective than oil and will continue to become even more so: <http://spectrum.ieee.org/green-tech/solar/residential-solar-power-heads-toward-grid-parity> With solar and wind technologies advancing and oil become more energy intensive to produce, the financial motivations of oil have become questionable. Beyond that, the national security and environmental motivations are even more questionable for continued oil infrastructure investment. Pinning our infrastructure to oil, even that produced domestically or elsewhere in North America, puts our national security at risk by ignoring the need for our nation's self-reliance and continuing to misallocate our investments. Looking forward by investing in technologies more conducive to long-term independence, less likely to contribute to climate change, and less likely to become cost prohibitive is a better allocation of our limited resources. In short, the Keystone XL pipeline diverts our nation from more secure, cleaner, and cheaper energy resources. Please discontinue wasting time, effort, and other resources by even considering it a viable plan. Thank you.
Sincerely, Randy Fulara

04/16/2013

Randy Fulara

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It is great news for Exxon and the federal gov't. that Boston happened, it will keep the nations attention on something other than the disaster last month in Arkansas. Our news and elected officials want to keep it quite. No bad news about Keystone XL. XL is nothing but bad news. What a mess. I for one will never vote democrat if President Obama approves it, period. A spill in Mayflower, Arkansas 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, NOW and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Ray Anderson

04/16/2013

Ray Anderson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am 40 year health professional and scientist and I have read the State Dept. documents. I am appalled at the lies perpetrated by the oil industry as to the safety and wisdom of this project. Our American citizens, land owners, tax payers, ranchers, farmers and families will be victimized by this project. It places permanent liability on the American people while the malefactors of wealth get rich. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Lastly, I came through the Vietnam War and we fought for equal rights in the 60's and 70's and I observe our country being ruined by a corporate chokehold. This isn't the America I knew and loved as a child or young adult. Since when can foreign companies come in and walk all over American citizens! We have horror stories out here in the Mid-west. This project must be CANNED!!!!!!! Sincerely,
Rebecca Leas

04/16/2013

Rebecca Leas

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. President Obama, I live in New Hampshire. The Portland/ Montreal Pipeline travels through some of the most beautiful country you will ever see in northern Vermont, New Hampshire and a slice of Maine. Please do not approve the pipeline for Alberta Tar Sands to cross any part of our country. The recent Arkansas disaster is but one of many disasters. We don't need it. Help our nation by taking a courageous stand by promoting conservation and a changed lifestyle that weans us off fossil fuels. As Climatologist James Hansen states, we begin working on extraction from the Tar Sands and it's "game over." Sincerely, Rebecca Mackenzie

04/16/2013

Rebecca Mackenzie

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. Two other spills happened that same week in Canada and Texas, and the first Keystone pipeline spilled 12 times in its first year alone. The 2010 Michigan tar sands spill, which sickened children and killed family pets, still hasn't been fully cleaned up. The Arkansas spill is yet one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. This recent 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Rebecca McGoldrick

04/16/2013

Rebecca McGoldrick

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. There have already been too many accidents that have threatened and damaged our environment and the neighborhoods where we live. When are we going to put our full efforts toward viable, existing, proven, clean energy choices? WHY are we waiting? PLEASE step up and use your influence to stop this project before it is too late. Sincerely, Rebecca Ray

04/16/2013

Rebecca Ray

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Renata Landres

04/16/2013

Renata Landres

I am writing because the human community on our dear planet - with the tremendous impact of its technology, and ability to contravene the blessings of animal, plant, water, air and energy - continues to undermine and destroy the critical interdependence all forms of life have upon one another. The XL pipeline is yet one more example of human technological extraction of carbon-laden fossil fuel which will only exacerbate the enormous threat to the future of the planet. Please do not allow this further deterioration to happen ...for the sake of future generations and the intricate balance of life on our planet. Rev Peter Boeve

04/16/2013

Rev Peter Boeve

Allowing the Keystone XL Pipeline to be built on its proposed route violates the sovereignty of Native American tribes and First Nations peoples. For instance, the Keystone XL tar sands oil pipeline – if built – will cross the drinking water pipeline of the Lakota Nation. They know how dangerous this is for their lives, so they passed legislation opposing KXL and called upon all Lakota people to defend the water. The Oglala Sioux have passed a resolution through their tribal government to stop Keystone XL from entering their Treaty Territory. 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. Peace, Jeff ü Please consider the environment before printing this email. Rev. Jeffrey Spencer

04/16/2013

Rev. Jeffrey Spencer

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. And then there's the wide-ranging habitat destruction brought on by our changing climate, a process Keystone XL would accelerate. Reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. It's bad for wildlife. It's bad for us. Sincerely, The Rev. Jeffrey S. Spencer ü Please consider the environment before printing this email. Rev. Jeffrey Spencer

04/16/2013

Rev. Jeffrey Spencer

A new report released today – the most comprehensive study of Keystone's climate impacts yet – shows that the pipeline would carry 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, equal to 51 coal plants worth of carbon. Put another way: 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. Despite all this, the Draft SEIS says that the pipeline would have negligible climate impacts. That's just plain wrong! Try again! Peace, Jeff ü Please consider the environment before printing this email. Rev. Jeffrey Spencer Niles Discovery Church United in God's love for everyone's journey ... no exceptions!

HY

PERLINK

"<http://nilesdiscoverychurch.org/>" nilesdiscoverychurch.org read my blog at HYPERLINK
"<http://jeffsjottings.wordpress.com/>" jeffsjottings.wordpress.com follow me on Twitter at HYPERLINK
"<http://www.twitter.com/revjss>" www.twitter.com/revjss follow me on Facebook at HYPERLINK
"<http://www.facebook.com/revjss>" www.facebook.com/revjss check out my curriculum for adult learners at HYPERLINK "<http://www.deathpenaltycurriculum.com/>" www.deathpenaltycurriculum.com

04/16/2013

Rev. Jeffrey Spencer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please, you know the reasons why, just do the right thing and reject this proposal. Thank you. Sincerely, Richard & Ann Kurrasch

04/16/2013

Richard & Ann Kurrasch

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. I have seen videos and pictures from Mayflower, Arkansas. I can't imagine how people there will ever be able to return their homes to anything normal. At the same time, Exxon seems most concerned with keeping it all quiet. That is not how this country is supposed to work! This is especially not how our government is supposed to work. Oil is not the final answer. It will run out - or destroy the environment that makes quality life possible - whichever comes first. We cannot let oil trump every other solution - no matter how dirty it has to get for us to retrieve it. Big Oil has laughed off the environment as just the passion of "a bunch of tree-huggers." Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Richard Draper

04/16/2013

Richard Draper

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. My vote: No on Keystone XL pipeline Sincerely, Richard Holmes

04/16/2013

Richard Holmes

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. I also find it outrageous that Exxon Mobil has been allowed to restrict media access to the spill site and even to the airspace above it. How does this jibe with First Amendment guarantees of press freedom? Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Richard Khanlian

04/16/2013

Richard Khanlian

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. For what purpose? Devastate the Canadian wilderness forests; destroy a path across our country with an unsightly pipe and potential for catastrophic leakage; and not get us any closer to energy independence. Unbelievable that it is even considered. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Richard Krause

04/16/2013

Richard Krause

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It's transparently obvious that the organizations that will profit from the Keystone Pipeline are limited to a) the corporations in Canada that are developing the environmentally disastrous Tar Sands oil extraction facilities in Alberta, and those corporations like Exxon that will operate the Keystone Pipeline and will refine and export the Tar Sands crude to gasoline etc. which they will export. Neither the Canadian or American oil companies will bear the risk of the kind of oil spills like the one ruining homes in Mayflower Arkansas. Both of them will collect all the profits and export all the risks to the "little people" of the USA. Given the above it is inconceivable that a President who is rhetorically at least for a clean environment can favor a pipeline that puts the heartland of the USA at risk while pumping up the profits of Canadian and American oil companies. President Obama, are you for the Environment or for increased Oil Company profits? The State Department ruling on the viability of the Keystone Oil Pipeline will make clear where you really stand. My wife and I took real pleasure in both working on your campaign and voting for you in 2008 and 2012. We are counting on you to kill the Keystone Pipeline and We will both feel betrayed if you allow it to proceed. Sincerely, Richard Reinert

04/16/2013

Richard Reinert

Clean Energy Dear Conscious Americans, Are we all insane? Exhibiting unsoundness or disorder of mind; not sane; mad; deranged in mind; delirious; distracted... Obviously. Let us approach this question with the intension of solving the Most Important Issue facing the world. Clean Energy! Exhibiting unsoundness: To continue with coal when there are finally safer, healthier, more efficient, affordable, clean energy methods is INSANE! Disorder of mind: We are constantly being told lies. Everyone that breathes, sees, hears, feels knows the damage created by dirty energy. Not sane: "Insanity: doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results." Albert Einstein. To have all this great new solar technology and not use it is INSANE! Mad: If we're all not, mad as hell and finally going to do something about it then that's INSANE! Deranged in mind: "The significant problems we have cannot be solved at the same level of thinking with which we created them." Albert Einstein To continue down that path of dirty coal is INSANE! Delirious: light-headed, uncontrolled excitement or emotion. Bingo. Hello, don't make me list every health problem related to pollution. Every Single One is. Distracted: This debate should really be about which coal plants to redesign and switch over to solar power, rather than building new ones. That would be INSANE. Ask anyone over five years old. Sane: acting rationally; marked by sound judgment; being in a healthy condition Let us all start acting a little saner. With support of green jobs there is no limit to the advancements, efficiency, reliability, job opportunities, benefits and sales. We as Americans have the will, strength, love, technology, manpower, clever minds, and materials, THE RESOURCES to offer the whole world the very best affordable clean energy. What are we waiting for? Let's start using that stimulus money to Create green jobs. To Wait Is INSANE! Richard Schwagerl

04/16/2013

Richard Schwagerl

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. The safety of refining and transporting tar sands must be seriously questioned. Secretary Kerry and President Obama do not always believe the Big Oil lobbyists. They are putting a huge spin on the actual safety of this pipeline. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. The tar sands will cause significantly more pollution and CO2 emissions than refining regular oil. Sincerely, Richard Vladimir

04/16/2013

Richard Vladimir

Good day. As a Native Montanan, past ranch owner and Montana business owner, I strongly urge the support of the Keystone pipeline. Rick Leuthold

04/16/2013

Rick Leuthold

The pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline.
Robert Andrews

04/16/2013

Robert Andrews

If we succeed in blocking the pipeline, the shale oil will be shipped by truck and railroad tanker car, both of which have a much higher carbon footprint and are much more susceptible to accidental spillage than the pipeline. Would you advocate banning trains and trucks from crossing the Canadian border into the United States? Robert Baker

04/16/2013

Robert Baker

Perhaps the State Department's report on Keystone XL narrowly considered only the pipeline itself, rather than looking at its broader impacts. The Keystone XL pipeline won't, by itself, release much CO2 -- rather, it will enable the sale and transport of the oil. Not considering the broader impacts is like giving guns to Al Qaeda on the grounds that, since we're not also giving them bullets, there is no harm done. This is willful and irresponsible manipulation of the facts. The oil that this pipeline will carry has an exceptionally large carbon footprint. The military and the State Department recognize that global climate change presents a serious security threat. Friends don't let friends exploit tar sands. Please reject the Keystone XL pipeline. Robert Ewing

04/16/2013

Robert Ewing

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. For the good of our country and planet, please consider investing in solar and wind energy as a clean energy alternative. We have plenty of both in the Sunshine State. Sincerely, Robert Fleck, Jr.

04/16/2013

Robert Fleck, Jr.

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I see a lot of God in nature. When I run, I feel close to God. When you rape the Earth for money, you poison our very soul, an uncharted frontier for you. If you wish respect for your leadership and wisdom during these Imperial Times, then you must lead. The spotlight is right on your noggin. What will you do Abe? Do not rape the Earth for fat white boys. White people are overrated. Believe it. In all seriousness, Barack; this Earth cannot handle the tar sands and it should not have to so little boys can enrich their brief pathetic trip to Planet Bozo. Do something good or your little girls won't respect you. That's my last shot. I have a little girl so this is my last shot. Look into their eyes and tell them this Keystone is good for stopping global warming which may very well torment the rest of all our lives. IT'S JUST LIKE SLAVERY, SEGREGATION, STEALING IRAQ'S OIL; IT IS BLATANTLY OBVIOUS THE RIGHT THING TO DO IS USE THE PIPELINE FOR ANYTHING BUT THIS TAR SANDS OIL. I SUGGEST WATER BECAUSE THEIR IS AN IMPENDING DROUGHT FOR THE MIDEAST AND SOUTHWEST JUST SO YOU KNOW. DO THE RIGHT THING DAMNIT AND KILL KEYSTONE. WE LIBERALS WILL PROTECT YOU AND YOUR RATINGS WILL ASCEND. THESE OIL COMPANIES HAVE THE BLOOD OF CHILDREN ON THEIR HANDS FROM IRAQ TO THE NIGER DELTA TO THE ECUADOREAN RAIN FORESTS TO THE BIG MESS IN ARKANSAS YOU HAVE BEEN ORDERED TO DENY. PATHETIC, REALLY! ADIOS BARACK. THIS IS A BIG, BIG, BIG CHOICE AND FOLKS ARE BETTING AGAINST YOU TO TELL THE TRUTH. WE'LL SEE. I DON'T THINK YOU HAVE THE WILL. NOTHING IS FREE ABOUT FREE SPEECH BARACK BUT MOST POLITICIANS YOU KNOW SPEND THE REST OF THEIR LIVES REARRANGING THEIR AFFAIRS TO PRESENT SOME BIPEDAL REFLECTION OF THEIR LIFE WHEN IN REALITY YOU'RE JUST SERVANTS. YOUR SERFS ARE DULY STEEPED IN BETRAYAL AND IT SUCKS!

Sincerely, Robert Hyer II

04/16/2013

Robert Hyer II

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. REJECT KEYSTONE XL !!!!! Sincerely, Robert Landes

04/16/2013

Robert Landes

All of the reports are just ways to avoid the issue. The pipeline only benefits the Koch brothers. They need to Canadian heavy crude to replace the Venezuelan crude that is becoming difficult to get. Because the refineries are located in an export zone, they pay no taxes on it by exporting the refined oil to China. So stop wasting everyone's time with useless reports and either give the Koch brothers what they want to protect the environment and US citizens from corporate greed. Robert Mason

04/16/2013

Robert Mason

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a Presbyterian Minister, I am increasingly convinced that THE issue of our generation is the looming ecological crisis. You can talk about jobs all you want, but the damage we've done and continue to do to the environment will rack up costs that will dwarf any investment needed to green our economy and lifestyles. I urge you to lead with courage and wisdom and block this horrendous proposal. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Robert McClellan

04/16/2013

Robert McClellan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. If the product that will be exported from the KXL gets to the Asia market, you know that your great-grandchildren will not live as we are. This the future of our atmosphere we're talking about. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Robert Mccombs

04/16/2013

Robert Mccombs

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. I am a long-time supporter of both of you and promise you will have the support of millions in the know on this issue. Please stand up to Big Oil and begin the shift to clean energy investment in which we are behind many other nations. The public needs to know that few if any jobs will be created by this pipeline. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Robert Rosenthal

04/16/2013

Robert Rosenthal

Where is our nation's leadership when we need to take in the bigger picture. There are a lot of important issues, and the tragic attack in Boston weighs on us all at the moment. But we have to recognize that many other problems pale in comparison with the "undeniable judgment of science" and the costs of making the wrong decision on KXL. Make no mistake -- our decision here will resonate for many generations as a turning point for sanity and an example for the rest of the world for wisdom and restraint, or it will be a betrayal of the future and of many innocent lives for generations to come. Clean water, clean air, and a healthy sustainable future are not the destination if we open up KXL. So let us heed the new report on KXL that fully accounts for its carbon footprint -- equivalent to at least 181 million metric tons annually -- comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. President Obama, Secretary Kerry, I urge you to reject the pipeline. Robert Spector

04/16/2013

Robert Spector

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. A Single Family Home sized Oil Tank Leaked out onto the street in our home town once before and the damage was bad.....do you wish to smell oil around your home for as long as it takes to clean up?.....still not cleaned up and still smelling oil.....not to mention damage to your drinking water and land! I feel terrible about this event in Arkansas! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Robert Stastny

04/16/2013

Robert Stastny

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I implore you to listen to those of us who are counting on you to take serious action. To ignore this will certainly mean further destruction of our planet. Solar power is where the money needs to go, It's time we change our lifestyles and dependence on a ever decreasing and non-viable dwindling resource.

Please do the right thing and stop this now. Sincerely, Robin Gladstone

04/16/2013

Robin Gladstone

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. 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. The last thing our climate future needs is more fossil fuel, especially a fuel as dirty as tar (bitumen). As a scientist with four grandchildren, I urge you to reject the pipeline. Barrett Rock

04/16/2013

Rock Barrett

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. You already know, I'm sure, Mr. Secretary and Mr. President, how far reaching your decisions will be on this issue; sure you do! Generations in the future will know whom to thank for their health and well being, OR, whom to hate for causing their health problems! Are you looking in a mirror? You should be! This is your moment to make a decision which future generations will think of as courageous! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Rodney Vanvleet

04/16/2013

Rodney Vanvleet

I see no reason to deny the request by TransCanada Corp. to construct an oil pipeline in the United States. There is no proof of endangerment to flora or fauna by the construction and use of the oil pipeline. The benefits to our economy and our access to energy sources greatly out weight any consideration being presented by environmental groups. I have also reviewed the objects by the differing environmental groups and have found no concrete issue that should block the construction and use of the oil pipeline. The oil is being transported via the railways and presents much more of a hazard to property and life than the pipeline will. Please approve the construction and use of the oil pipeline. Most Sincerely, Ronald J. Kranz

04/16/2013

Ron Kranz

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Canada has tar sands. The US at the Gulf Coast has refinery capacity. So it makes good financial sense for Canadian tar sands heavy crude to be piped all across the United States to US refineries so the heavy crude can be processed. But most of the processed petroleum products will not be used to meet US energy needs. And more and more energy needs are being satisfied by natural gas. The "It makes sense" applies only to the holders of the Canadian tar sand fields and the commercial refinery owners. It does NOT make sense for US citizens. And it definitely is not worth the ecological damage potential for the United States. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Ronald Sheinson

04/16/2013

Ronald Sheinson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Let's see... Mayflower, Arkansas (major tar sands spill): ... Canada's environmental "awakening" (big steps away from developing tar sands infrastructure: Proposal... Keystone XL Needed... strong action to fight dirty fuels and climate change Result...climate leadership from President Obama and his team ... Very happy voter (me) ... Progress against one of the greatest challenges of our world! Sincerely, Rosamund Eiler

04/16/2013

Rosamund Eiler

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I am asking this President and his administration to be who they promised they would be- leaders concerned about the environment above private profit. Why would such leaders even consider the transportation of ktar sands "oil" across our nation, why would they even condone the extraction of tar sands" oil?" The Keystone XL pipeline is a threat to our beautiful environment and to our wonderful people. The exploitation of Nature and of the Native American People root this project in evil and no good will come of it. If we allow the pipeline we become partners to the evil with which it originated. Use our money and our talents to deal with the contaminated waste we have created by nuclear weapons and energy. Say, "NO" to Keystone. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Rose Mary Sullivan

04/16/2013

Rose Mary Sullivan

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Dear President Obama, The people voted you in because we thought you would stand up for the right thing now is your chance to prove it! Stop the pipeline we are counting on you it will be these kind of life saving things that will put you down in history as one of the Greats! 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, Rosemary Lucas

04/16/2013

Rosemary Lucas

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 well on the way due to fossil fuel emissions. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Roxie Newberry

04/16/2013

Roxie Newberry

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. In spite of the fact that Keystone XL bought and paid for the dis-honorable Govenor Brownback and the Entire Repugnant House of non-Representatives of the State of Kansas, they haven't bought me, nor will they! I completely reject Keystone XL from crossing my land! My land extends from "Shore to Shore", and from "Border to Border"! Not one drop of their poison belongs on "my Land" ! Although I trust not one career politician to do the right thing, I want each and every one of you to know how I feel about the project. DO NOT POISON MY LAND OR WATER FOR THE SAKE OF YOUR WALLET.

Sincerely, Russ Wilson

04/16/2013

Russ Wilson

State's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. 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. That means that the pipeline is not in our national interest, nor in the planet's interest. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Rusty Nelson

04/16/2013

Rusty Nelson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. It does not matter if Canada - or others - say that tar sands will be exported to markets without the XL pipeline. That's hardly a rationale for the expensive effort it will take and the short and long term damage it will bring. Further, if you permit this horrific technology to run a pipeline down the US to the Gulf, you are only encouraging this industry and filthy energy source, and it will continue to get worse because it will give a green light to industry's continuing the direction of more and more human-caused climate-change, because of devastating fossil fuel use. (not to mention the increases in cancer and other illness caused by fossil fuel) STOP DEVELOPMENT OF FOSSIL FUEL USE! THERE IS NO EXCUSE TO DO OTHERWISE. If you are worried about jobs, this is not the place to create 'thumb-in-the-dyke' holes. Renewable energy is much more a job creator because it is much more labor intensive. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Ruth Hardinger

04/16/2013

Ruth Hardinger

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I cannot allow myself to accept that this administration has become so disconnected from the populace, that the Keystone Pipeline in its current configuration with its current woefully inadequate safety elements could even be considered for a moment as a possibility. The current Keystone Pipeline proposition is a betrayal of American values never mind its ethics. What ever happened to the idea of taking away million dollar subsidies from oil companies? Think of what those millions of dollar could do for R&D in this country and its infrastructure. It makes no sense Mr President for you to make tradeoffs that buy the American people nothing. That's a one-off not a trade-off. You've obtained little for us and are slowly whittling away our future while oil companies make profits so large that the word huge is meaningless. Sincerely, Ruth Pennoyer

04/16/2013

Ruth Pennoyer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Ryan Roark

04/16/2013

Ryan Roark

S Snodgrass April 16, 2013 Dear Secretary of State Kerry: The Keystone pipeline is yet another bad idea from an industry that seems utterly indifferent to the safety of humans and other animals. REJECT THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE! Thank you, S. Snodgrass Sincerely S Snodgrass

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Come on Obama, we know you care about the Environment - Just Do It! Sincerely, Sally and Carl McKirgan

04/16/2013 Sally And Carl Mckirgan

This pipeline is bad for people. Stop it now! Sam Samuels

04/16/2013 Sam Samuels

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. You are on the right track with advancing clean energy. We know that fossil is a diminishing resource and clinging to it is foolish. We need to turn to clean energy full force. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Sandra Field

04/16/2013 Sandra Field

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. In conclusion, think of your own personal families, your own children and their descendants. Do you truly believe that the policies that you endorse in government will not affect them personally? If so, you are mistaken. You are truly sacrificing your loved ones and their descendants, who share this earth with the rest of our citizens. There is truly an environmental cliff and you must move our policies away from the fall. Sincerely, Sandra Kissam

04/16/2013

Sandra Kissam

I strongly urge you to reject the Keystone XL Pipeline proposal. It will not create permanent jobs. It will not increase American energy security, as it will be used to transport tar sands from Canada directly to ships to be exported to China, enriching only the Canadians and the oil magnates. The pipeline will not be safe, as can be seen from the 12 spills from the Keystone 1 pipeline. Proposed cleanup protocols have been designed for conventional oil, and do not work safely or efficiently for tar sands. 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. Burning all available fossil fuel will raise the average global temperature 10 degrees, causing mass havoc all over the world. The Alberta tar sands alone, if removed from the ground and burned, will raise the average global temperature 0.4 degrees, which may not seem like much, but it will be the beginning of the extraction of every last bit of fossil fuel out of the earth: in other words, the beginning of the end of human civilization. According to physicist Myles Allen of Oxford University, we need to start reducing carbon emissions by 2.5 % annually so as not to exceed the safe limit of 1 trillion metric tons by the year 2050. This past year, instead of cutting emissions by 2.5 %, we raised them by 3%. Please pay attention to the scientists who have nothing to gain except the lives of their children and grandchildren, rather than industry lackies who stand to get rich now, the hell with their children and grandchildren. We need to address climate change by reducing the use of fossil fuel right now. Natural gas is only a short-term "solution," which is in actuality no solution at all. You need to decide whose side you are on: the American people, or the energy corporations who would love to line your pockets to get their way. American citizens need their government to be making prudent plans for a very difficult future, rather than ignoring the consequences of short-sighted expedience. Thank you for listening to me, Sincerely, Sarah M. Braik

04/16/2013

Sarah Braik

To The State Department: Please do not allow a tar sands pipeline to be built. Existing pipelines are leaking and causing irrevocable damage. Please think of our collective future and do not permit another pipeline. Sincerely, Sarah Himmelheber

04/16/2013

Sarah Himmelheber

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. What was the definition of insanity again? Oh yes: Continuing to do the same failed thing we've always done and imagining it will have a different outcome. Sincerely, Sarah Tannehill

04/16/2013

Sarah Tannehill

It is only through courage to make a difference and to think outside of the box that we are going to have a habitable planet. We need you to have the courage to say NO to tarsands. The risks are way more than the benefits. let's be a leader and say no to allowing this oil to pollute our air. Sarita Khan

04/16/2013

Sarita Khan

Your claim that the KXL pipeline would not have significant environmental impact because the oil will be extracted, shipped, refined, and burned by somebody else even if the pipeline is not built is a little like that thing you told your mother about all the other kids doing it: Even if it were true it would be irrelevant. I'm pretty sure you understand that the science is sound in all the respects that matter, which leaves you looking even worse than if you honestly believed the science was weak or inconclusive. Scott A. Weir, Ph.D.

04/16/2013

Scott A. Weir

I'm a young man and I don't ask for a lot out of life. One of those things, however, is to live on a planet where we can breathe and have access to clean water. Please, for the love of God, divest from the cannibalistic bullshit before it costs us more than we want it to. The people responsible for our, almost, dystopian like future will eventually have monuments built to their evil. Reject this near-sighted stupidity masquerading as energy policy. Scott Christopher Mackie

04/16/2013

Scott Christopher Mackie

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We need to place Climate Change squarely at the top of the priority list. This issue should precede other priorities such as health care and immigration reform. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Scott Kane

04/16/2013

Scott Kane

Do not break treaties with the Great Sioux Nation by allowing the Keystone Pipeline to run over their land. Prohibit the Keystone XL pipeline. Jeanne Fudala

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. most unfortunately, 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. America will bear the brunt of the environmental costs of this pipeline. Even so, an astonishing 42% of CANADIANS are against it too. Stop this now. Sincerely, Shannon McEntee

04/16/2013

Shannon McEntee

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, I am a geology instructor at Northern Virginia Community College in _____, VA. I am writing to you as a person well trained in the Earth sciences but also as a concerned citizen and parent. I find that I must apologize to the generation of students that I teach for the condition of the planet. My generation, OUR generation, has done serious damage to the planet in our quest for, and exploitation of our natural resources. I am writing in particular about the Canadian exploitation of the Alberta Tar Sands. The mining of the Tar Sands has left a horrible scar on Earth's surface of such magnitude that you can see it using Google Earth from hundreds of miles above the Earth's surface. This is the absolute worst method of extracting energy resources from the Earth, although mountaintop removal of coal comes in a close second. 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. This is where we MUST draw the line. YES WE CAN say "no" to allowing the new leg of the Keystone XL pipeline to cross our boundary. With that we are saying to the world that the United States of America will not participate in advancing the exploitation of the dirtiest fuel source on the planet. The rationale that "it will happen anyway" does not have to shape our decision. We need to lead by example and show the world a better way to cure our addiction to fossil fuels. We must ultimately move to alternative fuel sources; we should look at this as a moment of opportunity and turn full focus to advancing alternatives. Our climate is warming at an alarming rate. Opening the spigot at our border to accelerated exploitation of the Canadian Tar Sands has been described as "game over" by leading climate scientists. Just last week the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration published new findings indicating that the Arctic will most likely be free of summer sea ice within just 10 to 20 years. This is disastrous for the Arctic ecosystem. Natural adaptation mechanisms for all affected species will not be able to keep up. We are staring into the face of an ecosystem collapse that will have major ramifications for all inhabitants of Earth. The people of the free world, as well as those struggling for freedom, look to the United States for leadership and guidance. The world is waiting for our signal with our decision on the Keystone pipeline. Saying "no" to our closest neighbor and ally will be difficult. However, it is our opportunity to demonstrate to the world that the line has been drawn and that the United States has taken a stand for the health and longevity of our planet and all of its inhabitants. It's the right thing to do. Reject the Keystone XL Pipeline. Shelley Jaye

04/16/2013

Shelley Jaye

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. Please remain resolute against this most polluting form of fossil fuel.

Sincerely, Shirley Fried

04/16/2013

Shirley Fried

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. Sid Sidney Madison

04/16/2013

Sid Sidney Madison

The initial analysis of the Keystone XL pipeline's impact on climate significantly underestimated and even discounted almost all of the likely effects of the State Department permitting its construction and use. A new report more fully accounts for expected impacts of the pipeline. It is expected to carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year, comparable to 51 coal-fired power plants. Please reject the State Department's faulty accounting, and stand firm for our national interest. Sidney Woods

04/16/2013

Sidney Woods

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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 the tar sands are developed. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and insist this has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. And that includes an open record of all communication this administration has with corporate interests related to the Keystone XL, as I am getting the impression that the administration is speaking out of both sides of its mouth. Sincerely, Sigi Moriece

04/16/2013

Sigi Moriece

I am writing because a new report that fully accounts for the carbon footprint of the Keystone XL pipeline, unlike the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL, which was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact, found that it will carry at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent each year, comparable to the tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. This amount of pollution shows that the pipeline is not in our national or our planet's interest. I therefore strongly urge you to reject the Keystone XL pipeline.
Sophia Coleman

04/16/2013

Sophia Coleman

To: U.S. State Department Regarding: Comment on Keystone XL Pipeline email: HYPERLINK "<mailto:keystonecomments@state.gov>" keystonecomments@state.gov Dear State Department, I am writing you as a resident of the state of Pennsylvania, where in a few short years we have seen our rural state turned into an industrialized warzone. Not an exaggeration. Literal. Drilling leaks, explosions and contamination incidents have become commonplace. The pipelines that criss cross our state are a toxic threat to human beings, watersheds, farms, and all organic life in their vicinity. Just two weeks ago we watched in horror as an aging tarsands pipeline ruptured underground, spewing tens of thousands of gallons of thick and noxious crude oil into the marshes, fields, roads and neighborhoods of Mayflower, Arkansas. We watched as Exxon dominated the "cleanup," closed off airspace to the press, and forced residents to their knees as their properties, their health and their futures drowned in oil. Children were sent home from school for passing out and vomiting blood. The U.S. Government must not allow the fossil fuel industry to plunder our last remaining rural lands, exposing our citizens, our wildlife, and our farmlands to toxic tar sands oil. Great economies are founded on a long view, on thinking that accounts for the sustainable health and prosperity of future generations. Beyond a handful of decades, oil and gas have no future. Wind power, solar power, bio reactors, and renewable energies are the economic and ecological solution to the energy climate crisis we now face. The people of this country are loving beings. We are fragil and strong. We are need our planet to sustain us. The keystone XL pipeline stands to benefit 1% of the 1%, while millions of Americans, Mexicans and Canadians must be exposed to toxic chemicals and wait like passive sheep for the slaughter. The U.S. must divest itself of environmentally criminal industries. Do not permit the Keystone XL pipeline. Invest in renewable energy infrastructure now. Sincerely, Sophia Hoffer-Perkins Small Business Owner ,P A -- Sophia Hoffer-Perkins, BA, LMT, RMPT Integrating spiritual practice into modern day living HYPERLINK "<http://www.IntuitiveTransformations.com/>" "www.IntuitiveTransformations.com

04/16/2013

Sophia Hoffer-perkins

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, Before I was in high school, I definitely knew about the greenhouse gas effect and how our planet's changing climate is detrimental. However, I assumed I didn't have to take any action because the adults around me – specifically those with power because of government positions – could care for the planet. The day I watched an ACE assembly about the severe impacts of climate change – more extreme weather conditions like Superstorm Sandy, sea level rise, species extinction – I realized it was an urgent issue I would have to take responsibility for and share with those around me. Climate change is a truly universal issue that affects everyone despite their occupation or location on the planet. And it's connected to several other aspects of our lives, especially to the economy. What ties us all together is the future, and how we must work together towards sustainability. If we invest in the Keystone XL Pipeline, we're taking a step in the wrong direction. By supporting a project that will expel significant amounts of CO₂ into the atmosphere, pollute freshwater sources, destroy animal habitats, and even cause diseases like cancer and asthma in humans, we are allowing the effects of climate change to profess. Youth Reps Fiona McRaith, Ivonne Morales, and Sara Kuse marching on the streets of DC! The billions of dollars supporting this project and the dirty fossil fuel industry could instead be used to fuel research and development of clean, green, alternative energy sources. At this point each decision we make is crucial to our climate and threatens the lives of the future generations. Youth compose more than half of the world's population and we are the ones who will have to deal with the most extreme impacts of climate change. The Earth was given to us humans in perfect condition. We've already permanently damaged it, so why tip the balance further? Why make it worse by investing in the Keystone XL pipeline? Haven't we destructed and depleted enough? The planet is sending us clear signals and society is not taking them seriously. I believe we all need to wake up to the climate change crisis. The sooner we acknowledge it, the sooner we can cooperate to build a sustainable, "Green" future. I mean how would you feel if your great grandchildren didn't know what trees were because by that time, we had cut so many down to build more power plants and pipelines that trees were rare as mammoths? Maybe I am being a bit extreme, but after watching Obama's "Fireside Hangout" I realized collective action on a massive scale is necessary. The president mentioned the reason Congress hasn't warmed up to passing bills on climate change is because society hasn't conveyed it as an urgent issue. Pretty much the skeptics are holding us back. President Obama, in 2009 you pledged to reduce the United States' greenhouse gas emissions by 17% from the 2005 level by 2020. It is impossible for you to do so by approving KXL, and this would be an unwise action to the rest of the world. The United States has always been a leader for other countries to model, but if we do not act against the KXL Pipeline the future of our entire planet is at stake. Quite frankly, passing KXL would make the US a world misleader. Thanks you for reading htis message. Sincerely, Srijesa Khasnabish

04/16/2013

Srijesa Khasnabish

In spite of the SEIS (which serious critics seem more and more to regard as "rigged" anyway) we must finally take a stand against the patent destructiveness of the Tar Sands development. Only symbolic? They'll do it anyway? Perhaps. But this scheme's total destruction of a vast tract of boreal forest goes so far toward creating a Hell on earth (both figuratively and literally) that a moral nation simply must not profit from it and must rather at the very least take a firm stand against it. Stanley L. Fischer,

04/16/2013

Stanley Fischer

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. I want my son and grandchildren to grow up and build families on a healthy environmentally safe planet! We as humans have the knowledge and responsibility to protect our planet and the species that we coexist with! Please do NOT allow any oil pipeline to go through or around our country! We need to be converting to clean renewable energy! Sincerely, Stefanie Bopp

04/16/2013

Stefanie Bopp

I am writing as a concerned scientist and parent. A recent report suggests the Keystone XL pipeline would carry the CO₂ equivalent of another 38 million cars. I fail to see how the State Department's environmental report could conclude that this would negligible impact on our environment. I urge the State department to live up to the Administration's lofty goal of reducing CO₂ emissions 17% by 2020. Building Keystone XL would only make this all the more difficult to achieve. Stephen Asztalos

04/16/2013

Stephen Asztalos

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. From March 11 to April 9 of this year, oil companies in North and South America spilled 1,185,000 gallons of oil and toxic chemicals in various parts of the world. Forty-five percent of that was tar sands oil and diluted bitumen. (See "13 Spills. 35 Days. Nearly 1.2 Million Toxic Gallons." at www.commondreams.org/further/2013/ 04/12-3). Can you imagine what the spill rate will be along the proposed 2,147 miles of the Keystone XL Pipeline? You probably don't want to think about it because your names will be associated with it. It will be called the Kerry-Obama Pipeline, and the media will have an impossible job of trying to cover up the news. I urge you, for your legacies and reputations, do not allow the Keystone XL Pipeline to be built. Sincerely, Stephen Spieckerman

04/16/2013

Stephen Spieckerman

I understand that producing the Alberta tar sands would result in about 20% more CO-2 emitted to the atmosphere than an equivalent number of barrels of normal oil. That is because of the extra energy needed to heat the stuff before extraction. Although it would be nice to expand and solidify our trade with our friendly neighbor, the world is awash with oil that it will never produce. If we do produce all the oil the earth holds, the amount of CO-2 will devastate our climate at the end of our century. Even if we level off and cut back in the next decade or two, the climate will get markedly worse. The tar sands will make things much worse. Canadians will thank us for making the right decision on this. Albertans do not represent Canadians any more than Texans represent Americans. Steve L Eittreim

04/16/2013

Steve L Eittreim

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. When will this insanity stop. How long will we have to witness the effects of climate change. How long will our beautiful land be destroyed by oil spills and other pollutions. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Steve Scalese

04/16/2013

Steve Scalese

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. You will leave a legacy, of honor and faithfulness to your word, or one of accommodation to the same political power structures that you promised to change. Please choose the former. Sincerely, Steven Esses

04/16/2013

Steven Esses

Please stop the Keystone XL pipeline from existence before it engenders far greater harm to our planet than our minds can currently imagine. I'm a mental health professional fully aware that how our minds work contributes to us allowing ourselves to believe the pipeline certainly must provide humanity some benefits. Our heuristic ways of thinking and our habitual ways of acting--attendant to values that have pitched toward wanting more and more that oil and other fossil fuels supply--make the pipeline seem quite reasonable. Same sort of heuristics, habits, and values that allow us to accept the Hitlers of the world before we awaken to our minds own faults. We have come far enough in our development as a species, though, to recognize the risks we're bringing on ourselves BEFORE they cause so much harm to humanity. The pipeline is one such risk to which we must open our minds ASAP or face the life-damaging consequences of our shortsightedness. That lack of vision is evident in a new report that shows the carbon footprint of the pipeline is comparable to at least 181 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) each year, which is roughly the same as tailpipe emissions from more than 37.7 million cars or 51 coal-fired power plants. Meaning, the pipeline is going to harm a whole bunch of Americans and other citizens of the world. Please, we need to invest the money going into projects like the XL pipeline into renewable energy resources, efficiency, and even moderated patterns of consumption that make use of fossil fuels but don't create greater well-being or more equality among people. In light of these accurate mental perceptions, I urge you to reject the pipeline. because the State Department's initial report on Keystone XL was deeply flawed in its analysis of the pipeline's climate impact. Steven M. Shapiro

04/16/2013

Steven M. Shapiro

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Come on Barack and John- You know what you need to do here. When are going to pay attention to the environment? It is time. Make us proud. Please stop this disaster from happening. Be brave. We are behind you. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Surrie Hobart

04/16/2013

Surrie Hobart

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. We are personally contributing to a healthier environment by insisting that our townhome community stop using hazardous chemical herbicides. Please keep your word and do not let that fossil fuel pipeline flow through our beautiful country. Spills are not a possibility, they are a probability. Sincerely, Susan & George Padilla

04/16/2013

Susan & George Padilla

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. As a very recent retiree from State, I am conscious of the political and economic issues. Nonetheless, I truly believe that in the long run the only truly important issue is the health of our planet. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Susan Beffel

04/16/2013

Susan Beffel

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. One more time, PLEASE do not approve this pipeline. Let Canada run it though their country and absorb the oil spills. They are devastating the Boreal forest, they may as well ruin the rest and leave us alone. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Susan Christensen

04/16/2013

Susan Christensen

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Susan Dennis

04/16/2013

Susan Dennis

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone Pipeline State Department Comment Line To State Department Comment Line, The Keystone XL pipeline is 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. It's time to declare our independence from big oil, not double down on 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. Read about the Koch brothers Kerr's ketchup plants and where the refined crap will go from Texas to Jamacia and other Caribbean places not here. Charvez Venezuela/Koch Sincerely, susan frates

04/16/2013

Susan Frates

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I urge you to listen to the people of America who care about the potential environmental damage that will almost inevitably occur as a result of this pipeline project. What does it take to convince you? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Susan Gaar

04/16/2013

Susan Gaar

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Please be remembered in history as the President and Secretary of State who woke up and saved the world. Oil is becoming obsolete as a fuel; please recognize the factual nature of science and help us survive. Sincerely, Susan Haywood

04/16/2013

Susan Haywood

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The recent Exxon-Mobil disaster involving a pipeline with Tar Sands should be a wake up call as to the environmental disaster that the Keystone XL project would be. Please do not allow this potentially-devastating, bad idea to continue. End any hope of it now! 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Susan Lilly

04/16/2013

Susan Lilly

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

NO FLY ZONES OVER THE PIPELINE ACCIDENT IN THE USA SOUTH MEANS MORE AND MORE PEOPLE WILL HEAR ABOUT IT. EVERYONE WANTS KEYSTONE XL STOPPED. IT IS TIME THAT THE PEOPLE WERE REPRESENTED BY THEIR GOVERNMENT WHICH ONLY DERIVES ITS POWER TO OPERATE OF, BY AND FOR THE PEOPLE. THE PEOPLE ARE THE DECISIONMAKERS AND ANYTHING ELSE IS ILLEGITIMATE. GET IT.

Sincerely, Susan Michetti

04/16/2013

Susan Michetti

Apr 16, 2013 Honorable John Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State Dear Kerry, U.S. Secretary of State, 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. That assessment gets it dangerously wrong on a number of fronts. 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. 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. 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. ----- This entire project is grotesque, and I really don't think we can trust the oil companies to do the right thing. Sincerely, Ms. Susan Monroe

04/16/2013

Susan Monroe

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Oil is an unhealthy, unsustainable and UNNECESSARY old paradigm that needs to go the way of the dinosaur. It is actually embarrassing that Americans are still addicted to this substance and our government seemingly controlled by its pushers. We are the INNOVATORS! We can do so much better - as is demonstrated by so many other countries who have seen the obvious and taken the lead in developing clean power from sun, wind and water. The cost to our environment, to our health, and to our economy is exorbitant and unjustified - and the fact that we subsidize these greedy companies who care only about profit at any expense, without holding them accountable for the total cost of safety and clean-up, is unethical and immoral when there are superior options. The risk inherent in this operation is a reckless gamble not worth betting our children's future on. Exploiting the earth, draining Mother Nature of her blood, and raping her of resources are violent and ignorant. To live ON this planet, we must learn to live WITH her. Biomimicry (design engineering that reveres Nature as model and master) and systems thinking (problem-solving which acknowledges interconnectedness and shared consequences) are viable answers to many of today's problems, including the climate crisis. Big Oil's dirty industry is based in reductionist thinking and a total disregard for people and the planet. Signs of an evolved, mature society include renunciation - knowing when to say NO. Keystone XL must be stopped. We must allow natural forces time to heal the damage we have already done and restore balance to its ecosystems. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. We the people have common sense. We are aware. We are watching your actions and ignoring your rhetoric. Show us you deserve the political power you have been given BY US. Sincerely, Susan Werb

04/16/2013

Susan Werb

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please follow the course you've already set in motion: recognize climate change (as opposed to the Republicans who continue to bury their heads in the sand about it) and reject Keystone XL. Sincerely, Suzann Withers

04/16/2013

Suzann Withers

Attn: Comments Regarding Keystone XL SEIS northern segment I am asking that the Keystone XL pipeline permit be denied. It is not a job creator, as claimed. Temporary jobs, yes, but the approximate thirty-five permanent jobs it would generate do not justify the danger to the water supply and environment along the path of a pipeline carrying tar sands crude. Tar sands crude is 19% more polluting than other forms of crude. The spills will occur, and they are far more serious than regular crude spills because tar sands crude sinks to the water table, and cannot be cleaned up by conventional means. I refer to the spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan and now, Mayflower, Arkansas. The oil is not for us, but for export, so our only function in this country is to help a foreign corporation get rich, and the risk is all on our side. Please reject the permit. Thank you. Suzanne Morris

04/16/2013

Suzanne Morris

Attn: Comments Regarding Keystone XL SEIS northern segment I am asking that the Keystone XL pipeline permit be denied. It is not a job creator, as claimed. Temporary jobs, yes, but the approximate thirty-five permanent jobs it would generate do not justify the danger to the water supply and environment along the path of a pipeline carrying tar sands crude. Tar sands crude is 19% more polluting than other forms of crude. The spills will occur, and they are far more serious than regular crude spills because tar sands crude sinks to the water table, and cannot be cleaned up by conventional means. I refer to the spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan and now, Mayflower, Arkansas. The oil is not for us, but for export, so our only function in this country is to help a foreign corporation get rich, and the risk is all on our side. Please reject the permit. Thank you. Suzanne Morris

04/16/2013

Suzanne Morris

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

THAT PORTION OF THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE ALREADY IN SERVICE HAS HAD TWELVE SPILLS JUST IN THE LAST YEAR. WHEREVER THERE IS OIL. THERE ARE OIL SPILLS. THE OIL THAT WOULD RUN IN THIS PIPELINE (WHICH EVEN THE CANDIAN PEOPLE DO NOT WANT) WILL NOT STAY IN THE US, BUT WILL GO OVERSEAS TO CHINA OR INDIA, BUT IT WILL BE THE US WHO WILL BE TAKING THE VERY CONSIDERABLE RISKS. PLEASE MAKE THE HARD RIGHT DECISION AND SAY NO TO THIS PIPELINE. Sincerely, Swami Daasyaananda

04/16/2013

Swami Daasyaananda

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. We must care about our environment and must act before it is too late.PLEASE reject the Keysont XI Pipeline. An ardent supporter and worker for you, Syrilla Everson Sincerely, Syrilla Everson

04/16/2013

Syrilla Everson

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department Mr President, What are you doing? Remember us? We're the ones who elected you to protect us and our planet. Please end this dangerous game...reject KXL! Please. 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. Sincerely, T Ryan

04/16/2013

T Ryan

Dear Ms. Walker: I am asking for the rejection of the Presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline northern segment. This project is not in the national interest of the United States. I also reject the State Department's refusal to make public the comments regarding this Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). The pipeline will cross more than 1,000 water bodies across the three states of Montana, North Dakota, and Nebraska. The 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. TransCanada's Keystone 1 pipeline, which carried tar sands crude, spilled 14 times in the U.S. in its first year of operation. 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. 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. 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. The total carbon pollution impacts of Keystone XL have been compared to placing up to 9 million cars on the road when considering the total emissions of tar sands and refining processes. Processing heavier, dirtier tar sands oil will increase the amount of toxic pollutants in poor communities near refineries that are already suffering from high rates of asthma and cancer. During TransCanada's initial claims regarding its Presidential permit, it noted that it would create from 20,000 to tens of thousands of jobs. According to the SEIS, only 35 permanent jobs would be created and 15 temporary jobs for pipeline inspection, repair and maintenance would result as a part of this pipeline's approval. 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. 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. And please notice that all pipelines rupture, especially as they age and are subject to corrosion from within and pressure from without, due to shifts in the soil. A case in point is the Exxon tar sands rupture in Mayflower, Arkansas. Tar sands crude constituents are highly corrosive, acidic and easily ignitable, even by the spark of a tool. 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 only built to conventional crude pipeline specs and standards. As pipes with 158 degree temperatures cross farmlands, the soil above the pipes is not arable. This negatively affects the farmers' livelihoods. 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. 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 at a time when we need a secure energy future. TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline product is meant for export. 60% of the oil refined on the Gulf coast is already destined for export. 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. Please take to heart the words of Dr. James Hansen, noted NASA climatologist, as he wrote in the New York Times, May 9, 2012: If Canada proceeds and we do nothing, it will be game over for the climate. 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. If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas and HYPERLINK "<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/coal/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier>" coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere eventually would reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk. That is the long-term outlook. But near-term, things will be bad enough. 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. Economic losses would be incalculable. More and more of the Midwest would be a dust bowl. California's Central Valley could no longer be irrigated. HYPERLINK

"http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/food_prices/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier" Food prices would rise to unprecedented levels. If this sounds apocalyptic, it is. Therefore, it is imperative that the State Department reject the Keystone XL pipeline, and I implore you to do so.

Sincerely, Tahma Metz

04/16/2013

Tahma Metz

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I write once again to urge you to deny construction permits for completion of Keystone XL. Keystone would not reduce domestic oil costs, create the thousands of jobs claimed or be safe. It is not needed, dangerous and a poor use of resources better invested in clean renewable energy. 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. Last month, we saw a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. The Pegasus pipeline is only a tenth the size of the proposed Keystone. Neighborhoods are destroyed and cleanup, as in Michigan a few years ago, will be costly, inadequate and take far longer than predicted. This spill is yet one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, still more toxic form of oil. These spills point out again that pipelines leak and rupture, often in very destructive, unpredictable locations. Oil spills are bad enough, as many spills show, but tar sands are far worse. No good clean up technologies or procedures have been demonstrated for dealing with tar sands spills. The northern proposed section would cross over many important U.S. waterways, the Ogallala aquifer, agricultural lands, and important natural habitats. Tar sands are the dirtiest fossil fuel source yet, worse even than coal. Their development is devastating the Canadian far north. Their development and shipment to refineries will take as much energy as they would produce, while emitting huge amounts of toxic air and water pollution, and greenhouse gases. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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 allow tar sands oil to enter our fuel mix. In Canada growing opposition from environmental and Native American groups means that new tar sands infrastructure may not be developed. There is a good possibility that tar sands oil will not find alternative outlet through Canadian ports. The destination of Keystone is the Houston area refineries and the market for this dirty oil is as much overseas as domestic. Stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands, and their terrible impact on global climate. Keystone is designed for the great profit of Canadian and American oil executives, including the Koch brothers, while it would do nothing to reduce domestic oil costs, and add greatly to climate deterioration, while risks would be borne largely by the public. I demand climate leadership from this Administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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.

Sincerely, Terry & Elvira Burns

04/16/2013

Terry & Elvira Burns

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Last month, a tar sands pipeline in Mayflower, Arkansas spill nearly 10,000 barrels of tar sands oil into a residential neighborhood. This spill is one more indication that we are not prepared to transport or clean up this dirtier, heavier, toxic form of oil. Records from Alberta's Energy and Resources Conservation Board (ERCB) show that, from 1975 to 2010, there were 25,942 company-reported releases from pipelines that transport oil, gas and water. Of these, 9,011 involved the release of crude oil, diesel oil, oily sludge, synthetic crude or oil crude bitumen. The added capacity of Keystone XL and the other two pipelines that have been built recently could more than triple U.S. consumption of tar sands oil one of the most polluting and carbon-intensive fuels in the world. If expansion of tar sands goes unchecked, it will be impossible to reach our goals to reduce global warming pollution, seriously harming both people and wildlife. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. I demand climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. I also request that all comments be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Sincerely, Terry Chin

04/16/2013

Terry Chin

Dear People, I would like to register my opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline. Developing the tar sands in Canada is a bad deal for the local environment as well as the planet as a whole. Anything we can do to make it less economically attractive is the responsible course of action. To say that the environmental damage can be justified by creating a few thousand jobs is terribly short-sighted and smacks of the arguments used to support such projects before the Environmental Protection Act. Let the market provide alternative, green energy solutions. Thanks for listening-- Tom Caffery, P.E.

04/16/2013

Tgcaffery

I am writing to say that I believe the Keystone XL's will have a negative impact on the climate. As you know, it 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." Yes, it would create jobs, but so would the construction and installation of devices that would create energy from the sun, wind, or the tide. There must be ways to create jobs that does not doom the next generation to frequent "freak" hurricanes. Thea Orozco

04/16/2013

Thea Orozco

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. There is no benefit to the U.S. in developing this pipeline. It will not help us to achieve energy independence, and will divert attention and funds from those things that will. It will not create many long lasting or local jobs. It will create dangers for the large area that it crosses and hardship for those who live along that route. I just received a very well thought out and well written letter from Senator Kaine saying why he is opposed to the pipeline. I suggest that you ask him for a copy of the letter he is sending constituents. I hope to hear something similar from you very soon. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Theo Giesy

04/16/2013

Theo Giesy

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We must go Solar / Hydrogen now. NOW . We should be leading in the World , instead of following Europe and Asia in Hydrogen Fuel Cell cars, power plants and infrastructure, millions of green jobs are at stake. Fossil Fuels are history, even in the Persian Gulf Abu Dahabi is building the largest solar plant in the world , in India a U.S. company; Air Products Inc. is building the largest Solar / Hydrogen fuel plant in the world, why not here, why this continuous, disaster of Gulf Oil , Alaskan oil, California, and now Arkansas OIL SPILLS ???? time to go solar/ hydrogen now stop spending billions on " trying non gas cars " running on natural gas etc, get over it. Go solar/ hydrogen now. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Theodore Desmarais

04/16/2013

Theodore Desmarais

Dear President Obama, Please don't let us down on this issue. I'm counting on you to step up and lead our country, our world, in protecting the environment. We're destroying our world for the sake of the almighty dollar. It has to stop. Theresza Schroepfer United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Theresa Schroepfer

Dear President Obama, Please don't let us down on this issue. I'm counting on you to step up and lead our country, our world, in protecting the environment. We're destroying our world for the sake of the almighty dollar. It has to stop. Theresza Schroepfer United States of America ____

04/16/2013

Theresa Schroepfer

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? Please explain your decisions to me. Thank you.

Therese MacKenzie

04/16/2013

Therese Mackenzie

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Oil will kill are planet.it kills are bothers and sisters every day fuck the oil companys I would rather die in some cold house without a car then live on a planet filled with these vile people this must stop now

Sincerely, Thomas Fahlman

04/16/2013

Thomas Fahlman

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Our future generations need a pro-green, environmentally positive present day leadership. Please continue to teach by action, that short term energy thinking can and will lead to a devastating environment for both our country and the world. Sincerely, Thomas Keenan

04/16/2013

Thomas Keenan

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I know all the excuses, all the explanations for doing this....what is becoming really sad is knowing that big money wins most of the time, with little to no attention to the damage to the environment. I know we need jobs, that we need to get free of foreign oil (although Canadian oil is foreign), but each day now I am reading of a new destruction to our environment. Years ago, before the oil spill in the gulf, on a charter fishing expedition, the captain of the ship then said that the gulf was all fished out due to the greed of people wanting fish...then can the oil spill and BP telling us everything is back to normal off the gulf coast. They lie...what sea life is harvested has been ruined if not totally damaged by big oil...now we must bear the burden of how we need jobs and the pipeline...if we don't stand up to big oil, to big money now, when? So I add my voice of opposition to this Keystone project, and endorse what is written below. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, Thomas Madden

04/16/2013

Thomas Madden

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. PLEASE REJECT KEYSTONE! Sincerely, Tim Chreene

04/16/2013

Tim Chreene

BUILD THE PIPELINE NOW IT IS ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND WE NEED THE JOBS Tim McCarthy

04/16/2013

Tim McCarthy

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. I know there are big money politics involved, but when does the line get drawn against blatant stupidity? When does the line get drawn in favor of what is obviously right vs. what is obviously wrong? History will call NOW that time. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Timothea Murphy

04/16/2013

Timothea Murphy

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. I urge you to reject the pipeline. Thank you. Timothy Burns

04/16/2013

Timothy Burns

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. How many spills must we see? How much environmental devastation can we live through? Is it worth it for 20 new jobs? Investing in renewable energy will create many more jobs than a pipeline. Please don't allow this travesty to happen. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Timothy Engel

04/16/2013

Timothy Engel

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. We don't need this nasty stuff going through our country from Canada to the Gulf coast. Providing 15,000 jobs is not worth the problems this pipeline is developing and causing let alone the maintenance of it. We Americans deserve better than this. INSIST ON DEVELOPING RENEWABLE, CLEAN, AND INFINITE ENERGY. The tar sands and Keystone are ridiculous and incredibly unhealthy for the United States. What were we thinking....no doubt money and oil and gas lobbyists. Take a stand against the Keystone and just say no and no way! Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Tina Bush

04/16/2013

Tina Bush

Tao Nguyen April 16, 2013 Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator Dear Genevieve Walker: Dear Ms. Walker: I am writing to comment on the State Department's Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline and to support a Presidential Permit for the project. Americans have waited nearly five years for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline to be approved and for the federal government to allow its benefits to be realized in our economy. After all the delays, it is time to act. The Keystone XL Pipeline will help ensure that Canadian oil will continue to play a significant and growing role in meeting U.S. energy demand for the foreseeable future. The State Department's own Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement accurately finds: - The pipeline running from the Canadian border to Steele City, Nebraska would have no significant impacts on the environmental resources along the pipeline route. - The project is unlikely to have substantial impact on the rate of Canadian oil sands development or the amount of heavy crude oil refined at Gulf Coast refineries. - The life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions impact of denying the project will also be small. - The evaluation of alternate pipeline options and designs did not identify any preferred options to the proposed project. Given the implications for national energy security and our economic well-being, I strongly urge the State Department to finalize its environmental review and authorize a Presidential Permit as soon as possible for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. A permit would clearly be in our nation's best interests. Sincerely, Tao Nguyen

04/16/2013 E-mail was provided in name field, redacted

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. My children, our children and grandchildren deserve a chance to live in a world with less dependence on fossil fuel for both economic and health reasons. The Keystone XL pipeline will simply continue our dependence on even more polluting and dangerous fossil fuels. The time is not to take a stand and redirect the country's energy investments. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so stopping Keystone XL will indeed be a big step against the tar sands. You promised environmental leadership and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, Tom & Maureen Olson

04/16/2013

Tom & Maureen Olson

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Please stand up for the people who put their faith in you instead of the wildly greedy fossil fuel supporters. The people need principaled leadership. If you start to show it you just might avoid the disintegration of society that will surely follow the continued sellout that the political class is pursuing. Please. Sincerely, tom schmitz

04/16/2013

Tom Schmitz

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. I AM IN OPPOSITION TO THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE!!!! 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.... PLEASE STOP THE CORPORATIONS FROM RUNNING THIS COUNTRY AND LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE WHAT IS BEST FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT. THANK YOU Sincerely, Toni Maira

04/16/2013

Toni Maira

No KXL!!!!!!!!!!11 Trevor Roark

04/16/2013

Trevor Roark

To whom it may concern: I am opposed to the Keystone XL pipeline being built. Our land, water, climate are being destroyed so people can drive cars a few more years, some people can have temporary work for a few years, a few companies can rake in a lot of cash. The trade-off is so not worth it I don't even know where to start. These comments are specifically about the EIR. This gives me two starting places. 1) The recent pipeline breakage in Mayflower, Arkansas. The people who were subjected to it would disagree with me, but we're lucky it didn't occur in endangered species habitat. What did the EIR say about the chance of this happening? For that matter, by rerouting the pipeline the parties involved are admitting that spills have a real good chance of occurring. This kind of poison the land does not need. 2) Climate change. Not the impact ON the project; the impact OF the project. This is such an obvious issue. Why wasn't it addressed? As an American, NO. As a human, I am sick of the negative impact our economic is having on the rest of the planet. One way or the other, we're either going to run out of oil or make the environment unable to support us. The radical path is business as usual. We need to admit it and take the reasonable path of enormous, difficult change. Reject this biased EIR. Don't allow the pipeline to be built. Sincerely yours, lyn stein

04/16/2013

Tumble Weed

The Keystone XL Pipeline would be a disaster for our planet. It would put \$ in the hands of TransCanada at our expense. It would poison our clean water and create horrific global warming, all for the benefit of foreign corporations. STOP THE PIPELINE NOW. Tusi Ritachild

04/16/2013

Tusi Ritachild

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Just this past month, we have seen 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. The Arkansas spill also highlighted numerous unanswered questions that must be addressed before we allow a tar sands pipeline nearly ten times the size of the Pegasus line to bisect our country and run through one of our most important aquifers in my home state of Nebraska. In any case, we do not have any shortage of fuel supplies in our country at this time. Already this month, we have seen several record-breaking temperatures across the United States -- just one more indication that we are already experiencing the increasing impacts of climate change and that we need to alter our course immediately. I believe that it is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. Many of the administration's bold advances in clean energy and vehicle efficiency have been positive and critically important for our future, but much of that progress -- and the credit that comes with it -- will be erased if we also develop the tar sands unnecessarily. Sincerely, V. Edward Olson

04/16/2013

V. Edward Olson

Dear State Department Representative, The more I study the issue of climate change, the more I am convinced that we need to be bold and act now. Despite all the money that has already been spent on the tar sands mines by Shell, Suncor, and others in the energy business; despite the idea that the US will finally become energy self-sufficient; despite the jobs that will be created for some; we must say NO to the pipeline and put all our efforts into transforming our culture. We need clean energy sources, not dirtier ones that have become "profitable." We need to save the livelihoods of the fishermen and shellfish farmers who are losing out to acidification of the seas. We need to save the lives of all those who live in the floodplains of Burma, India, and those who depend ice melt for drinking water. We need to save our commons: the land, the water, and the air, from degradation through the inevitable leaks and spills and accidents that will occur during transport. Yes pipelines are safer, but, saying Yes to the pipeline is like giving out free clean needles to junkies. The junkies still die in the end. The pipeline just makes the extraction business more profitable. Please stand up for all our descendants. Deny the pipeline. Valerie Brewster

04/16/2013

Valerie Brewster

I grew up in Nebraska and I do not want to see ANY possibility of a tar-sands oil spill polluting the great Sand Hills area, rivers or waterways, or eventually seeping into the very important Ogallala aquifer. Man-made pipelines can and do break or malfunction; they are vulnerable targets for "benign" vandalism as well as malevolent acts of terrorism. Do not allow the Keystone pipeline. Sincerely, Va Nee L. Van Vleck

04/16/2013

Vanee Van Vleck

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. We (the people) have said again and again: the climate is far more important than the minute benefit we derive from the Keystone Pipeline. Should there be an accident, the cost would far exceed that benefit. WE need to take the lead in abating carbon emissions, not enable them. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Vicki Leidner

04/16/2013

Vicki Leidner

Apr 16, 2013 US State Department Dear Department, I dont want to live in a world where all that exists is humans, animals destined to slaughter and plants destined to food production. Theres would be no magic, no discovery no diversity. The earth is a beautifull place because of its natural diversity! Please understand that money should not triumph over life. I have an electric car now in hopes to stop encouraging this sort of disasters and doing my share for OUR home, the planet. The weather has been so up and down this year. If it goes to much out of wack we wont be able to grow food anymore! Come on guys, spend money on finding an alternate energy source. We all know oil is not renewable, just drop it and stop kicking the dead horse. The U.S. State Department's environmental review of the northern segment of the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline fails to meaningfully assess this dirty energy project in a manner that accounts for its immense climate and environmental impacts. 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. 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. Sincerely, Victoria Druelle

04/16/2013

Victoria Druelle

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. please read all of this and vote NO TO THE KEYSTONE PIPELINE BEFORE THE ENTIRE US IS DESTROYED!!!!!! Now there is a major EXXON spill in Mayflower, Arkansas after their Pegasus pipeline sprung a leak while bringing heavy Canadian crude from Canada to Texas. This pipeline carries 90,000 barrels (!) a day of heavy toxic crude oil! Also this same week, a train carrying EXXON Canadian crude oil derailed in Mayflower, Minnesota, spilling 15,000 gallons of crude oil. This spill caused the EPA to categorize the spill as a "major spill" and 22 families had to evacuate!! And, of course, EXXON is now working hard to get our U.S. State Dept, EPA, Congress, and President to approve the Keystone XL pipeline, which would bring Canada's crude oil sands all the way down to our Gulf Coast for processing. This pipeline is so huge it will carry 800,000 barrels per day. Several months ago, an environmental group went down to view the Keystone XL pipe sections which are sitting along the roads awaiting the gov't approval to be buried. The group walked through many of the huge sections (remember these huge pipes would carry 800,000 barrels of caustic tar sands oil a day!) and were shocked by what they saw as they walked through the sections. They saw daylight coming through many holes along the seams of each section!!!! IF DAYLIGHT CAN COME IN, CAN'T OIL LEAK OUT THOSE SAME HOLES? 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Virginia Lindsey

04/16/2013

Virginia Lindsey

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. 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. 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. We *cannot* and *should not* risk damaging the aquifer that so many people (and farms) depend on. Future generations will not understand why we ruined our water resource and farmland for the brief gain of using a dirty fuel for a limited time. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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. Sincerely, Virginia Rosenbaum

04/16/2013

Virginia Rosenbaum

You know you are lying and that the pipeline is about short term gain for already filthy rich bastards. Grow up and do the right thing, before it is too late. You and your children will be as adversely affected. As all other life on the planet. Don't you dare approve this catastrophe. Virginia Soules

04/16/2013

Virginia Soules

Ms. Kingsley- I am happy to receive comments by mail at the following address: Genevieve Walker NEPA Coordinator US Department of State 2201 C Street, NW OES/ENV Room 2726 Washington, DC 20520 Thank you for asking. Genevieve -----Original Message----- From: Rachel Kingsley Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 11:58 PM To: Mailbox, KeyStoneComments Subject: How do people who have no email address submit comments? Hello, I know a few people who would like to submit comments, but they have no email, or are opposed to using the internet. Is there a way for them to submit their comments? Please let me know ASAP. thank you so much! Rachel Kingsley

04/16/2013

Walker, Genevieve

Tar sands oil extraction seems to be a bad idea from start to finish. It's an environmental disaster at its source, a potential environmental disaster in its movement through miles and miles of pipeline, and an environmental disaster as the oil is combusted. Let's move toward less destructive energy options!
Wayne Leeds

04/16/2013

Wayne Leeds

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Yes, it's a tough decision. But balance the promised jobs that could come with building the pipeline against the impact that this will have on our future. You both will no doubt live to regret your decision if this goes forward. 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. 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. Then this month, we have seen record-breaking temperatures in major cities across the United States -- just one more indication that we are experiencing the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change and need to alter our course immediately. It is impossible to fight climate change while simultaneously investing in the dirtiest, most carbon-intensive fossil fuels on the planet. 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. Environmental momentum in Canada means that other new tar sands infrastructure is no longer a guarantee, so 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. 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.

Sincerely, wes hetrick

04/16/2013

Wes Hetrick

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. Already we are at 390 parts per million of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.. The climate changes are occurring more quickly than the IPCC anticipated just a few years ago, and the informed scientists are alarmed. The consensus on the big picture among the specialists who aren't on the oil and gas industry payroll and who know what they're talking about is overwhelming. The glaciers are melting. The ocean is becoming more acidic. The extent of droughts and violent storms are becoming ever more frequent. Mother nature is going to force huge changes in the global human energy economy whether we like it or not. It's just a question of how abrupt and violent our transition is going to be. The longer we delay doing something serious about climate change, the more wrenching the transition and the attendant trouble and suffering. The long term consequences for all forms of life, especially more complex organisms and humans, are dire. Fifty years out, a hundred years out, unborn generations will suffer to a degree we can't imagine. Approval of the pipeline WILL INCREASE THE MAGNITUDE OF THE GLOBAL PROBLEM AND DECREASE THE BEGINNING OF THE NECESSARY TRANSITION TO A SUSTAINING CLEAN ENERGY ECONOMY. For the short term calculation of advantages and disadvantages, none of the industry arguments stand up to serious scrutiny. They vastly exaggerate the number of jobs the project will create, both for construction and maintenance. Pipeline accidents will happen eventually damaging the communities and the water supply in the communities the pipelines passes through. The extraction of tar sands oil is dirty, dirty, dirty and 30% more expensive financially than extraction of conventional oil., Already, a 100 square miles of wilderness in northern Alberta has been desecrated. Google Earth, which anyone can log on to, shows the light at night in the tar sands area is just as bright as New York City, so much gas is being flared off during the extraction.. It's not true that the tar sands oil will be extracted and sent to market anyway. If Transcanada can't get the dirty oil to the gulf refineries that can handle it, they and the other fossil fuel companies will have to make mega investments in refineries on the west coals of British Columbia. THEY WILL THINK TWICE ABOUT DOING THIS IT WILL BE SO EXPENSIVE AND TAKE SO LONG. the whole process of oil extraction and release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere will be slowed down . RATHER THAN PUSH ON THE ACCELERATOR WE NEED TO STEP ON THE BREAKS.

Approving the pipeline accelerates the process of climate change with its consequences not just in the short term but for future generations. Rejecting the pipeline will moderate the speed and depth of the adjustment. There is a conflict between the short term economic interests of oil and gas companies, and the interests of unborn generations of humans and other life. So I urge President Obama to take a step back from trying to balance the differing political pressures of the moment -- of the oil and gas industry, on the one hand, and the environmental movement, on the other -- and to think of unborn generations and the great disruption that is coming, and to reject the pipeline, which will deepen this enormous problem that is facing human life on our planet. Sincerely, William Rittenberg

04/16/2013

William Rittenberg

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. The time has come to fish or cut bait: expressing concern over global climate change is just hollow rhetoric unless we start making meaningful cuts in greenhouse gas emissions. Even more urgent, we must not do anything to enable sources of previously untapped fossil fuels to undergo widespread exploitation -- like tar sands oil. As the price of oil continues its inevitable slow rise, the fossil fuel industries will "find" that fuel extracted from brand new sources -- oil shale, fractured underground rock and tar sands -- can be economically developed. But extracting the fuel from these sources entails much greater environmental costs than the declining production of already-developed sources, none of which these fossil fuel pay for and include in their estimates of development costs. Society as a whole, and some unlucky individuals, will pay these costs. Do you think any compensation from Exxon Mobil will ever make up for what the current tar sands pipeline oil spill in Arkansas is doing to those people's homes and neighborhood? The fossil fuel companies do not really care about the adverse consequences of the sources and the processes by which they extract their products and bring them to market. The costs of accidents is just another one of their costs of doing business, which they just pass along to consumers. Even worse they have completely turned a deaf ear to their own impact on global warming. They absolutely do not care and their head-in-the-sand attitude must not prevail any longer. Finally, it would be the height of irresponsibility to approve any new permits for drilling or transporting oil until vastly more effective devices and techniques for cleaning up oil spills is developed. The oil industry has not come up with any effective means of containing and cleaning up oil spills yet, and the technology they have continued to employ right up to the present time has been shown to be woefully inadequate. We must have climate leadership from this administration, and that has to begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. 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. Sincerely, William Schoene

04/16/2013

William Schoene

Voo-doo science from the tobacco industry made it very difficult to get legislation against tobacco. Now, the fossil fuel industry, and those closely related, are using tobacco's method. Serious climate change is already here and if we don't reduce the greenhouse gas emissions significantly, NOW, civilization is on its way out. This is eminently more critical than the tobacco issue. We can change course drastically or we can suffer the consequences of greed and stupidity. We have to decide.

William T. Smith

04/16/2013

William T. Smith

Apr 16, 2013 Keystone XL State Department 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. 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. 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. I demand climate leadership from this administration. And that begins with the rejection of Keystone XL. There is no reason that I can see why the pipeline should go through the U.S. It could just as easily go through Canada to the coast and be shipped from there. It puts an enormous risk on the citizens of the United States. Sincerely, William Winstead

04/16/2013

William Winstead

Apr 16, 2013 State Department DC Dear Department, I write in favor of the climate and in opposition to Keystone XL and the tar sands. With your second term I am looking forward to climate leadership for the USA and the world and that can begin with the rejection of Keystone XL. This comment on the draft SEIS and the pipeline, and all other comments, should be made public in the interest of transparency and accountability. Thank you. Yolanda Morris

04/16/2013

Yolanda Morris

Dear President Obama and Secretary Kerry, I am asking you to reject the Keystone XL pipeline as a concerned American and high school student. It's not just about energy, fuel and jobs. It's about my future and the future of our country. This is our planet. We've only got one, and we need to treasure it. Please, please don't go through with this idea. We deserve a safe and healthy environment, and the Keystone XL pipeline will endanger not only the environment, but the climate as well. Thank you.
Zoë Coleman

04/16/2013

Zoë Coleman

My name is Kevin Zuhlke. I am a husband, father of one, and a 6th generation Nebraska farmer. I have lived in Nebraska in the Verdigris and Elkhorn river valleys most of my life. I am a graduate of UNL, Neligh High school, and an Eagle Scout. While living and farming here I have become more and more environmentally conscious and caring. Through the years we have put in structures to prevent water pollution from manure, fuel and fertilizer. We have stopped pouring used oil on the roads and now recycle that oil. Our farm tests our soil to prevent over fertilization, recently we have begun to take plant tissue tests to do an even better job of fertilizing. We no longer till our soils to prevent air pollution and keep this vital resource where it belongs. Herbicide use has been cut in half through the use of rotational grazing and fire. Our fences have been lowered to prevent wildlife injury. Trees are planted to slow the wind and provide shade and wildlife habitat. Since implementing these better methods, Trout have returned to the streams, prairie chickens, pheasants and quail to the grasslands, ducks, cranes, and geese to the lakes and swamps. All things that were not here when I was a child. All the while improving our bottom line. Keystone XL puts all of this at risk. One leak and it is all reversed. Years of hard work all for not. The reason why? I am told is we need more oil. Even though the oil is leaving the Midwest and is going to the coast for export. Some say our oil prices will even go up because of this pipeline. Yet, my elected leaders of Nebraska all support the pipeline. Are they from Nebraska? Do they even care? Am I missing something? Do they know something I do not? As I research this decision more and more it appears there are no benefits for our state or our people. Oil prices will go up or stay the same. The project only brings 418 million to the state. While just our corn production brings in 3 billion annually. A leak could destroy a Nebraskans' livelihood. I read the only taxes that will be applied will be property taxes. Why the oil is not taxed by the gallon I do not know? I cannot and will not support this pipeline. I have decided I will no longer support any Nebraska Representative that does support this pipeline. I encourage you to deny this permit. To stand up for me as a Nebraskan as a young Farmer, Father and Husband. Please do what is right and say no to keystone xl.

04/16/2013

Zuhlke, Kevin