

**From:** john h anderson [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2022 3:28 PM

**To:** PUC <[PUCPF@state.sd.us](mailto:PUCPF@state.sd.us)>

**Cc:** Jim Anderson [REDACTED] Mary Balducci [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: [EXT] SSC Carbon Transport LLC

Staff of PUC: I would appreciate a response to my question of 3/14/22 on the string below. The response I received simply states how I can ask questions and where to see the answers. That does not answer my question around remote attendance. In any event per you comments my name is John H. Anderson 55 Rolling Hills Dr. Cody Wyoming 82414. I would like my questions read per your policy during the meeting in DeSmet SD where our property is located. 1. Sounds as though the proposal to cross our land will require yet another easement in addition to the one we provided not long ago to another pipeline. Is that correct Yes or No? If yes this CO2 pipeline essentially follows the other and it would seem the same land owners are being specifically targeted to deal with yet another pipeline. Can you explain why alternative routes aren't being considered and is there any assurance we won't be faced with yet another line in the future and be asked to provide even more land for easements? 2. Does SSC have any relationship, financial or otherwise, to any of the sources of the CO2 and or the entities that will provide the geological site for the storage of the CO2? 3. Does SSC receive any financial benefit other than revenues from operating the pipeline? 4. Do any of the parties involved receive carbon credits that can be sold in the carbon credit market? If so will that be used as part of the calculus in determining the financial benefit for landowner who agree to allow for the easement on their property. I would like to comment that I have made several calls to the May Adam law firm representing SSC and never received any response. Regards John H. Anderson

On Monday, March 14, 2022, john h anderson [REDACTED] wrote:

I assume the answer to my question and request is a NO?

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** john h anderson [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2022 1:09 PM

**To:** PUC-PUC <[PUC@state.sd.us](mailto:PUC@state.sd.us)>

**Cc:** Mary Balducci [REDACTED] Jim Anderson [REDACTED]

**Subject:** [EXT] SSC Carbon Transport LLC

PUC: I am a partner in a Family LP that has owned farmland West of DeSmet SD for nearly 100 years maybe more. Some time ago we agreed to allow a oil and gas pipeline cross our property. The transmission of those fossil fuels ultimately became part of the problem with CO2 emissions and now we are being asked again to grant an easement to transport back in essence the same CO2 released by those fossil fuels. I personally like as much factual information before making a rational decision but at this point the letter dated 2/11/22 from May Adam law firm and the information on your website is insufficient to do so. Unfortunately I cannot attend the public hearing in person but would respectfully request that PUC allows for a webex, zoom or at minimum a speaker phone that will allow absent land owners and other people with an interest to partake in the proceeding. Certainly after the common usage of these technologies in the past two years to communicate remotely because of Covid this should not be an unreasonable request. In advance, my apologies, if such arrangements have already been made but the only thing I read in the event I cannot attend is the ability to email my questions

and access responses on your website. Not being able to hear or see all parties involved in the proceeding is a significant disadvantage for me to make a well informed decision. Would appreciate a response as soon as possible. Regards John H. Anderson