

From: Chuva Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 8, 2022 2:42 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] Comment on Docket #HP22-001

Chairman Nelson and Your Fellow Commissioners:

Thank you for responding to our comments raising concerns on docket #HP22-001.

In response to your points addressed to us, we are NOT requesting that commissioners "not follow the specific criteria in state law and deny this permit without proper cause." To the contrary, we citizens insist that as part of the PUC's process of "fully reviewing and processing the application" for this siting permit the commission recognizes that according to its own criteria for the *Applicant's burden of proof* (49-41B-22) there is thus far MOST CERTAINLY NOT a preponderance of evidence that:

- 2) The facility will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment nor to the social and economic condition of inhabitants or expected inhabitants of the siting area.
- 3) The facility will not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants.
- 4) The facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given the views of governing bodies of affected local units of government.

1.

It is our understanding that this proposed hazardous CO2 pipeline WOULD in fact pose a threat of serious injury to the environment and to the social and economic conditions of the inhabitants; WOULD pose a threat to substantially impair the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants; and WOULD unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. There has been no satisfactory evidence to the contrary on these points for us South Dakota citizens who are paying attention. Please take that into serious consideration as you go forward "fully reviewing and processing the application". Trusting an LLC company when it claims all the ways in which it will not harm the land and the citizens while virtually everyone else (including the "governing bodies of affected LOCAL units of government" 49-41B-22 *Applicant's burden of proof*) is aware of how that is precisely what's at risk will not indicate that the PUC is operating in accordance with its own clearly stated criteria. Please note that we are aware of what happened in Satartia, Mississippi, and it is not a matter of IF, but WHEN, something like that happens along this proposed hazardous pipeline.

Signed In Opposition to #HP22-001 and Its Alternate Route,

Chuva Johnson and Mark Brim

[REDACTED]

Garretson, SD 57030

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]