

From: Donald Klassen [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 5, 2022 5:48 PM
To: PUC <PUCPF@state.sd.us>
Subject: Re: [EXT] HP22-001

Thank you for your reply, Mr. Nelson. I would think that the PUC has an obligation to protect citizens from unfair easements that do not benefit the landowners. As I read [SDCL 49-41B-36](#), it seems as though legislature should change the wording to enable the PUC to reroute what is not desirable. To me, it seems as though SDCL ties the hands of the PUC.

Attorneys stand to make mega bucks for **each** property owner to hire an attorney to fight a multi-dollar company who wants the right to ALL the owner's property 24 hours a day. That is unreasonable! Easements should only be a narrow strip of land that is affected, NOT ALL property. Signing an easement puts landowners at risk several ways: 1) not being able to sue whereas the pipeline company can sue, 2) NOT being able to get insurance, and 3) not being able to develop the land because the pipeline company acts as though they own the land. As I see it, landowners lose all rights to their property. That seems unjust.

What criteria can the PUC use to deny SCS permit?

Respectfully,
Don Klassen