

**From:** Can i get a label on you hay inoculant please? [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2022 9:17 AM

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

**Subject:** [EXT] Carbon Pipeline

Jay Poindexter  
[REDACTED]

Ree Heights, SD 57371  
[REDACTED]

PUC Docket #(HP22-001) (Summit Carbon Solutions LLC, Petition for a Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Permit)

Members of the PUC,

I am writing this letter in opposition of the Summit Carbon Solutions Pipeline. I have several major concerns about this project.

The first reason I am opposed to the project is the pipeline will only be 4' in the ground. To those that don't farm, let me explain, on wet years things get stuck. From my personal experience, 2019 is still way too fresh in my mind. To say it lightly, everything was a challenge, and it seemed like everything got stuck in one way shape or form. We had combines stuck close to 4' in the ground. Imagine what would happen when you are combining along and happen to bury your combine right over this pipeline. The COO of Summit Carbon Solutions, Jimmy Powell, said via a zoom call at the Hand County Commissioners meeting on January 4th, that it would be "detrimental" to someone if they were close to the pipeline, and it exploded. Think about that for a second.

I attended the Hand County Commissioners meeting on March 2nd and asked Grant Terry, the chief pipeline engineer for South Dakota, why it couldn't be deeper. His response was the pipeline wouldn't be stable at a deeper depth. Evidently, frost heaves are not a problem? I have heard in some places; the pipeline will run within 200' of a dwelling. I ask of you, if you do approve this project, at least put some regulations that would consider public safety!

The next major problem I have is we have not met with our land agent. I have no idea who they are or even what their name is, we just received the easement via email. Some people who have had conversations with them, say they won't sign the easement. The land agents' response was, "It doesn't matter, they will just take it by eminent domain anyway." Summit doesn't even have the PUC permit and they are already telling people this? This isn't right; no wonder so very few of the people affected by this pipeline have signed the easement. The other concern is that Dan Lederman, the person from Summit, who is trying to promote this project to the public is also the Chairman of the Republican Party in South Dakota. Is this a conflict of interests? I question if politics already has this project bought? I hope South Dakota isn't going the way that national politics has gone, where money buys favor.

Another concern I have is the language in the easement itself. It doesn't say much about where liability falls, and who it falls on. For example, when asked if there was a natural rupture of the pipeline on your property, and a bunch of cows were killed due to the CO2, who is responsible for the damage? We have asked at the County Commissioner meetings some of these questions. The response is, "It's in the easement". When we told them it is not in the easement, they stated it is a "good faith" policy that the company would do the right thing. I'm sorry, but that is not a good enough answer for me. There is nothing in the easement limiting development of further infrastructure or use.

The last concern I will share with you is the money side of the project. I have read an article from Commstock Investment in which the author David Kruse from Royal Iowa, who is also directly involved with the project as it comes across his farm, did the math with the Carbon Credit and came up with that this company will make between

\$800,000,000 and \$2,200,000,000 a year once it is complete. When asked if yearly payments are an option, so landowners could become partners, it was refused at the public meeting in Redfield in October. I think landowners deserve to receive an annual payment, at minimum, of at least what the onetime payment offer is worth.

In conclusion, I believe that Summit Carbon Solutions is not being honest, and upfront with the public. We don't seem to be able to get the answers to questions we ask. We have gone from knowing nothing about this project to a request for a PUC permit in 6 months. It sure seems like they want this through quick for some reason. If they want to develop a working relationship with landowners, at least be honest with us.

Thanks for your time  
Jay Poindexter