
**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE
APPLICATION BY SCS CARBON
TRANSPORT LLC FOR A PERMIT TO
CONSTRUCT A CARBON DIOXIDE
TRANSMISSION PIPELINE**

HP22-001

INTERVENOR

MCHPERSON COUNTY

**INITIAL PRE-FILED TESTIMONY
REGARDING SUMMIT'S
APPLICATION**

Q: Please state your name.

A: My name is Austin Hoffman. I am the State's Attorney for McPherson County and I submit this on behalf of McPherson County which is an Intervenor in these proceedings.

Q: Is there a considerable amount of land located in McPherson County that you believe could be negatively affected by the proposed Summit hazardous CO2 pipeline (hereafter "proposed hazardous pipeline")?

A: Yes.

Q: Is there a considerable amount of county road crossings that would be needed in McPherson County should this proposed hazardous pipeline application be granted.

A: Yes.

Q: Does the County have any concerns about the effects of pre-construction, construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed hazardous pipeline should the PUC approve this application?

A: Yes. The County has many concerns.

Q: Is the County aware of any concerns related to property development and property taxes should the proposed hazardous pipeline application be approved?

A: Yes. Citizens our of County have been very vocal about their concerns and also opposition to this proposed hazardous pipeline. Our County Board of Commissioners has enacted zoning changes and other ordinances related to concerns about the orderly development of the community and related to placement and location of hazardous pipeline infrastructure. I am also aware of concerns that if this proposed hazardous pipeline is constructed through our County that landowners plan to protest their property valuations for those directly affected and there is concern that will lead to reduced tax revenue the County needs to operate.

Q: What was the intent of the Board in passing these ordinances?

A: To exercise their authority over local zoning and land use matters and focus on intelligent land use for years to come.

Q: Has Summit confirmed they would respect and follow the ordinances as passed?

A: Summit has sued the County challenging aspects of the ordinances. This is causing the County to devote time and attention to a lawsuit as well as incurring expenses that we don't believe we should be subjected to. The process has been distressing to those who were simply doing what they believe the needed to do for the good of the community.

Q: Has Summit and its representatives been a frequent presence at County meetings over the past year?

A: Yes they have. We have given them countless opportunities to present and be heard and get their points across. I believe the County has always keep an open mind to all sides of this issue and has always tried to do what it believe is best and within the powers of the County.

Q: Are all of your statements in your testimony provided above true and accurate as of the date you signed this document to the best of your knowledge?

A: Yes, they are.

Q: Have you fully expressed each and every opinion, concern, or fact you would like the PUC Commissioners to consider in their review of Summit's Application?

A: No, I have not. I have shared that which I can think of as of the date I signed this document below, but other things may come to me or my memory may be refreshed and I will add and address those things at the time of the Hearing and address any additional items at that time as is necessary

Q: Thank you, I have no further questions at this time and reserve the right to ask you additional questions at time of the Hearing in this matter.

Dated June 16, 2023

/s/ Austin Hoffman

Austin Hoffman, State's Attorney
for McPherson County