

Enclosed is the amended Application for Party Status for Ben Krohmer.

**RECEIVED**  
DEC 26 2024  
SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

I have a direct interest in this project for multiple reasons:

1. During the December 17<sup>th</sup> Hearing Commissioners indicated there would be future discussions on the width of the corridor on whether it would stay at 2 miles or be increased. If the distance is increased to the same distance as it was in previous similar dockets then I would live within the 10-mile corridor.
2. I am concerned for the orderly development of the community. There are three housing developments on the North side of Mitchell. One of the housing developments is within 2 miles of the proposed project. I'm concerned for the economic development and growth of the city to the North, since that is the direction it seems most housing developments are trending.
3. In the housing developments mentioned in the above Section 2, my company will be doing excavating work on new homes that will be constructed, including the housing development within 2 miles of the proposed project.
4. I have customers outside of the housing developments that are also within the narrowed 2-mile corridor where we will be required to conduct excavation work in the form of digging and trenching for sewer, water, septic tanks, yard hydrants, cattle waterers, stock tanks, etc.
5. I have a pilot's license and frequent the Mitchell Municipal Airport quite often. The Mitchell Municipal Airport is within 2 miles of the proposed project. The approach for Runway 13 goes right over the top of the project by only 1,500 feet.
6. As a taxpayer I have direct concerns for the costs to local governments for response and readiness plans along with the early alert system, vehicles, and equipment needed if an incident involving the carbon pipeline were to occur.
7. As of the date of both my original filing and this amended filing, I'm the elected State Representative for District 20 and I currently represent the affected Davison, Sanborn, and Minor Counties in the South Dakota Legislature. I have many concerned constituents along the route in all three affected counties. Elected officials are elected to represent their constituents.

If the corridor is extended to 10 miles, as it was in previous similar dockets, Section 1 above would be a direct interest.

During the hearing on December 17<sup>th</sup> PUC Staff stated that a direct interest extends beyond just living within the designated corridor, it also includes working and frequenting the area as well. When asked by Commissioner Fiegen if hiking, biking, motorsports, recreational activities, etc qualify as frequenting the area, PUC Staff answered in the affirmative. Those statements and answers by PUC Staff affirm that Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 above are a direct interest.

As a taxpayer Section 6 is a direct interest.

The above Section 7 is a direct interest by the nature of being elected to represent constituents, and the fact that it's on the PUC Application for Party Status form as a qualifier for party status. The only party that has mentioned this section of applications has been SCS, which requested to exclude elected office holders from seeking party status and represent their constituents; which means they disagree with the PUC application form. I have not seen any response to SCS request from PUC Staff or Commissioners. This section of my application was not mentioned or addressed at the December 17<sup>th</sup> hearing.