

**From:** Caleb Wiechmann [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, January 12, 2025 6:43 PM  
**To:** PUC-PUC <[PUC@state.sd.us](mailto:PUC@state.sd.us)>  
**Subject:** [EXT] HP24-001 In the Matter of the Application by SCS Carbon Transport LLC for a Permit to Construct a Carbon Dioxide Transmission Pipeline

Caleb Wiechmann  
[REDACTED]  
Prairie City, SD 57649

[REDACTED]

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing to encourage you to reject the Summit Carbon Solutions permit application. South Dakota does not want this. I helped with the effort to defeat SB201/Referred Law 21. With the majority of people, all it took was some truthful information and they were ready to vote against the referred law. The election results bore this out. And of course, a vote against Referred Law 21 was basically a vote against the pipeline. Since the voters have already given Summit a thumbs down, I would urge you to do the same.

South Dakota does not need a carbon dioxide pipeline. The proposed Summit pipeline would not create wealth. Rather, it is a waste of time and money that is based on the globalist lie that carbon is a pollutant. It is only because of the Federal tax credit that the pipeline is an economically viable idea. South Dakota is a land rich in natural resources and opportunity. We definitely don't need the crumbs of federal welfare that might fall from Summit's table in order to thrive here. The dangers of a high-pressure pipeline, along with the loss of control of our property, are not worth some hoped for gain—especially when that gain is taken off the backs of the taxpayers.

Since North Dakota has somewhat caved on this carbon dioxide pipeline scheme, South Dakota stands as the last defense against it. Besides the money that is at stake, there is the question of who will control the property. The control question is probably the bigger question. I realize that because of this there is intense pressure on you to give in. Although Summit and those pushing it are loud and important sounding, there are many more of us little guys than there are of them. And we are behind you.

You have told Summit "no" once. The South Dakota Supreme Court has told Summit "no." The South Dakota voters have told Summit "no." Summit is very slow to understand "no." We must continue to faithfully tell Summit "no" until they are able to fully comprehend.

Thank You very much for your consideration.  
Respectfully Submitted,  
Caleb Wiechmann