

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 7:38 AM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] SCS Carbon Transport PUC Docket HP24-001

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept this correspondence regarding the proposed pipeline (PUC Docket HP24-001) stating my opposition to the granting of the said pipeline. Applicant has failed on all counts to meet the Applicant Responsibility as stated in the Guide to Siting Pipelines. First, applicant has failed to comply with all applicable laws and rules: The route maps presented fail to adequately and accurately show the exact route meeting the applicable setbacks required by the various counties. Specifically routes do not indicate the distances the line runs from property lines and it appears in many instances, using GIS data, that the line encroaches on the setbacks. Additionally, applicant has materially misled the commission and public by indicating its pipeline by stating in Appendix 2 that the pipe would be buried between 30" and 48" depending on site, when it has apparently conducted the phase one environmental study based on the pipeline being buried over 40" in its entirety (see Phase 1 Geohazards, Section 5.6). If SCS has lied about this significant fact in the Phase 1 study, it is certainly difficult to believe they have been truthful about other items in its application.

Second, applicant has failed in its responsibility to show that the proposal will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment, as shown by its deception regarding the depth of the buried pipeline as indicated above.

Third, applicant has failed in its responsibility to not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants. Applicant has indicated in Sec. 6.5 that "consideration should be given to notifying and evacuating the public" in the event of an accidental/uncontrolled release of CO2. That is clearly unacceptable, as that should not be an option, but a requirement. It shows that the applicant is not serious in its care for the public.

Fourth, applicant fails in its duty to not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region. Each ethanol plant is located on a rail system or a highway system, which can transport CO2. This proposal is clearly a scam on the American and South Dakotan taxpayer, intended to harvest tax credits at the expense of the taxpayer, and to the enormous profit of the pipeline investors.

This permit should not be approved as the applicant fails on all counts to comply with the permitting requirements, and fails to show any public necessity or good in allowing this to move forward.

Very Truly Yours,

Jeffrey and Susan Danielson

[REDACTED]
Hartford, SD 57033

[REDACTED]