

BUCKET:
HP24-001

Leah Murray
[REDACTED]
Letcher, SD 57354

Hello,

I am Leah Murray, a Sanborn County resident and landowner who works and ranches on land in Davison County. The proposed route of this CO2 pipeline runs just 3 ½ miles away from where I live with my husband and two young children, and only 1 mile away from where my parent's live and own the family business where I work along with 8 other employees. My husband and I also own and run cattle on this land, along with my dad and grandma. Not only am I concerned for the safety of my own family, my co-workers, friends, and neighbors who would all be within a mile of this pipeline for the majority of their day – but also for the safety of our livestock which provides the livelihood for our ranching operation.

The reason for my concern about this pipeline is based on the many questions that surround it:

First - Is there really sufficient enough evidence to prove that this is a necessary pipeline? That we NEED to move CO2 at such high and dangerous concentrations, only to then sequester it underground? Is there really any benefit to this process at all? Isn't CO2 at normal levels one of the most basic and essential chemical compounds found on this earth? Isn't it necessary for the growth of the very plants and therefore also the animals that are the backbone of the very livelihood of the multitude of farmers and ranchers in this state? The very ones that will probably be most NEGATIVELY impacted by this pipeline not just if it ruptures, but WHEN it ruptures? The land that it will be traveling under near our home and workplace is on the James River valley, which has flooded almost every spring since I can remember (and I have lived here for 36 years). The river floods, making new channels, washing out entire roads, ditches, and land along the river. How easy then would it be to damage a shallow-buried pipeline running through land that is subject to such massive amounts of erosion EVERY YEAR?

It is a very basic fact that humans and animals need oxygen to survive and conversely that carbon dioxide at high levels causes death. According to the NIOSH exposure to levels as low as 10,000 ppm will cause headaches, dizziness, shortness of breath, and levels above 40,000 ppm can cause rapid loss of consciousness and death due to asphyxiation. So, I would ask Summit, have they done extensive studies to prove that there is NO possibility that this could happen when a pipeline of this capacity ruptures? The answer I have most often heard is that the pipeline won't rupture because it is constructed with rigorous testing standards- so just exactly what is Summit going to do so much better than all these other companies to prevent a rupture similar to those that caused pipeline explosions in other states like that in Mississippi causing dozens to be sent to the hospital?

A major question I have is why are they able to even consider building a pipeline before PHMSA has completely its safety reviews – shouldn't that be a very basic and foundational step in the process?? I am also concerned that our small, local emergency response agencies, sometimes mostly consisting of volunteers, will not be able to receive the appropriate training and equipment that would be necessary to respond to an emergency situation of a pipeline rupture, especially one of this size.

Looking forward to the future, I am concerned for the value of our land being negatively impacted by its proximity to a pipeline and any potential easements that might be forced upon us. And based on Summit's dealings with other people that I have spoken with, their disregard and lack of respect for the residents is very evident. Will South Dakota landowners be threatened into agreements that they are not comfortable agreeing to by use of eminent domain, as Summit has proven it has done in the past? If this is how this company operates - to force people into agreements they don't want by use of threats – is that a company with which our great state of South Dakota really wants to be associated?

All of this leaves me with a lot more questions and concerns than confidence, and therefore how can we approve something that has such potential for devastation to our family, our livestock, our community? I find no benefits to this pipeline, only a high possibility of devastating drawbacks. For that reason, I ask the PUC to deny this application.

Thank you.

RECEIVED

JAN 15 2025

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION