

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

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

HP22-001

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

David Daum

ON BEHALF OF

SCS CARBON TRANSPORT LLC

SCS EXHIBIT #

July 7, 2023

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address for the record.**

2 A. My name is David Daum.

3 **Q. What is your position with SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (“SCS”)?**

4 A. I am (position).

5 **Q. Please briefly describe your educational experience.**

6 A. I have a bachelor’s degree in occupational safety from Illinois State and a Master’s
7 degree in industrial management from Northern Illinois University. I have almost 30 years of
8 responsible experience in various facets of health, safety and environment for projects such as
9 the Applicant’s proposal here. My CV is attached.

10 **Q. Please describe your duties with SCS.**

11 A. I am responsible for all aspects of Health, Safety, Environmental, and security (HSSE)
12 associated with the SCS MCE project.

13 **Q. Have you previously submitted direct testimony and exhibits in this proceeding?**

14 A. I have not.

15 **Q. What is the basis for your rebuttal testimony?**

16 A. I have significant experience and expertise in the areas of HSSE as related to the design,
17 construction, and operation of pipelines and pipeline related facilities . My experience
18 includes development and execution of large scale projects in the U.S. as well as the operation of
19 a large asset or group of assets. At SCS, business priorities change from time to time so we
20 consider Safety a core value. As such, we take safety very seriously at Summit, and my job is
21 to ensure that the project is planned, constructed and operated safely.

22 **Q. Do you have general comment about the progress of the HSSE project?**

23 A. As stated in testimony by other SCS colleagues, SCS either is or is planning to meet or
24 exceed regulatory requirements in all facets of project (MCE) development, construction, and
25 operation. The extensive work completed to date that includes dispersant modeling, risk
26 assessment, design decisions, emergency response planning, integrity management, etc.
27 Underpin SCS's commitment to safety.

28

29 **Q. Have you reviewed the county ordinances with respect to setbacks and safety?**

30 A. Yes I have.

31 **Q. Do you have any comment on them?**

32 A. Based on the work completed by SCS specific to selecting the pipeline route, identifying
33 and understanding risk, and taking actions to either eliminate or mitigate risk has been adequate
34 to not only comply with PHMSA regulatory requirements but adequate to ensure the probability
35 of an incident associated with the MCE pipeline is extremely low. As such, restrictions imposed
36 by ordinances passed in Brown and Minehaha counties are prohibitive and unwarranted. In fact,
37 SCS has seen no technical basis for setbacks established in each ordinance. On one hand, SCS
38 has completed a significant amount of work to justify the pipeline location and on the other hand,
39 these two counties appear to have established prohibitive requirements with no rational basis.
40 Finally, these counties are also establishing prohibitive ordinances after the SCS permit
41 application has been submitted. Should these ordinances not be preempted, no future
42 infrastructure project can be confident in the rules of the game at any point in the PUC process.

43 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

44 A. Yes.

45

46 Dated this 7th day of July, 2023.

47

48

49 /s/ David Daum

50 David Daum