

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 6:45 PM

To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>

Subject: [EXT] Resubmitting my document correcting some errors and labeling images

the docket number = HLP-2021-0003

name of the company = Navigator

commenter's full name= Glen Heynen

mailing address [REDACTED]

e-mail address = [REDACTED]

phone number. = [REDACTED]

Dear PUC Members

We are writing to you out of concern of the impact of the Navigator CO2 pipeline (Iowa = HLP-2021-0003) and South Dakota = HLP-2021-0003. Thank you for this opportunity to express our concern. I attended the PUC meeting in Sioux Falls at which were encouraged to submit our comments to the PUC, so here goes....

Safety:

Given the scale and length this project can certainly be considered experimental. No matter how careful or skillful we as humans are, the systems we create all fail eventually as evidenced by the space shuttle disaster years ago. This pipeline like others like it will also fail eventually. Now is the time to look out into the future and design a route that minimizes the risk to the population that will surround it in the next 20 years,

Property values:

At the PUC meeting one of the individuals from the public asked how many people want the pipeline. Out of maybe 75 people I saw about 6 hands go up. Then he asked how many people want to live by the pipeline. Not one hand went up. Even in this informal small poll the answer was clear. If there are two identical building lots or houses for sale, they would pick the one without a pipeline. In order to compete, the owner of the one with a pipeline would have to drop his price. This represent the negative impact or "damage" of value when a pipeline is present.

My wife and I are retired. We own "Sanctuary in the Oaks" on the Iowa side of the Sioux River. It is divided into 4 lots of varying size each having building eligibilities. Although we were told Navigator avoids areas of development this isn't actually true. We happen to be an example of this fact. They want to install a pipeline through our Lot 6. Lot 6 has 100% old growth trees and a building eligibility. The other lots adjacent to it are about 75% to 50% old growth trees and also have building eligibilities. The tree canopy consists of Oaks (some with circumferences of 14 feet), Maples and Cedar. It is similar topography and feel as, Oak Park, Newton Hills, or Good Earth state park near Blood Run. We have a unique situation our land has trees and building eligible lots, not cropland; although that is the assumption made by Navigator when calculating damages to our lot.

The location where the pipeline is proposed to cross the Sioux River into Iowa is primarily determined by the route you approve. This is why we are writing to you. The current route also

results in the pipeline entering within a mile having a high concentration of single-family homes (South and East of Lake Alvin) impacting both states

This area surrounds a Sioux River flood plain bordered by high bluffs on the East which is the lowa side of the river, and rolling hills on the South Dakota side. There are a number of existing homes surrounding the flood plain and even a larger number of building eligibilities on both sides of the river for future single family housing growth.

If you approve the current pipeline route it will cross through this flood plain and then cross into lowa under the Sioux River from South Dakota. At that point it will cut thru one of our A2 (agriculture transition) zoned lots, at about a 45-degree angle. Lot 6 has a building eligibility and consists of 13 acres of 100% trees overlooking the flood plain on the lowa side of the river. Although Navigator plans to bore under the river and lot 6 they still have to cut down all the old growth forest trees growing above the easement in lot 6 so they can fly their drones over the route every week to check for leaks etc. This will result in a further devaluation of the property not to mention the continuous invasion of privacy of any future building sites with higher densities along the pipeline.

We believe Navigator chose a route not fully understanding that they were entering a high density area and given the high rate of residential growth in this area they are way too close to Sioux Falls. It is too near one of the metro's prime real estate areas along the Sioux River corridor. In order to impact fewer homes (and future) we would like to suggest a change in the route which could be easily accomplished. We have attached two drawings I did so you can better understand the proposal. One is a high-level view, the other a closeup of the properties surrounding the flood plain.

Review of the Route:

1. Navigators' current east/west route runs parallel to SD 275 from interstate 29 heading East about 5 miles then turns north about ½ mile west of county road 135, which is within a couple miles of the Sioux River. This is about 4 miles south of the prime future Sioux Falls metro development area mentioned above.
2. We are suggesting they change the route (alternative route) as it approaches the Sioux River. Instead of turning north crossing SD 275 approximately ½ mile west of county road 135, that they continue the pipeline eastwardly 1 ½ additional miles and then turn northward at an approximate 45-degree angle to cross the Sioux River into lowa at that point.
3. There are 3 residences that are in the area of this alternative route but the distance between the pipeline and these residences is larger than a number of farms/homes on the current proposed route. For example, there are two single family homes intersecting the pipeline route on county road 117 that are only about 800 feet apart. The pipeline runs between these two properties within about 400 feet of both.
4. After crossing the Sioux River, the alternative route would continue North through the east side of the Hidden Bridge Park which is a 160-acre wildlife preserve and also the East side of Peterson prairie park to the North which is basically a 320-acre grassland (no homes on either of these parks).

5. After that it would continue North into the middle of two sections in Lyon County which has no county gravel road between those sections (East side of Peterson Prairie Wildlife Park going north). Since existing farms and new building eligibilities generally are near county roads, the pipeline would have a one mile buffer on either side from existing farms or potential future development.
6. It then could continue on its existing proposed route northward.

This alternative is less impactful to existing and future development along the Sioux River corridor and significantly lowers the risk in the event of a pipeline failure give there is less concentration of current and future homes.

On the "closeup" image attached you have a better understanding of the number of lots and building eligibilities in the area. I did not mark up the SD side since I did not have the information. I was however told by the Navigator rep there is another development being planned directly west of Lot 6 on the SD side of the river. The green house icons on the images represent Building Eligibilities. I placed them in the most logical areas given topography i.e., near bluff etc. The location of existing houses is indicated with yellow house icons.

I have laid out the proposed route which I drew as best I could from arial maps and drawn maps on the docket site. The current route your considering for approval is highlighted in red line and an alternative suggested route in yellow line.

In summary, I think the alternative would be attractive to Navigator management and the public since the proposed alternative route will:

- 1) Be shorter. The proposed alternative is 4.8 miles long, the current route is 5.8 miles eliminating/saving nearly a mile of steel pipeline² and likely tons of CO₂ to manufacture those pipes.
- 2) avoids high concentration population areas both current and future development as this supposedly was one of their criteria for planning a route. The current route is simply too close to Sioux Falls metro area especially the Sioux River corridor.
- 3) The alternative route will only have one bend in the pipeline whereas the current proposed route requires six bends. Fewer bends is good as it causes less friction which requires more power (pump stations) to push the liquid through the pipe, saving costs.
- 4) It would reduce the amount of cropland impacted by approximate 2 miles, due the length reduction and also approximately 1 mile is a public parks. Less headaches for farmers and ranchers.
- 5) It would reduce the cost of easements due to the shorter route plus I would assume Lyon County would not require payment on any easement for crossing the Hidden Bridge and Prairie Park given the CO₂ project and the parks are for the benefit of the public.

6) Reduce liability exposure when the pipeline breaks, given the current route it would pool in the flood plain impacting higher density of homeowners in the next 20 years than farther downstream where it is less densely populated. I am not for passing the problem downriver but the concentration of current and future population should be a major factor in the route selected. Those living downriver would be affected regardless which route is taken. I heard at the meeting that if a pipeline broke the CO2 it will likely pool in low areas (and therefore likely follow the river downstream regardless which route is take).

7) In 2018 Governor Kim Reynolds signed the Iowa tree canopy cover proclamation. During the signing many statements were made about the importance of maintaining old growth tree canopies in a dwindling tree coverage in Iowa, which I assume is also true for South Dakota. Much of the old growth forests have been cut down over the years for farmland (or in our case pipe lines). For me it is very sad, in an effort to save the environment we destroy the environment that can never be replaced. The alternative route will have Less environmental impact as it will not cross large heavily old growth treed areas saving the rare old growth canopies which is the directive of Governor Reynolds as I am sure would be shared by Governor Noem.

8) It protects the tax base given less negative impact on property valuations within a mile of the pipeline and also protects future growth along the corridor which should considered positive for the public.

9) The alternative route does not go through flood plain, the current proposed route does. This also reduces expense to Navigator given there are additional regulations to strengthen the pipe if it goes through a flood plain (which floods nearly every year).

There is a viable alternative that accomplishes the above, and it makes sense.

Thank you for reading and considering.