

April 22, 2024

**VIA U.S. MAIL**

Mr. Steve Kahl  
Executive Secretary Director  
North Dakota Public Service Commission  
600 E. Boulevard, Dept. 408  
Bismarck, ND 58505-0480

**RE: SCS Carbon Transport LLC  
Midwest Carbon Express Project  
Case No. PU-22-391**

Dear Mr. Kahl:

Enclosed herewith, please find the following documents for filing with the North Dakota Public Service Commission ("Commission") in the above-referenced case:

1. SCS Carbon Transport LLC's Response to the Interrogatories (Set 1) from Intervenor Represented by Knoll Leibel LLP and Jorde/Domina Law Group; and
2. Certificate of Service.

An original and seven (7) copies of the foregoing are enclosed herewith. This letter and the above-described documents have been electronically filed with the Commission by e-mailing copies of the same to [ndpsc@nd.gov](mailto:ndpsc@nd.gov).

Should you have any questions, please advise.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lawrence Bender  
LAWRENCE BENDER

LB/tjg  
Enclosures  
#82271014v1

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION  
OF SCS CARBON TRANSPORT LLC FOR  
A CERTIFICATE OF CORRIDOR  
COMPATIBILITY AND ROUTE PERMIT  
FOR THE MIDWEST CARBON EXPRESS  
PROJECT IN BURLEIGH, CASS, DICKEY,  
EMMONS, LOGAN, MCINTOSH,  
MORTON, OLIVER, RICHLAND AND  
SARGENT COUNTIES, NORTH DAKOTA

CASE NO. PU-22-391

OAH FILE NO. 20230002

---

**Response of SCS Carbon Transport LLC to the Interrogatories (Set 1) from Intervenors  
Represented by Knoll Leibel LLP and Jorde/Domina Law Group**

---

SCS Carbon Transport LLC (“Summit”), by and through its attorneys of record, responds to the Interrogatories submitted by Intervenors represented by Knoll Leibel LLP and Jorde/Domina Law Group (“Intervenors”) on March 21, 2024 in the above-captioned proceeding (each a “Discovery Request” and collectively, the “Discovery Requests”). *See* Docket No. PU-22-391. Summit’s response is made without waiving or intending to waive any objection as to relevance, privilege, or admissibility of any information provided in response to the Discovery Requests in any subsequent proceeding of this or any other action on any ground. A partial answer to any Discovery Request that has been objected to, in whole or in part, is not intended to be a waiver of the objection. By responding to the Discovery Requests, Summit is not admitting that any aspect of the Discover Requests is factually accurate or relevant to this proceeding.

**GLOBAL OBJECTIONS**

The following Global Objections apply to each of the Discovery Requests—even if not separately restated below in response to a particular Discovery Request.

Summit objects to all Discovery Requests to the extent they seek the discovery of documents and/or information which are privileged for the reasons that they (a) are subject to the

attorney-client privilege; (b) are covered by the “work product” doctrine; and/or (c) were prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for Summit or its representatives, including its employees, consultants, or agents.

Summit objects to all Discovery Requests to the extent they are beyond the scope of discovery allowed pursuant to Rules 26, 33, 34, and 36 of the North Dakota Rules of Civil Procedure.

Summit objects to all Discovery Requests to the extent they seek identification or production of “all documents” of a particular description. It is impossible to guarantee that all such documents have been identified or located. Summit states, however, that in response to these requests, it has made a diligent search of records kept in the ordinary course of business in those locations likely to contain relevant information.

Summit objects to Intervenor’s definitions and instructions to the extent such definitions and instructions exceed or are inconsistent with the requirements imposed upon Summit under the North Dakota Rules of Civil Procedure, Chapter 28-32 of the North Dakota Century Code, or Section 69-02-05-12 of the North Dakota Administrative Code.

Summit objects to the Discovery Requests because they are unduly burdensome and disproportionate to the needs of this proceeding because they seek irrelevant information.

Summit objects inasmuch as the Discovery Requests seek information relating to anything other than Summit’s pipeline facilities in North Dakota. Only Summit’s North Dakota pipeline facilities are covered by its permit application in this proceeding.

Summit objects inasmuch as the Discovery Requests seek information that contains proprietary or confidential business information or is subject to trade-secret protections or that

contains information for which Summit owes a third party an obligation of confidentiality or privacy, whether contractual or under any federal or state laws or regulations.

Summit objects to all Discovery Requests that seek, and disclaims any obligation to identify or furnish, documents or information that Intervenor actually or constructively possesses or to which Intervenor has access through alternative means.

Summit objects inasmuch as the Discovery Requests seek information from third parties and information that is not within Summit's possession, custody, control, or personal knowledge of Summit.

Summit objects and responds to the Discovery Requests based upon information and documents available as of the date hereof and reserves the right to supplement and amend the responses.

Subject to the foregoing objections and conditions, and subject to the specific additional objections made with respect to each request, Summit responds to Intervenor's Discovery Requests as follows:

## **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORIES**

### **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of Intervenor Mary Jo Irmen, who testified at the June 2, 2023 hearing. By "identify," Intervenor is asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, "Summit") identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Mary Jo and Scott Irmen's property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that the current route of the pipeline is not located on property owned by these landowners.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Mary Jo and Scott Irmen as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed.

Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that the current route of the pipeline is not located on property owned by these landowners.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of Intervenor James Tiegs, who testified at the April 11, 2023 hearing. By “identify,” Intervenor are asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Mr. Tiegs’s property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that it holds executed easements into and out of the Tiegs property and a reroute to avoid such property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately two miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Mr. Tiegs as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, see response to Interrogatory No. 3, above.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of Intervenor Valera Hayen, who testified at the April 11, 2023 hearing. By “identify,” Intervenor are asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Ms. Hayen’s property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the

objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objection, Summit states that routing around Ms. Hayen's property adds substantial additional pipeline to other properties and moving the route approximately 1.75 miles outside the existing corridor. Nonetheless, Summit is in the process of evaluating a potential reroute recently proposed by Ms. Hayen through counsel.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Ms. Hayen as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, see response to Interrogatory No. 5, above.



**INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of the Staroba Revocable Living Trust, as stated by Loren Staroba, who testified at the April 11, 2023 hearing. By “identify,” Intervenor are asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to the property owned by Staroba Revocable Living Trust as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that a reroute to avoid the Staroba property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately 0.6 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by the Staroba Revocable Living Trust as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, see response to Interrogatory No. 7, above.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of Shirley Waloch, who testified at the March 28, 2023 hearing. By “identify,” Intervenors are asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Ms. Waloch’s property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the

objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objection, Summit states that a reroute to avoid the Waloch property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately two miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Shirley Waloch as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, see response to Interrogatory No. 9, above.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of James Rockstad, who submitted written testimony to the PSC [PSC Doc. 272]. By “identify,” Intervenor is asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Mr. Rockstad’s property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objection, Summit states that routing around Mr. Rockstad’s property introduces new landowners to the route of the project approximately 0.9 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors. Nonetheless, Summit is in the process of evaluating a potential reroute recently proposed by Mr. Rockstad through counsel.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by James Rockstad as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, see response to Interrogatory No. 11, above.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

*Please identify all measures taken to address the concerns of Diann Zajac, who submitted written testimony to the PSC [PSC Doc. 296]. By “identify,” Intervenors are asking that SCS Carbon Transport, LLC (hereinafter, “Summit”) identify all studies, reports, analysis, reroutes (both proposed and agreed), negotiations, discussions, or other measures initiated or considered by Summit with respect to Ms. Zajac’s property as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed.

Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that the current route of the pipeline is not located on property owned by this landowner.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Diann Zajac as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that the current route of the pipeline is not located on property owned by this landowner.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Harry L. Malloy Trust No. 2 as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its

proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that it holds executed easements into and out of the Malloy Trust property and a reroute to avoid such property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately 2.75 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by APH Farms as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that it holds executed easements into and out of the APH Farms property and a reroute to avoid such property would involve introducing

new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately 2.45 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Mary Kuehn as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that it holds executed easements into and out of the Kuehn property and a reroute to avoid such property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately 1.2 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Kari Curran as reflected on Ex. A.*



**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that its records do not reflect the current route of the pipeline being located on property owned by this landowner.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

*Please identify in full and complete detail all reasons, excuses, and justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by Leon Mallberg as reflected on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that a reroute to avoid the Mallberg

property would involve introducing new landowners to the project, amending other executed easements, and moving the route approximately 2.75 miles outside the existing corridor, among other factors.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

*Please identify all witnesses you intend to call in support of any reasons, excuses, or justifications why Summit cannot reroute its pipeline around the real property owned by those persons identified on Ex. A.*

**RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

Summit incorporates by reference its Global Objections set forth above. Summit further objects to this request to the extent it implies Summit is under any obligation to re-route its proposed pipeline on or around any specific piece of property. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that pipelines are linear infrastructure which, by definition, must be located somewhere; routing a pipeline off of a particular piece of property simply results in the pipeline being routed onto another piece of property. Pipelines are located in a manner that minimizes overall impacts, not every possible impact on each specific piece of property crossed. Subject to and notwithstanding the objections, Summit states that it has not made a final determination as to which, if any, witnesses will be called to discuss the specific parcels of property reflected on Exhibit A, but that Mr. James Powell will be available to discuss how Summit incorporates landowner requests and feedback into the routing process.

Dated this 22nd day of April, 2024.

FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.

By: /s/ Lawrence Bender  
LAWRENCE BENDER, ND Bar #03908  
304 East Front Avenue, Suite 400  
Bismarck, ND 58504-5639  
(701) 221-8700  
lbender@fredlaw.com

*Attorneys for SCS Carbon Transport LLC*

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**SCS Carbon Transport LLC  
Midwest Carbon Express CO2 Pipeline Project  
Sitting Application**

**CASE NO. PU-22-391**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, being of legal age, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the following:

1. Letter to S. Kahl forwarding documents for filing; and
2. SCS Carbon Transport LLC's Response to the Interrogatories (Set 1) from Intervenor's Represented by Knoll Leibel LLP and Jorde/Domina Law Group.

were, on April 22, 2024, filed with the North Dakota Public Service Commission and served electronically to the following:

Hope L. Hogan  
hlhogan@nd.gov

John Schuh  
jschuh@nd.gov

Zachary Pelham  
zep@pearce-durick.com

Randall J. Bakke  
rbakke@bgwattorneys.com

Bradley N. Wiederholt  
bwiederholt@bgwattorneys.com

Steven Leibel  
steve@bismarck-attorneys.com

David Knoll  
david@bismarck-attorneys.com

Brian E. Jorde  
bjorde@dominalaw.com

Kevin Pranis  
kpranis@liunagroc.com

Derrick Braaten  
derrick@braatenlawfirm.com

Julie Lawyer  
bc08@nd.gov

Patrick Zomer  
Pat.Zomer@lawmoss.com

Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2024.

FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.

By: /s/ Lawrence Bender  
LAWRENCE BENDER, ND Bar #03908  
304 East Front Avenue, Suite 400  
Bismarck, ND 58504  
(701) 221-8700  
lbender@fredlaw.com

#82271045v1