

# Letters to the Editor

How to Stop CO2 Pipelines



# Agenda

Introductions

LTE Basics

Tips & Tricks

Examples

Next Steps

# Introductions

**Name**

**Location**

**What pipeline are you impacted by?**

# What is a Letter to the Editor?

Short submission to a newspaper (or blog, church newsletter, etc.) that takes a position for/against an issue

OPINION LETTERS

## Letter: Proposed carbon pipeline lacks sound evidence

Why would anyone agree to go through the huge expense of employing 'carbon capture' technology for something that will have no effect on global warming?

## Letters: Carbon pipeline plans don't justify eminent domain

Letter: Opposing The Pipeline

## Neighbors will continue to oppose carbon pipeline project

*Letter: Carbon pipelines are not for South Dakota*

We all know plants need CO2 to grow, so why do we want to capture it? Let the corn and beans use it, or plant more trees.

**LETTER: Carbon pipeline is dangerous, ill-conceived**

*Writer urges call for action on Summit's Midwest Express Pipeline*

"For too long, I have remained silent, but I have come to realize that silence is not an option when the stakes are this high."

# Why L.T.E.s Matter

## Letters to the Editor can...

1. Persuade the public to agree with your opinion
2. Increase public knowledge of an issue
3. Spur discussion in the community
4. Elevate an issue for elected officials/decision makers/media

# Letter to the Editor Format

Keep it short – 250-300 words

1. Hook

A sentence that grabs attention. Bonus if you can relate it back to a recent event.

2. Briefly explain the issue

In a sentence or two, tell readers about the proposed project

3. Share why you oppose CO2 projects

What about this issue concerns you enough to write an LTE?  
Share a personal experience, cite a fact, or

4. End with a call to action

Ask readers to contact their legislator, demand Commissioners deny a permit, offer a way to learn more

# Messaging

- Highlight safety concerns + lack of oversight
- Dispute industry's claim of economic benefits
- Note the misuse of tax dollars + water resources
- Mention that eminent domain is not for private gain
- Point to recent victories

# Submitting an LTE

Check the paper's opinion section for guidelines!

Most outlets have an online submission form

Submit to one paper at a time

# Tips & Tricks

- State facts, but don't overuse numbers
- Include credentials
- Target your local paper
- Avoid jargon
- Keep it original
- Follow up

# Examples

## Letter to the Editor

I'm a simple farmer. I'm not a protester or an activist. I'm not even much of a writer. I guess sometimes we are forced to be things we are not.

I have to admit that I do feel guilty. I had heard about this carbon dioxide pipeline quite awhile ago. I dismissed it as a ridiculous idea and thought that common sense would prevail. It didn't hit home - well, until it hit home. Now I realize what we are up against, and the battle others have been fighting. I can't help but think that it could have been different if more had stood up sooner.

Some will tell us that this is a complicated and difficult decision. It's not. It's quite simple. Either you believe in property rights, or you believe in money. You can oppose this thing for a variety of reasons. Maybe you are concerned with the safety of a high pressure liquid CO2 line. I believe those concerns are justified. Maybe you are concerned that this costs too much. That it is just a money grab for private companies and we can't as taxpayers afford it. I believe this is obvious. Maybe you think there are better alternatives. Again, I believe this is true. Maybe you are like me, and in addition to these reasons you think, the whole idea is - well, stupid for lack of a better word. It still boggles my mind that in what is supposed to be such an advanced country, the best idea we have is to dig a hole and bury it.

If you are a proponent of the pipeline you believe in money - and a mountain of it for a select few. Anything else we are told is window dressing. So, in the end we have the thirst for financial gain versus the right to say no.

My question for the Absolute Energy board of directors: How much does it take? How much money before you ignore private property rights? How much money before you are willing to trample on your neighbors?

My question for politicians or other officials who will decide this: Given this appears to have a public polling of 70 plus percent against, what does it take to buy your approval? How about your silence? Is that a little cheaper?

As you can probably guess, there is no way on Earth I will be signing an easement. Part of me wants to urge anyone facing the same situation to do the same thing, but I can't do that. Because, unlike them, I firmly believe it is your choice.

**Mike Gerdts**

## LETTERS

### Carbon Capture-The Rest of the Story

#### To the Editor:

Growing up, I enjoyed listening to Paul Harvey's radio program, The Rest of the Story. To see the whole picture, this is my take on the rest of the story on Carbon Capture.

Did you know that CO2 makes up only .04 percent of the earth's atmosphere? Most of the world's carbon dioxide occurs naturally. It is debatable of what percent of the world's CO2 is contributed by the human race. CO2 levels have increased ever since the industrial revolution. The world's population has increased from 1.5 billion in the 1900s to 8.5 billion people today. This would be an increase of 550 percent over 124 years.

Did you know China leads the global CO2 emissions by country with 27 percent followed by USA at 15 percent .

Did you know in the process of CO2 capture from ethanol plants the CO2 emitted into the air from energy used in the process is not accounted for. If it was accounted for little to no CO2 reduction would be realized.

Did you know the average ethanol plant used 8 to 10 megawatts continuously just to run? It is projected that will increase by 40 to 45 percent in the process of carbon capture. This would mean the average continuous use of 12 to 14 megawatts. Fourteen megawatts would power over 10,000 homes continuously just from one ethanol plant.

Did you know Iowa has 42 ethanol plants that have a capacity to produce 4.5 billion gallons of ethanol. It takes 3.5 gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of ethanol, so 15.75 billion gallons of water will be used for ethanol production.

Did you know in a public health study it found that amines in their scrubbers to capture CO2 can omit cancer causing emissions into the air and water. Can these cancer-causing chemicals be found in the CO2 captured?

Did you know that the ethanol plants are hoping to get into the sustain-

able aviation fuel market?

They expected it to be a 35-billion-gallon market. The problem is the highest blend for any sustainable aviation fuel is 50 percent. Most commercially available blends will only be 30 to 38 percent blend. The lowest blend to qualify is 10 percent . The problem is it costs 2 to 3 times the cost of regular jet fuel. To date sustainable aviation fuel is only 15.8 million gallons a year. The Biden administration was hoping to get at least 3 billion gallons by 2030 a steep jump from the current gallons.

Did you know sustainable aviation fuel gets federal tax credits? Credits started at \$1.25 per gallon for qualifying biomass jet fuel and cap out at \$1.75 per gallon.

Did you know that under the current CORSIA methodology, corn-based ethanol does not even qualify to make sustainable aviation fuel. This is because if it was biomass like a tree, it would be considered carbon neutral because the carbon it collected during its life cycle is released, making a carbon neutral. Unlike corn, most all the carbon scores go to the grain.

Did you know a common misconception is that sustainable aviation fuel reduces tail pipe emissions? While some emissions of sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide may be reduced, the CO2 emissions are the same between sustainable aviation fuel I fossil jet fuel.

Did you know the Department of Treasury estimates section 45 tax credits for carbon sequestration be 30.3 billion dollars from 2022-2032.

Did you know an acre of corn yielding 180 bushels removes 8 tons of CO2 from the air during the average growing season and produces enough oxygen to supply 131 people with their years' needs of essentials for life. As a farmer why can't I get paid to capture CO2? and I'll give you the oxygen for free!

I hope this stirs up your interest on the Rest of the Story on carbon capture. Please if you can watch Youtube video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qsgFlxXOy8s>) to see what is really happening and talk to your legislators and tell them to say no to carbon pipelines.

**Paul Hamilton, Bancroft**

Examples

## Carbon company doesn't have farmers' best interests in mind

**To the editor:**

"No eminent domain for private gain" is a message that over 80% of South Dakota residents and landowners support. Landowners and farmers with farming backgrounds and pedigrees second to none are fighting to protect their constitutional rights. They are fighting back against a pipeline that will carry CO2, an asphyxiant, that will kill. They are wanting to protect their rural assets from a corporation with foreign investments.

Summit Carbon Solutions is seeking to bury a pipeline on private property crossing fields, acreages, streams, roads, pastures, feedlots and tree groves.

These same landowners and farmers have organized public forums and meetings, attended public utility commission and legislative hearings, and formed a legal team to protect their rights as South Dakota residents. They have done so donating their own time, money and travel expense.

Summit has no real concern for the environment. In fact, they have no real endeavor

to help ethanol other than using ethanol

plants as a means to pirate onto private land holdings to build their project. Their only end goal is to obtain lucrative tax credits, a program of tax spending, that causes you to pay more taxes and future generations to carry larger debt.

In the last few months, Summit has tried to rebrand itself as pro South Dakota, pro agriculture, but it is still the same out-of-state LLC that dragged over 160 landowners into condemnation court in 2023. It is the same company that continues to do away with local control and sue counties. It is the same company that has hired dozens of lobbyists to sabotage the law-making process for their own greed.

In the meantime, landowners and farmers are torn between trying to be present in Pierre while balancing the need to care for their own families and livestock. Sadly, Summit has con-

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

vinced several legislators to carry propaganda much like paid employees or agents. The amount of expensive advertising that allies of Summit are spending is in direct proportion to the greed and chaos that Summit carries as public garbage.

The real answer to carbon capture is the land itself. Healthy soil and plants are the true carbon sink. The ethanol industry can take two paths. Either carry the carpetbagging of Summit to grab expensive tax credits thus continuing more chaos as they seek to do now. Or build cooperative actions amongst farmers and community residents as they have done in past. We all know that the right answer lies with our own farmers not an out of state corporation. The South Dakota way is building within while respecting neighbors, friends, and fellow residents.

- **Charlie Johnson**  
Madison, S.D.

# Next Steps

- Write a letter to the editor
- Antelope Co CUP meeting March 12
- Dakota Co CUP meeting April 16
- Monthly Midwest Landowners Meeting March 20
- House Party

Need assistance? Contact:

Shelli Meyer  
shelli@boldalliance.org  
515-422-6136

Tom Genung  
Tom@boldnebraska.org  
402-984-7548

Emma Schmit  
emma@boldalliance.org  
712-830-3748