
**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION
OF DAKOTA ACCESS, LLC FOR A
PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE
DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE

**YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE'S
OBJECTIONS TO DAKOTA ACCESS'
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

HP14-002

COMES NOW Yankton Sioux Tribe (“Yankton”), by and through Jennifer S. Baker and Thomasina Real Bird with Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP, and hereby submits its objections to Applicant’s Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

On October 21, 2015, the Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) issued an order setting the post-hearing briefing schedule and decision date. In that order, the Commission set November 6, 2015, as the deadline for post-hearing briefs and ordered that proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law may be submitted with initial briefs. The Commission further ordered that response briefs shall be filed no later than November 20, 2015. It should be noted that the November 20, 2015 deadline applied only to the filing of response briefs and that the Commission set no deadline for the submission of responses or objections to proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

On November 6, 2015, Dakota Access, LLC (“Dakota Access”) filed its post-hearing brief. On that date Dakota Access also filed Applicant’s Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. In response to Dakota Access’ proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, Yankton hereby submits the following objections.

Preliminary Matters Addressed

Contrary to the assertion in Dakota Access' proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Public Utilities Commission Staff ("Staff") and Dakota Access did not file Stipulated Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law and Permit Conditions as alleged on page 3 of Applicant's Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. However, Staff did stipulate to Dakota Access' proposed permit conditions filed on November 20, 2015.

On page 2 of its proposed findings and facts and conclusions of law, Dakota Access states that, on February 13, 2015, the Commission considered and granted the ARSD 20:10:22:30 waiver, ordering that written testimony be submitted pursuant to a scheduling order. Dakota Access failed to clarify that applications for party status were not considered until after this waiver had been granted, depriving any intervening parties of the opportunity to challenge Dakota Access' request for a waiver.

Dakota Access' Proposed Findings of Fact

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 1: As of the hearing dates, the companies with membership in Dakota Access included Energy Transfer Partners and Phillips 66. Tr. 65 ln 24 – 66 ln 1. They did not include Sunoco Logistics. According to the testimony of Joey Mahmoud, Dakota Access was in the process of reaching an agreement with Sunoco Logistics but no such agreement had been reached as of the date of the hearing. Tr. 66 ln 3-4.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 11: Contrary to Dakota Access' proposed finding, the Yankton Sioux Tribe offered proposed conditions in the event the permit is granted. Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief at 25-27.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 16: While Dakota Access offered testimony that that Dakota Access will enter into a contract with "Sunoco Logistics," the testimony did not support a finding that Dakota Access, LLC members currently include Sunoco Logistics. As of

the hearing dates, the companies with membership in Dakota Access included Energy Transfer Partners and Phillips 66. Tr. 65 ln 24 – 66 ln 1. They did not include Sunoco Logistics. According to the testimony of Joey Mahmoud, Dakota Access was in the process of reaching an agreement with Sunoco Logistics but no such agreement had been reached as of the date of the hearing. Tr. 66 ln 3-4.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 17: It is not clear from the record whether the record will be operated by Sunoco Logistics or by Sunoco Pipeline L.P. (*see* Sunoco Pipeline L.P. Facility Response Plan (<https://puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/HP14-002/responseplan.pdf>)), but data from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (“PHMSA”) supports a finding that Sunoco Pipeline L.P. would be the operator of the Project, not Sunoco Logistics. *See* Yankton’s Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 2-5.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 18: Dakota Access provided no proof or evidence that connecting the Bakken and Three Forks production areas in North Dakota to a crude oil hub in Illinois would replace the United States’ reliance on less stable and less reliable sources of offshore crude oil. Dakota Access also offered no proof or evidence that the Bakken and Three Forks production areas in North Dakota are rapidly expanding.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 21: Dakota Access provided no proof or evidence that it has entered into binding contracts for the shipment of crude oil product pursuant to the Project plan.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 26: This proposed finding erroneously describes an emergency as an “unlikely event.” As shown by PHMSA’s historical data pertaining to Sunoco Pipeline L.P., a spill is indeed a likely event.

http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Pipeline/PHMSA_Pipeline_Safety_Flagged_Incidents.zip; *See also*, Yankton’s Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 5, 15-16.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 27: The use of excessive valves does not demonstrate the company’s commitment to use state-of-the-art safety features, as simply increasing a safety feature does not constitute “state-of-the-art.” In addition, the term “state-of-the-art” is not defined, leaving ambiguity as to the meaning of this finding.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 32: Dakota Access provided no proof or evidence that the transport of domestic crude oil to meet domestic refining needs will reduce the United States’ dependence on foreign offshore oil.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 33: Dakota Access provided no proof or evidence that it will provide opportunities for refiners in the United States to utilize the crude oil production coming out of the Bakken and Three Forks areas in North Dakota or that the proposed project would be reliable and safe or help ensure that U.S. energy needs are not subject to unstable political events.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 34: Dakota Access provided no proof or evidence that it has secured binding long-term transportation and efficiency contracts from multiple committed shippers to support development of the proposed project. Without this evidence, there is no demonstrated endorsement or support for the Project, its economics, proposed route and target market, or the need for additional pipeline capacity and access to domestic refinery markets.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 37: This proposed finding contains no citation to evidence or the record and is thus unsupported.

Dakota Access’ Proposed Finding No. 41: This proposed finding contains no citation to evidence or the record and is thus unsupported. In addition, neither Dakota Access nor the

Commission can know with certainty that farmland will be reclaimed and put back to pre-construction condition and use. Pursuant to testimony by Sue Sibson and Kent Moeckly, despite promises that a pipeline company will reclaim land to its pre-construction condition, that does not always happen and the Commission cannot find that it will happen in the future based merely on Dakota Access' promises. Tr. at 1186 ln 6 – 1191 ln 24, 1378 ln 1 – 1385 ln 9.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 42: This proposed finding contains no citation to evidence or the record and is thus unsupported.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No.51: Impacts to water bodies will not be limited to the construction phases as they could also occur through spills during abnormal operations of the pipeline.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 66: Dakota Access' cultural resource survey was not thorough and complete because it did not include consideration of oral history or the use of tribal cultural resource experts who have unique perspectives and abilities to identify resources that non-tribal surveyors do not possess. Furthermore, the route remains to be 100% surveyed. *See* Dakota Access' proposed finding of fact no. 67; Tr. 468 ln 9-10; Ex. Staff-6 at 9. When asked whether the Applicant can mitigate the risks associated with crossing sensitive cultural areas, Paige Olson responded, “[i]t is unclear as the identification of historic properties is not complete.” Ex. Staff-6 at 9.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 69: This proposed finding is misleading, as it indicates that all areas of particular cultural sensitivity had been identified by the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and thus that all areas of particular cultural sensitivity would be avoided. It is currently unclear whether all sensitive areas would be avoided because “the identification of historic properties is not complete.” Ex. Staff-6 at 9.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 70: This proposed finding erroneously describes an emergency as an "unlikely event." As shown by PHMSA's historical data pertaining to Sunoco Pipeline L.P., a spill is indeed a likely event. http://phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/Pipeline/PHMSA_Pipeline_Safety_Flagged_Incidents.zip; *See also*, Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 5, 15-16.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 102: Yankton objects to this proposed finding on the grounds that it is not supported by the evidence. For example, Dakota Access indicated that horizontal directional drilling is safer than the open cut method (*see, e.g.*, tr. 944 ln 13-15), yet horizontal directional drilling would only be used at four (tr. 2172 ln 17-18) of the 288 waterbody crossings (ex. DA-1 at 25). In addition, Dakota Access conceded that it would be possible to route the proposed pipeline further away from highly populated areas, but it chose not to do so. Tr. 2112 ln 5 – 2119 ln 23.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 103: While the Commission lacks authority to route a facility, SDCL 49-41B-36, nothing in the law prohibits the Commission from considering a proposed facility's route in making its decision to grant or deny a permit. This proposed finding is a misinterpretation of South Dakota law.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 104: Yankton objects to this proposed finding and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 20-23, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 13-21, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 106: Yankton objects to this proposed finding and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 20-23, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 13-21, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Finding No. 107: Yankton objects to this proposed finding and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 5-8, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 2-4, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusions of Law

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 1: Yankton objects to this conclusion of law on the grounds that it does not indicate that compliance with SDCL Chapter 49-41B, including SDCL 49-41B-1, is mandatory for the Commission to grant a permit for the proposed project.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 3: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 5-8, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 2-4, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 4: The project does involve federal agency action by both the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps of Engineers. Furthermore, "[t]he full extent of federal involvement in this project has not been established." Ex. Staff-6 at 9.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 5: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor asserts that it is necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the environmental impacts of the proposed project to conduct an environmental impact statement pursuant to South Dakota law. Yankton further incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 14-20, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 13-14, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 6: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 11-13, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 5-13, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 7: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 13-22, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 13-19, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 8: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 22-23, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 19-21, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 9: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 23-24, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 22-23, by reference.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 10: Both the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe are affected local units of government, as explained in Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief at 23-24.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 11: The Yankton Sioux Tribe does have adjudicated land rights to property that would be crossed by the proposed project pursuant to *Yankton Sioux Tribe v. United States*, 24 Ind. Cl. Comm. 208, 215 (1970) and Appendix A thereto. *See also*, Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief at 12; Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief at 7, 22-23.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 12: This proposed conclusion of law is irrelevant, as none of the Native American tribes involved in the proceeding have asked the Commission to adjudicate water rights.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 17: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law on the grounds that nothing in South Dakota law prohibits the Commission from considering the route of a proposed facility in its decision on whether or not to grant a permit. While the Commission cannot route a proposed facility, it can certainly consider a route

proffered by an applicant in making its decision. This proposed conclusion is a misinterpretation of South Dakota law.

Dakota Access' Proposed Conclusion of Law No. 19: Yankton objects to this proposed conclusion of law and as its basis therefor asserts that an environmental impact statement is necessary to fully assess the impact of the proposed project, and incorporates Yankton's Post-Hearing Brief, pages 14-20, and Yankton's Post-Hearing Reply Brief, pages 13-14, by reference.

Dated this 24th day of November, 2015.



Jennifer S. Baker, *Pro Hac Vice*
Thomasina Real Bird, SD Bar No. 4415
FREDERICKS PEEBLES & MORGAN LLP
1900 Plaza Drive
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 673-9600
Facsimile: (303) 673-9155
Email: jbaker@ndnlaw.com
Email: trealbird@ndnlaw.com

Attorneys for Yankton Sioux Tribe

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 24th day of November, 2015 the attached **YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE'S OBJECTIONS TO DAKOTA ACCESS' PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW** in docket number HP14-002 was filed on behalf of the Yankton Sioux Tribe electronically via the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission e-filing website and a true and accurate copy was sent via email or U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, to the following:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Ms. Kristen Edwards
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Mr. Brian Rounds
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
brian.rounds@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Mr. Darren Kearney
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
darren.kearney@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Mr. Brett Koenecke - representing Dakota Access, LLC
May, Adam, Gerdes and Thompson, LLP
PO Box 160

Pierre, SD 57501
Brett@mayadam.net
(605) 224-8803 - voice
(605) 224-6289 - fax

Ms. Kara Semmler - representing Dakota Access, LLC
May, Adam, Gerdes and Thompson, LLP
PO Box 160
Pierre, SD 57501
kcs@magt.com
(605) 224-8803 - voice
(605) 224-6289 - fax

Mr. Tom Siguaw
Senior Project Director - Engineering
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
tom.siguaw@energytransfer.com
(713) 989-2841 - voice
(713) 989-1207 - fax

Mr. Keegan Pieper
Associate General Counsel
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
keegan.pieper@energytransfer.com
(713) 989-7003 - voice
(713) 989-1212 - fax

Mr. Stephen Veatch
Senior Director - Certificates
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
Stephen.veatch@energytransfer.com
(713) 989-2024 - voice
(713) 989-1205 - fax

Mr. Joey Mahmoud
Senior Vice President - Engineering
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
Joey.mahmoud@energytransfer.com

(713) 989-2710 - voice
(713) 989-1207 - fax

Mr. Jack Edwards
Project Manager
Dakota Access, LLC
4401 S. Technology Dr.
South Suite
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
Jack.edwards@energytransfer.com
(844) 708-2639 - voice

Ms. Jennifer Guthmiller
McPherson County Auditor
PO Box 390
Leola, SD 57456
mcpersonaud@valleytel.net
(605) 439-3314 - voice

Mr. Keith Schurr
Edmunds County Auditor
PO Box 97
Ipswich, SD 57451
Keith.schurr@state.sd.us
(605) 426-6762 - voice

Ms. Kelly Toennies
Faulk County Auditor
PO Box 309
Faulkton, SD 57438
Kelly.toennies@state.sd.us
(605) 598-6224 - voice

Ms. Theresa Hodges
Spink County Auditor
210 E. Seventh Ave.
Redfield, SD 57469
spinkcoauditor@nrctv.com
(605) 472-4580 - voice

Ms. Jill Hanson
Beadle County Auditor
Suite #201
450 Third St. SW
Huron, SD 57350

auditor@beadlesd.org

(605) 353-8400 - voice

Ms. Jennifer Albrecht
Kingsbury County Auditor
PO Box 196
DeSmet, SD 57231

Jennifer.albrecht@state.sd.us

(605) 854-3832 - voice

Ms. Susan Connor
Miner County Auditor
PO Box 86
Howard, SD 57349

minerauditor@minercountysd.org

(605) 772-4671 - voice

Ms. Roberta Janke
Lake County Auditor
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042

lakeauditor@lakecountysd.com

(605) 256-7600 - voice

Ms. Geralyn Sherman
McCook County Auditor
PO Box 190
Salem, SD 57058

Geralyn.sherman@state.sd.us

(605) 425-2791 - voice

Mr. Bob Litz
Minnehaha County Auditor
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104

blitz@minnehahacounty.org

(605) 367-4220 - voice

Ms. Sheila Hagemann
Turner County Auditor
PO Box 370
Parker, SD 57053

turcoaud@iw.net

(605) 297-3153 - voice

Ms. Marlene Sweeter
Lincoln County Auditor
104 N. Main St.
Canton, SD 57013
auditor@lincolncountysd.org
(605) 764-2581 - voice

Ms. Lisa Schaeffbauer
Campbell County Auditor
PO Box 37
Mound City, SD 57646
campbellcommission@yahoo.com
(605) 955-3366 - voice

Ms. Karla Engle
Special Assistant Attorney General
South Dakota Department of Transportation
700 E. Broadway Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501-2586
karla.engle@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3262 - voice

Mr. Scott Pedersen
Chairman
Lake County
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042
lakegovt@lakecountysd.com
(605) 256-7600 - voice

Mr. Manuel J. de Castro, Jr.
Attorney
Lake County States Attorney
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042
lakesa2@lakecountysd.com
(605) 256-7630 - voice

General Manager
WEB Water Development Association, Inc.
PO Box 51
Aberdeen, SD 57402
office@webwater.org
(605) 229-4749 – voice

Mr. Randy Kuehn
17940 389th Ave.
Redfield, SD 57469
rlkfarms@gmail.com
(605) 472-1492 - voice

Mr. Jim Schmidt
Chairman
Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
104 N. Main, Ste. 110
Canton, SD 57013-1703
Auditor@lincolncountysd.org
(605) 764-2581

Mr. Michael F. Nadolski - Representing Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
Attorney
Lincoln County
Ste. 200
104 N. Main
Canton, SD 57077
mnadolski@lincolncountysd.org
(605) 764-5732 - voice
(605) 764-2931 - fax

Mr. Bret Merkle - Representing Pente Farms, LLC; KKKP Property, LLLP; Pederson Ag, LLC;
Calvin Schreiber; DLK&M, LLC; Jean Osthus; and Daniel & Marcia Hoiland
Merkle Law Firm
PO Box 90708
Sioux Falls, SD 57109-0708
bret@merklelaw.com
(605) 339-1420 - voice

Ms. Cindy Heiberger
Commission Chairman
Minnehaha County
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
cjepsen@minnehahacounty.org
(605) 367-4220 - voice

Mr. Kersten Kappmeyer
Attorney
Minnehaha County
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
kkappmeyer@minnehahacounty.org

(605) 367-4226 - voice
(605) 367-4306 - fax

Mr. Glenn J. Boomsma - Representing: Peggy A. Hoogestraat, Kevin J. Schoffelman, Linda Goulet, Corlis Wiebers, Mavis Parry, Shirley Oltmanns, Janice E. Petterson, Marilyn Murray, Delores Andreessen Assid, and Joy Hohn

Attorney

Breit Law Office, P.C.
606 E. Tan Tara Circle
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
glenn@breitlawpc.com

(605) 336-8234 - voice
(605) 336-1123 - fax

Ms. Peggy A. Hoogestraat
27575 462nd Ave.
Chancellor, SD 57015
gardengalpeggy@gmail.com
(605) 647-5516 - voice

Ms. Joy A. Hohn
46178 263rd St.
Hartford, SD 57033
rjnchohn@gmail.com
(605) 212-9256 - voice

Ms. Marilyn J. Murray
1416 S. Larkspur Trl.
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
murrayma1@sio.midco.net
(605) 321-3633 - voice

Mr. Larry A. Nelson - Representing: City of Hartford
Frieberg, Nelson and Ask, L.L.P.
PO Box 38
Canton, SD 57013
lnelson@frieberglaw.com
(605) 987-2686 - voice

Ms. Teresa Sidel
City Administrator
City of Hartford
125 N. Main Ave.
Hartford, SD 57033

cityhall@hartfordsd.us
(605) 528-6187 - voice

Ms. Linda Glaeser
Manager
Rocky Acres Land Investment, LLC
27324 91st Ave. E.
Graham, WA 98338
lglaeser@seattlecca.org
lmglaeser@wwdb.org
(253) 670-1642 - voice

Ms. Linda Goulet
27332 Atkins Pl.
Tea, SD 57064
45Lgoulet@gmail.com
(605) 359-3822 - voice

Mr. Dale E. Sorenson
Dale E. Sorenson Life Estate
45064 241st St.
Madison, SD 57042
a77man@msn.com
(605) 480-1386 - voice

Ms. Kimberly Craven - Representing Dakota Rural Action and Indigenous Environmental
Network (IEN)
3560 Catalpa Way
Boulder, CO 80304
kimecraven@gmail.com
(303) 494-1974 - voice

Ms. Sabrina King
Community Organizer
Dakota Rural Action
518 Sixth Street, #6
Rapid City, SD 57701
sabrina@dakotarural.org
(605) 716-2200 - voice

Mr. Frank James
Staff Director
Dakota Rural Action
PO Box 549
Brookings, SD 57006
fejames@dakotarural.org

(605) 697-5204 - voice
(605) 697-6230 - fax

Ms. Debra K., Mr. Duane H. & Mr. Dennis S. Sorenson
24095 451st Ave.
Madison, SD 57042
stubbyfarmer@yahoo.com
(605) 480-1370 - Debra Sorenson - voice
(605) 480-1162 - Duane Sorenson - voice
(605) 480-1055 - Dennis Sorenson - voice

Mr. Douglas Sorenson
24095 451st Ave.
Madison, SD 57042
plowboy@svtv.com
(605) 480-1385 - voice

Mr. William Haugen
Haugen Investments LP
PO Box 545
Hartford, SD 57033
wh401889@hotmail.com
(605) 359-9081 - voice

Mr. Phillip Fett
PO Box 572
Lennox, SD 57039
vonfett529@gmail.com
(605) 366-7155 - voice

Mr. Orrin E. Geide
46134 263rd St.
Hartford, SD 57033
(605) 261-4815 - voice

Ms. Shirley M. Oltmanns
26576 466th Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
ssoltm@gmail.com
(605) 941-0005 - voice

Mr. Bradley F. Williams
1044 Overlook Rd.
Mendota Heights, MN 55118
bwilliams@bestlaw.com
(612) 414-4950 - voice

Mr. Craig L. & Ms. Dotta-Jo A. Walker
733 NE 15th St.
Madison, SD 57042
court_walker@hotmail.com
(605) 256-0263 - voice

Mr. Kevin J. Schoffelman
712 W. Fourth Ave.
Lennox, SD 57039
klschoff@outlook.com
(605) 310-7062 - voice

Ms. Diane Best
Attorney
City of Sioux Falls
224 W. Ninth St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-7402
dbest@siouxfalls.org
(605) 367-8600 - voice

Mr. Charles J. Johnson
45169 243rd St.
Madison, SD 57042
c-bjohnson@svtv.com
(605) 270-2665 - voice

Ms. Janice E. Petterson
6401 S. Lyncrest Ave., Apt. 307
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
grmjarp@sio.midco.net
(605) 201-6897 - voice

Ms. Corliss F. Wiebers
607 S. Elm St.
PO Box 256
Lennox, SD 57039
wiebersco@gmail.com
(605) 647-2634 - voice

Mr. Paul A Nelsen
46248 W. Shore Pl.
Hartford, SD 57033
paul@paulnelsenconstruction.com
(605) 366-1116 - voice

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
27893 244th St.
Draper, SD 57531
jacknife@goldenwest.net
(605) 669-2777 - voice

Delores Andreessen Assid
c/o Laurie Kunzelman
3009 South Holly
Sioux Falls, SD 57105
(605) 332-8524 - voice

Mr. John Wellnitz
305 A St.
Osceola, SD 57353
johnwellnitz@gmail.com
(605) 350-5431 - voice

Mr. John Stratmeyer
46534 272nd St.
Tea, SD 57064
(605) 261-5572 - voice

Mr. Lorin L. Brass
46652 278th St.
Lennox, SD 57039
brass@iw.net
(605) 759-5547 - voice

Mr. Tom Goldtooth
Executive Director
Indigenous Environmental Network
ien@igc.org

Mr. Dallas Goldtooth
Community Organizer
Indigenous Environmental Network
goldtoothdallas@gmail.com

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold - Representing: RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office
and RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office
Rappold Law Office
816 Sixth St.
PO Box 873

Rapid City, SD 57709
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com
(605) 828-1680 - voice

Ms. Paula Antoine
RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office
PO Box 658
Rosebud, SD 57570
wopila@gwtc.net
(605) 747-4225 - voice

Mr. Royal Yellow Hawk
RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
yellowhawkroyal@yahoo.com
(605) 856-2998 - voice

Ms. Thomasina Real Bird - Representing - Yankton Sioux Tribe
Attorney
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1900 Plaza Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027
trealbird@ndnlaw.com
(303) 673-9600 - voice

Ms. Mavis A. Parry
3 Mission Mtn. Rd.
Clancy, MT 59634
mavisparry@hotmail.com
(406) 461-2163 - voice

Ms. Margo D. Northrup - Representing: South Dakota Association of Rural Water Systems, Inc.
Attorney
Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup LLP
PO Box 280
Pierre, SD 57501-0280
m.northrup@riterlaw.com
(605) 224-5825 - voice

/s/Ashley Klinglesmith

Ashley Klinglesmith
Legal Secretary/Paralegal