

MAY ADAM

— Since 1881 —

WWW.MAGT.COM

ROBERT B. ANDERSON
TIMOTHY M. ENGEL
MICHAEL F. SHAW
BRETT KOENECKE
CHRISTINA L. KLINGER
JUSTIN L. BELL
DOUGLAS A. ABRAHAM
KARA C. SEMMLER
A.J. FRANKEN

May 8, 2015

Writer's E-mail: brett@mayadam.net

OF COUNSEL
DAVID A. GERDES
CHARLES M. THOMPSON
GLENN W. MARTENS 1881-1968
KARL GOLDSMITH 1885-1966
BRENT A. WILBUR 1949-2006
TELEPHONE
605 224-8803
FAX
605 224-6289

Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
Public Utilities Commission
500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

**RE: APPLICATION TO THE SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
FOR A PERMIT FOR THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE UNDER THE
ENERGY CONVERSION AND TRANSMISSION FACILITY ACT;
HP14-002
Our file: 0300**

Dear Ms. Van Gerpen:

Enclosed please find Dakota Access, LLC's Objection to the Yankton Sioux Tribe's Motion to Compel along with its supporting brief. This matter was noticed for hearing on Tuesday, May 12, 2015. Dakota Access, LLC objects to Counsel for any party appearing telephonically at Tuesday's hearing.

Very truly yours.

MAY, ADAM, GERDES & THOMPSON, LLP



Brett Koenecke

BK/sjs

Enclosure

MAY, ADAM, GERDES & THOMPSON LLP
503 SOUTH PIERRE STREET • P.O. Box 160
PIERRE, SOUTH DAKOTA 57501-0160

002547

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE)
APPLICATION OF DAKOTA) HP14-002
ACCESS, LLC FOR AN ENERGY)
FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT)
THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE) OBJECTION TO YANKTON SIOUX
PROJECT) TRIBE'S MOTION TO COMPEL

COMES NOW Dakota Access, LLC, by and through one of its attorneys of record, Kara C. Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson LP and respectfully requests the Public Utilities Commission deny Yankton Sioux Tribe's Motion to Compel discovery. This Motion is supported by the records, files, and pleadings served in this action, as well as the attached Brief.

Dated this 8 day of May, 2015.

MAY, ADAM, GERDES & THOMPSON LLP

BY: 

BRETT KOENECKE
KARA SEMMLER
Attorneys for Plaintiff
503 South Pierre Street
PO Box 160
Pierre, SD 57501-0160
(605) 224-8803

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Kara C. Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson hereby certifies that on or before the 8 day of May, 2015, she electronically served through the PUC filing system or mailed by US First Class Mail, a copy of the Brief in Support of Opposition to Motion to Compel Discovery to the following:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Ms. Kristen Edwards
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us

Mr. Brian Rounds
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
brian.rounds@state.sd.us

Mr. Darren Kearney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
darren.kearney@state.sd.us

Mr. Tom Siguaw
Dakota Access, LLC
tom.siguaw@energytransfer.com

Mr. Keegan Pieper
Dakota Access, LLC
keegan.pieper@energytransfer.com

Mr. Stephen Veatch
Dakota Access, LLC
Stephen.veatch@energytransfer.com

Mr. Joey Mahmoud
Dakota Access, LLC
Joey.mahmoud@energytransfer.com

Mr. Jack Edwards
Dakota Access, LLC
Jack.edwards@energytransfer.com

Ms. Jennifer Guthmiller
McPherson County Auditor
mcpersonaud@valleytel.net

Mr. Keith Schurr
Edmunds County Auditor
Keith.schurr@state.sd.us

Ms. Kelly Toennies
Faulk County Auditor
Kelly.toennies@state.sd.us

Ms. Theresa Hodges
Spink County Auditor
spinkcoauditor@nrctv.com

Ms. Jill Hanson
Beadle County Auditor
auditor@beadlesd.org

Ms. Jennifer Albrecht
Kingsbury County Auditor
Jennifer.albrecht@state.sd.us

Ms. Susan Connor
Miner County Auditor
minerauditor@minercountysd.org

Ms. Roberta Janke
Lake County Auditor
lakeauditor@lakecountysd.com

Ms. Geralyn Sherman
McCook County Auditor
Geralyn.sherman@state.sd.us

Mr. Bob Litz
Minnehaha County Auditor
blitz@minnehahacounty.org

Ms. Sheila Hagemann
Turner County Auditor
turcoaud@iw.net

Ms. Marlene Sweeter
Lincoln County Auditor
auditor@lincolncountysd.org

Ms. Lisa Schaeftbauer
Campbell County Auditor
campbellcommission@yahoo.com

Ms. Karla Engle
South Dakota Department of Transportation
karla.engle@state.sd.us

Mr. Chris S. Giles
Lake County States Attorney
Chris.Giles@lakecountysd.com

Mr. Steve Harper
WEB Water Development Association, Inc.
sharper@webwater.org

Mr. Randy Kuehn
rlkfarms@gmail.com

Mr. Michael F. Nadolski - Representing Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
mnadolski@lincolncountysd.org

Mr. Bret Merkle - Representing Pente Farms, LLC; KKKP Property, LLLP; Pederson Ag, LLC;
Calvin Schreiber; DLK&M, LLC; Jean Osthus; and Daniel & Marcia Hoiland
bret@merklelaw.com

Ms. Cindy Heiberger
Minnehaha County
cjepson@minnehahacounty.org

Mr. Kersten Kappmeyer
Minnehaha County
kkappmeyer@minnehahacounty.org

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, Joy Hohn, and Orrin E. Geide
glenn@breitlawpc.com

Mr. Larry A. Nelson - Representing: City of Hartford
Frieberg, Nelson and Ask, L.L.P.
lnelson@frieberglaw.com

Ms. Linda Glaeser
Rocky Acres Land Investment, LLC
lglaeser@seattlecca.org
lmglaeser@wwdb.org

Mr. Dale E. Sorenson
Dale E. Sorenson Life Estate
a77man@msn.com

Ms. Kimberly Craven - Representing Dakota Rural Action and Indigenous Environmental
Network (IEN)
kimecraven@gmail.com

Ms. Debra K., Mr. Duane H. & Mr. Dennis S. Sorenson
stubbyfarmer@yahoo.com

Mr. Douglas Sorenson
plowboy@svtv.com

Mr. William Haugen
Haugen Investments LP
wh401889@hotmail.com

Mr. Phillip Fett
vonfett529@gmail.com

Mr. Bradley F. Williams
bwilliams@bestlaw.com

Mr. Craig L. & Ms. Dotta-Jo A. Walker
court_walker@hotmail.com

Ms. Diane Best
City of Sioux Falls
dbest@siouxfalls.org

Mr. Charles J. Johnson
c-bjohnson@svtv.com

Mr. Paul A Nelsen
paul@paulnelsenconstruction.com

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
jacknife@goldenwest.net

Mr. John Wellnitz
johnwellnitz@gmail.com

Mr. John Stratmeyer
46534 272nd St.
Tea, SD 57064

Mr. Lorin L. Brass
46652 278th St.
Lennox, SD 57039
brass@iw.net

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold - Representing: RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office
and RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office
Rappold Law Office
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com

Ms. Thomasina Real Bird - Representing - Yankton Sioux Tribe
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
trealbird@ndnlaw.com

Ms. Margo D. Northrup - Representing: South Dakota Association of Rural Water Systems, Inc.
Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup LLP
m.northrup@riterlaw.com



KARA C. SEMMLER

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE)
APPLICATION OF DAKOTA)
ACCESS, LLC FOR AN ENERGY)
FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT)
THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE)
PROJECT)

HP14-002

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL
DISCOVERY**

COMES NOW Dakota Access, LLC, by and through one of its attorneys of record, Kara C. Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson LLP and submits this Memorandum in support of Dakota Access, LLC's opposition to the Yankton Sioux Tribe's Motion to Compel Discovery.

FACTS

On or about December 15, 2014 Dakota Access, LLC filed an Application for a Facility Permit to Construct and Operate the Dakota Access Pipeline with the SD PUC. Per SDCL 49-41B-24, the Commission must render a decision on the Application by December 15, 2015. On March 11, 2015 the Commission entered a Scheduling Order to assure the statutory decision timeframe can be met.

Pursuant to the Commission's Scheduling Order, the Yankton Sioux Tribe sent 49 discovery requests to Dakota Access, LLC on April 1, 2015. In addition to the Yankton Sioux Tribe's requests, Dakota Access, LLC received discovery requests from other interveners. Dakota Access, LLC worked diligently to respond to all requests by May 1, 2015. Highly substantial but incomplete responses were Answers were provided on May 2, 2015. Specifically of the 49 requests, 4 answers were pending on May 2, 2015. Final signed responses were provided on May 8, 2015.

LAW

While the Supreme Court has indicated, “the scope of pretrial discovery is, for the most part, broadly construed,” discovery is not without boundaries. Bean v. Best, 80 N.W.2d 565 (SD 1957). “Application for discovery must contain facts showing or indicating a reasonable probability that documents...contain material evidence.” *Id.* The proper standard is to determine whether the information sought is “relevant to the subject matter involved....” Kaarup v. St. Paul Fire and Marine, Ins. Co., 436 N.W.2d 17 (SD 1989).

ARGUMENT

Interrogatories: 10, 20, 25, 26

Four individual requests for information made by the Yankton Sioux Tribe were not answered on May 2, 2015. Dakota Access, LLC indicated those Answers (Interrogatories 10, 20, 25, 26) were “Pending.” Those Answers required additional research that was not completed on May 2, 2015. The Yankton Sioux Tribe was aware that answers were forthcoming. Nonetheless, it included these items in its Motion to Compel which was filed on May 7, 2015. On May 8, 2015 answers to the above interrogatories were provided to the Yankton Sioux Tribe. See Attached Exhibit A. As a result, no Commission action is required.

Neither attorney fees nor other costs should be awarded to the Yankton Sioux Tribe. SDCL 15-6-37(a) instructs that attorney fees should not be awarded when the movant fails to first make “a good faith effort to obtain the disclosure or discovery without court action.” Court action on these four requests was completely unnecessary. Yankton Sioux Tribe did not make any good faith effort to resolve anything. Dakota Access, LLC assured the Yankton Sioux Tribe responses were on the way, and they have since been delivered. There was a 6 day delay in

answering these 4 requests. The slight delay in delivering answers did not prejudice Yankton Sioux Tribe in any way.

Interrogatory 11

This interrogatory asks, “Does Dakota Access recognize the Yankton Sioux Tribe, a federally recognized sovereign Indian Nation as a “local governmental unit?” Dakota Access answered, “Dakota Access considers the Yankton Sioux Tribe to be a federally recognized tribe.” Dakota Access fully answered the question, yet Yankton Sioux Tribe asks the Commission to Compel some further answer. Dakota Access is at a loss regarding what more the Yankton Sioux Tribe desired from this question. The Motion to Compel on this Interrogatory should be denied. The request for attorney fees should also be denied as the Interrogatory was answered.

Interrogatory 19

In this request, the Yankton Sioux Tribe asks for the description and location of all cultural or historic sites uncovered by surveys. By no means does Dakota Access intend to withhold any relevant information. However, it is concerned about the continued safety and preservation of historic sites it noted in its surveys. Additionally, State Statute protects much of this information as confidential per:

1-20-21.2. Confidentiality of records pertaining to location of archaeological site-- Exceptions. Any records maintained pursuant to § 1-20-21 pertaining to the location of an archaeological site shall remain confidential to protect the integrity of the archaeological site. The state archaeologist may make the information from the records of an archeological site available to any agency of state government and any political subdivision of the state or to any tribe, which, in the opinion of the state archaeologist, may conduct an activity that affects any such site. The state archaeologist shall also make the information from the records of an archeological site available to the owner of the land that is an archeological site and may make the information available to any qualified researcher or research entity.

If the cultural or historic resource is not protected under SDCL 1-20-21.2, the South Dakota Historic Preservation office regulates and otherwise manages the same. The historic preservation office is the agency with expertise and is the agency that the Yankton Sioux Tribe should work with to obtain detailed historic site information. If so compelled, Dakota Access will certainly provide the information. However, Dakota Access believes it is in the best interest of the State of South Dakota if the Yankton Sioux Tribe works directly with the Historic Preservation office, the experts in this area. The Motion to Compel on this Interrogatory should be denied as they are other more appropriate means for the Yankton Sioux Tribe to collect the requested information.

The request for attorney fees should be denied. Per SDCL 15-6-37(a) Dakota Access' objection is justified.

Interrogatory 40 and 18

There is no need for Commission action on these items. It seems the Yankton Sioux Tribe is merely seeking some clarification from Dakota Access regarding the answer to the above interrogatories. This is a conversation we can and should have without allocating Commission resources. See Attached Exhibit A. No Commission action is necessary or appropriate and as a result attorney's fees should not be awarded to Yankton Sioux Tribe as a result of this request.

Request for Production 4.

Document request 4 requests a variety of state based information generated in states other than South Dakota. This portion of the request is irrelevant, overbroad and burdensome. This Commission proceeding pertains to South Dakota only. With that said, Dakota Access did offer that no permits in any other state have been denied or revoked, in addition it provided a link to

other state applications. See Attached Exhibit A. The Yankton Sioux Tribe cannot justify this request or prove that this information is likely to lead to relevant information as it pertains to the South Dakota pipeline siting process. While discovery is broad, it is not without boundaries. The South Dakota siting process is not designed to “inspect” the permit process in all other states and any discovery along those lines is irrelevant. The Motion to Compel on this request for production should be denied.

Document request 4 also asks for “all documents” relating to required permits. The exchange of communication leading up to issuance of permit is irrelevant. Dakota Access followed the process required by each individual state or federal agency which has a permitting process. The applications, correspondence or other agency specific information is irrelevant to this process. Those state agencies are required to assure the permit requirements are met. The application process of outside agencies is irrelevant to the PUC siting process. In addition, it is overly burdensome for Dakota Access to produce all such information. The request for all information presumably includes e-mails, letters, applications, correspondence, notes and other internal communications. The Motion to Compel on this Request for Production should be denied.

The request for attorney fees should be denied. Per SDCL 15-6-37(a) Dakota Access’ objection is justified.

Request for Production 7.

Request for Production 7 asks for “all documents” related to any sensitive SD species located along or nearby the Dakota Access Pipeline Project. This request is overly broad. If the Yankton Sioux Tribe has any follow up question to Exhibit C which was filed with the Application and lists the Federal and State Threatened and Endangered species in South Dakota,

Dakota Access will make a good faith effort to reply. However, this particular request does not indicate in any way what type of information is sought. The Motion to Compel on this Request for Production should be denied.

Request for Production 7 also requests Dakota Access create a table to show breeding times of sensitive SD species and a map to show migration pathways of sensitive SD species. This request is outside the scope of discovery. The discovery process is used to obtain information or documents which exist. It is not intended to cause parties to create documents. It seems the Yankton Sioux Tribe would like Dakota Access to create documents which do not exist. The Motion to Compel on this Request for Production should be denied.

The request for attorney fees should be denied. Per SDCL 15-6-37(a) Dakota Access' objection is justified.

CONCLUSION

Discovery is a necessary tool to learn about the opposing side's evidence and arguments. However, discovery is not without limits. It is improper to use the discovery process to simply burden a party with requests to dig into unrelated information for unrelated purposes. It is improper to use the discovery process to cause unnecessary delay to further an outside cause. It appears that is what is going on here.


Dakota Access communicated its desire to completely answer Discovery and invited conversation among the parties. However, the Yankton Sioux Tribe's reply did not reflect a desire to work through its apparent issues in an effort to obtain the information necessary to advocate its position in this South Dakota siting docket. Rather, the Yankton Sioux Tribe has been very adversarial, demanding and has itself generated the current discovery issues. It

appears the Yankton Sioux Tribe desires to use the Discovery process as a tool to complicate the overall siting docket process in furtherance of an outside agenda.

Dakota Access respectfully requests the PUC deny Yankton Sioux Tribe's to Compel and deny the request for attorney fees for all the above stated reasons.

Dated this 8 day of May, 2015.

MAY, ADAM, GERDES & THOMPSON LLP

BY: 
BRETT KOENECKE
KARA SEMMLER
Attorneys for Plaintiff
503 South Pierre Street
PO Box 160
Pierre, SD 57501-0160
(605) 224-8803

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

8 Kara C. Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson hereby certifies that on or before the 8 day of May, 2015, she electronically served through the PUC filing system or mailed by US First Class Mail, a copy of the Brief in Support of Opposition to Motion to Compel Discovery to the following:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Ms. Kristen Edwards
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us

Mr. Brian Rounds
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
brian.rounds@state.sd.us

Mr. Darren Kearney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

darren.kearney@state.sd.us

Mr. Tom Siguaw
Dakota Access, LLC
tom.siguaw@energytransfer.com

Mr. Keegan Pieper
Dakota Access, LLC
keegan.pieper@energytransfer.com

Mr. Stephen Veatch
Dakota Access, LLC
Stephen.veatch@energytransfer.com

Mr. Joey Mahmoud
Dakota Access, LLC
Joey.mahmoud@energytransfer.com

Mr. Jack Edwards
Dakota Access, LLC
Jack.edwards@energytransfer.com

Ms. Jennifer Guthmiller
McPherson County Auditor
mcpersonaud@valleytel.net

Mr. Keith Schurr
Edmunds County Auditor
Keith.schurr@state.sd.us

Ms. Kelly Toennies
Faulk County Auditor
Kelly.toennies@state.sd.us

Ms. Theresa Hodges
Spink County Auditor
spinkcoauditor@nrctv.com

Ms. Jill Hanson
Beadle County Auditor
auditor@beadlesd.org

Ms. Jennifer Albrecht
Kingsbury County Auditor

Jennifer.albrecht@state.sd.us

Ms. Susan Connor
Miner County Auditor
minerauditor@minercountysd.org

Ms. Roberta Janke
Lake County Auditor
lakeauditor@lakecountysd.com

Ms. Geralyn Sherman
McCook County Auditor
Geralyn.sherman@state.sd.us

Mr. Bob Litz
Minnehaha County Auditor
blitz@minnehahacounty.org

Ms. Sheila Hagemann
Turner County Auditor
turcoaud@iw.net

Ms. Marlene Sweeter
Lincoln County Auditor
auditor@lincolncountysd.org

Ms. Lisa Schaeffbauer
Campbell County Auditor
campbellcommission@yahoo.com

Ms. Karla Engle
South Dakota Department of Transportation
karla.engle@state.sd.us

Mr. Chris S. Giles
Lake County States Attorney
Chris.Giles@lakecountysd.com

Mr. Steve Harper
WEB Water Development Association, Inc.
sharper@webwater.org

Mr. Randy Kuehn
rlkfarms@gmail.com

Mr. Michael F. Nadolski - Representing Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
mnadolski@lincolncountysd.org

Mr. Bret Merkle - Representing Pente Farms, LLC; KKKP Property, LLLP; Pederson Ag, LLC;
Calvin Schreiver; DLK&M, LLC; Jean Osthus; and Daniel & Marcia Hoiland
bret@merklelaw.com

Ms. Cindy Heiberger
Minnehaha County
cjepson@minnehahacounty.org

Mr. Kersten Kappmeyer
Minnehaha County
kkappmeyer@minnehahacounty.org

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, Joy Hohn, and Orrin E. Geide
glenn@breitlawpc.com

Mr. Larry A. Nelson - Representing: City of Hartford
Frieberg, Nelson and Ask, L.L.P.
lnelson@frieberglaw.com

Ms. Linda Glaeser
Rocky Acres Land Investment, LLC
lglaeser@seattlecca.org
lmglaeser@wwdb.org

Mr. Dale E. Sorenson
Dale E. Sorenson Life Estate
a77man@msn.com

Ms. Kimberly Craven - Representing Dakota Rural Action and Indigenous Environmental
Network (IEN)
kimecraven@gmail.com

Ms. Debra K., Mr. Duane H. & Mr. Dennis S. Sorenson
stubbyfarmer@yahoo.com

Mr. Douglas Sorenson
plowboy@svtv.com

Mr. William Haugen
Haugen Investments LP

wh401889@hotmail.com

Mr. Phillip Fett
vonfett529@gmail.com

Mr. Bradley F. Williams
bwilliams@bestlaw.com

Mr. Craig L. & Ms. Dotta-Jo A. Walker
court_walker@hotmail.com

Ms. Diane Best
City of Sioux Falls
dbest@siouxfalls.org

Mr. Charles J. Johnson
c-bjohnson@svtv.com

Mr. Paul A Nelsen
paul@paulnelsenconstruction.com

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
jacknife@goldenwest.net

Mr. John Wellnitz
johnwellnitz@gmail.com

Mr. John Stratmeyer
46534 272nd St.
Tea, SD 57064

Mr. Lorin L. Brass
46652 278th St.
Lennox, SD 57039
brass@iw.net

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold - Representing: RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office
and RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office
Rappold Law Office
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com

Ms. Thomasina Real Bird - Representing - Yankton Sioux Tribe
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
trealbird@ndnlaw.com

Ms. Margo D. Northrup - Representing: South Dakota Association of Rural Water Systems, Inc.
Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup LLP
m.northrup@riterlaw.com



KARA C. SEMMLER