1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION HP14-001 OF TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE,
5	LP FOR ORDER ACCEPTING CERTIFICATION OF PERMIT ISSUED IN DOCKET HP09-001
6	TO CONSTRUCT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE
7	
8	
9	Transcript of Proceedings October 29, 2015
LO	=======================================
L1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
_2	CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN
L3	KRISTIE FIEGEN, VICE CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER
L 4	COMMISSION STAFF
L5	Rolayne Wiest
L 6	Kristen Edwards Karen Cremer
L7	Adam de Hueck Greg Rislov
L 8	Brian Rounds Darren Kearney
L 9	Brittany Mehlhaff Joseph Rezac
20	Eric Paulson Lorena Reichert
	Patrick Steffenson
21	Katlyn Gustafson
22	
23	
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, Room 414, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 29th day of October, 2015.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: HP14-001, In the Matter of the Petition of TransCanada Keystone Pipeline LP for Order Accepting Certification of Permit Issued in Docket HP09-001 to Construct the Keystone XL Pipeline.

And the question that we're going to deal with today, one left over from the actual hearing that we had is shall the Commission grant Keystone's Motion to Strike Testimony and Exhibits of Cindy Myers.

And, with that, TransCanada.

2.3

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioners. Good morning.

The Commission will remember that as the pipeline hearing was winding down Ms. Myers testified. I had numerous objections to Ms. Myers' testimony, and we agreed through the office of then general counsel Mr. Smith that we would defer discussion of my objections until a later date and we would just let her testifying in order to bring the hearing to the conclusion within the time constraints that are available.

This hearing today is in response to a motion that I made after the hearing with respect to Ms. Myers' testimony.

My motion details the points of her testimony and her exhibit list that TransCanada finds objectionable. I don't know how you want to do this. I

can go through them step by step.

2.3

There have been a couple of briefs filed. I'd like to address the points raised in the briefs first, I think, and then we can decide whether we need to go through each objection.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: You know, maybe let me help you through that by asking maybe a baseline question.

And we'll -- I think as a Commission we'll deal with the motion to strike the exhibits first, but I want to make sure that we're all talking about the same exhibits since there were a couple of different lists.

And what I want to go through is a listing of exhibit numbers so that we make sure that this is exactly what you are objecting to. Is that fair?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. We had a difficult time aligning the exhibit numbers and I think I did it three ways in my motion.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And we spent an exorbitant amount of Staff time trying to do the same thing. So I want to make sure we're on the same page.

So the numbers that we believe you are objecting to are 6001, 6003, 4, 5, 6016, 6022, 6024, 27, 28, 6030, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, and then two unnumbered exhibits, the plastic water line survey results and the PowerPoint testimony.

MR. TAYLOR: I think that's right.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Then that is what we are going to base our discussion on today. And, with that, you may proceed.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Let me get my notes straightened out here.

The principal issue that we have with Ms. Myers' testimony is two-fold. One, hearsay. General hearsay objection. And number two is citations to information and data that's not properly admitted into evidence. The hearsay objection goes to a couple of levels.

First of all, there are a number of instances where Ms. Myers quotes other people. For example, she talked to some water plant operators and then in her testimony relates what the water plant operators told her. Basic hearsay. Unsworn, out of court statement offered for the truth of what it contains. And that's fundamentally objectionable and a ground zero objection in a hearing of this type.

Second, she cites a number of newspaper articles -- or includes as exhibits a number of newspaper articles or internet articles. Those are also base hearsay. They're unsworn, out of court statements offered for the truth of what they contain.

The next -- the third thing that she does is she

refers to various scholarly works, sometimes quotes from them, sometimes summarizes them, and adds those to her testimony.

2.3

There are rules on how scholarly works can be admitted in court and in administrative hearings. The principal way is that an expert witness testifies. I am, for example, Heidi Tillquist, expert toxicologist. She's qualified as an expert and relates her qualifications.

She then can say on a particular subject that the opinion that I'm going to render or that I have rendered is grounded in part in scholarly or scientific work X. And she identifies that.

Then the person who cross examines her can examine her about what she knows about X or what the foundation for X -- the rules say that X is not allowed to be placed in evidence. Rather, if she relies on a particular excerpt from X, that can be read into the record.

And that's very clear in the Rules of Evidence.

So while I understand the complications that go with being a lay Intervenor, I've served in your role as chair of the Board of Minerals and Environment in many cases where there were lay Intervenors. The law of South Dakota is very clear, and that is is that we have Rules of Evidence and we have rules of procedure for a

reason. That is so that chaos does not reign and so that everyone on all sides of every question has a fair opportunity to present their evidence and present their exhibits in a manner that's consistent.

2.3

Despite what some of the Intervenors argue in their briefing, the Rules of Evidence and the Rules of Civil Procedure apply in this proceeding, and the case law in South Dakota that says that pro se, lay parties are not entitled to any deference under the rules applies to this board.

We have a case cited by Staff, cited by us,

Oesterling v. Oesterling. Circuit Court Decision. It

says "Parties who appear pro se may not capitalize on

their unfamiliarity with the law. They are bound by the

same Rules of Evidence and procedure that bind

attorneys."

SDCL 1-26-19 from the Administrative Procedures Act, second sentence says "The Rules of Evidence as applied under the statutory provisions" that's the code "and in the trial of civil cases in the circuit courts shall be followed."

So there's -- despite Mr. Capossela's arguments in his briefs, there is no question that the Rules of Evidence apply in this case and that the Rules of Evidence apply to a pro se Intervenor in the same precise

manner as they apply to me, as they apply to Ms. Edwards, as they apply to Mr. Capossela, or any other lawyer representing a party in this case.

2.3

So in our motion hearing -- in our motion all we ask you to do is follow the Rules of Evidence and to exclude those items that are hearsay and to exclude those items that are quotes from purportedly scholarly articles or expert documents because they're improperly offered.

Now if you'd like me to go through them one by one, I can do that.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's at your option.

MR. TAYLOR: I know you have a busy docket today.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have -- you know, I've -speaking as one Commissioner, I have read your filing and
examined all of this. I don't have a need for you to do
that. Commissioner Hanson I'm sure does but we'll -just kidding.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd just make one other point rather than going through the exhibits.

Seeing Mr. Welk here reminds me of the Union

Carbide case. The Chairman of the -- the Chairman of the

Conservation Commission was a long time friend of mine, a

Russian German farmer from Bowdle, and it was his rulings

as Chairman of the Conservation Commission that ended up

in the Union Carbide decision.

2.3

In the course of that case Mr. Welk experienced something that I've experienced a number of times when there are pro se Intervenors.

The question is -- as raised by the Chairman of the Conservation Commission was really what difference does it make? Wilbert Blumhardt is who we're talking about. And Wilbert used to say when he served with me on the Board of Minerals and Environment I can sort this out. I know what evidence is important and what evidence isn't, and I can sort that out.

And that's a common feeling in lay boards. But the problem comes on appeal. You go up on appeal, and what happens on appeal is the information that was improperly admitted resurfaces and you have to brief it and you have to argue it and you have to consume the court's time.

My classic case is in the Homestake water rights case where Judge Zinter finally carved through a great deal of material that the Water Management Board had let in that it shouldn't have, made the correct decision, but, nonetheless, we spent uncounted hours briefing those issues.

So it is very important to get the record straight at this end.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. So far as striking some of the testimony, do you want to deal with -- I've got some issues to try to straighten out on that regard. Do you want to deal with that now, or do you want to come back?

2.3

MR. TAYLOR: I can address those points also.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Let me go through the questions I've got so we can make sure we're on the right page. I think so there's some questions.

On page 3 of the testimony you had indicated you wanted to strike paragraph C under aquifers. And then it refers to the first paragraph in paragraph C.

So can you help us out in exactly which paragraph under aquifers you're seeking to strike? Or is there just a sentence?

MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. There's a mistake. It should say sub B in 3 in my objection. It says in paragraph B, the second paragraph. That should say in paragraph B, the second sentence. Typographical error that I discovered last night. Assumes facts not in evidence and expresses an opinion which she's not qualified to render. And there's no foundation for her opinion.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So again is it the third paragraph in the section on aquifers that you're

1 seeking to strike? What is it we're --2 MR. TAYLOR: Catch up with me. Tell me where you're reading from in my motion. 3 4 So if we look at her sub topic, aquifers, we're 5 talking about her prefiled testimony. In the first 6 paragraph, A, that starts this massive toxic 7 infrastructure, that's argumentative. 8 In the second paragraph, B, no foundation. Opinion testimony. Assumes facts not in evidence. 10 The third paragraph, C, expresses opinions for 11 which there isn't any foundation. 12 Are we there yet? 13 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Stay right there. 14 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So in the second 15 paragraph, the one that begins "I live where" are you 16 seek to go strike the entire paragraph or just a 17 sentence? 18 MR. TAYLOR: Well, the first sentence she can 19 say where she lives. I live where the first KXL route 20 was to cross in Nebraska. It's the rest. The route was 21 moved because of the high water table and sandy soil. 22 And then follows by the rhetorical question. 2.3 There's no foundation for that testimony. It's 24 opinion testimony on her part, and it assumes facts not

25

in evidence.

1 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Fair enough. So then on the 2 third paragraph are you seeking to strike the entire 3 paragraph or just a portion? The one that begins "neither TransCanada". 4 MR. TAYLOR: I think there we strike the entire 5 6 paragraph. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okav. 8 On page 3 you indicate you want to strike the 9 third paragraph under waterways but there's only two 10 paragraphs on page 3 so are you --11 MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. It should be the second 12 paragraph. 13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: The one that begins "we know 14 the tar sands". 15 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. What she's really doing there 16 is quoting the newspaper articles that she later offers 17 in her testimony. 18 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Thank you for walking 19 through that with us. We needed to make sure exactly 20 what we're talking about. And with that, you can go 21 ahead and argue that. 22 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So we'll probably have 2.3 some additional questions on the hearing testimony 24 because there's a couple of questions there too.

Sure.

MR. TAYLOR:

25

```
1
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Just so you know that's
2
     coming.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. The final question
 3
4
    we've got as Commissioner Fiegen indicated is dealing
5
    with the actual testimony in the transcript.
 6
              On page 1,660.
7
              MR. TAYLOR: Did you say 1,660?
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Correct.
              MR. TAYLOR: Let me catch up.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Is it line 12 or line 13?
10
11
    line 8?
12
              MR. TAYLOR: All right. You're looking at line
13
    13?
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yeah. How far down on that
15
    page are we going?
16
              MR. TAYLOR: Well, I think lines 1 through 14 on
17
     1,660 lack foundation, starting with "and in the
    emergency" which is actually in line 2.
18
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. If you go through line
20
     14, that's cutting a sentence in half.
21
              MR. TAYLOR: Yeah. It should end at the
22
     sentence at the end of line 15. No foundation and it's
2.3
    hearsay. You know, she's talking about what someone told
2.4
    her.
                                Okay. I think we are clear on
25
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
```

1 | this end. Anything else to add?

2.3

2.4

MR. TAYLOR: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. If not, we will go to Ms. Myers.

And, Ms. Myers, just so we're clear, you heard the list that I read off earlier. You heard the discussion of the clarifications of what TransCanada is asking for and that is what we are working for today.

MS. MYERS: I understand.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And, Mr. Taylor, if you would be so kind as to maybe take a seat in the back and give her some space.

MS. MYERS: I do have a few comments to begin with. For the record I'm Cindy Myers R.N., Individual Intervenor in Docket HP14-001. I am thankful to be here today as a participating citizen. Over 40 parties were accepted as Intervenors in this docket and the message seemed to be that the PUC recognized the importance of including all interested parties.

Kristen Edwards, Staff attorney, was appointed as a resource for us Intervenors, and I appreciate that the Commissioners recognized lay Intervenors would need assistance navigating this process.

I relied on Kristen Edwards as a resource. I've participated to the best of my ability, and I've met all

deadlines. I've taken my commitment as an Intervenor seriously.

2.3

Despite doing all of this, I was not allowed to present my entire PowerPoint at the hearing. So when Mr. Taylor says that I testified, I didn't because I was cut short.

I'm here today because TransCanada wants to strike my testimony and exhibits from the record. I'm a pro se, nonfunded lay Intervenor. I feel like I'm being taken advantage of by a well financed corporate team of lawyers.

A brief history concerning my testimony and exhibits may be helpful. As suggested by the Commissioners, I communicated with Kristen Edwards throughout the process, and she answered several of my questions. Kristen e-mailed a sample exhibit list and that is the format I used.

Shortly before the hearing John Smith assigned exhibit numbers for each Intervenor, and his instructions were to number our exhibits with his assigned numbers and place on a thumb drive to present to the court reporter on day one of the hearing and that's what I did.

All my exhibits were previously filed by the deadline. My prefiled testimony was filed on April 2, meeting the deadline.

I asked Kristen Edwards if I could present my testimony as a PowerPoint at the hearing and she responded that was allowable. Using my prefiled testimony information, I created a PowerPoint for the hearing, and it was based on my prefiled testimony. And that's no different than when somebody files prefiled testimony for an expert witness and they get on the stand and it's not exactly what was in the prefiled testimony but it's based on that.

2.3

I asked Kristen Edwards if there was a time limit for presenting my PowerPoint testimony and she responded there was no time limit.

So due to several objections at the hearing $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ was only allowed to give a limited portion of my testimony.

TransCanada had asked that I not present any of my testimony at the hearing. So how come TransCanada did not object to my prefiled testimony before the hearing? It was filed on April 2, and there were deadlines to meet as far as responding to prefiled testimony.

And TransCanada did have many objections to several pieces of testimony and expert witnesses. So it seems they would or should have done this by earlier deadlines. Perhaps TransCanada has not followed the rules.

The PUC Staff's response to this motion relies on a Supreme Court ruling, <u>Oesterling v. Oesterling</u>.

According to the joint is your reply the Application of <u>Oesterling</u> is limited to the circuit courts. It does not apply to hearings conducted by administrative agencies.

2.3

And so I understand this to mean the PUC does not need to strictly apply the Rules of Evidence to strike my testimony and exhibits as requested by TransCanada.

Since I'm not a legal expert, I would like to use the joint sur reply filed by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Rosebud Tribe, and Yankton Sioux Tribe as my response to TransCanada's numerous objections about my exhibits and testimony.

When I was accepted as an Intervenor I felt confident about bringing my concerns before the PUC. I believe my testimony and exhibits offer other information otherwise not brought forth. I believe the public has a right to my information, but I believe it is information TransCanada doesn't want the public to know. It is more advantageous for TransCanada to sweep it under the rug.

I've been a registered nurse for 35 years. My primary purpose for being an Intervenor is because of my passion for protecting drinking water sources. My testimony and exhibits aren't about making profits.

They're about protecting the health, safety, and well-being of South Dakotans. I'm simply here for the common good.

2.3

I've respected the entire PUC process, and I ask the PUC to respect my testimony and exhibits by denying TransCanada's motion and accepting my prefiled testimony, my PowerPoint testimony, and my exhibits into the record for Docket HP14-001.

And now I have a few comments to make in response to what Mr. Taylor has presented.

He talks about these several newspaper articles that I've used as exhibits. I went back through my exhibit list while he was saying that. There's actually two newspaper articles.

He mentioned about how people are -- if you're a witness you can be cross-examined. I was my own witness. I put myself down as an expert -- or as a witness on my exhibit list as Kristen instructed me to. And I -- there was the opportunity to cross-examine me at the hearing, and I don't believe anybody had any questions for me.

Mr. Taylor talks about striking the term

"aquifer" because I'm not familiar with that term or I'm

not an expert with that term. I feel I'm very much an

expert on the basis I grew up in Holt County on a farm

where the aquifer was either at the surface or just

below. I know about the aquifer. You can dig a hole and
see the water fill the hole.

2.3

And I know firsthand about the route being moved because of the sandy soil and the high water table. I personally gave the speaker of our Unicameral,

Mike Flood, a tour of the area and showed him the flowing wells and I explained the water situation. And I had a lot of direct communication with him before the special session in which the route was moved from southwest Holt County because of the sandy soil and high water.

And I know you have a busy agenda today, but I think I request that this be dealt with fairly.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Normally because this is an issue between you and TransCanada, I would limit argument to you, but I also know there was a joint motion filed, and since you are a layperson, I am going to give a little bit of leeway and allow either Mr. Capossela or Mr. Rappold to offer any additional arguments that they'd like to offer.

MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Peter Capossela with Standing Rock.

Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: We can very good, Peter.

MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you. I had some issues with the sound so thank you. And I'll be brief.

I did consult with Mr. Rappold this morning, and he agreed to defer to me on this so I'll follow up. And I appreciate the Commission's review of the sur replies. We got that as quickly as we can after -- we consulted with one another after the filing of the reply.

2.3

We do submit that the interpretation of

Oesterling is being stretched from circuit court to the agencies. The Administrative Procedures Act established -- Section 19 of the South Dakota Administrative Procedures Act SDCL 1-26-19, it establishes the evidentiary standard.

And what that does is it codifies a common law rule in administrative law, that the Hearing Officer of an agency, administrative hearing, does have some leeway in her application of the Rules of Evidence as the fact finders in the furtherance of the fact-finding process when it comes to unrepresented litigants.

The reason for that is the Hearing Officer of an agency is deemed to possess expertise in the area of jurisdiction of the agency. Cut the wheat from the chafe in her evidence that may be borderline in circuit court with respect to the rules of evidence.

TransCanada contends that this thing may go on appeal to judicial review so it's somehow unfair to strictly apply -- narrowly apply the Rules of Evidence.

But on appeal the Circuit Court would give great deference to your findings. So as a matter of administrative law -- that's what we're asking is this is an administrative hearing. We're not in Circuit Court. As a matter of administrative law -- at common law here as officers, such as the Commissioners and the Commission counsel during the hearing, are granted the latitude in the Applicant issues in the Rules of Evidence because it deems to have expertise and that search to further the fact-finding process.

2.3

And that's what the rule is. And that rule is codified in Section 19 of the South Dakota APA,

Administrative Procedures Act.

And I think it's justified. The Commission and Commission Staff have a high level of expertise in this area.

A Circuit Court judge is a generalist. They hear cases from car wrecks to tax cases. The Commission focuses in your area of expertise.

Now the Applicant asks for its motion to strike to be granted, and they cite a rule which applies to its administrative proceedings as much as a rule that comes out of a car wreck or tax case. They're citing a rule under civil procedure law when we're in administrative

law under the Administrative Procedures Act and the statutes and procedures that apply to the agents of the Public Utilities Commission. I think the Commission's statutes and regulations also contemplate a much more open process that be advocated by TransCanada in its motion. And when you look at the steps that Ms. Myers has taken, she complied with all the rules. She's attempted to lay foundation. And she's attempted to come up with documentary evidence to back up her testimony. I think she's exactly the kind of Intervenor that the Legislature contemplated participating in a process such as this.

2.3

With respect to looking at the different pieces of testimony and exhibits that TransCanada is seeking to have excluded, when we look at Section 19 of the APA and its directives that evidence is to be excluded when it's irrelevant, incompetent, immaterial, or unduly repetitious, you know, we would concede that something like Dr. Davis's -- statements of Dr. Arden Davis would be repetitious because he testified himself and was subject to cross-examination of himself.

The two newspaper articles arguably are hearsay.

But the South Dakota Court does Permit administrative agencies to accept hearsay evidence that falls under one of the exceptions, and by far the overwhelming majority

of the evidentiary items complained upon by TransCanada do fit into acceptance of the hearsay rule.

2.3

Most of the exhibits or many of the exhibits with respect to cancer and health and some of the constituents of diluted bitumen are public agency records, which is an exception to the hearsay rule. So most of the items that -- many of the exhibits fall into that exception.

Counsel this morning talked about conversations that Ms. Myers testified about with respect to water treatment operators or the City of Colome.

There's an exception called the then existing mental impression. And so if a city official from Colome told Ms. Myers that, yes, they interacted with TransCanada about the route in Tripp County, and yes, TransCanada made some changes to the route in response to Colome's concerns with water pollution, but that they don't have a good feeling about the way the discussions went or TransCanada's predisposition in those discussions, that testimony is not admissible for the purpose of arguing that Keystone XL will pollute the aquifer. And to that purpose it's hearsay.

But it is admissible for the purpose of demonstrating that Colome city officials have concerns with the way their interactions with TransCanada went.

Their mental impression. Their feelings. Their impression of the situation. Not for whether or not it's going to be polluted by Keystone XL. That's -- that would be hearsay. But for a different purpose it fits under the then existing mental impression exception to the hearsay rule.

2.3

2.4

And some of the complained upon e-mails could be considered recorded recollections by city officials.

And so there are numerous exceptions which apply here, and I think TransCanada has pointed out some items, some exhibits of Ms. Myers which under Section 19 of the APA arguably should be excluded. But the overwhelming amount of her written and oral testimony and written exhibits were proffered and should be included in the record.

Now the statements with respect -- in her written testimony with respect to the toxicity of benzene and water born diseases, if Ms. Myers were a pipe fitter, that testimony may not be proper. But under Rule 701, which is the rule governing opinion testimony by lay witnesses, clearly that's admissible testimony from a nurse. Because it's rationally based on her experiences as a person and it's helpful to the Commission. And that's what the test is for lay opinion testimony.

Similarly, compilations or items that have been

prepared such as a map showing water treatment intakes or a compilation of the population that's served by the water treatment intakes downstream from Keystone XL, that kind of compilation testimony is accepted by courts all the time.

2.3

For example, in business litigation, a bookkeeper of a small business who's not an expert, who's not an accountant, who doesn't have a doctorate in accounting will often testify on income and expense statements, revenue statements of her corporation that she's compiled based on her work, on her life's experience.

She's not an expert. It's a document that that witness has prepared. But courts accept that stuff all the time.

And so the sum of the documents and the maps and the information with respect to rural water systems in South Dakota, that's not improper testimony. That kind of testimony is accepted all the time.

There was some discussion this morning about the third paragraph on page 3 of Ms. Myers' prefiled written testimony. And it suggested that the entire third paragraph should be deleted. That's another good example of the hearsay exception. Ms. Myers in that paragraph that they're asking be stricken states "TransCanada told"

me meeting the project's purposes and needs is a primary reason for the pipeline route." Well, a statement against interests by a party is always admissible evidence. So certainly that sentence is not hearsay. She's quoting TransCanada there. And she's got the right to do that under the rules.

2.3

The Standing Rock Tribe and the other Tribes do have some concerns with respect to some of the prehearing orders excluding evidence as it relates to tribal testimony.

And so now here we are in posthearing, and I think TransCanada's motion with respect to Ms. Myers simply reached too far. Ms. Myers followed the rules, the sphere of the rules, the letter of the rules, and the motion should be denied.

And thank you for hearing the Tribes on this issue.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Staff.

MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. As stated in our response, Staff does not intend to take a position on the underlying question of which exhibits or testimony should be stricken. We simply filed a brief outlining the law of the applicability of evidence because the one thing that is a constant in all the hearings we're going to have in the future is we will be a party. Therefore, we

need to protect precedent on what evidence we'll be going up against in the future. Beyond that, we are not taking any interest or position in this motion.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Taylor, a brief rebuttal.

And, Ms. Myers, if you would offer the same courtesy.

Thank you.

MS. MYERS: Sure.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. It's very difficult to argue against Mr. Capossela's contentions because he's just flat wrong. And it's always very difficult to argue about something that is so off the mark that there is no accurate response.

First of all, the 701 question. Did Ms. Myers present herself as an expert or a lay witness? She presented herself as a lay witness with specialized knowledge. There are rules about how expert witnesses must testify and what they can say. There's a whole body of case law that deals with that. She presented herself as a lay witness. She is not entitled to give expert opinions as a lay witness.

I respect very much that she's been a nurse for 35 years. I've been a lawyer for 44. There's no way in hell I could give an expert opinion on matters of federal income tax that are routinely handled by lawyers. Just

as she must demonstrate foundation for her opinions on toxicology and show some specialized knowledge if she wants to give those opinions. So her lay opinions cannot reach expert findings.

2.3

2.4

Number two, the Tripp County officials. Mental impressions under Rule 803(3), that's an exception to the hearsay rule. There is an exception to the hearsay rule that says that the mental impressions of persons can be offered through hearsay. The mental impressions of persons are things like I'm hurt. That's not fair. I'm dying. You just killed me. There are cases that address every single one of those.

Mental impressions that some guy in Tripp County in the water system says to Ms. Myers I sort of feel like maybe it wasn't fair what happened and then Ms. Myers comes here and testifies to that, how can I cross-examine the guy from Tripp County and say on what foundation did you arrive at that conclusion that it wasn't fair? Did you arrive at that by feeling the bumps on your head? Did you arrive at that by listening to the arguments made by TransCanada? Did you arrive at that because your wife said to you when you went home that night I'm not fixing you dinner if you treat those TransCanada people correctly?

That's what hearsay's all about. Hearsay's all

about the hot swift sort of cross-examination bringing out the truth.

So mental impressions, Mr. Capossela. His 803(3) argument just doesn't fit.

2.3

He talks about the public agency exception to the hearsay rule, 803(8). The public agency exception to the hearsay rule is very clear. 803(8) says that records, reports, and data compilations that are observed by an official office or agency pursuant to a duty imposed by law in which there was a duty to report can be offered into evidence as an exception to the hearsay rule. And when the NTSB investigates an airplane crash, which it is obligated by law, by federal law, to do, it prepares a report. The NTSB report can be admitted into evidence.

That does not mean that when some editorial issued an order writes an article and says this is my opinion, that that can be offered into evidence. That's hearsay.

It doesn't mean that a government agency, some person in a government agency, writes an opinion, that that can be offered into evidence.

I'll give you an example. We tried a lawsuit over this issue in front of the Board of Minerals and Environment. Region 7 of the EPA, some guy in Region 7

of the EPA decided what he thought would be the proper way to test the emissions, air emissions from an ethanol plant. And he wrote an article about that.

2.3

And the EPA tried to impose those emissions as a rule. That analysis, that theory that he had -- he's a government employee and he prepared the report in the course of his employment. But it was not a report required on matters to be observed pursuant to a duty imposed by law. So it's not admissible.

So so what if some guy in the White House writes an article that says I've done this and I've done that and I've read this and I've read that. The guy in the White House can come here and testify so I can cross-examine him.

Now if the guy in the White House writes an official report because he has the obligation to report that like the NTSB guy or the highway patrolman who investigates an accident, different story.

The issue about agencies having latitude to ignore the rules, that just simply is not the case. That is not what the statutes say.

19 is very clear. The caption of 1-26-19 is
"Rules of Evidence in contested cases." That's what this
was, a contested case. Hot lie contested case. 13
lawyers. A lawyer with two years less service before the

1 bar than me serving as the Hearing Officer. And the 2 statute says in the first sentence "irrelevant, 3 incompetent, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence shall be excluded." 4 5 In the second sentence if says "The Rules of 6 Evidence as applied under the statutory provisions in the 7 trial of civil cases in the circuit courts of this state 8 shall be followed." There isn't anything very confusing about that. 10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Would you give us a 11 complete cite for that for the record, please. 12 MR. TAYLOR: The citation that I read from is SDCL 1-26-19, Subpart 1. 13 14 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. 15 Mr. Capossela confuses a concept. MR. TAYLOR: 16 He says that because of an agency's expertise, the agency 17 should be shown deference. That has nothing to do with 18 evidence. What it has to do with is the concept that

The Board of Minerals and Environment, the Water Management Board, the Public Utilities Commission, the Dental Board, the medical boards. All of those boards

courts showed deference to the decisions of agencies that

there are agencies who have expertise in technical

matters and that the deference that the -- that the

have expertise in technical matters.

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

have expertise, and the cases say that the courts show deference to that expertise.

2.3

The cases don't say that the Rules of Evidence don't apply. There is a very crystal distinction. And especially in this type of hearing, conducted by lawyers, attended by lawyers.

You know, I was a junior in college when the Administrative Procedures Act was adopted in South Dakota, and it was controversial, 1966. The concept was Wilbert Blumhardt Conservation Commission approach. Lay boards, lay people, not represented by lawyers, and in those situations there is some room for relaxed -- relaxation of the Rules of Evidence. And our code takes that into account.

But a professional board in a hearing conducted by highly experienced lawyers -- probably conducted more administrative law hearings than anybody else before the Bar frankly, to make the contention that the Rules of Evidence should not apply is simply ludicrous.

I like Ms. Myers. Her heart's in the right place. She wants to do the right thing. But she has to do it according to the rules. And that applies -- has been uniformly applied throughout the course of this hearing, and there should be no exception for Ms. Myers.

I'd stand on my objections. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Questions from the Commission.
2 Commissioner Fiegen.

2.3

2.4

Ms. Myers. You know, I certainly read your prefiled testimony and read your testimony at the hearing several times and listened to it. But I just wanted to clarify the exhibits that you offered that Chairman Nelson stated today. They are the Exhibits 6000 through 6037 are the exhibits you offered in this hearing and then the two plastic water line survey results and the PowerPoint testimony. I just want to make sure because I looked at a whole bunch of different documents and wanted to make sure those were the ones you offered.

MS. MYERS: I'm sorry for that confusion. I used the format that Kristen provided, and then John Smith requested we use the assigned numbers so that's how that came about.

My exhibits are from 6000 to 6037. And at the hearing I asked to also be admitted into evidence 6038 and 6039. 6038 would be the PVC, the plastic line survey results, and 6039 would be the PowerPoint testimony, which was based on my prefiled testimony.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that was clarified today. Thank you for that.

1 MS. MYERS: Yes. Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional questions. 3 Commissioner Hanson. 4 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 Mr. Capossela, are you with us still? 6 Mr. Capossela, you may be on mute? 7 MR. CAPOSSELA: Yes, sir. 8 COMMISSIONER HANSON: I assume you've read all of the materials that have come through here and Staff 10 filed a -- I'll call it a neutral brief regarding 11 presentation of information from nonattorneys 12 participating as parties. 13 Are you familiar with that? Staff's brief? Let 14 me just read a portion of it to you, and you can react to 15 that. I have a question. I'd like your opinion in 16 regards to evidence. 17 You've stated that the Public Utilities 18 Commission should allow significant leeway to individuals 19 who are not attorneys. And the Staff's memo provides 20 with respect to the question -- I'm reading now from their memo. 21 22 "With respect to the question of whether the 2.3 same standard concerning presentation of evidence should 24 apply to individuals who are representing themselves as

to those represented by legal counsel, the South Dakota

25

- Supreme Court has set clear direction on this issue. The Court has stated that to grant such indulgence would be to work injustice in the name of justice for it will allow those who freely elect to act as their own counsel liberties not accorded to those who seek out members of the Bar to represent them." And it gives the cite for that quote.
- 8 MR. CAPOSSELA: Yes, sir. I'm familiar with 9 that. With the Staff's --
- 10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Capossela.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

2.3

24

- 11 Mr. Capossela, I haven't finished my question yet.
 - The brief goes on to state the court went on to state that Parties who appear pro se may not capitalize on their unfamiliarity with the law. They are bound by the same Rules of Evidence and procedures that bind attorneys. And a trial judge is not required to act as counsel for litigant."
 - All right. That's my question. I'd like you to give us your thoughts on that.
- MR. CAPOSSELA: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner
 Hanson.
 - I think the term "trial judge" is the key term there, distinguishing that case from the motion of Ms. Myers' testimony.
- We have not argued that the Rules of Evidence do

not apply, contrary to counsel's assertion. What we're arguing is are they to be applied strictly like they are in Circuit Court, per the <u>Oesterling</u> case? Or are they to be applied a little bit more liberally because we're in an administrative agency proceeding? That's the difference.

2.3

And so that case is distinguishable because we're in a different forum. And what happened in that case is for lack of a better term a dead beat dad didn't get a lawyer and was trying to get out of making his payments. And his argument was I don't have a lawyer. And they were in Circuit Court. And so the judge -- the judge and the Supreme Court ruled properly that's not an excuse.

We're in an administrative hearing, and the manner in which the Rules of Evidence are applied, the Commission is permitted to be more liberal in the implementation of those rules. And there's nothing in the Oesterling case that prohibits that. That's the common law rule, and I think that is codified in the Administrative Procedures Act.

So I think the answer to your question is the Oesterling case is distinguishable because it was in
Circuit Court and not before the PUC. And under
Section 19 of the Administrative Procedures Act the PUC

has discretion to confer a more liberal interpretation of the Rules of Evidence than in Circuit Court. It's a different forum.

And the difference in the forum is what distinguishes the <u>Oesterling</u> case. And I do submit that it is not binding upon the administrative agency. It's binding upon the Circuit Court but not an administrative agency such as the PUC.

So that is the rule of thumb of court, no doubt but it's not the rule of thumb before an administrative agency.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.

One question for the Applicant.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I've been in court a number of times. Fortunately -- I might have to explain that -- as an expert witness.

In regards to hearsay being what someone else said, I clearly understand that one may not say that Kristen informed me that Chris told her. You know, that's obvious hearsay.

However, if I were in court, it's always been permitted in my experience for me to say Commissioner Fiegen informed me that such and such.

MR. TAYLOR: Sure. The difference is that you

always testified as an expert. When you testify as an appraiser as an expert witness you can draw on this body of knowledge anything you choose that you think is appropriate to formulate your opinion.

2.3

And, for example, as an appraiser you may want to interview a landowner. And so you interview the landowner and you say to the landowner what about this and that on your property. And then you come into court and you testify. I formulated my opinion on these points, comparable sales, blah-blah-blah, and what the landowner told me. Perfectly admissible.

Then I can cross-examine you. And I can say, well, what part did that landowner's decision, opinion, play in your valuation opinion? And if I want, I can call the landowner and impeach your opinion with what he said.

Very different situation from me coming into court and testifying Tom Welk told me that Wilbert Blumhardt conducted the Union Carbide hearing in 1974. That's hearsay. Tom Welk can come in and testify and say I was there. Blumhardt was the Chairman. That's the distinction. Unsworn, out of court statement offered for the proof of its content. That's hearsay and it's not admissible. Simply not admissible.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.

1 MS. MYERS: May I make a comment to that? 2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Certainly, if you wish to piggyback on that, I'd entertain. 3 Please. 4 MS. MYERS: I personally visited with these 5 people, Carol and Kevin and the water treatment plants. 6 So to me that's firsthand information. It's not hearsay. 7 And I asked their permission to use their quotes 8 and they gave their approval. Before I gave my testimony I swore to say the 10 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth so I 11 believe my quotes are very legitimate and relevant and 12 very supportive of my testimony. 13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen. 14 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: On Exhibit 6031 for 15 Mr. Taylor I have a question on your objection of a 16 public health statement on benzene. Your objection is 17 hearsay. 18 Could you explain your objection on a public record on benzene? 19 20 MR. TAYLOR: Just a second. I have to catch up 21 with you. 22 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. So I'm talking 2.3 about 6031, the public health statement. 2.4 MR. TAYLOR: I don't have that document in front 25 of me. Could you tell me which one it is? Maybe I've

got it --1 2 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'll pull it up quick. Ιt is from the Agency of Toxic Substance and Disease --3 4 MR. TAYLOR: Oh, the ATSRD public health 5 statement --6 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: August of 2007. 7 MR. TAYLOR: There has to be some foundation 8 shown that that document comports with the hearsay exception that I talked about before for public records, 10 803(8). In order for that to be admitted there has to be 11 foundation shown that it is a record or a report or a 12 data compilation that was observed pursuant to a duty 13 imposed by law on the author and presumably on the agency 14 that employed the author who wrote the piece. 15 So it lacks foundation. Without the foundation 16 to demonstrate where that came from, what it stands for, 17 and the circumstances under which it was composed, it's 18 hearsay. It's an unsworn out of court statement offered 19 for the truth of its contents. There is an exception for 20 a report that's kept by an agency in its regular course 21 of business if the agency has a duty to keep that report. 22 And that's 803(8). 2.3 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Any additional Commissioner 25 questions?

```
1
              Seeing none, is there a motion? Commissioner
2
    Hanson.
 3
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Do you wish to take these
 4
     individually?
5
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think you can take it all
 6
    together or split it out, however you prefer.
7
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. I'm wrestling
8
    a little bit with some of them so I'll let you.
              MS. MYERS: May I make a comment on the ATSDR?
10
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                I think we're past that at
11
     this point unless Commissioner Fiegen wants a response?
12
              No. We're good.
13
              Additional -- anybody, motions?
14
              In HP14-001 I move that the Commission grant
15
    Keystone's motion to strike testimony and exhibits of
16
     Cindy Myers as we clarified verbally today.
              Discussion on the motion.
17
18
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman.
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes.
20
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: I fully appreciate and
21
    understand the hearsay discussion. I'm really struggling
22
    with some of that. For instance, 6001 with Paul
2.3
    Seamans' -- it seems to me that a part of that is so
24
    available as Mr. Seamans has been, would have had the
25
    part -- the Applicant would have had the opportunity to
```

cross-examine that person.

2.3

2.4

I understand the way in which Mr. Taylor articulated the -- the hearsay cross. I find myself in agreement with him. I just think we go too far when we eliminate some of those presentations to us. That's just my comfort zone at this juncture.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion?

I'm certainly sympathetic to Ms. Myers'
position. This legal stuff, if you will, obviously is a
new realm for you and not easy to navigate.

I appreciate the fact that you acknowledge that Staff has been as helpful as they could be, given their position.

established by our Supreme Court. And as Commissioner
Hanson earlier read from Staff's brief, it appears to me
that the law is very, very clear in that we can't -while we can give you some deference in assisting you to
navigate how do you file this, that, and the other thing,
I don't believe that established law, as evaluated by the
Supreme Court, gives us the latitude to allow you to
circumnavigate the rule that has been established and a
law that has been established in 1-26-19. And, hence, my
motion.

Additional discussion.

Commissioner Fiegen.

2.3

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It was certainly nice to meet Ms. Myers because she has spent a lot of time. And I read a lot of your things and listened and read and you brought a lot of things.

And if I was still a legislator, all of this stuff would have been brought in and we would have had it on file for the Legislature.

But now I'm in a different role, and at the Public Utilities Commission I have to adhere to the law that South Dakota has and the Rules of Evidence. So although I have read all of your stuff, I just don't believe I can take it all into consideration because of the rules that this Public Utilities Commission needs to go by according to the state law.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you for the sake of the motion run through all of the -- I believe I have it all correct here, but all of the items that are to be removed from the evidence?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Absolutely. In dealing with the Exhibits, 6001, 6003, 6004, 6005, 6016, 6022, 6024, 6027, 6028, 6030, 6031, 6032, 6034, 6035, 6036, 6037, and then the two unnumbered exhibits, the plastic water line

```
1
     survey and the PowerPoint testimony.
2
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: And I believe those were
     6038 and 6039, weren't they?
 3
 4
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: If they were numbered, that's
5
    what they would have been given.
 6
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right.
7
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: And then also the testimony as
8
    we stepped through that.
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you very much.
10
    Appreciate that.
11
              Mr. Chairman, we have a motion before us, and
12
    your motion -- for the sake of -- well, we did some clay
13
    pigeon shooting over the weekend. I'm going to send up a
14
    clay for the two of you to take a shot at.
15
              I'm really struggling with 6001.
16
    concern here. I don't fully -- well, I won't
17
    editorialize on it. I'm just struggling with that one,
18
    should not have been included in the omission. So I'm
19
     going to amend the Chairman's motion to not -- my motion
     is to amend the Chairman's motion to exclude Exhibit
20
21
     6001.
22
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Discussion on the motion.
2.3
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe I've already
2.4
    briefed it.
25
                                So, I mean, obviously
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
```

Mr. Seamans is an Intervenor here. He testified. If he had testified to this, he would have been able to be cross-examined at that point. And so I get all of that.

2.3

But as Ms. Myers introducing this it appears to me that it's hearsay. So how do we get around this being hearsay?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: It's a typed statement that is in first person from Mr. Seamans, and Ms. Myers has sworn that she received this from him. And so it's that gray area as opposed to having her say he said this. She's presenting us with a typed statement that was written by Mr. Seamans, and she's presented it as a part of her testimony. I think that crosses that line of ambiguity as to whether or not it's accurate.

And if the Applicant opposed it, they could present their own information pertaining to -- pertaining to whether or not it's accurate.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Additional discussion.

Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'm not going to be supporting that amendment today. Mr. Seamans was a party in the case. He could have put it in his exhibits or put it in his prefiled. And so I just think it's a little odd that we have this exhibit with another Intervenor,

1 and that's why I'm not going to support your amendment 2 today. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion on the 3 4 amendment to exclude 6001. 5 Seeing none, all those in favor of the amendment 6 will vote aye; those opposed, nay. 7 Commissioner Hanson. 8 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen. 10 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes no. 11 CHAIRMAN NELSON: And Nelson votes no. 12 Amendment fails. Clay pigeon busted. 13 Additional discussion. 14 All those -- Commissioner Hanson. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: I just wish to state that 16 Ms. Myers's sincerity and integrity is not being questioned here in any fashion by the vote that I'm about 17 18 to take, but I do agree with the majority of those 19 situations where newspapers are being quoted and, you 20 know, I won't go through that but there's a litany of, 21 you know, YouTubes and things like that that just cannot 22 be part of an accurate evidentiary hearing. 2.3 So thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2.4 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion? 25 MS. MYERS: Will my prefiled testimony be struck

too then? 1 2 CHAIRMAN NELSON: The portions that were 3 objected to. 4 MS. MYERS: So not in totality? 5 CHATRMAN NELSON: Correct. 6 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So actually the majority 7 of your exhibits are going to go into evidence. Just so 8 you know that. And, of course, your testimony, only portions of that was stricken and only a portion of your 10 prefiled was stricken. So the majority of what you 11 brought to the Commission is going to be into evidence 12 and we appreciate that hard work. 13 MS. MYERS: How about the PowerPoint testimony? 14 Will that be portioned out? 15 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You know, that's a great 16 question because yesterday when I looked at that --17 actually last week I wanted to go through every page and 18 try to figure out what was hearsay and what I could keep 19 in. And it was starting to be overwhelming and so I 20 chose not to decide on what slide and decided that the 21 whole thing probably shouldn't be in evidence. 22 CHAIRMAN NELSON: And that is part of the 2.3 motion, that the entire PowerPoint would not be accepted. 24 That's part of the motion.

25

MS. MYERS:

I don't believe I had my question

answered as far as objection to my testimony. Why it wasn't done before the hearing? Or it was just --CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I don't think that's a question we have to answer here today. Any further discussion on the motion? Hearing none all those in favor will vote aye; those opposed, nay. Commissioner Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. The motion carries. Thank you all for coming back today. 2.1

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF SULLY)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
7	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings
LO	had in the above-entitled matter on the 29th day of
L1	October, 2015, and that the attached is a true and
L2	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
L3	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 1st day of
L 4	December, 2015.
L 5	
L 6	
L7	
L 8	Cheri McComsey Wittler,
L 9	Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter
20	Certified Realtime Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	6	accident [1] - 30:18	40:20, 40:21	appropriate [1] - 38:4 1
•	_	accorded [1] - 35:5	agency's [1] - 31:16	approval [1] - 39:8
		according [3] - 17:3,	agenda [1] - 19:11	April [2] - 15:24, 16:19
1 [2] - 13:16, 31:13	6000 [2] - 33:8, 33:18	32:22, 43:15	agents [1] - 22:2	aquifer [4] - 18:22,
1,660 [3] - 13:6, 13:7,	6001 [6] - 4:22, 41:22,	account [1] - 32:14	agree [1] - 46:18	18:25, 19:1, 23:22
13:17	43:23, 44:15, 44:21,	accountant [1] - 25:8	agreed [2] - 3:15, 20:2	aquifers [4] - 10:11,
1-26-19 [5] - 7:17,	46:4	accounting [1] - 25:9	agreement [1] - 42:4	10:14, 10:25, 11:4
20:10, 30:22, 31:13,	6003 [2] - 4:22, 43:23	accurate [4] - 27:13,	ahead [1] - 12:21	Arden [1] - 22:19
42:23 12 _[1] - 13:10	6004 [1] - 43:23 6005 [1] - 43:23	45:14, 45:17, 46:22	air [1] - 30:2	area [5] - 19:6, 20:19,
13 [3] - 13:10, 13:13,	6016 [2] - 4:22, 43:23	acknowledge [1] -	airplane [1] - 29:12	21:17, 21:20, 45:10
30:24	6022 [2] - 4:22, 43:23	42:11	aligning [1] - 4:16	arguably [2] - 22:22,
14 [2] - 13:16, 13:20	6024 [2] - 4:22, 43:23	Act [7] - 7:18, 20:8,	allow [4] - 19:17,	24:12 argue [5] - 7:5, 9:16,
15 [1] - 13:22	6027 [1] - 43:24	20:10, 21:13, 32:8, 36:21, 36:25	34:18, 35:4, 42:21	12:21, 27:10, 27:11
19 [6] - 20:9, 21:12,	6028 [1] - 43:24	act [3] - 22:1, 35:4,	allowable [1] - 16:3 allowed [3] - 6:15,	argued [1] - 35:25
22:15, 24:11, 30:22,	6030 [2] - 4:22, 43:24	35:16	15:3, 16:14	arguing [2] - 23:21,
36:25	6031 [3] - 39:14,	actual [2] - 3:6, 13:5	ambiguity [1] - 45:14	36:2
1966 [1] - 32:9	39:23, 43:24	Adam [1] - 1:16	amend [2] - 44:19,	argument [3] - 19:15,
1974 [1] - 38:19	6032 [1] - 43:24	add [1] - 14:1	44:20	29:4, 36:11
1st [1] - 49:13	6034 [1] - 43:24	additional [12] -	amendment [5] -	argumentative [1] -
_	6035 [1] - 43:24	12:23, 19:18, 34:2,	45:22, 46:1, 46:4,	11:7
2	6036 [1] - 43:24	40:24, 41:13, 42:7,	46:5, 46:12	arguments [3] - 7:22,
	6037 [3] - 33:8, 33:18,	42:25, 43:16, 45:18,	amount [2] - 4:19,	19:19, 28:20
2 [3] - 13:18, 15:24,	43:24	46:3, 46:13, 46:24	24:13	arrive [4] - 28:18,
16:19	6038 [3] - 33:19,	address [3] - 4:3,	analysis [1] - 30:5	28:19, 28:20, 28:21
2007 [1] - 40:6	33:20, 44:3	10:6, 28:11	answer [2] - 36:22,	article [3] - 29:17,
2015 [4] - 1:9, 2:4,	6039 [3] - 33:20,	adds [1] - 6:2	48:4	30:3, 30:11
49:11, 49:14	33:21, 44:3	adhere [1] - 43:10	answered [2] - 15:15,	articles [8] - 5:21,
27 [1] - 4:22	7	Administrative [7] -	48:1	5:22, 8:7, 12:16,
28 [1] - 4:22	/	7:17, 20:8, 20:10,	APA [3] - 21:12, 22:15,	18:11, 18:14, 22:22 articulated [1] - 42:3
29 [1] - 1:9		21:13, 32:8, 36:21, 36:25	24:12 appeal [5] - 9:13, 9:14,	assertion [1] - 36:1
29th [2] - 2:4, 49:10	7 [2] - 29:25	administrative [17] -	20:24, 21:1	assigned [3] - 15:18,
	701 [2] - 24:19, 27:14	6:5, 17:5, 20:13,	appear [2] - 7:13,	15:20, 33:16
3		20:14, 21:3, 21:4,	35:13	assistance [1] - 14:23
	8	21:5, 21:23, 21:25,	applicability [1] -	assisting [1] - 42:18
3 [5] - 10:10, 10:17,		22:1, 22:23, 32:17,	26:23	assume [1] - 34:8
12:8, 12:10, 25:21	8 [1] - 13:11	36:5, 36:15, 37:6,	Applicant [5] - 21:8,	assumes [3] - 10:20,
31 [1] - 4:23	803(3 [2] - 28:6, 29:4	37:7, 37:10	21:21, 37:13, 41:25,	11:9, 11:24
32 [1] - 4:23	803(8 [1] - 29:7	admissible [8] -	45:15	ATSDR [1] - 41:9
34 [1] - 4:23	803(8) [3] - 29:6,	23:20, 23:23, 24:21,	Application [1] - 17:3	ATSRD [1] - 40:4
35 [3] - 4:23, 17:22,	40:10, 40:22	26:3, 30:9, 38:11, 38:24	application [1] - 20:15	attached [1] - 49:11
27:23		admitted [6] - 5:10,	applied [6] - 7:19,	attempted [2] - 22:8
36 [1] - 4:23	Α	6:5, 9:15, 29:14,	31:6, 32:23, 36:2, 36:4, 36:16	attended [1] - 32:6
37 [1] - 4:23		33:19, 40:10	applies [3] - 7:9,	attorney [1] - 14:20 attorneys [3] - 7:16,
4	ability [1] - 14:25	adopted [1] - 32:8	21:22, 32:22	34:19, 35:16
4	able [1] - 45:2	advantage [1] - 15:10	apply [16] - 7:7, 7:24,	August [1] - 40:6
	above-entitled [2] -	advantageous [1] -	7:25, 8:1, 8:2, 17:5,	author [2] - 40:13,
4 [1] - 4:22	2:2, 49:10	17:21	17:7, 20:25, 22:2,	40:14
40 [1] - 14:16	absolutely [1] - 43:22	advocated [1] - 22:5	24:9, 32:4, 32:19,	available [2] - 3:19,
414 [1] - 2:3	accept [2] - 22:24,	agencies [6] - 17:5,	34:24, 36:1	41:24
44 [1] - 27:23	25:14	20:8, 22:24, 30:19,	appointed [2] - 14:20,	Avenue [1] - 2:3
	acceptance [1] - 23:2	31:19, 31:21	49:8	aye [6] - 46:6, 46:8,
5	accepted [5] - 14:17,	agency [18] - 20:14,	appraiser [2] - 38:2,	48:6, 48:9, 48:11,
	17:15, 25:4, 25:19,	20:19, 20:20, 23:5,	38:5	48:12
5 [1] - 4:22	47:23 ACCEPTING [1] - 1:5	29:5, 29:6, 29:9, 29:20, 29:21, 31:16,	appreciate [6] - 14:21,	
500 [1] - 2:3	accepting [2] - 3:3,	36:5, 37:6, 37:8,	20:3, 41:20, 42:11,	
	18:6	37:11, 40:3, 40:13,	44:10, 47:12 approach [1] - 32:11	
		,,	αρμισασιτ[1] - 32.11	
	L		L	1

chair [1] - 6:22 46:7, 46:9, 46:14, Brittany [1] - 1:18 clarifications [1] -B brought [4] - 17:18, Chairman [13] - 8:22, 14:7 48:8, 48:10 43:5, 43:7, 47:11 8:25, 9:5, 19:20, clarified [2] - 33:24, Commissioners [4] bar [2] - 31:1, 35:6 **Building** [1] - 2:3 33:7, 34:4, 38:21, 41:16 3:10, 14:22, 15:14, **Bar** [1] - 32:18 41:18, 43:2, 43:18, **clarify** [1] - 33:6 21:6 bumps [1] - 28:19 base [2] - 5:3, 5:22 bunch [1] - 33:12 44:11, 46:23 classic [1] - 9:18 commitment [1] - 15:1 based [5] - 16:5, 16:9, business [3] - 25:6, CHAIRMAN [53] clay [3] - 44:12, 44:14, common [5] - 9:12, 24:22, 25:11, 33:22 1:12, 1:12, 3:1, 4:6, 25:7, 40:21 46:12 18:3, 20:12, 21:5, baseline [1] - 4:7 4:18, 5:2, 8:11, 8:14, clear [8] - 6:19, 6:24, 36:20 busted [1] - 46:12 basic [1] - 5:16 10:1, 10:7, 10:24, communicated [1] busy [2] - 8:12, 19:11 13:25, 14:5, 29:7, basis [1] - 18:24 11:14, 12:1, 12:7, 30:22, 35:1, 42:17 15:14 beat [1] - 36:9 12:13, 12:18, 13:3, communication [1] -C clearly [2] - 24:21, **BEFORE** [1] - 1:11 13:8, 13:10, 13:14, 19:8 37:19 begin [1] - 14:13 13:19, 13:25, 14:3, code [2] - 7:19, 32:14 comparable [1] cancer [1] - 23:4 14:10, 19:13, 19:23, begins [3] - 11:15, 38:10 codified [2] - 21:12, cannot [2] - 28:3, 12:3, 12:13 26:18, 27:5, 33:1, compilation [3] - 25:2, 36:20 46:21 34:2, 39:13, 40:24, below [1] - 19:1 25:4, 40:12 codifies [1] - 20:12 capitalize [2] - 7:13, 41:5, 41:10, 41:19, benzene [3] - 24:17, compilations [2] college [1] - 32:7 35:13 39:16, 39:19 42:7, 43:16, 43:22, 24:25, 29:8 Colome [3] - 23:11, Capitol [2] - 2:2, 2:3 best [1] - 14:25 44:4, 44:7, 44:22, compiled [1] - 25:11 23:13, 23:24 CAPOSSELA [5] -44:25, 45:18, 46:3, better [1] - 36:9 complained [2] - 23:1, Colome's [1] - 23:17 19:20, 19:24, 34:7, 46:9, 46:11, 46:24, between [1] - 19:14 comfort [1] - 42:6 24:7 35:8, 35:20 47:2, 47:5, 47:22, beyond [1] - 27:2 coming [3] - 13:2, complete [1] - 31:11 Capossela [9] - 8:2, 48:3, 48:10, 48:12 bind [2] - 7:15, 35:15 complications [1] -38:17, 48:14 19:18, 19:21, 29:3, chairman's [2] binding [2] - 37:6, 6:20 comment [2] - 39:1, 31:15, 34:5, 34:6, 44:19, 44:20 37:7 complied [1] - 22:7 41:9 35:10, 35:11 changes [1] - 23:16 bit [3] - 19:17, 36:4, comports [1] - 40:8 comments [2] - 14:13, Capossela's [2] chaos [1] - 7:1 41.8 composed [1] - 40:17 18:9 7:22, 27:10 CHERI [1] - 49:5 bitumen [1] - 23:5 concede [1] - 22:18 Commission [22] caption [1] - 30:22 Cheri [2] - 1:24, 49:18 concept [3] - 31:15, **blah** [3] - 38:10 3:7, 3:12, 4:8, 8:23, car [2] - 21:19, 21:24 **choose** [1] - 38:3 blah-blah [1] -8:25, 9:6, 21:6, 31:18, 32:10 Carbide [3] - 8:22, 9:1, chose [1] - 47:20 38:10 21:14, 21:15, 21:16, concern [1] - 44:16 38:19 **Chris** [1] - 37:20 Blumhardt [4] - 9:7, 21:19, 22:3, 24:23, concerning [2] -Carol [1] - 39:5 **CHRIS** [1] - 1:12 32:10, 38:19, 38:21 31:24, 32:10, 33:1, 15:12, 34:23 carries [1] - 48:13 Cindy [3] - 3:8, 14:14, Board [6] - 6:22, 9:9, 34:18, 36:17, 41:14, concerns [4] - 17:16, carved [1] - 9:19 41:16 9:20, 29:24, 31:23, 43:10, 43:14, 47:11 23:17, 23:24, 26:8 case [21] - 7:7, 7:11, Circuit [9] - 7:12, 21:1, 31:24 COMMISSION [3] **conclusion** [2] - 3:18, 7:24, 8:3, 8:22, 9:2, 21:4, 21:18, 36:3, board [3] - 7:10, 1:1, 1:11, 1:14 28:18 9:18, 9:19, 21:24, 36:12, 36:24, 37:2, Commission's [2] -31:25, 32:15 conducted [5] - 17:5, 27:19, 30:20, 30:24, 37:7 boards [4] - 9:12, 20:3, 22:3 32:5, 32:15, 32:16, 35:23, 36:3, 36:7, circuit [5] - 7:20, 17:4, **COMMISSIONER** [39] 31:25, 32:11 38:19 36:9, 36:19, 36:23, 20:7, 20:21, 31:7 **body** [2] - 27:18, 38:2 - 1:13, 11:13, 12:22, confer [1] - 37:1 37:5, 45:23 bookkeeper [1] - 25:7 circumnavigate [1] -13:1, 31:10, 31:14, confident [1] - 17:16 cases [9] - 6:23, 7:20, 42:22 33:3, 33:23, 34:4, borderline [1] - 20:21 confuses [1] - 31:15 21:19, 28:11, 30:23, circumstances [1] -34:8, 35:10, 37:12, **born** [1] - 24:18 **confusing** [1] - 31:9 31:7, 32:1, 32:3 40:17 37:15, 38:25, 39:2, bound [2] - 7:14, confusion [1] - 33:14 catch [3] - 11:2, 13:9, citation [1] - 31:12 39:14, 39:22, 40:2, 35:14 conservation [1] -39:20 **citations** [1] - 5:9 40:6, 40:23, 41:3, Bowdle [1] - 8:24 8:23 certainly [5] - 26:4, cite [3] - 21:22, 31:11, 41:7, 41:18, 41:20, Brian [1] - 1:17 Conservation [3] -33:4, 39:2, 42:8, 35:6 43:2, 43:18, 44:2, brief [9] - 9:15, 15:12, 8:25, 9:6, 32:10 43:3 cited [2] - 7:11 44:6. 44:9. 44:23. 19:25, 26:22, 27:5, consideration [1] -CERTIFICATE [1] -45:7, 45:21, 46:8, cites [1] - 5:20 34:10, 34:13, 35:12, 43:13 49:2 46:10, 46:15, 47:6, citing [1] - 21:24 42:16 considered [1] - 24:8 **CERTIFICATION** [1] -47:15, 48:9, 48:11 **citizen** [1] - 14:16 briefed [1] - 44:24 consistent [1] - 7:4 Commissioner [20] -City [1] - 23:11 briefing [2] - 7:6, 9:22 constant [1] - 26:24 certification [1] - 3:3 8:15, 8:17, 13:4, city [3] - 23:13, 23:24, briefs [3] - 4:2, 4:3, constituents [1] - 23:5 Certified [2] - 49:6, 33:2, 34:3, 35:20, 24:8 7:23 constraints [1] - 3:19 37:23, 39:13, 40:24, Civil [1] - 7:7 bring [1] - 3:18 construct [1] - 3:4 **CERTIFY** [1] - 49:8 41:1, 41:11, 42:15, civil [3] - 7:20, 21:25, bringing [2] - 17:16, CONSTRUCT [1] - 1:6 chafe [1] - 20:20 43:1, 43:17, 45:20, 31:7 29:1 consult [1] - 20:1

consulted [1] - 20:4 11:20, 18:16, 18:19, 31:21, 32:2, 42:18 30:11, 48:2 42:23 consume [1] - 9:16 22:21, 28:16, 29:1, deleted [1] - 25:23 doubt[1] - 37:9 establishes [1] -30:14, 38:12, 42:1, demonstrate [2] down [3] - 3:13, 13:14, 20:11 contain [1] - 5:24 42:3, 45:3 28:1. 40:16 18:17 ethanol [1] - 30:2 contains [1] - 5:17 cross-examination [2] evaluated [1] - 42:20 demonstrating [1] downstream [1] - 25:3 contemplate [1] - 22:4 - 22:21. 29:1 23:24 Dr [2] - 22:19 evidence [31] - 5:10, contemplated [1] cross-examine [5] denied [1] - 26:15 draw [1] - 38:2 6:16, 7:3, 9:10, 22:11 18:19, 28:16, 30:14, contends [1] - 20:23 dental [1] - 31:25 drinking [1] - 17:24 10:21, 11:9, 11:25, 38:12, 42:1 denying [1] - 18:5 17:7, 20:21, 20:22, content [1] - 38:23 drive [1] - 15:21 cross-examined [2] contention [1] - 32:18 despite [3] - 7:5, 7:22, due [1] - 16:13 22:9, 22:16, 22:24, 18:16, 45:3 26:4, 26:9, 26:23, contentions [1] -15:3 duly [1] - 49:8 crosses [1] - 45:13 27:1, 29:11, 29:15, details [1] - 3:23 duly-appointed [1] -27:10 CRR [1] - 1:24 29:18, 29:22, 31:3, difference [4] - 9:6. 49:8 contents [1] - 40:19 crystal [1] - 32:4 36:6. 37:4. 37:25 31:18, 33:19, 34:16, contested [3] - 30:23, during [1] - 21:7 different [10] - 4:11, 34:23, 43:21, 47:7, cut [2] - 15:6, 20:20 30:24 duty [5] - 29:9, 29:10, 47:11, 47:21 cutting [1] - 13:20 16:6, 22:13, 24:4, contrary [1] - 36:1 30:8, 40:12, 40:21 Evidence [21] - 6:19, 30:18, 33:12, 36:8, controversial [1] dying [1] - 28:11 6:25, 7:6, 7:15, 7:18, D 37:3, 38:17, 43:9 32:9 7:24, 7:25, 8:5, difficult [3] - 4:15, conversations [1] -E 20:15, 20:25, 21:8, 27:9, 27:11 23:9 dad [1] - 36:9 30:23, 31:6, 32:3, dig [1] - 19:1 corporate [1] - 15:10 **DAKOTA** [2] - 1:2, e-mailed [1] - 15:16 32:13, 32:19, 35:15, diluted [1] - 23:5 corporation [1] -49:1 e-mails [1] - 24:7 35:25, 36:16, 37:2, dinner [1] - 28:23 25:10 Dakota [13] - 2:2, 2:4, East [1] - 2:3 43.11 direct [1] - 19:8 correct [5] - 9:21, 6:24, 7:8, 20:9, easy [1] - 42:10 evidentiary [3] direction [1] - 35:1 13:8, 43:20, 47:5, 21:12, 22:23, 25:18, editorial [1] - 29:16 20:11. 23:1. 46:22 directives [1] - 22:16 49:12 32:9, 34:25, 43:11, editorialize [1] - 44:17 exactly [5] - 4:13, correctly [1] - 28:24 discovered [1] - 10:20 49:7, 49:13 10:13, 12:19, 16:8, **Edwards** [7] - 1:15, discretion [1] - 37:1 counsel [6] - 3:15, **Dakotans** [1] - 18:2 8:1, 14:20, 14:24, 22:10 21:7, 23:9, 34:25, discussion [15] - 3:16, Darren [1] - 1:18 examination [2] -15:14, 16:1, 16:10 35:4, 35:17 5:3, 14:7, 25:20, data [3] - 5:10, 29:8, 22:21, 29:1 **EDWARDS** [1] - 26:19 counsel's [1] - 36:1 41:17, 41:21, 42:7, 40:12 examine [6] - 6:14, either [2] - 18:25, **COUNTY** [1] - 49:3 42:25, 43:16, 44:22, date [1] - 3:17 19:17 18:19, 28:16, 30:14, 45:19, 46:3, 46:13, County [6] - 18:24, Dated [1] - 49:13 elect [1] - 35:4 38:12, 42:1 19:10, 23:15, 28:5, 46:24, 48:5 **Davis** [1] - 22:19 eliminate [1] - 42:5 examined [3] - 8:16, 28:13, 28:17 discussions [2] -Davis's [1] - 22:19 18:16, 45:3 emergency [1] - 13:18 couple [4] - 4:2, 4:11, 23:18, 23:20 de [1] - 1:16 **examines** [1] - 6:13 emissions [3] - 30:2, disease [1] - 40:3 5:11, 12:24 dead [1] - 36:9 example [6] - 5:13, 30:4 course [5] - 9:2, 30:7, diseases [1] - 24:18 deadline [2] - 15:24, 6:7, 25:6, 25:23, employed [1] - 40:14 32:23, 40:20, 47:8 distinction [2] - 32:4, 15:25 29:23, 38:5 **employee** [1] - 30:6 38:22 Court [15] - 7:12, 17:2, deadlines [3] - 15:1, exception [13] - 23:6, employment [1] - 30:7 21:1, 21:4, 21:18, distinguishable [2] -16:19, 16:24 23:8, 23:12, 24:5, end [4] - 9:25, 13:21, 36:7, 36:23 35:1, 35:2, 36:3, deal [5] - 3:5, 4:8, 25:24, 28:6, 28:7, 13:22, 14:1 36:12, 36:13, 36:24, distinguishes [1] -9:20, 10:2, 10:4 29:5, 29:6, 29:11, ended [1] - 8:25 37:2, 37:7, 42:15, 37:5 dealing [2] - 13:4, 32:24. 40:9. 40:19 entertain [1] - 39:3 42:21 distinguishing [1] -43:22 exceptions [2] entire [7] - 11:16, court [15] - 5:16, 5:23, 35:23 deals [1] - 27:19 22:25, 24:9 12:2, 12:5, 15:4, 6:5, 15:21, 20:7, **DO**[1] - 49:8 dealt [1] - 19:12 excerpt [1] - 6:17 18:4, 25:22, 47:23 20:21, 22:23, 35:12, docket [2] - 8:12, **December** [1] - 49:14 entitled [4] - 2:2, 7:9, **exclude** [4] - 8:6, 37:9, 37:15, 37:22, 14:17 decide [2] - 4:4, 47:20 44:20, 46:4 27:20, 49:10 38:8, 38:18, 38:22, Docket [3] - 3:3, decided [2] - 30:1, excluded [4] - 22:15, Environment [4] -40:18 14:15, 18:8 47:20 22:16, 24:12, 31:4 6:22, 9:9, 29:25, court's [1] - 9:17 **DOCKET** [1] - 1:5 decision [4] - 7:12, excluding [1] - 26:9 31:23 courtesy [1] - 27:6 doctorate [1] - 25:8 9:1, 9:21, 38:13 excuse [1] - 36:14 **EPA**[3] - 29:25, 30:1, courts [7] - 7:20, 17:4, document [3] - 25:13, decisions [1] - 31:21 Exhibit [2] - 39:14, 30:4 25:4, 25:14, 31:7, 39:24, 40:8 deemed [1] - 20:19 44:20 **Eric** [1] - 1:19 31:21, 32:1 documentary [1] exhibit [8] - 3:24, deems [1] - 21:9 error [1] - 10:19 crash [1] - 29:12 22.9 4:13, 4:16, 15:16, defer [2] - 3:16, 20:2 especially [1] - 32:5 created [1] - 16:4 documents [3] - 8:8, 15:19, 18:13, 18:18, **deference** [7] - 7:9, established [5] - 20:9, Cremer [1] - 1:16 25:16, 33:12 45.25 21:2, 31:17, 31:20, 42:15, 42:20, 42:22, cross [12] - 6:13, done [4] - 16:23,

exhibits [34] - 3:8, 4:9, 4:10, 4:23, 5:21, 7:4, 8:20, 15:8, 15:13, 15:20. 15:23. 17:8. 17:14. 17:17. 17:25. 18:5, 18:7, 18:12, 22:14. 23:3. 23:7. 24:11, 24:14, 26:21, 33:7, 33:8, 33:9, 33:18, 41:15, 43:23, 43:25, 45:23, 47:7 existing [2] - 23:12, 24:5 **exorbitant** [1] - 4:18 expense [1] - 25:9 experience [2] -25:12, 37:23 experienced [3] - 9:2, 9:3, 32:16 experiences [1] -24:22 expert [20] - 6:6, 6:7. 6:8, 8:8, 16:7, 16:22, 17:10, 18:17, 18:23, 18:24, 25:7, 25:13, 27:15, 27:17, 27:20, 27:24, 28:4, 37:17, 38:1, 38:2 **expertise** [9] - 20:19, 21:9, 21:16, 21:20, 31:16, 31:19, 31:22, 32:1, 32:2 **explain** [2] - 37:16, 39:18 **explained** [1] - 19:7 expresses [2] - 10:21, 11:10

F

fact [4] - 20:15, 20:16, 21:10, 42:11 fact-finding [2] -20:16, 21:10 facts [3] - 10:20, 11:9, 11:24 fails [1] - 46:12 fair [6] - 4:14, 7:2, 12:1, 28:10, 28:15, 28:18 fairly [1] - 19:12 **fall** [1] - 23:7 falls [1] - 22:24 familiar [3] - 18:22, 34:13, 35:8 far [7] - 10:1, 13:14, 16:20, 22:25, 26:13, 42:4, 48:1 farm [1] - 18:24

farmer [1] - 8:24 fashion [1] - 46:17 favor [2] - 46:5, 48:6 federal [2] - 27:24, 29.13 feelings [1] - 24:1 felt [1] - 17:15 few [2] - 14:13, 18:9 FIEGEN [17] - 1:12, 11:13, 12:22, 13:1, 33:3, 33:23, 39:14, 39:22, 40:2, 40:6, 40:23, 43:2, 45:21, 46:10. 47:6. 47:15. 48:11 Fiegen [11] - 13:4, 33:2, 37:24, 39:13, 41:11, 43:1, 45:20, 46:9, 46:10, 48:10, 48:11 figure [1] - 47:18 file [2] - 42:19, 43:7 filed [8] - 4:2, 15:23, 15:24, 16:19, 17:11, 19:16, 26:22, 34:10 files [1] - 16:6 filing [2] - 8:15, 20:5 fill [1] - 19:2 final [1] - 13:3 finally [1] - 9:19 financed [1] - 15:10 finders [1] - 20:16 findings [2] - 21:2, 28:4 finished [1] - 35:11 first [10] - 4:3, 4:9, 5:12, 10:12, 11:5, 11:18. 11:19. 27:14.

firsthand [2] - 19:3, 39:6 fit [2] - 23:2, 29:4 fits [1] - 24:4 fitter [1] - 24:18 fixing [1] - 28:22

31:2. 45:8

flat [1] - 27:11 flood [1] - 19:6 flowing [1] - 19:6 focuses [1] - 21:20 fold [1] - 5:8 follow [2] - 8:5, 20:2

followed [4] - 7:21, 16:24, 26:13, 31:8 follows [1] - 11:22 FOR [1] - 1:5

format [2] - 15:17, 33:15

formulate [1] - 38:4 **formulated** [1] - 38:9 **forth** [1] - 17:18

fortunately [1] - 37:16 forum [3] - 36:8, 37:3, 37:4 foundation [14] - 6:15, 10:22, 11:8, 11:11, 11:23, 13:17, 13:22, 22:8, 28:1, 28:17, 40:7, 40:11, 40:15 frankly [1] - 32:18 freely [1] - 35:4 friend [1] - 8:23

front [2] - 29:24, 39:24 fully [2] - 41:20, 44:16 fundamentally [1] -5:18

furtherance [1] - 20:16

future [2] - 26:25, 27:2

G

GARY [1] - 1:13 general [2] - 3:15, 5:8 generalist [1] - 21:18 German [1] - 8:24 given [2] - 42:12, 44:5 governing [1] - 24:20 government [3] -29:20, 29:21, 30:6 grant [3] - 3:7, 35:2, 41:14 granted [2] - 21:7, 21:22 gray [1] - 45:10 great [3] - 9:19, 21:1, 47:15 Greg [1] - 1:17 grew [1] - 18:24 ground [1] - 5:18 grounded [1] - 6:11 **Gustafson** [1] - 1:21 guy [7] - 28:13, 28:17, 29:25, 30:10, 30:12, 30:15, 30:17

Н

half [1] - 13:20 handled [1] - 27:25 Hanson [9] - 8:17, 34:3, 35:21, 41:2, 42:16, 43:17, 46:7, 46:14, 48:8 HANSON [23] - 1:13, 31:10, 31:14, 34:4, 34:8, 35:10, 37:12, 37:15, 38:25, 39:2, 41:3, 41:7, 41:18, 44:6, 44:9, 44:23, 45:7, 46:8, 46:15, 48:9 hard [a] - 47:12 head [a] - 14:2, 28:19 health [5] - 18:1, 23:4, 39:16, 39:23, 40:4 hear [a] - 19:22, 21:19 heard [a] - 14:5, 14:6 Hearing [a] - 20:13, 20:18, 31:1 hearing [32] - 3:6, 3:13, 3:18, 3:20, 3:21, 5:19, 8:4,

41:20, 43:18, 44:2,

3:13, 3:18, 3:20, 3:21, 5:19, 8:4, 12:23, 15:4, 15:18, 15:22, 16:2, 16:5, 16:13, 16:17, 16:18, 18:19, 20:14, 21:4, 21:7, 26:16, 32:5, 32:15, 32:24, 33:5, 33:9, 33:19, 36:15, 38:19, 46:22, 48:2, 48:6

hearings [4] - 6:5, 17:5, 26:24, 32:17 hearsay [36] - 5:8, 5:11, 5:16, 5:23, 8:6, 13:23, 22:22, 22:24, 23:2, 23:6, 23:22, 24:4, 24:6, 25:24, 26:4, 28:7, 28:9, 29:6, 29:7, 29:11, 29:19, 37:18, 37:21, 38:20, 38:23, 39:6, 39:17, 40:8, 40:18, 41:21, 42:3, 45:5, 45:6, 47:18 hearsay's [2] - 28:25

heart's [1] - 32:20 Heidi [1] - 6:7 held [1] - 2:1 hell [1] - 27:24 help [2] - 4:6, 10:13 helpful [3] - 15:13,

24:23, 42:12

hence [1] - 42:23 HEREBY [1] - 49:8 herself [3] - 27:15, 27:16, 27:19 high [4] - 11:21, 19:4, 19:10, 21:16 highly [1] - 32:16 highway [1] - 30:17

22:21 history [1] - 15:12 hole [2] - 19:1, 19:2

himself [2] - 22:20,

Holt [2] - 18:24, 19:9 **home** [1] - 28:22

Homestake [1] - 9:18 hot [2] - 29:1, 30:24 hours [1] - 9:22 House [3] - 30:10, 30:13, 30:15 HP09-001 [2] - 1:5, 3:4 HP14-001 [5] - 1:4, 3:1, 14:15, 18:8, 41:14 Hueck [1] - 1:16

hurt [1] - 28:10

identifies [1] - 6:12 ignore [1] - 30:20 immaterial [2] - 22:17, 31:3 impeach [1] - 38:15 implementation [1] -36:18 **importance** [1] - 14:18 important [2] - 9:10, 9:24 impose [1] - 30:4 imposed [3] - 29:10, 30:9, 40:13 impression [4] -23:13, 24:1, 24:2, 24:5 impressions [5] -28:6, 28:8, 28:9, 28:13, 29:3 **improper** [1] - 25:18 **improperly** [2] - 8:8, 9:15 IN [2] - 1:4, 1:5 included [2] - 24:14, 44.18 includes [1] - 5:21 including [1] - 14:19 income [2] - 25:9, 27.25 incompetent [2] -22:17, 31:3 indicate [1] - 12:8 indicated [2] - 10:10, 13:4 Individual [1] - 14:14 individually [1] - 41:4 individuals [2] -34:18, 34:24 indulgence [1] - 35:2 **information** [10] - 5:9, 9:14, 16:4, 17:17, 17:19, 25:17, 34:11, 39:6, 45:16 informed [2] - 37:20, 37:24

infrastructure [1] -11:7 injustice [1] - 35:3 instance [1] - 41:22 instances [1] - 5:12 instructed [1] - 18:18 instructions [1] -15:19 intakes [2] - 25:1, 25:3 integrity [1] - 46:16 intend [1] - 26:20 interacted [1] - 23:14 interactions [1] -23:25 interest [1] - 27:3 interested [1] - 14:19 interests [1] - 26:3 internet [1] - 5:22 interpretation [2] -20:6. 37:1 Intervenor [11] - 6:21, 7:25, 14:15, 15:1, 15:9, 15:19, 17:15, 17:23, 22:10, 45:1, 45:25 Intervenors [6] - 6:23, 7:5, 9:4, 14:17, 14:21, 14:22 interview [2] - 38:6 introducing [1] - 45:4 investigates [2] -29:12, 30:18 irrelevant [2] - 22:17, issue [6] - 5:7, 19:14, 26:17, 29:24, 30:19, 35.1 **ISSUED** [1] - 1:5 issued [2] - 3:3, 29:17 issues [4] - 9:23, 10:3, 19:24, 21:8 items [7] - 8:6, 8:7, 23:1, 23:7, 24:10, 24:25, 43:21

J

John [2] - 15:18, 33:15 joint [3] - 17:3, 17:11, 19:16 Joseph [1] - 1:19 Judge [1] - 9:19 judge [5] - 21:18, 35:16, 35:22, 36:12, 36:13 judicial [1] - 20:24 juncture [1] - 42:6 junior [1] - 32:7 jurisdiction [1] - 20:20 justice [1] - 35:3 justified [1] - 21:15

K

Karen [1] - 1:16

Katlyn [1] - 1:21 Kearney [1] - 1:18 keep [2] - 40:21, 47:18 kept [1] - 40:20 Kevin [1] - 39:5 **key** [1] - 35:22 **KEYSTONE** [2] - 1:4, Keystone [5] - 3:2, 3:4, 23:21, 24:3, 25:3 Keystone's [2] - 3:7, 41:15 kidding [1] - 8:18 killed [1] - 28:11 kind [4] - 14:11, 22:10, 25:4, 25:18 knowledge [3] -27:17, 28:2, 38:3 knows [1] - 6:14 Kristen [10] - 1:15, 14:20, 14:24, 15:14, 15:16, 16:1, 16:10, 18:18, 33:15, 37:20 **KRISTIE** [1] - 1:12 **KXL**[1] - 11:19

L

lack [2] - 13:17, 36:9

lacks [1] - 40:15

landowner [5] - 38:6, 38:7, 38:11, 38:15 landowner's [1] -38:13 last [2] - 10:20, 47:17 latitude [3] - 21:7, 30:19, 42:21 law [26] - 6:23, 7:8, 7:14, 20:12, 20:13, 21:3, 21:5, 21:25, 22:1, 26:22, 27:19, 29:10, 29:13, 30:9, 32:17, 35:14, 36:20, 40:13, 42:14, 42:17, 42:20, 42:23, 43:10, 43:15 lawsuit [1] - 29:23 lawyer [5] - 8:2, 27:23, 30:25, 36:10, 36:11 lawyers [7] - 15:11,

27:25, 30:25, 32:5, 32:6, 32:12, 32:16 lay [16] - 6:21, 6:23, 7:8, 9:12, 14:22, 15:9, 22:8, 24:20, 24:24, 27:15, 27:16, 27:20, 27:21, 28:3, 32:11

27:20, 27:21, 28:3, 32:11

layperson [1] - 19:16
leeway [3] - 19:17, 20:14, 34:18
left [1] - 3:6
legal [3] - 17:10, 34:25, 42:9
legislator [1] - 43:6
Legislature [2] - 22:11, 43:8
legitimate [1] - 39:11
less [1] - 30:25

letter [1] - 26:14 level [1] - 21:16 levels [1] - 5:11 liberal [2] - 36:17, 37:1

liberally [1] - 36:4 liberties [1] - 35:5 lie [1] - 30:24 life's [1] - 25:11

17:4

limit [3] - 16:11, 16:12, 19:15 limited [2] - 16:14,

line [12] - 4:24, 13:10, 13:11, 13:12, 13:18, 13:19, 13:22, 33:10, 33:20, 43:25, 45:13 lines [1] - 13:16

list [5] - 3:24, 14:6, 15:16, 18:13, 18:18 listened [2] - 33:6, 43:5

listening [1] - 28:20 listing [1] - 4:12 lists [1] - 4:11 litany [1] - 46:20

litigant [1] - 35:17 litigants [1] - 20:17 litigation [1] - 25:6 live [2] - 11:15, 11:19

lives [1] - 11:19 look [3] - 11:4, 22:6, 22:15

looked [2] - 33:11, 47:16 looking [2] - 13:12,

Lorena [1] - 1:20 LP [2] - 1:5, 3:2 ludicrous [1] - 32:19

22:13

M

mailed [1] - 15:16 mails [1] - 24:7 majority [4] - 22:25, 46:18, 47:6, 47:10 Management [2] -9:20, 31:24 manner [3] - 7:4, 8:1, 36:16 map [1] - 25:1 maps [1] - 25:16 mark [1] - 27:12 massive [1] - 11:6 material [1] - 9:20 materials [1] - 34:9 **MATTER** [1] - 1:4 matter [5] - 2:2, 3:1, 21:2, 21:5, 49:10 matters [4] - 27:24, 30:8, 31:20, 31:22 MCCOMSEY [1] - 49:5 McComsey [2] - 1:24, 49:18 mean [4] - 17:6, 29:16, 29:20, 44:25 medical [1] - 31:25 meet [2] - 16:19, 43:3 meeting [2] - 15:25, 26:1 Mehlhaff [1] - 1:18

24:1, 24:5, 28:5, 28:8, 28:9, 28:13, 29:3 mentioned [1] - 18:15 message [1] - 14:17 met [1] - 14:25 might [1] - 37:16 mike [1] - 19:6 mine [1] - 8:23 Minerals [3] - 6:22, 29:24, 31:23 minerals [1] - 9:9 mistake [1] - 10:16 morning [4] - 3:11, 20:1, 23:9, 25:20 most [2] - 23:3, 23:7 motion [32] - 3:7, 3:20, 3:23, 4:9, 4:17, 8:4, 11:3, 17:1, 18:6,

19:16, 21:21, 22:6,

26:12, 26:15, 27:3,

35:23, 41:1, 41:15,

41:17, 42:24, 43:19,

44:11, 44:12, 44:19,

members [1] - 35:5

memo [2] - 34:19,

mental [8] - 23:13,

34:21

44:20, 44:22, 47:23, 5 47:24, 48:5, 48:13 motions [1] - 41:13 move [1] - 41:14 moved [3] - 11:21, 19:4, 19:9 MR [34] - 3:10, 4:15, 5:1, 5:5, 8:12, 8:19, 10:6, 10:16, 11:2, 11:18, 12:5, 12:11, 12:15, 12:25, 13:7, 13:9, 13:12, 13:16, 13:21, 14:2, 19:20, 19:24, 27:9, 31:12, 31:15, 34:7, 35:8, 35:20, 37:14, 37:25, 39:20, 39:24, 40:4, 40:7 **MS** [13] - 14:9, 14:13, 26:19, 27:8, 33:14, 34:1, 39:1, 39:4,

41:9, 46:25, 47:4, 47:13, 47:25 must [2] - 27:18, 28:1 mute [1] - 34:6 Myers [25] - 3:8, 3:13, 5:13, 14:4, 14:5, 14:14, 22:6, 23:10, 23:14, 24:11, 24:18, 25:24, 26:12, 26:13, 27:6, 27:14, 28:14, 28:15, 32:20, 32:24, 33:4, 41:16, 43:3, 45:4, 45:8 MYERS [12] - 14:9,

14:13, 27:8, 33:14, 34:1, 39:1, 39:4, 41:9, 46:25, 47:4, 47:13, 47:25

Myers' [6] - 3:14, 3:21, 5:7, 25:21, 35:24, 42:8

Myers's [1] - 46:16

name [1] - 35:3
narrowly [1] - 20:25
navigate [2] - 42:10,
42:19
navigating [1] - 14:23
nay [2] - 46:6, 48:7
Nebraska [1] - 11:20
need [5] - 4:4, 8:16,
14:22, 17:7, 27:1
needed [1] - 12:19
needs [2] - 26:1, 43:14
negates [1] - 42:14
Nelson [3] - 33:7,

		_	_	I
46:11, 48:12	objected [1] - 47:3	27:24, 29:18, 29:21,	people [5] - 5:13,	27:3, 42:9, 42:13
NELSON [52] - 1:12,	objecting [2] - 4:14,	34:15, 38:4, 38:9,	18:15, 28:23, 32:11,	possess [1] - 20:19
3:1, 4:6, 4:18, 5:2,	4:21	38:13, 38:14, 38:15	39:5	posthearing [1] -
8:11, 8:14, 10:1,	objection [9] - 4:5,	opinions [5] - 11:10,	per [1] - 36:3	26:11
10:7, 10:24, 11:14,	5:9, 5:11, 5:18,	27:21, 28:1, 28:3	perfectly [1] - 38:11	PowerPoint [11] -
12:1, 12:7, 12:13,	10:17, 39:15, 39:16,	opportunity [3] - 7:3,	perhaps [1] - 16:24	4:24, 15:4, 16:2,
12:18, 13:3, 13:8,	39:18, 48:1	18:19, 41:25	permission [1] - 39:7	16:4, 16:11, 18:7,
13:10, 13:14, 13:19,	objectionable [2] -	opposed [4] - 45:10,	PERMIT [1] - 1:5	33:10, 33:21, 44:1,
13:25, 14:3, 14:10,	3:25, 5:18	45:15, 46:6, 48:7	Permit [2] - 3:3, 22:23	47:13, 47:23
19:13, 19:23, 26:18,	objections [6] - 3:14,	option [1] - 8:11	permitted [2] - 36:17,	precedent [1] - 27:1
27:5, 33:1, 34:2,	3:16, 16:13, 16:21,	oral [1] - 24:13	37:23	precise [1] - 7:25
39:13, 40:24, 41:5,	17:13, 32:25	ORDER [1] - 1:5	person [5] - 6:13,	predisposition [1] -
41:10, 41:19, 42:7,	obligated [1] - 29:13	order [4] - 3:2, 3:18,	24:23, 29:21, 42:1,	23:19
43:16, 43:22, 44:4,	obligation [1] - 30:16	29:17, 40:10	45:8	prefer [1] - 41:6
44:7, 44:22, 44:25,	observed [3] - 29:8,	orders [1] - 26:9	personally [2] - 19:5,	prefiled [15] - 11:5,
45:18, 46:3, 46:9,	30:8, 40:12	otherwise [1] - 17:18	39:4	15:24, 16:3, 16:5,
46:11, 46:24, 47:2,	obvious [1] - 37:21	outlining [1] - 26:22	persons [2] - 28:8,	16:6, 16:8, 16:18,
47:5, 47:22, 48:3,	obviously [2] - 42:9,	overwhelming [3] -	28:10	16:20, 18:6, 25:21,
48:10, 48:12	44:25	22:25, 24:12, 47:19	pertaining [2] - 45:16	33:4, 33:22, 45:24,
neutral [1] - 34:10	October [3] - 1:9, 2:4,	own [3] - 18:16, 35:4,	Peter [2] - 19:21,	46:25, 47:10
new [1] - 42:10	49:11	45:16	19:23	prehearing [1] - 26:8
newspaper [6] - 5:20,	odd [1] - 45:25	_	Petition [1] - 3:2	prepared [3] - 25:1,
5:21, 12:16, 18:11,	Oesterling [10] - 7:12,	P	PETITION [1] - 1:4	25:14, 30:6
18:14, 22:22 newspapers [1] -	17:2, 17:4, 20:7,		piece [1] - 40:14	prepares [1] - 29:14
46:19	36:3, 36:19, 36:23,	page [9] - 4:20, 10:9,	pieces [2] - 16:22,	present [8] - 7:3, 15:4,
next [1] - 5:25	37:5	10:10, 12:8, 12:10,	22:13	15:21, 16:1, 16:16,
nice [1] - 43:3	OF [8] - 1:2, 1:4, 1:4,	13:6, 13:15, 25:21,	Pierre [1] - 2:3	27:15, 45:16
night [2] - 10:20,	1:5, 2:1, 49:1, 49:3	47:17	pigeon [2] - 44:13,	presentation [2] -
28:22	offer [4] - 17:17,	paragraph [21] -	46:12	34:11, 34:23
nonattorneys [1] -	19:18, 19:19, 27:6	10:11, 10:12, 10:14,	piggyback [1] - 39:3	presentations [1] - 42:5
34:11	offered [12] - 5:17, 5:24, 8:8, 28:9,	10:18, 10:19, 10:25,	pipe [1] - 24:18	presented [4] - 18:10,
none [4] - 41:1, 42:14,	29:11, 29:18, 29:22,	11:6, 11:8, 11:10,	PIPELINE [2] - 1:4, 1:6	27:16, 27:19, 45:12
46:5, 48:6	33:7, 33:9, 33:13,	11:15, 11:16, 12:2,	Pipeline [2] - 3:2, 3:4	presenting [2] - 16:11,
nonetheless [1] - 9:22	38:22, 40:18	12:3, 12:6, 12:9,	pipeline [2] - 3:13, 26:2	45:11
nonfunded [1] - 15:9	offers [1] - 12:16	12:12, 25:21, 25:23,		presumably [1] -
normally [1] - 19:13	office [2] - 3:15, 29:9	25:24	place [2] - 15:21, 32:21	40:13
Notary [2] - 49:7,	Officer [3] - 20:13,	paragraphs [1] - 12:10	placed [1] - 6:16	previously [1] - 15:23
49:18	20:18, 31:1	part [9] - 6:11, 11:24,	plant [3] - 5:14, 5:15,	primary [2] - 17:23,
notes [1] - 5:5	officers [1] - 21:6	38:13, 41:23, 41:25,	30:3	26:1
nothing [3] - 31:17,	official [3] - 23:13,	45:12, 46:22, 47:22,	plants [1] - 39:5	principal [2] - 5:7, 6:6
36:18, 39:10	29:9, 30:16	47:24	plastic [4] - 4:24,	pro [6] - 7:8, 7:13,
NTSB [3] - 29:12,	officials [3] - 23:24,	participated [1] -	33:10, 33:20, 43:25	7:25, 9:4, 15:9,
29:14, 30:17	24:8, 28:5	14:25	play [1] - 38:14	35:13
number [8] - 5:9, 5:12,	often [1] - 25:9	participating [3] - 14:16, 22:11, 34:12	point [3] - 8:19, 41:11,	problem [1] - 9:13
5:20, 5:21, 9:3,	omission [1] - 44:18	particular [2] - 6:9,	45:3	procedure [3] - 6:25,
15:20, 28:5, 37:16	one [18] - 3:6, 5:8, 8:9,	6:17	pointed [1] - 24:10	7:15, 21:25
numbered [1] - 44:4	8:10, 8:15, 8:19,	parties [6] - 7:8, 7:13,	points [4] - 3:23, 4:3,	Procedure [1] - 7:7
numbers [6] - 4:13,	11:15, 12:3, 12:13,	14:16, 14:19, 34:12,	10:6, 38:10	Procedures [7] - 7:17,
4:16, 4:21, 15:19,	15:22, 20:5, 22:24,	35:13	pollute [1] - 23:21	20:8, 20:10, 21:13,
15:20, 33:16	26:23, 28:12, 37:13,	party [4] - 8:3, 26:3,	polluted [1] - 24:3	32:8, 36:21, 36:25
numerous [3] - 3:14,	37:19, 39:25, 44:17	26:25, 45:22	pollution [1] - 23:17	procedures [3] - 22:1,
17:13, 24:9	ones [1] - 33:13	passion [1] - 17:24	population [1] - 25:2	22:2, 35:15
nurse [3] - 17:22, 24:22, 27:22	Onida [1] - 49:13	past [1] - 41:10	portion [4] - 12:3,	proceed [1] - 5:4
۲۶.۷۲, ۲۱.۷۷	open [1] - 22:5	Patrick [1] - 1:20	16:14, 34:14, 47:9	proceeding [2] - 7:7,
0	operators [3] - 5:14, 5:15, 23:11	patrolman [1] - 30:17	portioned [1] - 47:14	36:5 Proceedings [1] - 1:8
	opinion [16] - 6:10,	Paul [1] - 41:22	portions [2] - 47:2,	PROCEEDINGS [1] - 1.6
	10:21, 10:23, 11:9,	Paulson [1] - 1:19	47:9	2:1
object [1] - 16:18	11:24, 24:20, 24:24,	payments [1] - 36:11	position [4] - 26:20,	proceedings [3] -
	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
I	1	i	I .	1

21:23, 49:9, 49:12 process [7] - 14:23, 15:15, 18:4, 20:16, 21:10, 22:5, 22:11 Professional [2] -49:6, 49:19 professional [1] -32:15 proffered [1] - 24:14 profits [1] - 17:25 prohibits [1] - 36:19 project's [1] - 26:1 proof [1] - 38:23 proper [2] - 24:19, 30:1 properly [2] - 5:10, 36:13 property [1] - 38:8 protect [1] - 27:1 protecting [2] - 17:24, 18:1 provided [1] - 33:15 provides [1] - 34:19 provisions [2] - 7:19, 31:6 public [10] - 17:18, 17:20, 23:5, 29:5, 29:6, 39:16, 39:18, 39:23, 40:4, 40:9 Public [7] - 22:3, 31:24, 34:17, 43:10, 43:14, 49:7, 49:18 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:11 **PUC** [9] - 14:18, 17:1, 17:6, 17:16, 18:4, 18:5, 36:24, 36:25, 37:8 pull [1] - 40:2 purportedly [1] - 8:7 purpose [5] - 17:23, 23:21, 23:22, 23:23, purposes [1] - 26:1 pursuant [3] - 29:9, 30:8, 40:12 put [3] - 18:17, 45:23 **PVC** [1] - 33:20

Q

qualifications [1] - 6:8 qualified [2] - 6:8, 10:22 questioned [1] - 46:17 questions [9] - 10:8, 10:9, 12:23, 12:24, 15:16, 18:20, 33:1, 34:2, 40:25 quick [2] - 33:3, 40:2 quickly [1] - 20:4 quote [1] - 35:7 quoted [1] - 46:19 quotes [5] - 5:13, 6:1, 8:7, 39:7, 39:11 quoting [2] - 12:16, 26:5

R

R.N [1] - 14:14

20:1

raised [2] - 4:3, 9:5

Rappold [2] - 19:18,

rather [2] - 6:16, 8:20 rationally [1] - 24:22 reach [1] - 28:4 reached [1] - 26:13 react [1] - 34:14 read [14] - 6:17, 8:15, 14:6, 30:12, 31:12, 33:4, 33:5, 34:8, 34:14, 42:16, 43:4, 43:5, 43:12 reading [2] - 11:3, 34:20 really [4] - 9:6, 12:15, 41:21, 44:15 realm [1] - 42:10 Realtime [2] - 49:6, 49:19 reason [3] - 7:1, 20:18. 26:2 rebuttal [1] - 27:5 received [1] - 45:9 recognized [2] -14:18, 14:22 recollections [1] -24.8 record [9] - 6:18, 9:24, 14:14, 15:8, 18:7, 24:15, 31:11, 39:19, 40:11 recorded [1] - 24:8 records [3] - 23:6, 29:8. 40:9 refers [2] - 6:1, 10:12 regard [1] - 10:3 regarding [1] - 34:10 regards [2] - 34:16, 37:18 region [1] - 29:25 Region [1] - 29:25 Registered [2] - 49:5, 49.19 registered [1] - 17:22 regular [1] - 40:20 regulations [1] - 22:4 Reichert [1] - 1:20

reign [1] - 7:1 relates [3] - 5:15, 6:8, 26:9 20:24 relaxation [1] - 32:13 relaxed [1] - 32:13 relevant [1] - 39:11 relied [1] - 14:24 relies [2] - 6:16, 17:1 remember [1] - 3:12 reminds [1] - 8:21 removed [1] - 43:21 render [2] - 6:10, 10.22 rendered [1] - 6:11 repetitious [3] - 22:18, 22:20, 31:3 replies [1] - 20:3 reply [3] - 17:3, 17:11, 20:5 report [10] - 29:10, 29:14, 30:6, 30:7, 30:16, 40:11, 40:20, 40:21 Reported [1] - 1:24 reporter [2] - 15:21, 49.9 **Reporter** [4] - 49:6, 49:19. 49:19 42.22 reports [1] - 29:8 represent [1] - 35:6 represented [2] -32:11, 34:25 representing [2] - 8:3, 34:24 request [1] - 19:12 requested [2] - 17:8, 33:16 required [2] - 30:8, 35:16 resource [2] - 14:21, 14:24 respect [14] - 3:21, 18:5, 20:22, 22:13, 23:4, 23:10, 24:16, 24:17, 25:17, 26:8, 26:12, 27:22, 34:20, 34:22 respected [1] - 18:4 responded [2] - 16:3, 16:12 responding [1] -16:20 response [8] - 3:20, 17:1, 17:13, 18:10, 23:16, 26:20, 27:13, 41.11 rest [1] - 11:20 results [3] - 4:24, 33:10, 33:21

resurfaces [1] - 9:15

revenue [1] - 25:10 review [2] - 20:3, Rezac [1] - 1:19 rhetorical [1] - 11:22 **rights** [1] - 9:18 Rislov [1] - 1:17 Rock [3] - 17:11, 19:21, 26:7 Rolayne [1] - 1:15 role [2] - 6:21, 43:9 room [1] - 32:12 Room [1] - 2:3 Rosebud [1] - 17:12 Rounds [1] - 1:17 route [7] - 11:19, 11:20, 19:3, 19:9, 23:15, 23:16, 26:2 routinely [1] - 27:25 RPR [1] - 1:24 rug [1] - 17:21 rule [22] - 20:13, 21:11, 21:14, 21:22, 21:23, 21:24, 23:2, 23:6, 24:6, 24:20, 28:6, 28:7, 29:6, 29:7, 29:12, 30:5, 36:20, 37:9, 37:10, Rule [1] - 24:19 ruled [1] - 36:13 rules [17] - 6:4, 6:15, 6:25, 7:9, 16:25, 17:7, 20:22, 22:7, 26:6, 26:13, 26:14, 27:17, 30:20, 32:22, 36:18, 43:14 Rules [22] - 6:19, 6:25, 7:6. 7:15. 7:18. 7:23. 7:24, 8:5, 20:15, 20:25, 21:8, 30:23, 31:5, 32:3, 32:13, 32:18, 35:15, 35:25, 36:16, 37:2, 43:11 ruling [1] - 17:2 rulings [1] - 8:24 **run** [1] - 43:19 rural [1] - 25:17 Russian [1] - 8:24 S

safety [1] - 18:1 sake [2] - 43:19, 44:12 sales [1] - 38:10 sample [1] - 15:16 sands" [1] - 12:14 sandy [3] - 11:21, 19:4, 19:10 scholarly [4] - 6:1, 6:4, 6:11, 8:7 scientific [1] - 6:11 **SDCL** [3] - 7:17, 20:10, 31:13 se [6] - 7:8, 7:13, 7:25, 9:4, 15:9, 35:13 Seamans [5] - 41:24, 45:1, 45:8, 45:12, 45:22 **Seamans'** [1] - 41:23 search [1] - 21:9 seat [1] - 14:11 second [9] - 5:20, 7:18, 10:18, 10:19, 11:8, 11:14, 12:11, 31:5, 39:20 Section [3] - 22:15, 24:11, 36:25 section [3] - 10:25, 20:9, 21:12 see [1] - 19:2 seeing [3] - 8:21, 41:1, 46:5 seek [2] - 11:16, 35:5 seeking [4] - 10:14, 11:1, 12:2, 22:14 send [1] - 44:13 sentence [10] - 7:18, 10:15, 10:19, 11:17, 11:18, 13:20, 13:22, 26:4, 31:2, 31:5 **seriously** [1] - 15:2 **served** [3] - 6:21, 9:8, 25:2 service [1] - 30:25 serving [1] - 31:1 session [1] - 19:9 set [1] - 35:1 several [5] - 15:15, 16:13, 16:22, 18:11, 33.5 shakes [1] - 14:2 **shall** [4] - 3:7, 7:21, 31:4, 31:8 **shooting** [1] - 44:13 **short** [1] - 15:6 **shorthand** [2] - 49:9 **shortly** [1] - 15:18 shot [1] - 44:14 **show** [2] - 28:2, 32:1 **showed** [2] - 19:6, 31:21 **showing** [1] - 25:1 **shown** [3] - 31:17, 40:8, 40:11 sides [1] - 7:2 significant [1] - 34:18

similarly [1] - 24:25

simply [6] - 18:2,

26:13, 26:22, 30:20, 32:19, 38:24 sincerity [1] - 46:16 single [1] - 28:12 Sioux [2] - 17:11, 17:12 situation [3] - 19:7, 24:2, 38:17 situations [2] - 32:12, 46:19 slide [1] - 47:20 **small** [1] - 25:7 Smith [3] - 3:16, 15:18. 33:16 soil [3] - 11:21, 19:4, 19:10 **someone** [2] - 13:23, 37:18 sometimes [2] - 6:1, 6:2 sorry [1] - 33:14 **sort** [4] - 9:9, 9:11, 28:14, 29:1 sound [1] - 19:25 sources [1] - 17:24 **SOUTH** [2] - 1:2, 49:1 South [14] - 2:2, 2:4, 6:24, 7:8, 18:2, 20:9, 21:12, 22:23, 25:18, 32:9, 34:25, 43:11, 49:7, 49:13 southwest [1] - 19:9 **space** [1] - 14:12 speaker [1] - 19:5 speaking [1] - 8:15 special [1] - 19:8 specialized [2] -27:16. 28:2 **spent** [3] - 4:18, 9:22, 43:4 sphere [1] - 26:14 **split** [1] - 41:6 **SS** [1] - 49:2 Staff [8] - 4:19, 7:11, 14:20, 21:16, 26:18, 26:20, 34:9, 42:12 **STAFF** [1] - 1:14 Staff's [5] - 17:1, 34:13, 34:19, 35:9, 42:16 stand [2] - 16:7, 32:25 standard [2] - 20:11, 34.23 Standing [3] - 17:11, 19:21, 26:7 stands [1] - 40:16 starting [2] - 13:17, 47:19 starts [1] - 11:6 state [5] - 31:7, 35:12,

35:13, 43:15, 46:15 **STATE** [2] - 1:2, 49:1 State [2] - 2:2, 49:7 statement [9] - 5:16, 26:2, 38:22, 39:16, 39:23, 40:5, 40:18, 45:7, 45:11 statements [5] - 5:23, 22:19, 24:16, 25:10 states [1] - 25:25 statute [1] - 31:2 statutes [3] - 22:2, 22:4, 30:21 statutory [2] - 7:19, 31:6 stay [1] - 11:13 Steffenson [1] - 1:20 step [2] - 4:1 stepped [1] - 44:8 steps [1] - 22:6 still [2] - 34:5, 43:6 story [1] - 30:18 straight [1] - 9:25 straighten [1] - 10:3 straightened [1] - 5:6 stretched [1] - 20:7 stricken [4] - 25:25, 26:22, 47:9, 47:10 strictly [3] - 17:7, 20:25, 36:2 strike [13] - 3:7, 4:9, 10:11, 10:14, 11:1, 11:16, 12:2, 12:5, 12:8, 15:8, 17:8, 21:21, 41:15 striking [2] - 10:1, 18:21 struck [1] - 46:25 struggling [3] - 41:21, 44:15, 44:17 stuff [4] - 25:14, 42:9, 43:6, 43:12 **sub** [2] - 10:17, 11:4 subject [2] - 6:9, 22:21 submit [2] - 20:6, 37:5 **subpart** [1] - 31:13 **substance** [1] - 40:3 suggested [2] - 15:13, 25:22 **SULLY** [1] - 49:3 sum [1] - 25:16 summarizes [1] - 6:2 support [1] - 46:1 supporting [1] - 45:22 supportive [1] - 39:12 Supreme [5] - 17:2, 35:1, 36:13, 42:15,

42.21

sur [2] - 17:11, 20:3

surface [1] - 18:25 survey [4] - 4:24, 33:10, 33:20, 44:1 sweep [1] - 17:21 swift [1] - 29:1 swore [1] - 39:9 sworn [1] - 45:9 sympathetic [1] - 42:8 system [1] - 28:14 systems [1] - 25:17

Т

table [2] - 11:21, 19:4 talks [3] - 18:11, 18:21. 29:5 tar [1] - 12:14 tax [3] - 21:19, 21:24, 27:25 **Taylor** [7] - 14:10, 15:5, 18:10, 18:21, 27:5, 39:15, 42:2 **TAYLOR** [29] - 3:10, 4:15, 5:1, 5:5, 8:12, 8:19, 10:6, 10:16, 11:2, 11:18, 12:5, 12:11, 12:15, 12:25, 13:7, 13:9, 13:12, 13:16, 13:21, 14:2, 27:9, 31:12, 31:15, 37:14, 37:25, 39:20, 39:24, 40:4, 40:7 team [1] - 15:10 technical [2] - 31:19, 31:22 term [6] - 18:21, 18:22, 18:23, 35:22, 36:9 test [2] - 24:24, 30:2 testified [7] - 3:13, 15:5, 22:20, 23:10, 38:1, 45:1, 45:2 testifies [2] - 6:6, 28:16 testify [6] - 25:9, 27:18, 30:13, 38:1, 38:9, 38:20 testifying [2] - 3:17, 38:18 testimony [69] - 3:8, 3:14, 3:22, 3:23, 4:25, 5:8, 5:15, 6:3, 10:2, 10:10, 11:5, 11:9, 11:23, 11:24, 12:17, 12:23, 13:5, 15:8, 15:12, 15:24, 16:2, 16:4, 16:5, 16:7, 16:8, 16:11,

16:15, 16:17, 16:18,

17:14, 17:17, 17:25, 18:5, 18:6, 18:7, 22:9, 22:14, 23:20, 24:13, 24:17, 24:19, 24:20, 24:21, 24:24, 25:4, 25:18, 25:19, 25:22. 26:10. 26:21. 33:5, 33:11, 33:21, 33:22, 35:24, 39:9, 39:12, 41:15, 44:1, 44:7, 45:13, 46:25, 47:8, 47:13, 48:1 thankful [1] - 14:15 **THE** [6] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:6, 1:11 themselves [1] - 34:24 theory [1] - 30:5 therefore [1] - 26:25 third [7] - 5:25, 10:25, 11:10, 12:2, 12:9, 25:21, 25:22 thoughts [1] - 35:19 three [1] - 4:16 throughout [2] -15:15, 32:23 thumb [3] - 15:21, 37:9, 37:10 **Tillquist** [1] - 6:7 **TO**[1] - 1:6 today [15] - 3:6, 3:20, 5:3, 8:13, 14:8, 14:16, 15:7, 19:11, 33:8, 33:24, 41:16, 45:22, 46:2, 48:4, 48:14 together [1] - 41:6 Tom [2] - 38:18, 38:20 took [1] - 49:9 topic [1] - 11:4 totality [1] - 47:4 tour[1] - 19:6 toxic [2] - 11:6, 40:3 toxicity [1] - 24:17 toxicologist [1] - 6:7 toxicology [1] - 28:2 TransCanada [25] -3:2, 3:9, 3:24, 14:7, 15:7, 16:16, 16:17, 16:21, 16:24, 17:9, 17:20, 17:21, 19:14, 20:23, 22:5, 22:14, 23:1, 23:15, 23:16, 23:25, 24:10, 25:25, 26:5, 28:21, 28:23

TRANSCANADA [1] -

TransCanada" [1] -

TransCanada's [4] -

1:4

12:4

16:20, 16:22, 17:8,

17:13, 18:6, 23:19, 26.12 Transcript [1] - 1:8 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1 transcript [1] - 13:5 transcription [1] -49:12 treat [1] - 28:23 treatment [4] - 23:11, 25:1, 25:3, 39:5 trial [4] - 7:20, 31:7, 35:16, 35:22 tribal [1] - 26:9 Tribe [4] - 17:12, 26:7 Tribes [2] - 26:7, 26:16 tried [2] - 29:23, 30:4 **Tripp** [4] - 23:15, 28:5, 28:13, 28:17 true [1] - 49:11 truth [7] - 5:17, 5:24, 29:2, 39:10, 40:19 try [2] - 10:3, 47:18 trying [2] - 4:19, 36:10 two [11] - 4:23, 5:8, 5:9, 12:9, 18:14, 22:22, 28:5, 30:25, 33:9, 43:25, 44:14 two-fold [1] - 5:8 type [2] - 5:19, 32:5 typed [2] - 45:7, 45:11 typographical [1] -10:19

U

uncounted [1] - 9:22

under [17] - 7:9, 7:19, 10:11, 10:14, 12:9, 17:21, 21:25, 22:1, 22:24, 24:5, 24:11, 24:19, 26:6, 28:6, 31:6, 36:24, 40:17 underlying [1] - 26:21 unduly [2] - 22:17, 31:3 unfair [1] - 20:24 unfamiliarity [2] -7:14, 35:14 unicameral [1] - 19:5 uniformly [1] - 32:23 **Union** [3] - 8:21, 9:1, 38:19 unless [1] - 41:11 unnumbered [2] -4:23, 43:25 unrepresented [1] -20:17 unsworn [4] - 5:16,

5:23, 38:22, 40:18

up [12] - 8:25, 9:13,
11:2, 13:9, 18:24,
20:2, 22:9, 27:2,
39:20, 40:2, 44:13

Utilities [5] - 22:3,
31:24, 34:17, 43:10,
43:14

UTILITIES [2] - 1:1,
1:11

V

valuation [1] - 38:14 various [1] - 6:1 verbally [1] - 41:16 VICE [1] - 1:12 visited [1] - 39:4 vote [3] - 46:6, 46:17, 48:6 votes [4] - 46:10,

25:14, 27:15, 27:16, 27:20, 27:21, 37:17, witnesses [3] - 16:22, 24:21, 27:17 Wittler [2] - 1:24, 49:18 **WITTLER** [1] - 49:5 works [2] - 6:1, 6:4 wreck [1] - 21:24 wrecks [1] - 21:19 wrestling [1] - 41:7 writes [4] - 29:17, 29:21, 30:10, 30:15 written [5] - 24:13, 24:17, 25:21, 45:12 wrote [2] - 30:3, 40:14

X

XL [5] - 1:6, 3:4, 23:21, 24:3, 25:3

W

46:11, 48:11, 48:12

walking [1] - 12:18 wants [4] - 15:7, 28:3, 32:21, 41:11 Water [2] - 9:20, 31:23 water [20] - 4:24, 5:14, 5:15, 9:18, 11:21, 17:24, 19:2, 19:4, 19:7, 19:10, 23:10, 23:17, 24:18, 25:1, 25:3, 25:17, 28:14, 33:10, 39:5, 43:25 waterways [1] - 12:9 ways [1] - 4:17 week [1] - 47:17 weekend [1] - 44:13 Welk [4] - 8:21, 9:2, 38:18, 38:20 well-being [1] - 18:2

Υ

Yankton [1] - 17:12 years [3] - 17:22, 27:23, 30:25 yesterday [1] - 47:16 YouTubes [1] - 46:21

Ζ

zero [1] - 5:18 **Zinter** [1] - 9:19 **zone** [1] - 42:6

well-being [1] - 18:2 wells [1] - 19:7 wheat [1] - 20:20 White [3] - 30:10, 30:13, 30:15 whole [4] - 27:18, 33:12, 39:10, 47:21 Wiest [1] - 1:15 wife [1] - 28:21 Wilbert [4] - 9:7, 9:8, 32:10, 38:18 winding [1] - 3:13 wish [3] - 39:2, 41:3,

46:15

witness [12] - 6:6, 16:7, 18:16, 18:17,