

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

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF)	
TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE,)	Docket 14-001
LP FOR ORDER ACCEPTING)	
CERTIFICATION OF PERMIT ISSUED IN)	DAKOTA RURAL ACTION'S
DOCKET HP09-001 TO CONSTRUCT THE)	MOTION AND SUPPORTING
KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE)	MEMORANDUM TO COMPEL
)	DISCOVERY
)	

Pursuant to SDCL §15-6-37(a), Dakota Rural Action (“DRA”), by and through counsel, hereby moves the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (the “Commission”) for an order compelling the Commission’s staff (“PUC Staff”) to provide the documents requested by DRA its First Request for Production of Documents to the PUC Staff, Number 5. DRA respectfully contends that since the information sought in this request for production of documents is relevant and discoverable, PUC Staff’s objections should be overruled and the PUC Staff should be directed to produce documents responsive to the subject document requests.

In compliance with SDCL §15-6-37(a)(2), counsel for DRA hereby certify that they have in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with counsel for the PUC Staff in an effort to secure the information or material sought through discovery requests prior to filing this motion.

Legal Standard Mandates Compelling Discovery

Under Public Utilities Commission Administrative Rule 20:10:01:22.01, an order to compel may be granted by the Commission upon the showing of good cause by a party to the proceeding. Additionally, this rule sets forth that discovery is to proceed “in the same manner as in the circuit courts of this state.” A.R.S.D. 20:10:01:22.01.

In South Dakota circuit court discovery is governed by SDCL §15-6-26(b):

Unless otherwise limited by order of the court in accordance with these rules, the scope of discovery is as follows:

- (1) In general. Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of any other party, including the existence, description, nature, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter. It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at the trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

The ability to engage in meaningful and complete discovery is an essential component to affording parties to proceedings due process rights. SDCL §15-6-26(b) covers the scope of discovery. That statute provides, in part, that:

“Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action, whether it relates to the claim or defense of the party seeking discovery or to the claim or defense of any other party, including the existence, description, nature, custody, condition and location of any books, documents, or other tangible things and the identity and location of persons having knowledge of any discoverable matter. It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at the trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. SDCL §15-6-26(b)(1) (emphasis added).

The South Dakota Supreme Court has ruled that the discovery rules are to be accorded a “broad and liberal treatment.” *Kaarup v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Co.*, 436 N.W.2d 17, 21 (S.D. 1989). “A broad construction of the discovery rules is necessary to satisfy the three distinct purposes of discovery (1) narrow the issues; (2) obtain evidence for use at trial; (3) secure information that may lead to admissible evidence at trial.” *Id.* at 19 (citing 8 C. Wright and A Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure*, §2001 (1970)).

Furthermore, “[t]he proper standard for ruling on a discovery motion is whether the information sought is “relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action....” SDCL 15–6–26(b)(1). This phraseology implies a broad construction of “relevancy” at the discovery stage because one of the purposes of discovery is to examine information that may lead to admissible evidence at trial.” *Id.*

Discovery Sought to be Compelled – Document Production

In connection with these proceedings, DRA sent the PUC Staff its First Request for Production of Documents, with request No. 5 asking for: “All correspondence between TransCanada or its Affiliates and the Commission or Commission Staff concerning the Project. [Applicable Finding or Condition No.: all].”

In response, the Staff objected:

OBJECTION. Staff objects to this request on the grounds of attorney work product. All communications between Staff and TransCanada have been conducted by attorneys and are, therefore, the subject of attorney work product. Furthermore, Staff operates as a party, separate from the Commission and does not have access to or knowledge of Commission communications.

Informal efforts to resolve the issue of disclosure with PUC Staff Counsel solely as to communications between PUC Staff and TransCanada, including attorneys therefore, have been unsuccessful.

DRA respectfully contends that the requested communications pertaining to the KXL Pipeline construction permit application in HP 09-001 and HP 14-001, however documented, are clearly relevant to these proceedings. As PUC Staff noted in its objection, it is a party to these proceedings separate from the Commission. It is also supposed to be a party separate from TransCanada. As a party, it is subject to discovery under A.R.S.D. 20:10:01:22.01 and SDCL §15-6-26(b). In *Kaarup v. St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Co.*, *supra*, the South Dakota Supreme Court held that communications between attorneys for a party and the company responsible for the decision is issue was relevant and therefore discoverable. *Id.*, 436 N.W.2d at 22.

PUC Staff, in their objection, did not state what the basis was for the privilege, other than it was between attorneys. It did not claim the communications were privileged work product consisting of an “attorney’s opinions and mental impressions” which “receive a greater level of protection.” *Kaarup*, 436 N.W.2d at 21-22. See, also, SDCL §15-6-26(b)(3). Communications

not containing such opinions or impressions should therefore be discoverable. It should be noted that although the request for production was not limited to communications between attorneys for the TransCanada and the PUC Staff, no objection or disclosure was made as to disclosure of any communications between TransCanada and PUC Staff who were not attorneys.

DRA therefore requests that the Commission enter its order compelling PUC Staff to disclose such documents, whether between attorneys or staff of TransCanada.

Conclusion

Counsel for the PUC Staff should be instructed to state the search conducted for such documents and whether the requested communications concern solely the opinions and mental impressions of attorneys, or whether they involve other matters related to the pipeline construction permit. Should the PUC Staff continue to assert its objection is based upon the purported “privileged” nature of any or all of the documented communications requested, DRA requests the PUC examine those documents *in camera*, to determine if they really are attorney opinions and mental impressions, or whether they are otherwise discoverable as related to TransCanada’s efforts to get and get recertified its construction permit. If any documents or parts thereof are non-privileged, the Motion to Compel should be granted and the Staff ordered to disclose. Should the PUC determine that any of the documents are privileged, DRA asked that they be placed sealed in the file of this case to permit later judicial review.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bruce Ellison

Bruce Ellison
518 6th Street #6
Rapid City, South Dakota 57701
Telephone: (605) 348-1117
Email: belli4law@aol.com

and

MARTINEZ MADRIGAL & MACHICAO, LLC

By: /s/ Robin S. Martinez

Robin S. Martinez, MO #36557/KS #23816
616 West 26th Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
816.979.1620 phone
888.398.7665 fax
Email: robin.martinez@martinezlaw.net

Attorneys for Dakota Rural Action

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 7th day of April 2015, the foregoing document on behalf of Dakota Rural Action in Case Number HP 14-001, was filed on the Public Utilities Commission of the State of South Dakota e-filing website. Also on this day, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was transmitted via email to the following:

Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Brian Rounds
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
brian.rounds@state.sd.us

James E. Moore
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
james.moore@woodsfuller.com
*Attorney for TransCanada Keystone Pipeline,
LP*

Paul F. Seamans
27893 249th St.
Draper, SD 57531
jackknife@goldenwest.net

Elizabeth Lone Eagle
PO Box 160
Howes, SD 57748
bethcbest@gmail.com

Viola Waln
PO Box 937
Rosebud, SD 57570
walnranh@goldenwest.net

Kristen Edwards
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us

Darren Kearney
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
darren.kearney@state.sd.us

Bill G. Taylor
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
bill.taylor@woodsfuller.com
*Attorney for TransCanada Keystone Pipeline,
LP*

John H. Harter
28125 307th Ave.
Winner, SD 57580
johnharter11@yahoo.com

Tony Rogers
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility
Commission
153 S. Main St.
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Jane Kleeb
Bold Nebraska
1010 N. Denver Ave.
Hastings, NE 68901
jane@boldnebraska.org

Benjamin D. Gotschall
Bold Nebraska
6505 W. Davey Rd.
Raymond, NE 68428
ben@boldnebraska.org

Cindy Myers, R.N.
PO Box 104
Stuart, NE 68780
csmyers77@hotmail.com

Lewis GrassRope
PO Box 61
Lower Brule, SD 57548
wisestar8@msn.com

Robert G. Allpress
46165 Badger Rd.
Naper, NE 68755
bobandnan2008@hotmail.com

Louis T. Genung
902 E. 7th St.
Hastings, NE 68901
tg64152@windstream.net

Nancy Hilding
6300 W. Elm
Black Hawk, SD 57718
nhilshat@rapidnet.com

Bruce & RoxAnn Boettcher
Boettcher Organics
86061 Edgewater Ave.
Bassett, NE 68714
boettcherann@abbnebraska.com

Cyril Scott
President
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
cscott@gwtc.net

Paula Antoine
Sicangu Oyate Land Office Coordinator

Byron T. Steskal & Diana L. Steskal
707 E. 2nd St.
Stuart NE 68780
prairierose@nntc.net

Arthur R. Tanderup
52343 857th Rd.
Neligh, NE 68756
atanderu@gmail.com

Carolyn P. Smith
305 N. 3rd St.
Plainview, NE 68769
peachie_1234@yahoo.com

Jeff Jensen
14376 Laffin Rd.
Newell, SD 57760
jensen@sdplains.com

Peter Capossela, P.C.
Attorney at Law
PO Box 10643
Eugene, OR 97440
pcapossela@nu-world.com
Attorney for Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

Gary F. Dorr
27853 292nd
Winner, SD 57580
gfdorr@gmail.com

Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio
9748 Arden Rd.
Trumansburg, NY 14886
wrexie.bardaglio@gmail.com

Eric Antoine
Attorney
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
ejantoine@hotmail.com

Chris Hesla
South Dakota Wildlife Federation

Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 658
Rosebud, SD 57570
wopila@gwtc.net
paula.antoine@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Harold C. Frazier
Chairman
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
PO Box 590
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
haroldcfrazier@yahoo.com

Debbie J. Trapp
24952 US HWY 14
Midland, SD 57552
mtdt@goldenwest.net

Joye Braun
PO Box 484
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
jmbraun57625@gmail.com

Thomasina Real Bird
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1900 Plaza Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027
trealbird@ndnlaw.com
Attorney for Yankton Sioux Tribe

Douglas Hayes
Sierra Club
Ste. 102W
1650 38th St.
Boulder, CO 80301
doug.hayes@sierraclub.org

Tom BK Goldtooth
Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
PO Box 485
Bemidji, MN 56619
ien@igc.org

PO Box 7075
Pierre, SD 57501
sdwf@mncomm.com

Amy Schaffer
PO Box 114
Louisville, NE 68037
amyannschafter@gmail.com

Gena M. Parkhurst
2825 Minnewasta Place
Rapid City, SD 57702
gmp66@hotmail.com

Robert Flying Hawk, Chairman
Yankton Sioux Tribe
PO Box 1153
Wagner, SD 57380
Robertflyinghawk@gmail.com

Chastity Jewett
1321 Woodridge Dr.
Rapid City, SD 57701
chasjewett@gmail.com

Duncan Meisel
350.org
20 Jay St. #1010
Brooklyn, NY 11201
duncan@350.org

Dallas Goldtooth
38371 Res. HWY 1
Morton, MN 56270
goldtoothdallas@gmail.com

Robert P. Gough, Secretary
Intertribal Council on Utility Policy
PO Box 25
Rosebud, SD 57570
bobgough@intertribalCOUP.org

Tracey Zephier
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
910 5th Street, Suite 104
Rapid City, SD 57701
tzephier@ndnlaw.com
Attorney for Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe

Ms. Mary Turgeon Wynne, Esq.
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility
Commission
153 S. Main St
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Bonny Kilmurry
47798 888 Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
jackiekilmurry@yahoo.com

Terry & Cheryl Frisch
47591 875th Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
tcfrisch@q.com

Matthew L. Rappold
Rappold Law Office
816 Sixth Street
PO Box 873
Rapid City, SD 57709
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com
Attorney for Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Intervenor

Ms. Kimberly E. Craven
3560 Catalpa Way
Bouleder, CO 80304
kimcraven@gmail.com

And on April 7, 2015, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was mailed via U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, to the following:

Jerry Jones
22584 US HWY 14
Midland SD 57552

Elizabeth Lone Eagle
PO Box 160
Howes, SD 57748

Ronald Fees
17401 Fox Ridge Rd.
Opal, SD 57758

/s/ Robin S. Martinez
Attorney for Dakota Rural Action