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

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

**YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE'S
RESPONSE TO
APPLICANT'S MOTION TO
PRECLUDE CONSIDERATION OF
ABORIGINAL TITLE OR
USUFRUCTUARY RIGHTS**

HP14-001

COMES NOW Yankton Sioux Tribe ("Yankton"), by and through Thomasina Real Bird and Jennifer Baker with Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP, and for its *Response to Applicant's Motion to Preclude Consideration of Aboriginal Title or Usufructuary Rights* asserts the following. Because *Applicant's Motion to Preclude Consideration of Aboriginal Title or Usufructuary Rights* is without merit and because the relief requested by the Applicant would frustrate the purposes of SDCL Chapter 49-41B, Yankton requests that the Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") deny the Applicant's motion.

I. INTRODUCTION

TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP ("Keystone") filed a motion seeking to preclude the Commission from considering aboriginal title or usufructuary rights in its certification determination based on three allegations: 1) that the Commission lacks authority to determine whether such rights exist; 2) that assertion of such rights is a challenge to the proposed route, over which the Commission lacks authority; and 3) that such rights do not exist with respect to the proposed project's route. All three of these allegations are made in error and must be rejected. While the Commission certainly lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate land use rights in this matter for

purposes other than its own determination on permit certification, the Commission just as clearly *does* have authority to take those claims and rights into account when it makes the certification determination. Tribes' assertion of those rights in these proceedings does pertain to the route of the proposed pipeline, but the impact on those rights is a permissible consideration for the Commission under Chapter 49-41B. While the Commission is restricted from selecting or altering the route, it is both relevant and necessary that the Commission consider factors tied to the location of a proposed project when it makes a decision pursuant to SDCL § 49-41B-27. Finally, Keystone's allegation that Yankton and other tribes do not have usufructuary rights to the land along the proposed project route is not only false but absurd given that Keystone claims the Commission lacks authority to make that determination. Because Keystone has provided no valid basis for its motion, Keystone's requested relief must be denied.

II. BACKGROUND

Keystone initiated this action by filing a petition on September 15, 2014, seeking to certify that its proposed Keystone XL pipeline project (the "proposed project") continues to meet the conditions upon which a permit was granted pursuant to SDCL 49-41B-27 in 2010. The proposed project is a tar sands pipeline that would cross through land in South Dakota that was reserved for occupancy and various other uses for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and several other Indian tribes pursuant to the Treaty of 1851 at Fort Laramie between the United States and said tribes.

III. ARGUMENT

A. The Commission Has Authority to Consider Intervenors' Usufructuary Rights.

The Commission is entitled to hear all arguments regarding the proposed project so that it has all the facts to make its decision. Moreover, all parties to this case are entitled to present their

concerns to the Commission as a matter of due process. This includes concerns pertaining to usufructuary rights.

Yankton's usufructuary rights in the land at issue have existed since the Treaty at Fort Laramie was signed in 1851. The Commission is authorized to consider Yankton's concerns with respect to its usufructuary rights regardless of whether those rights have been identified as such in court. While the South Dakota Supreme Court has made clear that the Commission cannot exercise *purely* judicial functions, it does not and cannot prohibit the Commission from interpreting the law. To do so would preclude the Commission from functioning as an administrative tribunal.

The case Keystone relies on to support its position, *In re West River Electric Association*, 675 N.W.2d 222 (S.D. 2004) ("*West River*"), only addressed the Commission's authority within the narrow scope of altering the meaning of a statute by changing its interpretation of the statute. The issue in that case was how the term "location" should be interpreted using rules of statutory construction. The scope of the Commission's authority was discussed only to address the Commission's argument that its authority to "redefine its views to reflect its current view of public policy regarding the utility industry" includes authority to give new interpretations to statutory language. *Id.* at 229-230. The Supreme Court of South Dakota held that because the "PUC is not a court, and cannot exercise purely judicial functions...it cannot read into a statute a new definition of 'location' that never previously existed." *Id.* at 230. The Commission therefore is precluded from interpreting a statute in such a way that it gives new meaning to the language of the statute.

Yankton does not seek to have the Commission alter the meaning of a statute in this matter, as was the issue in *West River*. Yankton simply wishes to present to the Commission facts that are relevant to the Commission's determination pursuant to SDCL § 49-41B-27. Nothing in *West River* precludes the Commission from considering such information, and the limitation to the

Commission's authority discussed in that case is irrelevant to the pending matter. The fact that a court has not yet expressly identified Yankton's usufructuary rights as such makes them no less valid and of concern to Yankton and to the Commission's decision in this case. The Commission has the authority to consider usufructuary rights concerns that pertain to the permit certification process, and it must do so in order to fully carry out its functions under SDCL § 49-41B-27.

B. The Commission Has Authority to Consider Arguments that are Specific to the Proposed Route.

Although Keystone correctly asserts that the Commission lacks authority to reroute the proposed pipeline, Keystone incorrectly concludes that this precludes the Commission from hearing objections based on the route. Under Keystone's logic, the Commission would be unable to hear all relevant facts about the disadvantages of a proposed project because many of those are directly related to the route. The Commission would be restricted to considering only broad concerns about the project as a whole, unable to consider potential impacts to specific locations such as rivers, residential areas, or specific hazards. Fortunately, this is not the case. The Commission has the authority and discretion to hear all relevant facts to decide whether to deny, grant, or amend a permit. Likewise, the Commission has the authority and discretion to hear all relevant facts to decide whether to grant certification for a permit under SDCL § 49-41B-27.

The legislature enacted SDCL Chapter 49-41B in order to balance the welfare of the people and the environmental quality of the state with the necessity of expanding industry. SDCL § 49-41B-1. To ensure that new facilities will produce minimal adverse effects on the environment and upon the citizens, the legislature requires that a "facility may not be constructed or operated in this state without first obtaining a permit from the commission." *Id.* This cannot be done without giving consideration to the environment and citizens in the vicinity of a proposed project's route.

Though the Commission cannot route a facility, it can deny a permit. SDCL 49-41B-36 directs that “[n]othing in this chapter is a delegation to the commission of the authority to route a transmission facility.” However, “SDCL 49-41B-20 grants the PUC the authority to approve or to disapprove permit applications, including the proposed route.” *In re Nebraska Pub. Power Dist. Etc.*, 354 N.W.2d 713, 721 (S.D. 1984) (emphasis added). Furthermore, if an application is disapproved based on the route, “the applicant can revise the route and seek PUC approval. SDCL 49-41B-22.1 through 49-41B-22.2.” *Id.* Thus, while Commission cannot accept a proposed reroute submitted by another party or propose a reroute itself, it is clearly within the Commission’s authority to deny a permit – and therefore to deny permit certification - for reasons relating to the proposed route.

C. The Yankton Sioux Tribe and Other Intervenors Retain Usufructuary Rights to Lands Along the Proposed Pipeline Route.

Yankton and other tribes, some of which have intervened in this action, retain usufructuary rights in lands in South Dakota that would be crossed by the proposed project. These rights do not require adjudication or formal recognition to exist; they exist by virtue of the Fort Laramie Treaty. For an act of the United States to extinguish these rights, the act would require express language to that effect. Keystone has not identified an act that would support its assertion as to these rights. For purposes of responding to Keystone’s motion, Yankton asserts that such rights do exist by virtue of the government-to-government Treaty. Yankton will refrain at this time from arguing the merits of its usufructuary rights claims; however, Yankton appreciates the opportunity to demonstrate these interests and their relevance to the Commission’s certification determination at the evidentiary hearing and through post-hearing briefing. Because Keystone has alleged the Commission cannot determine whether usufructuary rights exist, it cannot at the same time ask the Commission to find that such rights do not exist. Furthermore, Keystone had the opportunity early

in these proceedings to raise any challenges it might have to the inclusion of treaty rights issues in the Commission's determination. Yankton's *Application for Party Status* expressly identifies its ancestral and treaty lands on which the proposed pipeline corridor is located and the risks to those lands as part of its interest in the permit proceedings. Keystone failed to object at that time, when it was first placed on notice of Yankton's interests and intentions. Keystone sat on its rights to challenge the scope of Yankton's participation, thereby waiving this argument. Because Keystone has waived its right to object to the scope of Yankton's participation, Keystone's motion must be denied.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicant's *Motion to Preclude Consideration of Aboriginal Title or Usufructuary Rights* is without merit and must be denied. The allegations on which this motion is based are not grounded in law. Because the relief requested would severely impair the Commission's ability to fulfill its duties under SDCL Chapter 49-41B and would violate Yankton's rights to participate as a party to these proceedings, Keystone's motion must be denied.

Dated this 2 day of June, 2015.



Thomasina Real Bird, SD Bar No. 4415
FREDERICKS PEBBLES & MORGAN LLP
1900 Plaza Drive
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 673-9600
Facsimile: (303) 673-9155
Email: trealbird@ndnlaw.com



Jennifer S. Baker, OK No. 21538, NM No. 28101
FREDERICKS PEEBLES & MORGAN LLP
1900 Plaza Drive
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 673-9600
Facsimile: (303) 673-9155
Email: jbaker@ndnlaw.com

Attorneys for Yankton Sioux Tribe

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 2nd day of June, 2015, a true and correct copy of this **YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE'S RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO PRECLUDE CONSIDERATION OF ABORIGINAL TITLE OR USUFRUCTUARY RIGHTS** was filed on the Public Utilities Commission of the State of South Dakota e-filing website. And also on this day, a true and accurate copy was sent via email to the following (or US Mail first-class postage prepaid where no email is given):

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

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

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

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

Mr. James E. Moore - Representing: TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP
Attorney
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
james.moore@woodsfuller.com
(605) 336-3890 - voice
(605) 339-3357 - fax

Mr. Bill G. Taylor - Representing: TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP
Attorney
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
bill.taylor@woodsfuller.com
(605) 336-3890 - voice
(605) 339-3357 - fax

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
27893 249th St.
Draper, SD 57531
jacknife@goldenwest.net
(605) 669-2777 - voice

Mr. John H. Harter
28125 307th Ave.
Winner, SD 57580
johnharter11@yahoo.com
(605) 842-0934 - voice

Ms. Elizabeth Lone Eagle
PO Box 160
Howes, SD 57748
bethcbest@gmail.com
(605) 538-4224 - voice
Serve both by email and regular mail

Mr. Tony Rogers
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility Commission
153 S. Main St.
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov
(605) 856-2727 - voice

Ms. Viola Waln
PO Box 937
Rosebud, SD 57570
[walnranch@goldenwest.net](mailto:waln ranch@goldenwest.net)
(605) 747-2440 - voice

Ms. Jane Kleeb
Bold Nebraska
1010 N. Denver Ave.
Hastings, NE 68901
jane@boldnebraska.org
(402) 705-3622 - voice

Mr. Benjamin D. Gotschall
Bold Nebraska
6505 W. Davey Rd.
Raymond, NE 68428
ben@boldnebraska.org
(402) 783-0377 - voice

Mr. Byron T. Steskal & Ms. Diana L. Steskal
707 E. 2nd St.
Stuart NE 68780
prairierose@nntc.net
(402) 924-3186 - voice

Ms. Cindy Myers, R.N.
PO Box 104
Stuart, NE 68780
csmyers77@hotmail.com
(402) 709-2920 - voice

Mr. Arthur R. Tanderup
52343 857th Rd.
Neligh, NE 68756
atanderu@gmail.com
(402) 278-0942 - voice

Mr. Lewis GrassRope
PO Box 61
Lower Brule, SD 57548
wisestar8@msn.com
(605) 208-0606 - voice

Ms. Carolyn P. Smith
305 N. 3rd St.
Plainview, NE 68769
peachie_1234@yahoo.com
(402) 582-4708 - voice

Mr. Robert G. Allpress
46165 Badger Rd.
Naper, NE 68755
bobandnan2008@hotmail.com
(402) 832-5298 - voice

~~Mr. Jeff Jensen
14376 Laffin Rd.
Newell, SD 57760
jensen@sdplains.com
(605) 866-4486 - voice~~

Mr. Louis T. Genung
902 E. 7th St.
Hastings, NE 68901
tg64152@windstream.net
(402) 984-7548 - voice

Mr. Peter Capossela, P.C. - Representing: Standing Rock Sioux Tribe
Attorney at Law
PO Box 10643
Eugene, OR 97440
pcapossela@nu-world.com
(541) 505-4883 - voice

Ms. Nancy Hilding
6300 W. Elm
Black Hawk, SD 57718
nhilshat@rapidnet.com
(605) 787-6779 - voice

Mr. Gary F. Dorr
27853 292nd
Winner, SD 57580
gfdorr@gmail.com
(605) 828-8391 - voice

Mr. Bruce & Ms. RoxAnn Boettcher
Boettcher Organics
86061 Edgewater Ave.
Bassett, NE 68714
boettcherann@abbnebraska.com
(402) 244-5348 - voice

Ms. Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio
9748 Arden Rd.
Trumansburg, NY 14886
wrexie.bardaglio@gmail.com
(607) 229-8819 - voice

Mr. Cyril Scott
President
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
cscott@gwtc.net
ejantoine@hotmail.com
(605) 747-2381 - voice

Mr. Eric Antoine
Attorney
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
ejantoine@hotmail.com
(605)747-2381 - voice

Ms. Paula Antoine
Sicangu Oyate Land Office Coordinator
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 658
Rosebud, SD 57570
wopila@gwtc.net
paula.antoine@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov
(605) 747-4225 - voice

Mr. Harold C. Frazier
Chairman
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
PO Box 590
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
haroldcfrazier@yahoo.com
(605) 964-4155 - voice

Mr. Cody Jones
21648 US HWY 14/63
Midland, SD 57552
(605) 843-2827 - voice

Ms. Amy Schaffer
PO Box 114
Louisville, NE 68037
amyannschaffer@gmail.com
(402) 234-2590

Mr. Jerry Jones
22584 US HWY 14
Midland SD 57552
(605) 843-2264

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

Ms. Gena M. Parkhurst
2825 Minnewasta Place
Rapid City, SD 57702
gmp66@hotmail.com
(605) 716-5147 - voice

Ms. Joye Braun
PO Box 484
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
jmbraun57625@gmail.com
(605) 964-3813

Mr. Robert Flying Hawk
Chairman
Yankton Sioux Tribe
PO Box 1153
Wagner, SD 57380
Robertflyinghawk@gmail.com
(605) 384-3804 - voice

Ms. Chastity Jewett
1321 Woodridge Dr.
Rapid City, SD 57701
chasjewett@gmail.com
(605) 431-3594 - voice

Mr. Duncan Meisel
350.org
20 Jay St. #1010
Brooklyn, NY 11201
duncan@350.org
(518) 635-0350 - voice

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

Mr. Frank James
Dakota Rural Action
PO Box 549
Brookings, SD 57006
fejames@dakotarural.org
(605) 697-5204 - voice
(605) 697-6230 - fax

Mr. Bruce Ellison
Attorney
Dakota Rural Action
518 Sixth St. #6
Rapid City, SD 57701
belli4law@aol.com
(605) 716-2200 - voice

Mr. Tom BK Goldtooth
Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
PO Box 485
Bemidji, MN 56619
ien@igc.org
(218) 760-0442 - voice

Mr. Dallas Goldtooth
38371 Res. HWY 1
Morton, MN 56270
goldtoothdallas@gmail.com
(507) 412-7609

Mr. Ronald Fees
17401 Fox Ridge Rd.
Opal, SD 57758
(605) 748-2422 - voice

Ms. Bonny Kilmurry
47798 888 Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
bjkilmurry@gmail.com
(402) 925-5538 - voice

Mr. Robert P. Gough
Secretary
Intertribal Council on Utility Policy
PO Box 25
Rosebud, SD 57570
bobgough@intertribalCOUP.org
(605) 441-8316 - voice

Mr. Terry & Cheryl Frisch
47591 875th Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
tcfrisch@q.com
(402) 925-2656 - voice

Ms. Tracey Zephier - Representing: Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
Ste. 104
910 5th St.
Rapid City, SD 57701
tzephier@ndnlaw.com
(605) 791-1515 - voice

Mr. Robin S. Martinez - Representing: Dakota Rural Action
Martinez Madrigal & Machicao, LLC
616 W. 26th St.
Kansas City, MO 64108
robin.martinez@martinezlaw.net

Ms. Mary Turgeon Wynne, Esq.
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility Commission
153 S. Main St
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov
(605) 856-2727 - voice

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold - Representing: Rosebud Sioux Tribe
Rappold Law Office
816 Sixth St.
PO Box 873
Rapid City, SD 57709
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com
(605) 828-1680 - voice

Ms. April D. McCart - Representing: Dakota Rural Action
Certified Paralegal
Martinez Madrigal & Machicao, LLC
616 W. 26th St.
Kansas City, MO 64108
april.mccart@martinezlzlaw.net
(816) 415-9503 - voice

Mr. Paul C. Blackburn - Representing: Bold Nebraska
Attorney
4145 20th Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55407
paul@paulblackburn.net
(612) 599-5568 - voice

Ms. Kimberly E. Craven - Representing: Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
Attorney
3560 Catalpa Way
Boulder, CO 80304
kimecraven@gmail.com
(303) 494-1974 - voice

Mr. James P. White
Attorney
TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP
4547 Rincon Place
Montclair, VA 22025
Jim_p_white@transcanada.com

Tina Douglas
Web Specialist
SD Public Utilities Commission
605-773-3055
Tina.douglas@state.sd.us

Mr. Travis Clark - Representing: Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
Ste. 104
910 5th St.
Rapid City, SD 57701
tclark@ndnlaw.com
(605) 791-1515 – voice



J. Wagner, Legal Secretary