
**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

DOCKET HP 14-001

**CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE'S
RESPONSE TO KEYSTONE'S
MOTION TO PRECLUDE
CONSIDERATION OF ABORIGINAL
TITLE OR USUFRUCTUARY RIGHTS**

COMES NOW, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, by and through counsel, responding to Keystone XL Pipeline's Motion to Preclude Consideration of Aboriginal Title or Usufructuary Rights. The Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe asks the Public Utilities Commission to dismiss TransCanada Keystone Pipeline's Motion for the reasons detailed herein.

I. The PUC May Hear Testimony and Consider Evidence Regarding Tribal Aboriginal Rights.

Keystone argues that issues related to aboriginal and usufructuary rights are beyond the scope of the PUC. Keystone bases its argument on the holding in *Petition of West River Electric*, 675 N.W.2d 222, 230 (S.D. 2004). Specifically, Keystone argues that “[t]he proper forum for determination of Indian land interests is the state or federal courts. The PUC simply does not have jurisdiction to hear and decide questions regarding claimed aboriginal title to or usufructuary rights on the land that hosts the pipeline.” Keystone's Motion to Preclude, pg. 2, ¶ 3. In essence, Keystone alleges that Intervenors have asked the PUC to adjudicate their legal claims regarding aboriginal and usufructuary rights. However, not a single Intervenor makes such a request to the PUC.

The issue in *Petition of West River Electric* was materially different from the instant issue. The issue in that case involved two utilities which submitted competing motions to the

PUC asking for declaratory rulings adjudicating their respective legal rights. No such request for declaratory ruling has been made by any Intervenor asking the PUC to adjudicate their aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights. Intervenors may, however, desire to submit testimony and evidence related to such rights in order to aid the PUC in its consideration of Keystone's petition for certification.

Keystone is correct in stating that the PUC is not a court and cannot exercise purely judicial functions. See *Petition of West River Electric*, 675 N.W.2d 222, 230 (S.D. 2004). Nonetheless, by Keystone's own admission the PUC is "...a quasi-judicial agency..." Keystone's Motion to Preclude, pg. 2, ¶ 1. Under South Dakota law, such agencies are "...administrative tribunal[s] with expertise" that are entitled to "...appropriate deference..." *Northern States Power Co.*, 489 N.W.2d at 370 (citing *In re Jack Rabbit Lines, Inc.*, 283 N.W.2d 402 (S.D.1979)).

Contrary to Keystone's vague and generalized allegation that tribal Intervenors are asking the PUC to dispositively adjudicate their aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights, in fact tribal Intervenors wish to simply bring such issues to the PUC's attention so that the Commission can make a fully informed final certification decision. Nothing in the law or the PUC's rules prohibits such evidence and or testimony. Indeed, SDCL 49-41B-1 directs the PUC to ensure that projects such as the Keystone XL Pipeline have "minimum effects" on the citizens of South Dakota. By choosing to approve Keystone's petition for certification, the PUC may subject the State of South Dakota to significant, expensive, and time consuming litigation with regard to issues of aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights. Arguing that the PUC cannot take into consideration such consequences is nonsensical and certainly does not minimize the effects of such projects on the citizens of South Dakota. Moreover, Keystone carries the burden of

showing that such evidence and/or testimony is disallowed by the law and/or PUC rules: which it has not.

Moreover, Keystone is the only party that has asked the PUC to dispositively adjudicate the merits of such claims. Though never specifically requested, Keystone makes it clear that it would like the PUC to adjudicate potential aboriginal and/or usufructuary claims by devoting the bulk of its Motion arguing the merits of such claims. In other words, Keystone has committed the same error that it baselessly accuses the Intervenors of committing.

II. Intervenors Have Not asked the PUC to Route the Applicant's Proposed Pipeline.

Keystone also argues that allowing testimony and evidence related to aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights amounts to a request to route the project. This argument is groundless. Keystone correctly states that SDCL 49-41B-36 prohibits the PUC from routing a project. However, not a single Intervenor has asked the PUC to direct the route of the project, nor does the submission of testimony and evidence regarding aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights necessarily require the PUC make such prohibited route direction.

The matter before the PUC involves certification of Keystone's permit to build the Keystone XL Pipeline. Any and all evidence, including testimony and evidence related to aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights, submitted on the part of the Intervenors is not made as part of a request to route the pipeline, but rather is submitted in opposition of certification of Keystone's petition. As such, Keystone's argument on this issue is groundless and defies logic.

III. Tribes in Western South Dakota Have a Valid Legal Basis to Claim Aboriginal and/or Usufructory Rights.

Finally, Keystone argues that tribal Intervenors do not have aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights in Western South Dakota. As stated previously, by submitting such an argument Keystone commits the same error that it accuses tribal Intervenors of making. Nonetheless, Keystone's erroneous, superficial, and inaccurate argument must be rebutted here.

The legal claims outlined below are in no way exhaustive, rather, they are meant only to illustrate the fact that a valid grounds for litigation exists and that the PUC is within its power to consider such potential issues when deciding Keystone's Petition for Certification.

The gist of Keystone's argument is that the Fort Laramie Treaty has been abrogated, along with any potential aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights. Specifically, Keystone argues that the Act of March 2, 1889, ch. 405, 25 Stat. 888 abrogated all aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights in non-reservation lands in Western South Dakota. Keystone's claim is overly sweeping and misapplies federal case law.

Keystone correctly states that Congress has the power to abrogate treaty rights. *See, e.g., Rosebud Sioux Tribe v. Kneip*, 430 U.S. 584, 594 (1977). However, Keystone failed to state that Congress must **clearly and unequivocally** express its intent to abrogate a treaty right. *See Menominee Tribe v. United States*, 391 U.S. 404, 412–413, (1968); *United States v. Dion*, 476 U.S. 734, 738, (1986). *See also County of Yakima v. Confederated Tribes and Bands of Yakima Nation*, 502 U.S. 251, 269, 112 S.Ct. 683, 693, (1992) (“[S]tatutes are to be construed liberally in favor of the Indians, with ambiguous provisions interpreted to their benefit”) (citations omitted). Indeed, the law at issue here, Western Sit is well established law that the land in Western South Dakota identified in the Fort Laramie Treaty is tribal aboriginal area. *See Sioux Tribe v. United States*, 21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 371, 382 (1969) *aff'd United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians*, 428 U.S. 371, 424 (1980). This legal recognition by the federal judiciary makes Keystone's assertion of abrogation all the more untenable.

Keystone makes a vague and conclusory statement that the Act of March 2, 1889 abrogated all tribal rights on non-reservation lands. Such vague, generalized, and conclusory statements are legally insufficient to find that Congress has clearly and unequivocally abrogated a treaty right. The Fort Laramie Treaty guaranteed a multitude of rights, including numerous

aboriginal and usufructuary rights, and the Act of March 2, 1889 does not clearly and unequivocally abrogate such rights. If it did, Keystone would have undoubtedly seized on such language in its argument. If Keystone wishes to claim that all tribal aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights have been abrogated, then it must carry the burden of showing that Congress clearly and unequivocally intended such abrogation. Moreover, *and more importantly*, as Keystone correctly points out, it would need to carry this burden in federal court, not before the PUC.

Also, The entire pipeline route in South Dakota has been adjudicated by the U.S. Court of Claims to be Sioux aboriginal area. *Sioux Tribe v. United States*, 21 Ind. Cl. Comm. 371, 382 (1969) *aff'd* *United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians*, 428 U.S. 371, 424 (1980).


Tribal Intervenors merely desire to present testimony and evidence related to potential aboriginal and usufructuary issues for the PUC's consideration. It is the contention of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe that such information will better equip the PUC in determining Keystone's Petition for Certification. The purpose of such evidence and/or testimony would be to inform the PUC that aboriginal and/or usufructuary claims such as those successfully brought in *U.S. v. Adair*, 723 F.2d 1394 (9th Cir. 1983) and *Washington v. Fishing Vessel Ass'n*, 443 U.S. 658 (1979) exist in Western South Dakota, and that infringement of those right may subject the State of South Dakota to costly and time consuming federal litigation.

IV. Conclusion

For all the forgoing reasons, testimony and evidence regarding aboriginal and/or usufructuary rights on land crossed by the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline should be allowed and Keystone's Motion to Preclude should be dismissed. The Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe respectfully requests the Commission to enter an order to that end.

Dated this 2nd day of June, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tracey Zephier". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Tracey A. Zephier,

Attorney for Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Intervenor

FREDERICKS PEEBLES & MORGAN LLP

910 5th Street, Suite 104

Rapid City, SD 57701

Telephone: (605) 791-1515

Facsimile: (605) 791-1915

Email: tzephier@ndnlaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 2nd day of June, 2015, the original of this **RESPONSE TO KEYSTONE'S MOTION TO PRECLUDE CONSIDERTION OF ABORIGINAL TITLE OR USUFRUCTUARY RIGHTS** on behalf of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe in Case Number HP 14-001, was served on the parties listed below via electronic mail.

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. William 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. James P. White
Attorney
TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP
Ste. 225
1250 Eye St., NW
Washington, DC 20005
jim_p_white@transcanada.com
(202) 682-4701 ext. 224 - voice

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

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. 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
amyanschaffer@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
(605) 843-2155 - voice

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. Thomasina Real Bird - Representing - Yankton Sioux Tribe
Attorney
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1900 Plaza Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027
trealbird@ndnlaw.com
(303) 673-9600 - voice
(303) 673-9155 - fax

Ms. Jennifer S. Baker – Representing Yankton Sioux Tribe
Attorney
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1900 Plaza Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027
Jbaker@ndnlaw.com
303-673-9600 - voice
303-673-9155 – fax

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
(605) 348-1117 - 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. 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

Mr. Robin S. Martinez - Representing: Dakota Rural Action
Martinez Madrigal & Machicao, LLC
616 W. 26th St.
Kansas City, MO 64108
robin.martinez@martinezlaw.net
(816) 979-1620 – voice
(888) 398-7665 - fax

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@martinezlaw.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