

RE: HP14-001

To: South Dakota Public Utilities Commission, TransCanada and Intervenors in the Keystone XL Permit Hearings.

RESPONSE TO KEYSTONE'S MOTION TO DEFINE THE SCOPE OF DISCOVERY UNDER SDCL 49-41 B-27

I object to Transcanada's motion to define the scope of discovery for the following reasons:

1) Although I did not apply for party status in the 2010 SD PUC permit process, I still have a right to request Due Process and Equal Access, granted under the United States Constitution, in the current re-certification of Transcanada's KXL permit, as it pertains to the scope of discovery, as well as general knowledge of the proposed Transcanada project and its potential destructive effects on the land, water, and communities of South Dakota.

2) It seems to me that Transcanada wishes to limit the scope of discovery based on a flawed interpretation of state law/statute. Although I do not pretend to be a lawyer, it seems apparent that the SD Public Utilities Commission retains the right to re-examine any and all aspects of the permit conditions established in 2010 - as well as allow intervenors to present evidence that may show conditions have changed and/or present concerns that were not addressed in the 2010 permit. To not do so would be a grave disservice to the general public, animals, lands, and water that will be affected by the proposed pipeline project.

Because of these reason above, I kindly request the SD Public Utilities Commission to deny Transcanada's Motion to Define the Scope of Discovery and to adopt the widest, most comprehensive approach to discovery in respects to all aspects of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Thank you. Pidamayaypi do!

Respectfully Submitted;

Dallas Goldtooth

38731 Res hwy 1

Morton, MN 56270

goldtoothdallas@gmail.com