RECEIVED

OCT 0 1 2009

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, LP FOR A PERMIT UNDER THE SOUTH DAKOTA ENERGY CONVERSION AND TRANSMISSION FACILITY

ACT TO CONSTRUCT THE KEYSTONE XL PROJECT

HP09-001

Transcript of Proceedings September 23, 2009 **ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DUSTIN JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN STEVE KOLBECK, VICE CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER

COMMISSION STAFF
Rolayne Ailts Wiest
John Smith
Kara Semmler
Greg Rislov
Bob Knadle
Nathan Solem

APPEARANCES

James E. Moore Brett M. Koenecke appearing on behalf of the Applicant appearing as co-counsel on behalf of the

Applicant

James White

(by telephone) appearing as co-counsel on

behalf of the Applicant

Paul Blackburn

appearing on behalf of Dakota Rural

Action

Caitlin F. Collier

appearing as co-counsel on behalf of

Dakota Rural Action

Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 23rd day of September, 2009, commencing at 8:30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We will call this Ad Hoc Meeting of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission to order. This is September 23 at about 8:30 in the morning, and we're in the State Capitol. This is the time and place that was noticed for this meeting.

2.4

I am Dusty Johnson. My colleagues, Commissioner Steve Kolbeck and Gary Hanson, are also here this morning. We only have one item on our agenda that does deal with the TransCanada Keystone XL case.

But the question before us today deals with discovery. And my thought, subject to check with my colleagues and the parties, is that perhaps we'd allow each side a few minutes to give a general overview of their arguments, but then we would after that was completed really take each discovery request individually and allow arguments.

Is that acceptable? Great.

So with that, we sort of have it a little bit of order here, but if no one objects, I would treat DRA, Plains Justice, as the moving party and allow you to go first. The order of filing was a little different, but I think that makes sense to key up that way.

So with that, go ahead. Proceed.

MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Commissioner Johnson, and thank you to the other Commissioners as well. I

appreciate the structure -- I appreciate the structure you've suggested, and I think it's the way we should proceed.

2.2

In terms of the general overview of our arguments, essentially what TransCanada has proposed -- or has argued in many of these different discovery disputes is that the Commission is without jurisdiction to consider these issues.

And I think it's important for the Commission to decide some of these jurisdictional issues because the Commission should -- I mean, obviously values its own time, and we are concerned that Interveners, TransCanada, and others not spend time on issues that the Commission believes is not jurisdictional.

So to the extent that these issues are nonjurisdictional, we would like the Commission to rule on which issues it would like to take testimony and evidence on and which issues it would like to not take evidence and testimony on so that we don't end up producing testimony or evidence that the Commission does not choose to consider.

I also think it's important for the landowners who are involved here to know clearly what kinds of issues and what kinds of relief the Commission is empowered to and capable of providing and what kind of

issues it would like to hear from landowners so that they don't provide information to the Commission not understanding that the Commission's jurisdiction is limited in a particular area, the Commission has limited powers to remedy their particular concerns.

Obviously there are different federal forums, and there's other ways that the landowners can participate to make sure that the concerns are heard and considered and addressed.

In terms of the overall structure of how we proceed, there is the first -- there's a general objection related to the scope of discovery and to TransCanada and its affiliates. You know, the actual Applicant, TransCanada Keystone, is, as I understand it, a purpose developed -- a purpose setup organization, company, to develop the Keystone Pipeline system.

And because of that, it itself does not operate pipelines, and instead it's corporate parent has. And that's the way these kind of structures are set up. But because of that, it can't be expected to have all the documents relative to TransCanada's operating experience.

So, for example, and different kinds of matters related to TransCanada's effectiveness of its spill prevention programs, for example, it's looking at TransCanada documents, not at Keystone Applicant's

documents itself. So that issue is first, and I suggest you address that. And then, yes, we can move through the other issues there.

As I said the primary concern we --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Just a reminder to those folks on the telephone that you are coming through so please mute your phones when you're not speaking.

Apologies, Mr. Blackburn. Go ahead.

MR. BLACKBURN: We would very much appreciate clarity from the Commission about which issues in our discovery are jurisdictional and which issues are not. And we're prepared to argue those.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. TransCanada.

MR. MOORE: Good morning. Thank you.

James Moore on behalf of TransCanada.

I agree with you that some of these issues in the abstract are not nearly as helpful to talk about as just discussing the particular discovery requests and the responses and the objections, and I think that will be more productive than sort of a general overview.

My only opening comments would be that

TransCanada has nothing to hide in terms of discovery.

There were 24 document requests that were propounded by

Dakota Rural Action. TransCanada served its objections

early so that those could be resolved as quickly as

possible if there were issues. We timely produced a great volume of information. I brought along a couple of bankers boxes full of the documents that we produced today.

Of the 24 requests, there were only two subject areas where TransCanada produced no documents. One was with response -- with respect to the Emergency Response Plan, and the other was a series of requests all related to demand.

And aside from those, TransCanada has provided a lot of information, and I think that at this proceeding the burden is really on Dakota Rural Action to explain why either the responses are insufficient in the cases where TransCanada produced documents and Dakota Rural Action is here seeking more documents or to explain why the objections that TransCanada raised with respect to relevance or jurisdiction or federal preemption are without merit.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Moore. We've got a number of other parties. We will just see if -- it doesn't appear as though any of them are here in person or on the telephone. We'll pause to see if they are.

Okay. Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Staff does not have any opening comments to make

but would reserve any comments as you go through the individual discovery requests.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: If at any point another

Intervener joins the line or comes in, please, anybody
who sees them let me know. Otherwise, we'll just presume
that they're not here and not participating, and
certainly if we figure out they're here, then we'll work
them in.

So with that, I'm kind of working off Dakota Rural Action's motion as a template. We'd take it in that order, which was just the numeric order of the requests that were under dispute.

So with that, we'll bring up request number 1, related to the damage caused by a crude oil pipeline rupture.

Mr. Blackburn.

2.0

MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Commissioner. I understand that you can see the documents that -- the couple of boxes that were provided by TransCanada. But I think the issue -- first off, the majority of those, probably three-quarters to, you know, 80 percent of them, relate to this particular request.

And I disagree with TransCanada about the request, not in terms of the volume because the volume is certainly there but in terms of the quality of the

documents and the responsiveness of the documents.

In particular, I went through the documents, and a lot of them are somewhat marginally relevant. The discovery request we propounded was really directed at trying to figure out setbacks, setbacks about how far the physical damage of the pipeline could be in a rupture.

So the oil we know is up to 1,600 psi. And if it blows, the oil could be projected a long distance, catch fire, and there is a certain physical damage that is caused by pipelines when they rupture.

We've seen pictures of, for example, a pipeline that was shot by a bullet, and it spewed oil hundreds of feet from that little hole. And obviously it's an above-ground pipeline so it's different. And we've seen pictures of an oil pipeline rupture in Washington state where the oil was jetting out of the ground long distance and covering everything along in all directions with oil.

And landowners have a very simple question, and that is how far could the physical damage from the pipeline spread if it ruptures. And, you know, that would include fire or other kinds of immediate damages. And that I think is a very reasonable question they have. Because even though the federal construction setback is 50 feet, that was set in 1981. It was set for sort of as a one-size-fits-all setback for construction. And the

pipelines back then didn't operate -- weren't as large and operate at the same pressures and temperatures typically. So they would like to know what the zone of damage is for this pipeline.

Because a lot of land it goes through is not under any particular zoning, other than the, you know, agricultural zoning and the farmers and ranchers are free to build a lot of structures there. And they would like to know for their own purposes why -- you know, how far away they should be from the pipeline to make sure that whatever they build is not potentially threatened by the pipeline in terms of its direct and immediate physical damages under a fire that could be caused by the pipeline.

So that was what we were getting at. Now I understand that the discovery request could be read extremely broadly, but if you look at it as a whole, it talks about the distance that oil could be projected through the air.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Maybe bring the whole base a little closer Mr. Blackburn. I think that will help.

MR. BLACKBURN: So and the other -- how far the fire could spread from it, what kinds of risks of fire there are, what the effect of projecting the oil would be on houses, those sorts of things. And that is the kind

of information we were seeking.

And the discovery request could be read to ask for everything related to any issue about damage from a pipeline, including, you know, damage to water supplies or surface water impacts or whatever. And that really wasn't what we were getting at.

And to the extent that the discovery request is read as a whole, I think it's clear that it was focusing on this issue of setbacks.

And, unfortunately, TransCanada decided to read that as a kitchen sink request for everything related to pipeline damage. And that's unfortunate they spent time responding to it. If they had called me, asked me what we were trying to get it, if they needed more clarity, I'd be happy to talk to them about that.

And then the kinds of documents they replied with some of them were nonlegible. Some of the maps they provided were colored maps copied in black-and-white without a key. You look, you know, at the small words. You can't really read them. And they're not useful.

Also they provided things like the Big Stone II

Power Plant Application. And I have no idea why the

Big Stone II Power Plant Application is related to damage

from pipelines. I mean, there may be something in that

Application that has to do with oil spills from the power

plant. You know, I don't really know. I didn't bother reading through it because it didn't seem to be at all relevant to this proceeding.

So and there are a lot of other documents like that that just really were filler. And I didn't try to go through and index and document every single why every one of them was nonresponsive or illegible or, you know, irrelevant because there were 232 of them, and that would have taken a very long time to index them.

I did that for Exhibit B, which was responsive to our request 2. But I didn't have time to do it. As it was, it took a long time.

Also the documents provided -- this, I suppose, what people do. But the documents were provided in large piles of white paper with white separating pages between them. They weren't stapled or Bates-stamped. They weren't -- so basically I had to flip through page by page to figure out where one document started, and it took a lot of time, frankly, to go through and try to organize the material.

So there's a lot of -- the quantity is there.

Undoubtedly, the quantity is there. The quality, there's nothing there that I can tell that's related to setbacks.

I didn't see anything related to how far this pipeline or any engineering about how far this pipeline might impact

the zone of danger on this pipeline or other pipelines as far as I can tell.

There may have been things in there, but it was so hard to get through it all. So what we're looking for is specific information that would help the farmers and ranchers understand where the setbacks are there. The other thing you should know is other communities have looked at this issue and have imposed local land use zoning requirements to protect communities.

So, for example, the City of Austin, Texas has a 500-foot setback from hazardous liquid and natural gas pipelines for things like nursing homes, day care centers, hospitals, you know, those kinds of facilities that you don't want to necessarily have it tooth by jowl with an industrial facility of this type.

And, you know, the Commission may want to consider either itself or encouraging the counties to say that there should be reasonable land use provisions to protect certainly kinds of vulnerable communities and facilities from potential risk. It may be a small risk, but do you really want a hospital built right next door to a pipeline like this? And we believe the answer to that is no.

Or do you want a local first responder, you know, a fire station, built close to these or some other

kind of water treatment plant or pumping station or water supplies near these kinds of facilities. And we believe they should not be allowed near these kinds of facilities.

So, I mean, that is totally within the Commission's jurisdiction to decide how we'd like to proceed and protect communities beyond what that 50-foot federal threshold setback is.

Thank you.

MR. MOORE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. TransCanada did not file any objection to this particular request. It was a very broad request asking for all documents concerning the potential damage caused by a crude oil pipeline rupture.

We went to the people working on the KXL project and said please give us the documents you have that are responsive to this request. I got the documents. Ι indexed them. I reviewed them. I thought that they were all responsive. We produced them.

I don't know what more Dakota Rural Action wants, and I don't know what more TransCanada can do. Because we don't have additional documents in the Keystone files that are responsive to this request. We've produced everything that we have.

And, in fact, Mr. Blackburn's objection seems to be that we produced too much. It's just not what he was hoping to find. And I don't have any control over that. We produced the documents we have that are responsive to the request.

And, in fact, Mr. Blackburn's argument goes so far as to say at the bottom of page 11 of his most recent filing that it is possible that some relevant information's buried somewhere in the thousands of pages of documents provided.

We didn't object to this. We produced the documents. I don't know what more we can do.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Kara Semmler for staff. You know, I think we have to take the Applicant at face value when it says it produced the information that it has. If it has nothing else responsive, so be it.

It does seem that the analysis of how far a crude oil spill -- I mean, that seems like an analysis that could be done by an expert of Dakota Rural Action and that would be part of its testimony if it thinks it is relevant to the Application.

MR. WHITE: Commissioner Johnson, can you hear me? This is Jim White.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. White.

MR. WHITE: I wonder if I could just add one thing to Mr. Moore's comments.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okav.

MR. WHITE: There is one document that's arguably responsible that was not produced, and that was a document that's subject to the objection to the extent that materials involve high consequence areas.

There's a document called Evaluation of Risk to High Consequence Areas, which defined portions of the project, which if a spill occurred, would have the potential to reach a high consequence area. And as we dealt with in the initial Keystone proceeding, documents that disclose the location of high consequence areas are subject to confidentiality at the direction of the DOT PHMSA because they identify high consequence areas and we obtained high consequence locational information from DOT PHMSA subject to a confidentiality requirement. So that single document was not produced.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

With that, questions?

Mr. White, Mr. Moore, I mean, in previous proceedings we've had, siting proceedings dealing with high consequence areas, I mean, opposing counsel has had an opportunity to review that information subject to some confidentiality agreements and some very stringent

protocols.

Is there a reason why those protocols won't work in this situation with that particular document?

MR. WHITE: Essentially the same reason that we discussed in the last Keystone proceeding, which is the commitment that we make to DOT PHMSA not to disclose this information outside of government agencies once we receive it from them.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, somebody, anybody, remind me what happened last time then. Because it seems to me that Mr. Hohn in particular had an opportunity to review that information.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Well, again, I regret to say I didn't bring the protective order from the first case here. I'm going to just go on my recollection, Mr. White, is that we did not allow the turning over of such documents that identify HC areas to the Interveners in the first case.

But we did establish a procedure by which -- and this is my recollection, and it was subject to these people having to come here and under our custody and with observation from us have access to those documents for the purposes of review and but not to copy and take away copies.

And, again, I'm just going from memory, but that's what I recall. We did not have an utter prohibition concerning the ability of Interveners to at least look at and understand what those documents contained.

Does anybody disagree with that characterization?

MR. KOENECKE: Commissioners and staff, this is Brett Koenecke. That recitation by Mr. Smith comports completely with my recollection. My recollection is that Mr. Hohn did come down to the Commission offices and review the documents with a member of the staff. I don't know who that was, but that's my recollection.

MR. BLACKBURN: And, Commissioner, if I may, this may be simplified too because, as I said, we are not seeking the location of high consequence areas. And to the extent that that is the primary concern of PHMSA, we are not looking for that particular kind of information.

What we're looking for is any information about how far the physical damage of the pipeline would project. That may be able to be provided in a redacted copy or just the sections that are relevant. So I think that is one way to resolve that.

Another issue that we didn't address, which I'm not sure if the Commission would like to, is whether this

is just from the files of Applicant or whether this is from the files of Applicant and its corporate parent,

TransCanada.

What's the scope of they say they have only these documents? I believe that the Applicant has only these documents. Is that just Applicant's documents, or does that include TransCanada's corporate parent's documents or their affiliates that may have produced this kind of engineering?

MR. WHITE: All right. So the document search on this particular item was done broadly, but given that TransCanada Keystone is the only TransCanada entity with oil pipeline experience, that's where the search generated the responsive documents.

And I guess with response to Mr. Blackburn's further comment, if, you know, his interest is in seeing this risk assessment absent the HCA locational information, that may be a good compromise result here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Other questions?

If there aren't any -- oh, yes. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As -- I'm understanding that this information on air travel propulsion, distance of -- and I see crude oil in my notes. I'm not sure if that's exactly what was asked for, if it was crude oil or if it was defined

differently. And I forget in your request.

MR. BLACKBURN: Crude oil.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: But assuming that we hear it's different substances, assuming that Keystone is going to be operating this pipeline, they certainly should have an idea of to an extent the substance going through it. And assuming that, then they should be able to I would think in their own interest know the air travel distance of the substance.

Are you telling us you just don't have that information?

MR. WHITE: This was a document request. So it wasn't in the form of an Interrogatory. So, I mean, my response would be that we do not have documents that would be responsive to that particular request relating to air travel of crude oil.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm puzzled by that. I'm just -- I'm really surprised at that. I just can't believe that you don't have some information written down somewhere that shows the distance of the air travel.

You certainly have that information. It's not in someone's head. What is the disconnect here? Why am I not understanding that there isn't a document showing this information?

MR. WHITE: Well, typically a crude oil leak is

not propelled through the air but rather leaks out either onto the ground or whatever the environment is where the leak occurs. And that's the focus of leak assessments.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: But you have a document of some sort setting that information out, do you not?

MR. WHITE: Yes, we do.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Has that been shared with the other parties?

MR. WHITE: Yes. The risk assessment and spill volume analysis with respect to potential crude oil leaks was shared. The additional piece of that is the Risk to High Consequence Area document that we discussed. And, you know, it has high consequence area location information in it. However, it could be provided without that locational information.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. I mean, it sort of seems as though the parties have -- that we're close to an agreement on this. Maybe we're even there.

You know, let's throw this out and see if anybody disagrees, but that that risk assessment of risk to HCAs would be provided, specific locations would be redacted, and that, Mr. White, it's my understanding then that information could be provided outside of a protective order; is that right?

1 MR. WHITE: Correct. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Does that not work for 3 anyone? 4 MR. BLACKBURN: That's acceptable to DRA. 5 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okav. Then I would so move 6 that with regard to discovery request number 1. 7 Any discussion? 8 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 9 Hanson. 10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 12 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion 14 carries 3-0. 15 All right. Request number 2 deals with the 16 potential for pipelines to lose their earth cover. 17 Mr. Blackburn. 18 Again, here the issue the DRA MR. BLACKBURN: 19 landowners are concerned about is a pretty common sense 20 issue. The pipeline for safety reasons is buried beneath 21 the ground. It's supposed to be -- likely be required to 22 have a 4-foot minimum depth of cover over it. 23 We know that over time pipeline -- soil erodes. 24 Pipelines tend to come to the surface. And, in fact, I

was visiting with an attorney in Iowa after coffee hour

25

at church a couple of weeks ago, and he was representing landowners, farmers in an action dealing with a Williams Pipeline that had come above the ground and they were worried about having their implements hook the pipeline as they went over it. These were very old pipelines.

But what we're concerned about is the life of the proposed pipeline is claimed to be 50 plus years. Over 50 years soil can erode a substantial amount. And some parts of the state of South Dakota have highly erodible soils. And depending on how well remediation works or other kinds of climatic events happen, the pipeline could have less than 4 feet of soil. It could come close to the surface.

So they'd like to know where the risks are for that kind of erosion to happen. They'd also like to know what kind of monitoring TransCanada will do to ensure that that 4-foot depth of cover is maintained over time. Because at this point we understand it's a helicopter flyover. I don't think helicopter flyovers can determine how deep the soil is over a pipeline.

And, third, they'd like to know what happens if the pipeline loses cover. Because then it -- my understanding is they would be required to bring in more soil to maintain that 4-foot depth of cover, and that could obviously interfere with farming and ranching

operations. So, you know, that is the core of the concern here.

Now the response -- the documents we were provided by TransCanada included things like earthquake records for Montana and South Dakota, Nebraska. It included general descriptions of how land slides happen and other kinds of general geologic information. It also included the study about where coal deposits are in South Dakota.

I don't understand why -- I mean, some of the documents did not seem to be relevant or -- and/or helpful. Other documents were somewhat helpful in a very conceptual sense. But none of the documents addressed how is the monitoring going to occur or how it is -- what happens if the depth of cover is lost. Except for there is some language in -- the Keystone I Construction Mitigation and Reclamation Plan that described for that pipeline in very general terms how this process had worked to maintain depth of cover.

They're very conclusory and summary statements, and the farmers and ranchers would like to know in more detail how that's going to be maintained and what happens if the depth of cover is lost.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada, your comments with regard to request number 2.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, we asked Keystone personnel to search files for documents responsive to the broad request, which were all documents concerning the potential for pipelines to lose their earth cover due to soil erosion, movement of earth, or movement of the pipe. And we produced the documents that were collected in response to that request.

We did not state any objection to this particular request. And I think that Dakota Rural Action's response indicates that while they didn't find exactly the information they were hoping, there were responsive documents that were produced. Again, this was a document request, not an Interrogatory asking for a particular explanation of how things that are indicated in the Construction Mitigation Reclamation Plan, for instance, would be done.

And at the top of page 15 of its motion DRA says that they believe that TransCanada has greater information about monitoring depth of cover. And I think that to come before the Public Utilities Commission and say TransCanada or Keystone has an obligation to produce additional documents, there needs to be some greater showing than that, given that we did not object to this request and produced the documents that were located and

found in Keystone's files.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: I don't know that staff really can add a whole lot to the arguments made other than again to take the Applicant at face value. It says it has nothing left that's responsive. Staff would have no reason to know whether it does or doesn't.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Questions? Commissioner Kolbeck?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Yes. I think what DRA is after is basically with any other utilities or any other of the thousands of miles of pipeline, there is going to be some monitoring done. Spring rains will cause erosion. Anything could cause a shift, maybe some settling.

Does Keystone have any -- is that an agreement with the landowners, anything that you could produce that way that says we will maintain the land, anything like that?

MR. MOORE: Well, actually, Commissioner, I think that that issue is addressed in the Construction Mitigation Reclamation Plan, which is referred to in DRA's response. And, I mean, the document says that TransCanada takes efforts to monitor that very issue after construction of the pipeline.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Okay. And that was my understanding also. So what is it, I guess, Mr. Blackburn, that you're after?

MR. BLACKBURN: Well, what kind of monitoring?

I mean, all they say is they are planning to do

monitoring. Does that mean coming on the land with metal

detectors that can determine how deep the soil cover is?

Does that mean they need regular access every few years?

It's not that -- we agree we understand they plan to do monitoring, are required to do monitoring.

Landowners have no idea what that monitoring looks like.

And they would like to know because if they are going to monitor, we believe they have to come on landowners' land to do so. And landowners would like to know, you know, what that monitoring looks like.

And then also if depth of cover fails, who pays for it and how is it fixed and those kind of issues.

Again, it's a very practical issue. Just saying there will be monitoring, trust us, it's good enough, is not want landowners are looking for. And we believe that the technology is understood about how to monitor for actual depth of cover and what kinds of equipment you need to bring on land and how often it should be done and those sorts of things.

The Construction Mitigation Reclamation Plan

says there will be visual observations of erosion. So that's more like you fly over with a helicopter, you see that there's been a storm or rain and adding to erosion at this particular place.

Well, when you're talking about erosion on farmland, especially cropland, the erosion can happen over time. And there isn't any dramatic appearance of loss of soil cover that you can see from the air. And also the same thing can happen on rangeland, that over time the soil can slowly erode, and that is the kind of issue that they would like more information about.

So it's not just merely monitoring but it's the kind of monitoring, when it would happen, how often it would happen, and what would be the result if they have to bring on more soil to fix the depth of cover.

MR. MOORE: May I just respond to that? Again, this was a document request, not an Interrogatory, and many of the issues Mr. Blackburn is talking about can be addressed through testimony.

But I just want to point out that the face of the CMRP, which is quoted in DRA's own brief says that there are going to be methods to monitor soil erosion other than helicopter flyovers. And one of those which is principally mentioned is direct communication with the landowners. The document says Keystone shall maintain communication with the landowner and/or tenant throughout the operating life of the pipeline to allow expedient communication of issues and problems as they occur.

The document also says that any erosion identified shall be reclaimed as expediently as is practicable by Keystone or by compensation of the landowner to reclaim the area.

1.5

2.0

So I think those issues are addressed. To the extent that Mr. Blackburn wants further development, I think it's an appropriate issue for testimony.

MR. BLACKBURN: Commissioner, I understand that we weren't looking for an Interrogatory on that. I was just surprised that there weren't responsive documents that talk about what kind of equipment would be used to do that kind of monitoring.

And it seems like from that language that the landowners have been obligated to monitor that themselves, that, yes, they will be in communication with landowners. But does that mean that the landowners, that they're responsible for going out and figuring out what that depth of cover is and insisting it should be done, or should TransCanada have that burden.

And landowners believe TransCanada should have that burden of monitoring and maintaining the depth of cover, and they shouldn't trust the landowners to keep

1 | track of how deep that pipeline is on an annual basis.

1.3

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Moore, at some point you had said that Keystone doesn't have that information.

Was the document request for this request done more broadly?

MR. MOORE: It was not, based on the general objection Keystone raised. And since Keystone is the Applicant here, the request was made to the people working on the Keystone XL project.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I wonder if -- I mean, this may be a recurring issue. I mean, one wonders if we shouldn't take up and have some ruling on to what extent the corporate parent should be subject to these discovery requests.

Mr. Smith, thoughts.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I mean, in the end, you know, I took a look at the legal authority that Mr. Blackburn cited. And I -- you know, I found it to be in accord with the argument you make, subject to -- with some subject-tos. And they're right in the cases that you cite.

And those subject-tos -- the problem with the subject-tos, like all discovery requests, we always end up back in the same spot. And that is breadth and burden. And, you know, I think that's where this cuts.

And, you know, without some inquiry of TransCanada on this particular issue, I have no idea, you know, what's involved in that, what would be involved.

And, again, whether anything more could be gained than what they could gain through cross-examination, I'm not sure. But, you know, maybe that's where we ought to take this, is down that specific path.

Because basically what the cases say is that discovery doesn't end at an affiliate level. But there's some subject-tos. And that is showing that -- first of all, is availability and access. And some other subject-tos are reasonableness of breadth and assessment of burden.

So I think that's where it cuts. And I apologize, Mr. Chairman, that everything always ends up in that mushy realm. But that's exactly what the case says, and it even characterizes it that way.

MR. WHITE: Commissioner Johnson, if I could comment on that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. White.

MR. WHITE: I guess one of the reasons for -CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Actually, Mr. White, let's
just hold on a second. Because if we're going to open up
a legal debate on this topic, I want to make sure we

maintain the proper order here. So hold on just a second.

Mr. Smith, what I was asking specifically was, does it sort of make sense to take this particular issue -- hold that in abeyance until we determine what the Commission feels about this affiliate corporate shield legal issue?

MR. SMITH: Sure. If you want to have a general discussion about that, I think that's fine. And if you want to make sort of a broad ruling, that would be fine. Again, I just want to point out, though, that the cases that are out there, and there aren't -- I mean, there's not a whole lot of authority, but in the end you always get down to the issue of having to rule on everything somewhat case by case because of the limiting parts of it.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Well, maybe we won't make one motion, and maybe we will, depending on what my colleagues want to do, that deal with this issue specifically, but because it's germane to this particular request, let's go ahead and take some comments on it.

We've read the briefs. Is there anything in addition to what you've included here that the Commission should know about this issue about corporate affiliate and to what extent their discovery requests apply to the

corporate parent?

MR. BLACKBURN: I would just emphasize I agree with Mr. Smith that there is a certain amount of judgment and discretion involved here in terms of how far discovery should reach.

At the same time I don't believe here it would be particularly onerous for TransCanada Keystone to inquire of its engineering staff and Canada about, you know, what kinds of monitoring equipment is available to ensure depth of cover and, you know, how that process should happen.

I don't see this as being particularly onerous, and I see that they regularly have access to documents from their corporate parent and are probably in fairly close communication with that corporate parent about a lot of these matters.

So in a very practical sense I think there's an engineering staff in Canada. There's probably engineering staff in other places perhaps, and that some of this issues is not that complicated and not that burdensome or onerous for them to cross the border with a telephone call or an e-mail and find out.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. Moore,

Mr. White -- since I cut you off, Mr. White, please go
ahead.

```
1
              MR. WHITE:
                          Thank you. Yeah.
                                             I quess I have
2
     to -- I just have to note that it appears that
3
     Mr. Blackburn has suddenly redefined this request.
                                                          The
 4
     original request was for all documents relating to soil
     erosion, movement of earth, movement of pipe, and means
5
6
     to monitor depth of pipeline.
7
              If we went back and searched for documents that
8
     touch on those topics across the 63,000 miles of pipeline
9
     that TransCanada operates in North America, it would be a
10
    massive request. It's not a phone call across the
11
     border.
              If the request is being redefined to seek only
12
     information relating to monitoring equipment and how
13
    monitoring might be done, that's a completely different
14
     question, and it's, you know, considerably more
15
     manageable to be done on a corporate basis.
16
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.
                                        Thank you.
17
              Mr. Moore, anything to add?
18
              MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Chairman.
19
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                Okay.
20
              Okay. Other questions? If not, perhaps
21
              MR. SMITH: I have a question.
22
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Go ahead.
23
              MR. SMITH:
                          I mean, he threw out something like
24
     an olive branch there, Mr. Blackburn. What's your
25
     response?
```

1 MR. BLACKBURN: I think that that would be 2 acceptable. Like I said, there are three basic issues 3 that we're getting to here I think that are the core of this. And that is the monitoring, how to maintain what 5 happens practically to maintain depth of cover and any 6 liability or who pays for all of that. Because, you 7 know, if you're going to be doing that during the cropping -- during the summertime, it could damage farm 8 and ranch income. 10 So those are the issues we're looking at. 11 to the extent we narrow them to those particular issues, 12 that's acceptable to DRA. 13 14

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: For discussion sake, I will move that the Commission approve the Motion to Compel for request 2 with regard to monitoring and remediation and that that would also include search through the corporate parent but to deny request number 2 on all other areas.

Discussion?

Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote.

Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion

25 carries 3-0.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

With that, we'll proceed to request number 3 which deals with the abandonment of pipelines.

DRA.

MR. BLACKBURN: Again, this is a very practical concern for landowners along the pipeline route. Once pipelines reach the end of their useful life, which all inevitably do, that pipe is still there, and the landowners would like to have more clarity and understanding about it and are seeking documents about what happens to that pipe after it's at the end of its operational life.

Having a 3-foot diameter pipe, you know, at that point hopefully at 4 feet underground could present safety and problems of other kinds -- have other kinds of impacts on the activity, use of land along the pipeline route.

The question becomes, you know, what kinds of options are there for covering the pipe be addressed. And it can either be left in place. It can be left in place and filled with some kind of solid material like gravel or other kinds of grouts. Or it can removed.

And what happens in a particular location is something of a judgment call that the landowners would like to know their rights to be involved in.

Also removal of the pipe or any of these

remediation efforts does result in cost. And the landowners do not want to be stuck with a large white elephant across their property in 50, 60, 70 years. And this issue is not -- has not been an issue that's -- it's come up in other parts of the country, but because not many of these kinds of large pipelines have been abandoned at this point, it isn't that there's a lot of evidence or data about the problems that are coming up. But we do know that for smaller, older pipelines that there have been issues and problems with abandonment.

And there's a real set of legal things that can develop around these abandonment issues. Because although the landowner owns the land, the utility has the easement. The utility also owns the steel pipe in the ground. There's case precedent on that. So when the pipe is no longer used, the question becomes, well, when does the land revert to the landowner and who has responsibility for addressing the pipe.

TransCanada provided a single document on this relating to its internal policy. We understand that TransCanada's parent company has been involved in a rather detailed study in Canada and regulatory process in Canada to determine how -- what kinds of -- how to deal with this abandonment issue and we should pay for the costs of when the pipe needs to be either removed or

filled or dealt with when it's done being used.

2.2

So we believe there's a fair amount of information in TransCanada's corporate files about this abandonment issue. And yet all we've received is simply their internal policy. We also expect that because they have a corporate policy on abandonment that they did some kind of investigation and research to develop that policy. And, therefore, they probably have more documents and information about, you know, what the options are and how to address abandonment issues.

So we don't -- we don't believe that the only document that TransCanada should provide here is just their own internal corporate policy. We believe that's a fairly self-serving document and that there are a lot of -- that there's a great deal of other information about this particular issue.

And, again, it's a very practical issue. The landowners in western South Dakota, many of them have been there for a long time. They are very concerned about the land that they live on. They take care of it. They maintain the land. And they are concerned about not leaving a big white elephant of an underground 3-foot diameter pipeline running through their land for their grandkids to deal with.

And I think recently in Canada they recently

required that the companies determine how much it would cost to deal with these abandonment issues. Because the big problem here is that it's very expensive to remove pipe from the ground. And the farmers and ranchers do not want to be stuck with the costs of removing the pipe.

2.4

Also there's a good chance that TransCanada will transfer the ownership of this pipeline at some point to another company that may or may not have money to pay for the abandonment costs. So the Canadians again decided to set up a special fund that all consumers essentially paid for through the cost of the oil transport to make sure that landowners weren't stuck with the burden that was a benefit to the entire country without having the country pay them to make sure that they're made whole when this entire pipeline effort -- the life of the pipeline ends.

And I've heard things that it could be used for telecommunications equipment. You know, possibly. It could be used for other kinds of purposes. It's possible. But that doesn't mean it will be used for those purposes. And the landowners are looking for documents from TransCanada about this abandonment issue. We believe they have more, and we believe they should produce them.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again,

this is a request to which TransCanada and Keystone did not object. The document that was produced is a operating procedure of TransCanada. And my understanding is that there are no additional corporate documents that TransCanada has related to that operating procedure.

Mr. Blackburn to some extent has again redefined this request and talks on page 16 of his motion about TransCanada -- not Keystone's but TransCanada's participation in the Land Matters Consultative Initiative before the Canadian National Energy Board.

To the extent that there are public documents related to that proceeding, they were developed in connection with Canadian regulatory matters. The operating procedure that was produced in response to the request was designed by TransCanada to comply with applicable Canadian and United States codes.

And certainly that document is responsive.

There's not an argument about the relevance of abandonment to the proceedings before the PUC. But we thought that at the time that this request was made and answered that it was a legitimate request and it was adequately answered.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Again, staff doesn't know whether there are or are not documents in TransCanada's office

that are relevant here. So nothing further to add.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Questions?

So, Mr. Moore, I want to make sure that I understand you right. You're saying you searched through the corporate entity and that no other documents existed that were responsive to this request and more specifically what Mr. Blackburn has said today he's trying to get to.

MR. MOORE: Jim White, correct me if I'm wrong because you actually made the request. But my understanding is that there are no additional corporate documents related to TransCanada's operating procedure concerning abandonment.

MR. WHITE: That's right. So just to make sure that we're clear on this, we did not search the corporate files for all documents concerning abandonment of pipelines, which was the request, but I did refocus in on internal documents that would support the TransCanada operating procedure that was produced, and I was advised that there were no internal documents that -- in addition to that particular TOP.

You know, I do concede that TransCanada participated in the Land Matters Consultative Initiative before the NEB. As to whether there are additional corporate documents that "concern abandonment of

pipelines," I have not made that inquiry.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: The work product from that process, the final work product that was done with Canadian regulators, that's a public document?

MR. WHITE: Correct. I believe there are a number of public documents that came out of that NEB proceeding.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Blackburn, I mean, what say you? If they don't have anything else and the work product from the process standard took is public, do you have knowledge of something specific else that they should be offering up?

MR. BLACKBURN: On the web, what's available from the Land Matters Consultative Initiative is, as far as I can tell, only their order from a few other supporting procedural documents about the process that they're going through.

But I was not able to locate, for example, discussions of the kinds of impacts that -- adverse impacts that abandoned pipelines could have on communities. What they have on-line is just simply their final order that doesn't discuss all the facts in detail. It just has conclusions about how they're going to address it.

So I couldn't find, you know, what kinds of

impacts there would be, what the options should be, when certain kinds of remedial processes should be undertaken, whether you should fill a pipeline or whether you should remove it.

They looked at a lot of different detail. There were two streams. One was the financial impacts of pipelines, and one was the physical impacts of pipelines. The final document for the entire process on-line does not mean that it's easy to get access to or I have access to all the documents that went into that process preceding it, which was quite a long process.

And my understanding is that TransCanada has those kinds of documents. Because it wasn't just the final order that, you know, is relevant here, but it was all the other evidence that was brought to bear in that Canadian proceeding that is useful here.

And that material is available somewhere.

TransCanada I assume has it. But it is not available generally to the public or on-line.

Now if I call up and request from the Canadian government that they send all of that material, I suppose I could do that. But if TransCanada has it already and it's subject to discovery, then they should have disclosed that material to us as part of discovery.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commissioners, questions?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I guess my question goes to Mr. Smith. Is that part of the question that they asked? Is that part of the discovery that they actually asked, or is Mr. Blackburn actually into another realm of this study that the Canadian government has?

Because if TransCanada says they produced all that they had, should have he asked a different question pertaining to this study?

MR. SMITH: Well, again, the request is very broad. So documents like that would be within the scope of the original, I think. You know, Mr. White or Mr. Moore can argue with me, but it's so broad that it -- it's hard to imagine anything dealing with abandonment that wouldn't be within that.

MR. WHITE: These documents would fall within the scope of the request. They were not produced because they are -- they were not Keystone documents. However, I would add that TransCanada does have certain documents that came out of the Land Matters Consultative Initiative that are in addition to the final NEB order that Mr. Blackburn has referred to.

And if it would facilitate resolution of this issue, I would certainly undertake to provide him with the other documents from that proceeding that are in TransCanada's corporate possession.

MR. SMITH: Does that get us there, or --

MR. BLACKBURN: Provided that the definition isn't just the public documents but also other documents that are discoverable that are perhaps not as part of the Docket of that particular proceeding that we believe that all of those documents should be disclosed, and we do not think it's unduly burdensome because, you know, I assume that they have those kinds of materials in their files and they're organized.

This is a very important matter. The Canadians have done a lot of work on it. The Commission should have the benefit of all the relevant factual information about abandonment TransCanada has in its files wherever those files are located. And I believe those are just primarily in Canada because that's as far as we know the only place that TransCanada has been involved in such an event and proceeding.

I think the other thing I should add is, you know, I did some research to try to find out whether the abandonment issue had been addressed in the United States. And it really hasn't been addressed, but there have been problems that have propped up around the country because of abandonment. Iowa has a statute on abandonment. Kansas has a statute on abandonment, only related to the abandonment of construction easements, not

utility easements. I believe Texas and Louisiana do a little bit of work on abandonment too.

Because of all of these pipelines in Texas, they just have this ongoing problem of dealing with abandoned pipelines. There's is this financial structure set up in Texas, I think -- I haven't been able to track all of this down -- related to abandonment. So it is been the state's prerogatives to do that. The material is there. We think we can get this material to you from TransCanada.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any other questions? If not, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I guess I'll motion in Dakota Rural Action's request number 3 to grant the discovery request for TransCanada to supply all the relative materials that they have in the I believe -- I'll just stop right there.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: National Energy Board. Both public and documents that haven't yet been made public regarding that process?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Exactly. Not limited to documents that can be found in the public domain.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any discussion on the pending motion?

Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote.

1 Hanson. 2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 5 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion 6 carries 3-0. 7 I sort of feel like the different parties are 8 also getting into the habit of reciting most of what they 9 And so if we could -- I mean, the Commissioners 10 have read that. I don't mind a brief summary of your 11 argument, but if we could highlight the specifics and add 12 any other important legal points maybe you didn't 13 include. But if we can keep this -- I mean, we have 14 read. 15 So with that, we'll move to request number 5, 16 which deals with liability for damages. 17 DRA. 18 MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Commissioner. 19 The issue here is frankly not so much one of 20 what's been responded to so far but one of jurisdiction, 21 that TransCanada has in their objections, said they 22 objected to this request because the Commission has no 23 jurisdiction to consider this issue. The issue of

Now I understand the Commission investigated

liability of TransCanada for oil spills.

24

this in the Keystone I proceeding and, therefore, DRA believes that it is jurisdictional. However, if TransCanada believes that it has an argument that this subject matter is not jurisdictional to the Commission, then we would like to have a ruling now about whether the subject issues related to liability are subject to jurisdiction so that we don't go to the effort of putting testimony in on this matter and then have TransCanada argue later that it's not jurisdictional.

We might as well decide, you know, up front whether the Commission would like information relevant to the probable liability. And I understand that the Commission last -- in the Keystone I proceeding looked at liability. But what we're particularly concerned about is not just the technical definition of liability or the scope of liability for TransCanada but also the procedure for getting resources -- you know, to get recovery for a spill.

It's one thing to have a right to go to court to get damages for a spill. It's an entirely different thing to be able to pay a lawyer and the experts necessary to get those -- to get -- you know, to go to court and to recover damages. So it's not just the level of liability, but it's also the process for recovery to make sure that it is a process that's fair and equitable

for landowners.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On page 19 of DRA's motion I think that DRA essentially again redrew this request and says that DRA requests nonprivileged documents containing statements about oil spill liability provided by Applicant to nonprivileged parties. And those would be documents not constituting any sort of admissions.

Based on that request, TransCanada has done an additional search, and Jim White can clarify this, but my understanding is that there are several responsive nonprivileged documents that we will provide to Dakota Rural Action as a result of that further inquiry in response to that specific request.

MR. WHITE: That's right. There are at least three documents that fall into that category and two other documents that I'm reviewing now for privilege that may or may not fall into that category.

MR. MOORE: To the broader question about jurisdiction, I don't view this as much as a jurisdictional matter as it is just a question about this is a legal issue, and ultimately legal liability for a pipeline spill is a matter for the courts. And this is a document request, and to the extent that it's been

1 narrowly defined on page 19, we can respond to that. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Time line on the offering up 3 of these other documents? 4 MR. WHITE: Within 48 hours. 5 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. 6 Commission staff. 7 MS. SEMMLER: Again, I don't -- I agree that it 8 may not be appropriate today to deal with the legal 9 arguments surrounding liability, and that may be best 10 left for the hearing as we deal with it. It is a 11 discovery request, and it sounds as if there's a 12 compromise. 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ouestions? 14 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Mr. Blackburn, does that 15 suffice? Those documents that would be coming from --16 MR. BLACKBURN: I will review them, but I think 17 that will probably be sufficient, that scope of discovery 18 would be sufficient. Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: And then we can wait 20 until hearing to make the other determination? 21 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. I don't know. I sort 22 of have a tendency to agree with Mr. Blackburn that if 23 we're not going to dive in, if we're not going to wade

into the legal liability argument, it may be fairest to

the parties to let them know that now.

24

25

I will tell you I don't think that's going to be in the public interest. I don't think that's part of the Commission's job in this proceeding, that legal liability really is a circuit court issue. Now maybe we don't need to take a vote on that. But maybe if the Commissioners disagree with me they can -- or you can be silent. But, I mean, he's asked for some guidance. I don't think it's an inappropriate request on his part.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: And I guess I would comment on that too. I do agree that's probably a Circuit Court issue. I don't think the issue of liability without knowing what the circumstances are to -- an event that hasn't even happened yet. I know that liability is well drawn out. The court is set up for that type of a matter.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, it would be hard to imagine for me at least that we would want to deal with that issue.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: With that, then perhaps I would move that in this request the Commission would approve the Motion to Compel with regard to the three documents that TransCanada is offering up and deny the request on other grounds.

Any discussion?

Not other grounds but for other components of

that request.
Hear

Hearing no further discussion, Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion carries 3-0.

With that, I think request 6, which deals are with ERP.

MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Emergency Response Plan issue raises a whole nother set of jurisdictional questions about what is appropriately considered and reviewed by the Commission with regard to different federal requirements.

The Emergency Response Plan is required by federal law, and it is the primary document -- in fact, as I understand it, it is the only document that the purpose of which is to ensure that if there is an oil spill, the communities are protected from that oil spill.

You know, it discusses things, for example, about where you're going to put spill equipment and what kind of personnel that are available to respond to the spill and how TransCanada's contractors or its personnel will communicate and interface with local emergency personnel. There's a lot of very nuts and bolts things

in the Emergency Response Plan. And it is required by federal law.

However, TransCanada then argues that because it's a federal law that, therefore, the Commission has no authority to inquire into how well that federal law's being complied with, you know, what the particular components of the Emergency Response Plan are, and, you know, whether there's more that the Commission should do, for example, by providing additional state resources for emergency response personnel in this state.

So even though this is a federal issue, the Commission can inquire into what protections are required -- or provided by the federal law and to see whether it's adequate to protect the state of -- the citizens of South Dakota.

Obviously, sometimes the Federal Government does a better job. Sometimes they do a bad job of implementing their own laws, and the Commission commenting and participating in these processes can help protect the citizens of the state. You speak for a lot of the citizens of state with regard to the Federal Government.

And in the past the Commission has looked at federal issues. For example, in the Keystone I proceeding you requested that TransCanada treat the

Middle James Aquifer as a high consequence area. Now that's a federal definition and a federal standard of a high consequence -- you know, regulations are federal. But the Commission looked at those issues and said, well, we think that the implementation of these federal laws should include the Middle James Aquifer, that the Commission will look and make sure the Federal Government does a good job with this plan. Because it really is the heart and sole of protecting the communities from oil spills.

So that is why we're requesting information on the Emergency Response Plan. Also TransCanada argues that it's not going to be done until operations start. Well, the Commission will issue its decision before operation starts so if the Commission's going to have any role, any say, in making sure the Federal Government implements this law, you know, the way it should and to weigh in with its weight to protect the citizens, it needs to do that during the development of the plan, not after the plan is there after the pipeline is operating.

So that's really the heart of it, that we're looking for information about -- very practically about what is going to be -- you know, how the Federal Government is going to protect the interests of the state and what the Public Utilities Commission could do to

supplement, if necessary, federal requirements.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada.

2.2

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As with the Keystone Pipeline, we expect to have to provide, excuse me, a copy of the Emergency Response Plan to the PUC and to DENR. It's required by state statute when it is completed and when it has been submitted to the federal agency with authority, which is the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration.

But beyond that, I think that the request is enormously burdensome. It asks for all documents associated with the preparation of that document. And as we indicated, there are Keystone employees who have worked for the better part of a year in preparing the Emergency Response Plan.

I think it is only tangentially related to the issues that will be before the PUC for determination and approval of the permit and to the extent that it is explicitly an issue governed by federal law, I just don't think that the request is warranted for information beyond providing the ERP once it's completed to the Public Utilities Commission.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Staff took the position in the

first TransCanada docket and does again in this pipeline siting that that Emergency Response Plan is regulated by PHMSA, the contents are regulated by PHMSA, and the Commission does not have an opportunity to change those PHMSA requirements.

So we would maintain the same argument that the Commission should have a copy once it's produced per PHMSA regulations, but beyond that I don't think this Commission has jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I don't know, Mr. Blackburn.

I know the ERP is a big deal. I am having a hard time -
I mean, it almost seems as though you're arguing the PUC

should be playing an oversight function over federal and

other levels of government. I mean, where does it end?

I mean, you know, of course, you know, the four-part test of the burden of proof you do have to follow all applicable federal and state and local laws. But, I mean, are we to verify that they're paying people above federal minimum wage? Are we to verify that the meals being served on site meet, you know, health codes? How about speed limits? How about vehicle design, safety construction standards?

I just don't -- I mean, it seems to me if we start to say that it's the PUC's job in this proceeding and to make sure that every other level of government

that has an oversight function over this project and the operation of this plan, that we're supposed to double-check their work, we're going to be here a long time.

I mean, where am I wrong? Where are my concerns misplaced?

MR. BLACKBURN: As I said, there are -- the Commission in other times has looked at federal requirements and commented on those with the agencies. Even though the Commission doesn't have authority to require that the Federal Government do something, it certainly has commented in the past on a variety of issues of federal concern to weigh in with its concerns about how the federal law's being implemented, even if it can't require them to do something.

Now because the Emergency Response Plan is so key to protecting the citizens of South Dakota, we believe that the Commission needs to -- and PHMSA should provide greater opportunity for public input into this process of developing the emergency response plan.

If the Emergency Response Plan was developed for hurricanes in Louisiana, you would expect citizens to be involved in that planning process. As I understand it, there is no process that the Federal Government for citizen participation in development of this Emergency

Response Plan.

And because of that, even though there are obviously a lot of areas that the Commission should not weigh into, this really is a very key issue for the landowners and a great concern to them. And I understand it could be a larger amount of work, and I don't know all of the documents that are in -- I don't know any of the documents in TransCanada's files. And I understand it is an awkward or somewhat difficult situation to resolve how much should the Commission look at this and how does the Commission help to protect citizens from inadequate federal behavior.

And at the same time if the Commission chooses not to provide any opportunity for reviewing this plan or chooses not to look at it, we would like a clear -- you know, a ruling from the Commission that it is not going to consider this issue within its procedure, and I'll leave it at that.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would have to add is in connection with Keystone Pipeline, Keystone actually considered and responded to particular requests from staff concerning the preparation of the Emergency Response Plan.

So there has been conversation between Keystone and staff in the past concerning the ERP. It's not as if

Keystone is here saying that this is a subject that's completely off limits for the PUC. But for the purposes of this discovery request, I think the jurisdictional and the preemption arguments are good ones.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So, I mean, I'll follow up with that. I mean, if TransCanada's been willing to respond to requests before regarding the ERP, why not now?

MR. MOORE: Well, I --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: It's just the scope, the breadth of the request?

MR. MOORE: I think it's the scope, and I think to the extent there was particular conversation with staff, that's a different matter than the broad -- extremely broad request for all documents associated with the preparation of the Emergency Response Plan.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, I mean, the argument with breadth and scope may carry some weight. I'm not sure who asked on the question matters.

MR. KOENECKE: Commissioner, perhaps I could be responsive. This is Brett Koenecke. The interchange with staff about the ERP was for the Keystone base pipeline, the original project. And that was after the ERP had been almost fully developed and was ready to be put in place. And, in fact, it had been submitted to

PHMSA.

The request here is for an ERP which is not at nearly that stage of development. And, thus, the timing is, I think, completely different with respect to that process that happened then with Commission staff and also with the people at DENR. And in this case where it's, you know, becoming developed, those thousands of pages are out there. And I see a tremendous difference myself in the timing of that interchange.

Is that helpful to you? I'm not sure that it is, looking at your face.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So when do we get to the analogous spot in this proceeding? I mean, when is that ERP going to be submitted to PHMSA? When will TransCanada be comfortable having those conversations with staff and Interveners?

MR. WHITE: Commissioner, this is Jim White.

Maybe I can address that. My understanding is that the ERP for Keystone XL will be completed sometime in 2010. I don't know specifically whether it will be before or after March of 2010. It may well be after that as Keystone XL will not be going into operation until late 2010 and 2011, and that's in the Gulf Coast area. So it may well be that the ERP, the final ERP, would be submitted after the Commission's order issues. Which I

believe is the same situation that occurred on the Keystone I case.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other questions?

not sure if this is for staff or -- but I understand that we can't tell what the meal's going to be but we should be able to look at the pork and beans before we eat the meal. I think what we're talking here -- and I understand the request is that we want to know what's in the Emergency Response Plan, not necessarily dictate how the Emergency Response Plan comes out.

Is that what you're after, Mr. Blackburn?
MR. BLACKBURN: Roughly, yes.

jurisdiction? I don't necessarily have a problem with seeing what are the documents flowing from TransCanada to the Federal Government if we can get those documents.

I'm not saying -- I'm not saying that we should tell the Federal Government what to do but on the side line seeing what passes from one entity to the other I would think is a reasonable request.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I don't know. This is

John Smith here. I don't know. Mr. White, do you have a response to that?

MR. WHITE: I just want to make clear that, you

know, we would have no objection to a condition similar to that which was in the Keystone I order that we file the ERP with the Commission at such time as it's filed with PHMSA.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Kolbeck. I'll support your comments. I mean, I agree with you 100 percent. Mr. Blackburn started to lose me when he said that, well, the Federal Government doesn't have an open enough process so you all can be -- you know, by proxy that process whereby people can influence the drafting of an ERP. I agree with you 100 percent.

I mean, I think what it is matters, but us to dictate -- we don't have the authority to probably dictate, you know, Xs and Ys.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I don't think that we can say that we disagree with PHMSA and oh, no, it should have been an X instead of a Y, but the material that goes into that I think should be released.

Now what I don't know is if that process -- how open that process is on the Federal Government's side.

Is that like we have open dockets any time something is filed? Is that put on the web? Is that something that is fairly accessible? Which if it is, then I think producing this to Dakota Rural Action would be burdensome to TransCanada if it's already being provided someplace

l else.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I can't answer that. You know, I would probably allow -- you know, Mr. Blackburn's made a representation that he -- Dakota Rural Action can't intervene as a party in that proceeding and be involved in it. I don't know the answer to that. I did not research that prior to today.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commissioner Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that PHMSA, that we don't have jurisdiction over PHMSA, but so I don't mean this question to reflect that.

However, would we in the PUC -- would the ERP have -- be subject to review by the PUC, meaning that even though it is approved by PHMSA, would we be able to look at that if we did not feel it satisfactory and state that additional work needs to be completed by Keystone?

MR. SMITH: After it's done?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: After it is done if we believe that the Emergency Response Plan is not satisfactory in our eyes -- it's satisfactory to PHMSA but does the State have the ability, the PUC have the ability to say, no, there are some areas that are lacking here?

MR. SMITH: We don't have the right to decide

that. But you would have the ability and it's why we put the condition in the first one that we did so that you would get that at the time of filing at PHMSA so you would have the comment period available at PHMSA in order for you to be able to make comments to get any changes that you believe were necessary at that point.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. However, but once it's completed, then you're saying that the State of South Dakota cannot state that we have some question about the Emergency Response Plan and we want X component to be completed differently?

I know we can't tell PHMSA that. But can we as a state state that the Emergency Response Plan that has been presented on this from the standpoint of the citizens of the State of South Dakota we just don't believe that it's complete so you're not going to change the plan necessarily to please PHMSA but it has to pass muster in South Dakota as well?

Do we have that ability?

MR. SMITH: You know, I've got to say, you know, the preemption statute to me with respect to certain things like design specifications, you know, the calculations related to pipe strength and all of that stuff, I think the preemption argument is pretty darned cut and dried on that.

You know, this may be just me personally. The ERP gets to a point where I see -- you know, I think in the end the approval of the ERP is a PHMSA matter. And that's that. I mean, the oddity about the ERP is because it splashes over into domains other than those within either PHMSA or TransCanada's control, namely local government and State type of facilities and that -- it's one of those awkward places, Commissioner Hanson, where that one's a harder one to say absolutely black-and-white where that cuts for me.

I don't know that -- maybe somebody has a case or something on that. I'm not aware of one.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: So we need to maintain our ability to be able to comment on it in the process that you elaborated on just --

MR. SMITH: Well, that's one reason I think why we put the condition we did is so that it would afford the Commission an opportunity to comment before PHMSA has acted and approved so that they would have the ability to consider any comments that you might have.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. And one last question on that. It's my understanding -- and I want to just make certain that I recollect correctly -- that the operation of the pipeline is subject to the ERP being completed.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay.

MR. SMITH: The reason it's not finalized prior to the final days until the pipeline is complete is because you can't necessarily -- you can't finalize all the potential inputs into it until you know precise location and those kinds of things. Because the ERP has to be somewhat tailored, you know, with respect to that.

You know, you have different things in there depending on what you're having to plan for contingency-wise, if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think you're right there on top of it.

Any other questions?

MR. SMITH: I just had one. And, again, I hope I'm not getting us off the track here. But just recalling back to the first case, you know, we had an awful lot of testimony on flow rates and streams and -- from both staff and from Ms. Tillquist and from others and that kind of thing and the impacts of those kind of data inputs into planning for the ERP. You know, and that occupied a whole lot of the hearing time that we did.

Are we talking about those basic kinds of hydrologic and other assumptions that go into the ERP as having been objected to here and not relevant for discussion -- or for discovery or production?

1.8

2.2

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, if I may, DRA was not intending to look at all of the -- this discovery request. And we may provide testimony. It's not intending to look at all of the information available about the size of oil spills or the potential kinds of damage that are there or that. We believe that that will come out.

But what this discovery request to the Emergency Response Plan does is saying given the range of possible spills, you know, here is the level of equipment that's needed. Here's the level of personnel that's needed to respond to that range of spills. We believe that the worst-case scenario, which we have a discovery request about later, sets the outer range for what kinds of equipment would be needed, the maximum amount.

And between that and small amounts of oil, you know, we just need to know most of what the maximum amount would be and how much equipment and what kind of response would be required. So it wouldn't need to get into the same level of detail about that.

And I'll leave it at that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other questions? Any action?

2.4

Plan, period.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Well, I guess I'd maybe approve in part -- grant it in part. I'll just throw this out for discussion's sake, but I'll move to approve the DRA request that they produce all documents concerning the preparation of the Emergency Response

I don't see where they could give the information that Mr. Blackburn is after right now, but I do feel that they should be allowed to be seeing the information flow from Keystone to the Federal Government. So I guess I'll grant it in part, just limit it to the documents concerning the preparation of the Emergency Response Plan.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. WHITE: If I might comment on that. The documents that are being developed in conjunction with preparation of the ERP are not going to the Federal Government. It's the ERP itself once it's finalized that goes to the Federal Government.

So while there are, you know, hundreds of man hours and thousands of documents going into the preparation of the document, it's only the ERP itself that flows to the government.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks, Mr. White.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Thank you for that clarification. I guess my motion can still stand, just that TransCanada produce all the documents concerning the preparation of the Emergency Response Plan.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion is made. Open for discussion. And I -- as you were talking, Commissioner Kolbeck, I mean, I did find that I agreed with you that information that's flowing to the Federal Government we want to see. The motion, as it stands, all documents pertaining to the preparation of ERP I think probably goes from a scope and breadth perspective is a little too big for me.

So with the motion as it's made, I mean, I would be opposed to it. But I think in the big picture I'm headed the same way you are.

Other discussion?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with your comments.

My concern is that the State of South Dakota have the ability and that we do participate and that all the parties have the ability, Interveners have the ability to participate from the standpoint of commenting.

But I don't know that we need to see the documents that are used to prepare the information. I think what we need to see is that final document so that

1 we can see whether or not that complies with all of 2 everyone's concerns. So a motion of that nature I'll 3 support. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Unless there's any further Δ discussion, we'll proceed to vote. 5 Hanson. 6 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 7 No. 8 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 9 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes nay. 10 The motion fails 1-2. 11 12 Any further motions? 13 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Do we need a motion in 14 order to -- we have the ability and the Interveners have 15 the ability, do they not, to examine that document? 16 Isn't that a part of the process? 17 MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, if I may, we do 18 not -- that document will not be produced until this 19 process is over. So we won't have the opportunity during 20 this process to review that document. It won't be 21 produced until after this proceeding is finished. Ιt 22 cannot be logically produced until after the proceeding 2.3 is finished. 24 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

MS. COLLIER: One potential compromise is

25

normally in any kind of process you get to the point where there is a draft. It may not be the final version that is going to be prepared, but it is usually at the point where it is responding to the majority of the federal requests.

Would it be possible rather than going with all of the documents to look at a compromise of a first draft, again, understanding that TransCanada may not be submitting that final version that we get but it would give the landowners a chance to at least have some idea prior and it would give the PUC also that opportunity without, again, holding them to that being the final version. It would at least be a compromise as a kind of winnowing down of material.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, a question of Mr. Smith or whomever could answer it.

Is it not a part of the process, standard operating procedure, for PHMSA to allow comment on that document? They don't have Interveners, they don't have -- it's just presented to them, they make the decision and that's it?

MR. SMITH: I think it is, yeah. I think that's it. I think our thought on the first one was if we felt there was an inadequacy and we made a comment, maybe they'd listen to us anyway.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Wow.

MR. SMITH: But in terms of a formal process, no, it's just strictly a PHMSA decision.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm concerned certainly that the state and the citizens have the opportunity to make a comment. I'm not sure how to make that motion, but on the structure of it I don't see how we can tell PHMSA to do that.

MR. KOENECKE: Commissioner, apologize for interrupting you. The 2008 legislature adopted a statute. The Emergency Response Plan has to satisfy a number of areas -- I believe my recollection is it's eight or nine specific areas of inquiry -- and be submitted to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources before the pipeline can be -- it has to be approved by them before the pipeline can be operated. That's a State statute that's in place and has been effective for both projects based on its timing.

So I wouldn't want you to have the feeling that there's nothing more than the PUC process at play here with respect to the ERP. That process is out there, and we've filed the document for the Keystone Pipeline, the original one, with that department and have engaged them in those discussions.

Similarly, the document's been filed here with

staff. And staff, of course, did ask us for some clarification and some changes to be made, and my recollection is that those were made.

But the place where we'd get into problems would be if staff or the department asked us to make changes to that document, which we've always said was a living document subject to changes as conditions along the pipeline route change, that that document we've always said would be a living, breathing document, and staff certainly had the opportunity to speak on behalf of all people in the state. They represent the public interest. And staff had that opportunity and took that, and we took that as well.

The place like I was leading to before where we'd get into problems is if someone asked us to make a change that PHMSA would not then approve, then we'd be set up for difficulties. But I confess, I don't see the requirement or the need for the document or the documents leading to it to be proposed for this Commission in order to make an order and a permit in the spring, you know, posthearing.

Because of those processes that are in place,
I've got to say I don't see the need for the Commission
to do anything more than what we've done in the past.
Because there are places, multiple stops along that

process, where those comments can be brought back and put into the document.

1.5

2.3

Because the Interveners in the previous Keystone document didn't avail themselves of that, I can't -- you know, not for me to tell them what their business was, but I don't see -- given those processes and the things which weren't coming through, I don't think anybody had told you that there was a statute and the Department of Natural Resources is involved in that previously. I hope that's helpful to you.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you for reminding me of that process of what we did last time, Mr. Koenecke. I just simply want to be certain that we maintain that opportunity. And I recognize we've had very strong citizen advocates on the Commission who will continue to maintain those relationships. But I just want to be absolutely certain that we have that ability to comment somewhere along the line and that we use that process, whether it's in the DENR or the PUC. I just want to make certain that that communication flows.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Blackburn.

MR. BLACKBURN: If I may, please. Staff has the opportunity to comment, but Interveners don't have the opportunity to comment. I don't know that public

1 citizens have the opportunity to comment on that. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: From my perspective, you 3 know, state law has DENR playing that role. If there 4 need to be revisions to the statute, I think that makes 5 sense. 6 But what we're talking about here is the PHMSA 7 process. People wanting more input into the PHMSA 8 I want to make sure that we're focused on our 9 process and getting our job right. I think the state 10 statute does deal with this situation. 11 So with that, I would make a motion to deny 12 request number 6. Not saying that the ERP is important. 13 I'm not saying that there shouldn't be some public input. 14 I'm not saying that the PUC isn't interested in giving 15 lots of input to PHMSA because I think we are. But I 16 don't think request number 6 is the way to get there. 17 Any further discussion? 18 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 19 Hanson. 20 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 21 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 22 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 23 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion 24 carries 3-0.

With that, let's take a 10-minute break.

25

will be back -- well, we'll come back at 10:20.

(A short recess is taken)

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: With that, it is 10:20. We'll come back on the web. I believe we are up to request number 7. This deals with advisory bulletin ABD-0901.

Dakota Rural Action.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, this is another issue related to federal law. And there is a certain amount of information available about it on the web but only a very limited amount. My understanding is what this advisory bulletin is about is that all companies that build pipelines have quality control requirements in place to make sure the pipe they use is both -- meets standards so that it won't burst and, you know, complete oil spills.

Apparently what happened was that some companies -- and I believe they are natural gas companies which use similar kind of pipe as oil companies or crude oil pipelines tested their pipe and it burst. And where it burst was along the longitudinal seams of the pipe. So this was not, as I understand it, the joints between the pipes and the field weld. Actually the pipe itself failed.

And, as I understand it -- and I don't know what

2.3

the full answer here is unless we're trying to find the answer to -- something went wrong with the quality control mechanisms that these companies have in place, which I imagine are very similar to what TransCanada has in place.

And either the metallurgy or the metal itself was defective or the welding of the fabrication -- first they form steel plates and they roll it into the pipe shape and then they weld the edges of the steel plate together to form a pipe. Or the welding failed or something failed. But it was the failure of quality control.

So PHMSA put out an advisory to said check into this situation and, you know, make sure that you don't have this same problem, essentially. I mean, there's more detailed words about it. But that's essentially what they're saying. And it makes sense that if some company's bad pipe got through quality control then other companies — because there are only a limited number of pipe mills and a limited number steel mills in the world that other companies could have had, you know, detective pipes slide through their safety nets too.

Now TransCanada sent you a letter that said that essentially in a variety of ways that our quality control structures are adequate and that we've been complying

with the law and regulations for a very long time. At the same time, those same quality control structures similar ones in other companies failed. So what we would like to know is whether TransCanada has procured pipe or intends to procure pipe from the -- one of these steel mills or pipe fabrication mills that managed to sneak around the U.S. standards for pipes or managed to avoid those standards for pipes.

So we believe that there is other information the Commission should do a more thorough investigation of what compliance TransCanada did with this to make sure that the pipeline will not have defective pipe.

I'm sure it was a heartbreaking thing for those natural gas companies to hydrotest those pipes and have them blow. That's something that a project developer would -- you know, it's like a very bad day for them. But, nonetheless, these things happen. These things happen. And PHMSA was so worried that the quality control systems, which TransCanada's provided a lot of information on, failed that they wanted to know whether TransCanada had actually put pipe, defective pipe in place. Joints of pipe is the word they used. In other words, segments of pipe that might have been defective.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an issue over which PHMSA has jurisdiction. PHMSA has taken

an active role in the matter by issuing the advisory bulletin. TransCanada has complied with the advisory bulletin by investigating the issue that is addressed in the advisory bulletin. And Robert Jones addressed the specific manner in which Keystone has responded to the advisory bulletin in his letter to the Public Utilities Commission.

The investigation is not a matter that is completed. It is an ongoing obligation. And it pertained to both the Keystone Pipeline and the XL Pipeline.

So I think that the document that has been produced in response to the request is responsive. But I also think that a broad request for documents concerning this matter is really not helpful to the proceeding, given that this is ultimately a matter within the jurisdiction of PHMSA.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Staff takes a similar position, that the documents in the procedures surrounding that advisory bulletin are within the jurisdiction of PHMSA, not one that this Commission has jurisdiction over.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Questions?

If there are no questions, is there any action?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I'll move to deny

```
1
     Dakota Rural Action's request number 7.
2
              I'll agree that it was a PHMSA advisory
3
     bulletin.
                The company has responded. They've responded
     to the Commission. They've responded to Dakota Rural
4
5
     Action. And they say they don't have anything more.
                                                            So
6
     I'll go with that.
7
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Motion has been made.
8
     Is there any discussion on the motion?
9
              Hearing none, proceed to vote.
10
              Hanson.
11
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Aye.
12
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.
13
              COMMISSIONER KOLBECK:
                                     Aye.
14
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye.
                                                      Motion
15
     carries 3-0.
16
              With that, we will proceed to request number 8
17
     which deals with the design factor of the pipe.
              Dakota Rural Action.
18
19
              MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
                                                         This
2.0
     is another similar issue. I think this issue has been
21
     reviewed by the Commission in the Keystone I proceeding.
22
     And I don't think I need to go into anymore detail about
23
     this particular issue.
2.4
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada.
25
              MR. MOORE:
                          Again, there's a jurisdictional
```

```
1
     issue here. But not withstanding that, we produced the
 2
     special permit Application that was filed, and it
 3
     contains documents that are directly responsive to the
     request, and I've heard no argument from Dakota Rural
 4
 5
     Action about why the data that has been provided is
     insufficient or what additional documents would be
 6
 7
     relevant to any further proceedings before the Public
 8
     Utilities Commission.
 9
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                  Staff.
10
              MS. SEMMLER: Staff again takes the position as
11
     it did in the first crude oil pipeline docket that this
12
     is a nonjurisdictional issue.
13
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Questions?
14
              Hearing none, is there any action?
15
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                     I move to deny.
16
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion has been made.
                                                          Ιs
     there any discussion?
17
18
              Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote.
19
              Hanson.
20
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
21
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                  Kolbeck.
22
              COMMISSIONER KOLBECK:
23
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye.
                                                      Motion
24
     carries 3-0.
25
              With that, we will proceed to request number 9
```

which deals with the composition of the materials to be transported by the proposed pipeline.

Dakota Rural Action.

MR. BLACKBURN: What Dakota Rural Action is looking for is information about the kind of materials the pipeline will produce -- or will transport. This is basic factual information about the operation of the pipeline. And we believe that the information about the contents of the material that the pipeline will transport is necessary to a full environmental review. It's necessary to understand the potential impacts to humans. It's also necessary to the problems of internal corrosion of the pipeline.

Now Keystone has said that it's only provided its FERC tariff. The Federal Engineering Regulatory Commission, FERC, does not regulate pipeline safety. They do have in their tariff a requirement that oil meet certain kinds of very minimal composition requirements so that it can be pumped so that oil from different sources can be pumped through the pipeline and not contaminate each other. But it doesn't have to do with -- those requirements in the FERC tariff don't have anything to do with preventing internal corrosion, for example. That's not a FERC jurisdictional issue.

So the responsive document that TransCanada

provided to this request, the FERC tariff, is just not relevant to this, and all it provides is just a very general sense of what the quality of the oil should be from a commercial point of view, not from a safety point of view.

Also TransCanada has stated, and I mentioned this in the brief, that internal corrosion is a problem. It's not a problem with new pipelines, but they haven't said it's not a problem with old pipelines. There are internal corrosion problems with old pipelines.

Also this material is not like the kind of crude oil that's been transported by the industry in the past, which has primarily transported syn crude from Canada, which is a refined product, a semi-refined product. And what we are concerned about is the chemical composition of the nature of the product that's being transported may have an effect on the operational life of the pipeline because it could increase corrosion and it may be more sour, it may include more mineral components that could produce erosion, could be more water. And even though it's not the same thing, we'd like to know what that is.

Now TransCanada also they said they objected to this, to providing more information, but in request 1 they actually provided a fair amount of information about chemical composition of all Canadian crude oils. So

they're saying two things here, that, one, they shouldn't provide the information. But then they provided it in response to another discovery request.

And that's -- we appreciate that they provided that information about the chemical composition, but it's for all crude oils in Canada. What we'd like to know is more information about the kind of crude oils that they intend to actually ship because we think that they can -- because they know many of the shippers and they know the kinds of crude oil that will be come out of Canada in the future, it won't be as much syn crude. It will be more of this bitumen blend. We believe that they can provide a greater understanding of how fast internal corrosion would happen inside these pipes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada -- Keystone.

MR. MOORE: To the except that this is a document request that asks for specific information, it was hard to respond to because the specifics of the kind of oil to be transported through the pipeline is, in fact, governed by the tariff which was produced in draft form, and apparently that's not what DRA was looking for.

To the extent that what DRA is looking for is some sort of internal study by Keystone concerning the abrasive characteristics of the crude oil expected to be transported through the pipeline and what effect that may

have on internal corrosion, Keystone has not done such a study. And the reason is because I think fundamentally I disagree with some of what Mr. Blackburn said. The kinds of oil shipped from the oil sands are already being transported in pipelines run by other companies.

And TransCanada has not conducted its own internal study regarding the matter that Mr. Blackburn is apparently looking for documents on.

It seems to me that given the characteristics of the oil to be transported through the pipeline which has been disclosed through the tariff, that this is really a subject that DRA could produce expert testimony on and develop on its own. I just don't think that we have documents that are -- that are what he's looking for.

MS. SEMMLER: Staff has nothing further to add regarding what documents Keystone may or may not have.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Questions?

Incidentally, I mean, I find myself do thinking that this is an area that's relevant to discuss. But, Mr. Blackburn, if they don't have the documents, they don't have the documents.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, we can't predict what documents they do or don't have. Again, I'd ask whether this is the stuff that the review went to just the Applicant or whether to TransCanada in Canada. Or,

you know, they may have an understanding of what the performance is of the pipelines from their competitors.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Fair question. Keystone, was this document search done throughout the corporate entity?

MR. WHITE: Commission, let me address that. I believe that this document -- this request went back to the corporate entity. But, again, because Keystone is the only oil pipeline entity within the corporate structure, that would be the responsive entity.

I hear a frustration with respect to, you know, our position that we can't say specifically which type of crude will be transported because that's the matter within the control of the shippers and there will be a range of crudes transported.

I would say that maybe as a means of facilitating this request, you know, there are generally two types of crude, Western Canadian Select, which is diluted bitumen, and Suncor, synthetic A, which is the syn crude, which are sort of representative of the ends of the spectrum. And if it would be helpful, we could provide assays of the components of those types of crude as sort of benchmarks for sort of the range of crudes that might be transported.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other questions?

1 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Not necessarily a 2 Well, maybe to TransCanada. 3 I know that Mr. Jones and Ms. Kothari in our other proceedings here have given a lot of different 4 5 information about the oil that does go down the pipeline. 6 Has that information been given to Dakota Rural Action? 8 MR. WHITE: I guess, Commissioner, I'm not quite 9 clear on what types of information you're referencing. 10 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Well, I quess I would go right back to what you just said, you would give the 11 12 information. And I remember Mr. Jones talking about the 13 two types of crude. 14 MR. WHITE: Okay. 15 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I think he basically said 16 exactly what you said, there were two main types, two 17 base types that would flow through. 18 MR. WHITE: Okay. So my response is we have not provided that information to DRA to date but would be 19 20 willing to do so as a compromise here. 21 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: All right. Thank you. 22 Is that sufficient, Mr. Blackburn? MR. BLACKBURN: I think that's all we're going 23

to get so it's sufficient, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Thank you.

24

25

1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any further discussion or 2 questions? Not necessarily action. Is there any action? 3 Did you have a question? 4 COMMISSIONER HANSON: No. Do you need a motion 5 then that Keystone will provide -- is to provide the 6 information to the extent possible on the -- on the 7 spectrums of the two types of oil? 8 That would be my motion. 9 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any discussion on the motion? 10 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 11 Hanson. 12 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 13 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 14 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Ave. 15 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion 16 carries 3-0. 17 With that, I believe that brings us to request 18 10, which deals with a worst-case spill assessment. 19 Dakota Rural Action. 20 MR. BLACKBURN: The worst-case spill assessment 21 is again a matter of federal law. It's a factual issue, 22 how much oil would spill in a worst case. That fact 23 about how much oil would come out and where it would come out are facts. That's not a matter -- that's not a 24 25 federal -- it's not a federal law. It's not a federal

regulation. It's a simply fact about where the worst-case oil spill would be and how much it would be.

1.7

Now we're sensitive to the fact that the disclosure of the exact location of that worst-case event would be inappropriate because that would, for example, allow somebody to understand where to sabotage the pipeline and that would create an enormous disaster and we wouldn't want to have everybody and their brother knowing where that location was.

That being said -- the precise location was.

That being said, we understand that knowing what the worst-case volume is is not sensitive information. And knowing, for example, what county that would occur in, you know, or where -- again it relates somewhat to the Emergency Response Plan because it determines where the equipment is located and whatnot.

Knowing generally where that would happen would enable local first responders and citizens to understand that if an event happens in this county, there could be a -- it could be a catastrophic event and that the state may -- and local governments may want to ensure that additional equipment and additional resources are available to respond to such an event. Even if we don't know exactly where it is, if there isn't -- if there aren't prepositioned resources for spilled response

nearby, then they won't -- they won't anticipate it.

2.3

So what we're looking for again is relatively focused information about where -- how much -- what the volume of the worst-case spill event would be.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Applicant.

MR. MOORE: That information -- excuse me. That information has been provided. It is in that portion of the risk assessment report that was produced as Exhibit I in this case. It's on pages A24 and A25. It indicates the amount, the volume of oil that could be spilled in a worst-case scenario. It's been provided.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff? Nothing? Okay. Mr. Blackburn, a response?

MR. BLACKBURN: I looked through that document, and I saw a lot of discussion about theoretical, you know, amounts, but in the process for doing that perhaps I missed it. I'll have to go back and look at it again. I didn't see the actual numbers for a worst-case spill response, but I could have missed it. So I'll have to check.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, perhaps -- this is just one Commissioner, but, I mean, I do feel like a worst-case spill assessment is valid. It is relevant. And so to the extent Mr. Blackburn that it's not in there, I mean, let the Commission know, and we can take

1 this up again. That's my thought. 2 MR. WHITE: Mr. Johnson, if I could help Mr. Blackburn. 3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: 4 Yes. 5 MR. WHITE: If he would look at Section 5.4.4 on page A24 and then the chart at the top of page A25, I 6 7 think you'll see the information you're looking for. MR. BLACKBURN: So it's in a chart. 8 MR. WHITE: 9 It's also in a paragraph. 10 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, I don't speak for the 11 Commission so let's pause and see if anyone disagrees with what I said. 12 13 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Could we make a motion to 14 grant the discovery request that they should produce it 15 if they have not already had -- have produced it subject 16 to the protective order in the HCA protective provisions. That should cover us. If they haven't provided 17 it, then they should. And if they have, then there's no 18 19 obligation to TransCanada. 2.0 If I might, the actual data request MR. WHITE: 21 or discovery request itself asked for "all documents 22 concerning worst-case spill."

And what we're saying is we've provided the key

document that generates that worst-case spill number.

Not all documents relating to that. That's subject to

23

24

25

our burdensomeness request.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. White, does that document discuss release rate? I mean, how quickly a product would be --

MR. WHITE: Commissioner Johnson, I'm going to have to plead the 5th on that one. It's an extensive document, and I have not recently read it so I don't know whether it has release rate in it.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Commissioner Kolbeck, if I might, I'd like the motion -- to narrow it from all documents just to something specific that I think is more germane.

Can we say all documents -- or -- can we focus it just on the volume that I think Dakota Rural Action is most interested in?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Sure. I think we could do a --

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would like it a bit beyond that and look at the documents that provide information and the methodology for coming to that number. Because just having the raw number by itself is not as useful as understanding how that number was derived. Because we would like to understand how the number was derived as well as the number itself. And that may be a narrower set of documents.

1 But we need to understand the methodology. 2 Because without the methodology the raw number, you know, 3 we don't know how they got to it. 4 MR. WHITE: So that methodology is actually set 5 forth in the document we've been discussing. 6 MR. BLACKBURN: The methodology is set forth but 7 not with any numbers attached to it. It says in general 8 here's how you do a worst-case spill assessment, but it 9 didn't actually provide any calculations, I don't 10 believe, of how that number was --11 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Let me step in here a little bit. Commissioner Kolbeck has a pending motion. 12 13 Commissioner Kolbeck, did you want to tweak that 14 in any way or --15 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I understand what 16 Mr. Blackburn's getting at. Maybe we can do this. We 17 can grant request number 10 as it relates to the 18

worst-case spill and how the numbers are derived of a worst-case spill, subject to any protective order and HCA protective provisions.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Motion has been made. Any discussion?

Hearing none -- go ahead, Commissioner. Did you have something?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I was just going to say

1 that my motion should be to the extent that TransCanada 2 has it in their possession. 3 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Motion has been made. Is there any further discussion? 4 5 COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm not quite clear on the 6 specific information that's being required of Keystone 7 here. CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Let me --8 9 COMMISSIONER HANSON: TransCanada. Excuse me. 10 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Let me try to restate the 11 pending motion and the motion -- correct me if I'm wrong. 12 But Keystone should produce documents that identify the volume and -- the volume of worst-case release as well as 13 14 methodology for deriving that information. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any discussion on the motion? 17 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 18 Hanson. 19 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 21 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion carries 3-0. 23 24 With that, we'll proceed to request 12 Okay. 25 through 19. This deals with projected demand.

Dakota Rural Action.

MR. BLACKBURN: This is again a jurisdictional question as raised by TransCanada. The information that we're trying to find here is what the impact of that economic downturn and the decreased forecast for oil production in Canada have on the timing for the construction of this pipeline and the need and the demand for this pipeline.

We all know that the economy has gone down, and I think that the Commission probably understands that oil consumption in the U.S. has gone down. We also -- you probably understand that a lot of projects -- quite a number of the projects in Canada in the tar sands have also been cancelled or delayed because of the lack of demand for this oil.

TransCanada argues that this is not a matter of jurisdiction for the Commission and instead argues that because the Department of State will determine the national interest for they say the pipeline I say it's for the border crossing itself, but, therefore, the Commission should not investigate the demand for this pipeline. Yet state law requires -- state regulation requires that the Commission consider demand.

And, again, demand is related not only to the ultimate need for the pipeline, but it's also related to

when the pipeline construction start date would be, which is also within the Commission's jurisdiction.

1.0

2.3

As TransCanada mentioned earlier, this pipeline is being -- Keystone XL is being developed in two phases. The first phase goes from Oklahoma to Texas, and the second phase from Alberta to Steel City.

The understanding I have is that based on TransCanada's red line of their Application and from some of the statements they've made in the press is that the construction start date for this project has been slid off from originally they were told -- they were telling the press that in 2010 they'd start construction on the Steel City segment. Later in the press they said they'd start construction on the Steel City segment on 2011 instead of 2010. Recently there have been some comments by TransCanada spokespeople that they are going to start construction in 2012.

Well, the landowners would like to know when the construction is going to start. And we believe that that determination is based in large part on projected demand for the pipeline.

Now TransCanada in its Application relied on the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers Report 2008, even though the 2009 material was coming out and has been out since they red lined their Application. The 2009 cap

report Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers

Report, the cap report. 2009 showed a dramatic decrease
in oil forecasted oil production in Canada.

Even though that may or may not have an impact on the long-term demand for the pipeline, it definitely would have an impact on the construction start date for the pipeline. And we believe that's one of the reasons why the construction start date seems to have been delayed by up to two years at this point. So that is the kind of information we want.

Now we believe the Commission should have the most up-to-date information about demand for this pipeline, and we would be asking this as an Interrogatory for an explanation about how this decreased demand and the forecast of decreasing demand would impact the development of the pipeline.

And we think that's a reasonable question to ask, and we would like an answer to that question. We think the Commission deserves an answer, and we think the landowners should have a clear understanding about whether the pipeline will start reduction and if it isn't needed because it's possible demand could stay down for a long time and they don't necessarily need this northern part because they can get oil -- once the phase one from Oklahoma to Texas is done, they can actually bring oil

down all the way from Kansas to Texas without this segment being built. At some point demand will be sufficient they hope for this northern segment.

But when will that be, and if it isn't sufficient, are we putting landowners through an awful lot of trouble for no good reason.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Keystone.

MR. MOORE: Several points. First of all, the subject of demand is an issue that is subject to federal law. The pipeline cannot be constructed without a border crossing permit to be granted by the Department of State.

As part of that process under NEPA there is a purpose and need analysis that is done. So the demand issue will clearly be determined as part of that, and if the presidential permit is granted, it's granted because this pipeline is in the national interest, meaning that there is demand for the pipeline.

Second of all, this is a multibillion dollar project, and it strains credulity to believe that TransCanada would pursue that kind of investment if there were no demand for oil to be shipped through the pipeline.

Thirdly, as I listened to Mr. Blackburn's comments today, his primary concern seems to be about scheduling. And, Jim White, correct me if I'm wrong, but

my understanding is that the schedule for the Keystone
Pipeline has not changed from what was submitted in the
Application to the PUC. And I said Keystone Pipeline. I
meant KXL.

MR. WHITE: Correct. Start date for the Steel City segment is 2011.

MS. SEMMLER: Staff does not believe that need is an issue for this Commission to decide. And it is a nonjurisdictional issue that is not within the burden of proof that this Commission will consider at the hearing.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Commission staff.

Although demand is one of the items required by statute and some of the Administrative Rules that be produced, it's not part of the burden of proof. Thus, I believe that the information that's been provided is adequate to meet the needs of -- or the requirements of that statute and Administrative Rule.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, could I just add a comment about the particular administrative rule?

I think it makes sense and should be understood in the context of an intrastate facility where there would be demand for the facility within the state in the context of an interstate pipeline that has no terminus in South Dakota, I don't think that that demand requirement makes sense in the regulation and the context in which

the information has been sought in the discovery requests here.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, if I may respond, that may be or may not be the case. The law, nonetheless, requires that the Applicant include information about demand in the Application.

The DRA believes that a failure to require

TransCanada to update information about demand would

mean -- and to explain what situation is happening with

oil production would mean that they could put whatever

they wanted to about demand in their Application and then

nobody would be able to say or comment on it with any

meaning because, as Ms. Semmler has said, it's not

jurisdictional.

Why put something in a statute if you can't -- I mean, if it's not jurisdictional, it can't be considered by you. It cannot be considered by you. And if that's the case, then why put it in the statute. We think that that would make that particular regulatory provision irrelevant. You know, they can put whatever numbers they want in. Nobody can question them. Nobody can challenge those numbers. Nobody can get information out of them about those numbers, and it becomes a meaningless piece of information that has no bearing on the Commission's proceeding.

We do not believe that the legislature or the Commission in promulgation of its own regulations promulgates regulations that are meaningless. If you're going to consider demand, you need to consider it.

Otherwise, we believe it's a violation of law.

1.7

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Blackburn, I do have a tendency to think demand is of some interest to the Commission in this proceeding. Some of your requests are for what I presume are publicly available analyses about demand.

Is there a reason why Keystone should be gathering those numbers rather than DRA?

MR. BLACKBURN: It's their business to gather those numbers, and the numbers that are publicly available aren't necessarily the same quality and character as the information that TransCanada would have in its files related to demand.

You know, the numbers that -- the only numbers we have access to are industry prepared numbers from a general report. You know, they may or may not be that accurate. We believe that TransCanada provides much closer tracking of demand for its pipeline, and we believe that they should be more forthcoming about how the impact of this economic downturn and decreased demand for oil is affecting their business plans for this

project. That is relevant information, and it's information the Commission should have.

1.0

General public statements found in, you know, an industry give us an indication, the DRA an indication that there is a problem, but we don't have access to the information about how those numbers were derived. We don't know how it might affect TransCanada's planning for this project. But we know that if those numbers in the cap report are correct, that that could have a dramatic effect on TransCanada.

And with respect to Mr. Moore, project proponents and developers -- and I've been on the development side. Proposed projects, you know, all time they can't predict the future. Nobody can predict the future obviously. So, you know, the mere fact they're going ahead with the development of this project does not mean it will be successful in its execution.

And that's the question, one of the questions for the Commission to consider is, you know, is demand sufficient for the northern segment of the pipeline and when would that demand be sufficient to justify the start of construction. And the shippers agreements TransCanada also claimed it's enough to start regulatory process, not to construct the project. Perhaps that's changed, but that's what their website says.

So we think that having more information about the effect of this very dramatic economic situation on this pipeline is relevant to the Commission's proceeding and very important to the landowners.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Moore, again, I'm just one person, but I am leaning toward allowing information on demand to be discoverable here. So then I -- sort of my next -- the next hurdle to clear is what would be overly burdensome.

Would you make any argument that any of the requests 12 through 19 are overly burdensome?

MR. MOORE: I want to include Mr. White in this conversation because he may have a better sense than I do of the documents. The requests are certainly broad. And I can't help but note that Mr. Blackburn has sort of argued both sides of this issue.

On the one hand he said that TransCanada shouldn't be in a position where it can submit numbers in its Application and then he can't challenge. On the other hand he responded to you and said I need this information because TransCanada has the only good numbers and I can't get any other numbers.

I have a little bit of trouble with that.

Jim, do you have any comments about specific requests that are burdensome?

MR. WHITE: I'm looking at requests 12, 13, 14, and 15, which are produce all documents requests, which, again, are very broad and potentially quite burdensome.

I also note that 16, 17, 18, and 19, excuse me, are a bit more focused in that they are sort of Interrogatory requests going to specific questions. Perhaps it might be constructive if we agree to respond to the specific and directed Interrogatories in lieu of the broad requests for all documents associated with demand.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So your compromise offer,
Mr. White, would be that Keystone would produce requests
16 through 19 but not 12 through 15 if that was amenable
to Dakota Rural Action.

MR. WHITE: Yes. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, that is not acceptable to us. That is not acceptable to us, to Dakota Rural Action. The numbers that TransCanada has, they may or may not wish to disclose. That they have better numbers with us doesn't mean that the numbers they developed themselves or, like I said, that they would choose to disclose those kind of numbers.

So the fact that I'm asking them for the best numbers they have doesn't mean that, therefore, I'm

somehow being hypocritical about, you know, wanting information.

2.3

2.4

And also if we -- if TransCanada only answers -- gives an explanation, they can give an explanation for how this would be and it may or may not be detailed. But we'd like to see the actual numbers, the actual data, for what's happening in Canada and what their projections are, their own in-house projections for the demand for this pipeline. We think that the numbers will provide some confidence that what TransCanada is saying is correct.

And besides that, it is relevant information, and it is discoverable. And I don't believe -- I also disagree that it would be unduly burdensome. I don't know all the documents they have in their files, but I can't imagine for a multibillion dollar company that they couldn't collect information related to demand and demand forecasts and provide that to us.

We could talk about that more perhaps with them and they could provide us an index or some sense about why this would be burdensome. But, you know, all discovery requests are burdensome. The standard isn't whether they're burdensome. It's whether they're unduly burdensome, given the particular party that's supposed to produce them.

We don't see that they would have truckloads of information about this kind of issue. And to the extent that they do have a lot of information, we would be happy to talk to them about what kinds of information they have available to find out what would be appropriate. But we would disagree that simply allowing a response to an Interrogatory would provide the information that the Commission needs to determine demand.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I've got a few more questions, but I should give my colleagues an opportunity.

Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I think Commissioner

Johnson and I are on the same wavelength here. I don't

think that we can totally exclude demand, but I haven't

been totally sold by Mr. Blackburn why TransCanada's

offer is not sufficient.

I understand the numbers. You want the numbers from TransCanada, but that's not to say that TransCanada's numbers are anymore right than the industry's numbers. I don't understand how their numbers would be more relevant than what you can get on an industry basis.

MR. BLACKBURN: I don't know for sure, but one of the points of discovery is find out, you know, whether

they do have more detailed numbers. The cap report is fairly summary. You know, it doesn't provide a lot of And I don't -- and also the cap report, the most recent one was 2009. The next midterm will come out in the middle of the year, but I assume there's a lot of data that goes into the background of that cap report. And we would like to be able to not just take the industry's word for what the demand is but actually look at their numbers.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff, any enlightening comments?

MS. SEMMLER: Well, as we were chatting here, we did have an idea that -- we heard that there are binding shipper agreements and wouldn't that be the demand, those shipping agreements?

And beyond that, what is the relevancy? CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: A fair comment.

Mr. Blackburn.

2.0

MR. BLACKBURN: The binding shipper agreements we're not sure are sufficient to allow actual construction of this northern segment because TransCanada's website says it's sufficient to allow going ahead with permitting. That's not the same thing as going ahead with construction.

Also they're called binding shipping agreements but agreements as all lawyers know are more or less binding depending on what the terms of those agreements are, and we're not entirely sure because we've never seen the agreements how binding they are. We take TransCanada's word for it that they are commercially binding, but that depends on what the penalties would be for withdrawing from those agreements.

For example, if demand continued to crash, the northern segment may not be used for a long time and could theoretically be not built. In that case presumably the shippers would be able to get out of those agreements. But again we don't know what the terms of those agreements are.

We don't know, for example, what level of demand is required for actual construction. And we also don't -- and TransCanada if their shipper agreements -- the shipper agreements are an indication of intent for the future, but shippers, if they don't have oil to ship, are not going to be complying with those agreements. And they won't have oil to ship if demand continues to drop and production of oil in Canada falls.

That there is a certain demand, the demand is from the shippers, but the shippers can't read the future either. But the forecasts are indicating that the

shipper demand is dropping dramatically right now. And we'd like to know how that demand in shipper interest is affecting the planning for the pipeline.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other Commissioner, advisor questions?

MR. SMITH: I have a question or maybe a couple of them for Mr. Blackburn.

I guess maybe to clarify on the end result of all of this, I guess, could you point me to the particular -- you know, when we get down to the burden of proof, which inevitably that's where we wind up regardless of what the Application section says, which particular provision of that burden of proof would the Commission be able to make a finding or render findings and conclusions based on generalized demand data and deny a permit on that basis, I guess.

Is there one of those you can point to me where we would be able to deny the permit on the basis that there isn't an adequate demonstration airtight of demand for the facility?

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Smith, I think your question is in opposite. The burden of proof is not -- does not solely determine what the scope of discovery -- what's relevant in a proceeding. If that were the case, then there would be a large amount of information provided by

the Applicant that would be irrelevant to this proceeding.

The demand is required by law. Therefore, it needs to be in there. In terms of the burden of proof I would say, though, that I believe it's the second paragraph, second point there, requires consideration of the socioeconomic impacts on the -- of the project on South Dakotans.

Now it also doesn't -- it doesn't have to be only things that would result in a denial of the permit because the Commission can also condition the permit on, you know, vary -- with different conditions related to, for example, the start date or demand for the project.

Because certainly when the project will start and if it would start is related to socioeconomic conditions of the state.

So the problem that the Commission faces is that the burden of proof is TransCanada's burden of proof, and that is a very general set of burdens of proof. But if it's narrowed, if it's read as you have to find it right within Section 22, the burden of proof, then all kinds of information in the Application become irrelevant. And we believe that that would be a violation of law.

So it's not just that it has to stop. If the -- if the standard for discovery is that the information has

to be a but-for result -- could be the but-for result of denying the permit, that is a far too narrow reading of the law and such that, you know, the information related to whether -- what the legislature and regulations require to be included in the permit should be included -- should be subject to discovery.

And to the extent that the Commission can condition the permit, it should do so and not just on what's in the burden of proof. Because the Commission's authority to condition the authority is much broader than what's in the burden of proof.

MR. SMITH: And I don't disagree with the fact that discoverable materials are not within that which we can say is within the very narrow reading of that section. I think my question I asked it for the reason of because whenever we get down to discovery requests we always get down to some kind of reasonableness balancing of burden versus the usefulness for something in the end. And that was the reason for asking it.

MR. BLACKBURN: And I think it's very simple. It's very simple. You know, we all know that demand for oil is dropping. We all know that production in Canada is dropping dramatically right now.

Those will have an effect on the operation of the pipeline. They'll have an effect on the construction

start date of the pipeline. Even though TransCanada has said they're still on schedule to start in 2011, their own spokespeople have suggested it could be as late as 2012.

And, you know, they want -- they hope to have it in 2011, but their plans aren't necessarily going to come to fruition if the economy continues to go down and if production in Canada goes down and demand in the United States stays flat.

So it's a very practical question. You know, is the economy having an effect on their schedule, and is it going to have an effect on the need for this project?

MR. SMITH: Well, on that subject I might just point out that under our statute, Section 27 provides that there's a four-year term for beginning of construction. So, I mean, we're -- even at -- I'm just making an observation there that based upon the black letter law in our code, you know, in 2012 we're well within that.

But --

2.3

MR. BLACKBURN: If you're a landowner, you want to know more than a four-year window when they're going to be on your property.

MR. SMITH: Right. I'm just saying from an actual legal conclusory standpoint. But regardless of

that.

I think my other question was -- and what you're asking for here -- just for clarification, you're asking for existing documents. Because a couple of those questions sounded like requests for somebody to go out there and develop documents that don't exist.

MR. BLACKBURN: No. We're asking for existing documents, but we're also asking for an explanation from TransCanada about how the current market is affecting their business planning. And in that sense it's the nature of an Interrogatory.

And I have no doubt that TransCanada is very closely tracking what the current markets are doing to its planning for this pipeline in terms of its construction start date, in terms of its profitability, in terms of how the shippers are going to respond to it.

This is their core business to understand, you know, how markets are evolving and then adapting to those markets to make sure that they're profitable. If they're not doing that, they're not doing their business.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. Blackburn, I want to try to cut to the chase here.

I do find myself believing that demand is -could potentially be of some relevance. But when I look
at the four-year limit in state statute, when I look at

the federal role with demand, when I look at, you know, the request for all documents in eight different requests for information, I find myself -- I find myself wishing we could reach some compromise that we had with some earlier data requests where you're able to get what you want by scaling back your request.

1.7

Now Keystone made an offer that was not sufficient in your mind. What I'm asking you is I'd like to give you some information, but I'm not sure what you've asked for -- I think we may be overreaching just a little bit there. But is there something you can offer by way of we can make sure you get what you need without asking for anything more?

MR. BLACKBURN: We'd like their data, their projections for forecast for demand and their forecast for production in Canada.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are there specific data requests that would get you what you need? Or no?

MR. BLACKBURN: Well, 12 would get us data for the production forecasts in Canada. And we'd like their numbers on their production forecast for Canada. Also we know that the Alberta Clipper Pipeline has been permitted and is likely to start construction. And so there's also a demand for export capacity from Canada --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: What I just want is I don't

want an explanation of everything you're looking for. What I want to do is have you throw something on the table, and we're going to see if we can get Keystone to be comfortable with it. If they're not, then we can burrow into the details.

1.4

But I've got to believe that we can come to an agreement here on getting you what you need and having them agree to get you that info.

MR. BLACKBURN: We'd like their data for production forecasts for Canada. And we'd like the data they use for demand forecasts for the United States. And that would be 12 and 14. We would like to know what the binding shipper agreements — commercial terms are with regard to how binding they are, what the penalties are for cancelling those agreements. And I think that then if they agree or if I were to agree to provide answers to 16, 17, 18, 19, that would be acceptable to us.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: TransCanada, thoughts.

MR. WHITE: If I might respond, I think Keystone would be comfortable responding to data requests 12 and 14.

With respect to the request for the binding shipper agreements, that gets into a real confidentiality concern as those agreements are subject to confidentiality agreements with the shippers.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. White, are those agreements uniform, or do they vary?

1.3

2.0

MR. WHITE: In all honesty, I don't know the answer to that question. There may be shipper specific variancy in that. I don't know that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Sorry for the interruption. Proceed.

MR. WHITE: I thought I heard Mr. Blackburn state earlier even if they're binding shipper agreements, they may not be binding. So I'm not sure of the value there.

With respect to the Interrogatories in 16 through 19, again, I thought Mr. Blackburn rejected my initial offer to provide those because he was afraid that the responses would be self-serving. So I'm not sure that there's a whole lot of value in providing responses to those. So I guess at this point what I'm offering is a response to 12 and 14.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Listen, guys. I mean, we can go -- what you're leaving the Commission with is at a crossroads. We're going to need to painstakingly examine each of these requests to try to get what we think the Interveners are entitled to.

I don't mind doing it if that's what we've got to do. It just seems to me we should be able to get a

little closer like you have been willing to do with some of these other requests.

1.8

So is there room -- first Mr. Blackburn and then Mr. White. Is there room for you to adjust where you're at?

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, I think we've come together a little bit closer than we were before and would acknowledge that. I do not believe that providing data for forecasts for 12 and 14 would be particularly burdensome or onerous for TransCanada to provide. I believe they have that information probably fairly well at hand and it would not be horribly voluminous or difficult for them to provide that information.

In terms of the binding shipper agreements, my understanding is that when they have the open season for these pipelines they have a packet that they provided to --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Blackburn, I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm not asking you to justify your current stance. I get it. If where you're at is where you're at, then I don't have a problem with that. I just want to know.

MR. BLACKBURN: You asked about whether the agreements are uniform. I just wanted to say that my understanding is they provide a uniform packet to every

one of the shippers, and I don't know beyond that. I

So I don't think our request is unreasonable as it stands, and I'll leave it at that.

MR. WHITE: Let me see if I can --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Hold on just a second, Mr. White. Hold on.

Would that uniform packet that is provided to shippers be -- would that be acceptable to you rather than every shipper agreement?

MR. BLACKBURN: I think that would be helpful and provided that we have the ability to ask TransCanada about the uniformity of those terms within other shipping agreements. And even though it could be that 16 through 19 could be self-serving, we'd still like to have an explanation from TransCanada as, you know -- since this is their business about how this market's affecting their business. And it would be helpful to the Commission, I believe.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Mr. White, I'll give you an opportunity to respond. But first I want to ask you this: If the Commission were to -- some Commissioner were to move to allow request 12, 14, 17, 18, and 19 and then a partial with 16 asking Keystone to provide a single uniform packet that provides the starting point

for negotiations with shippers, what objections do you have to that?

1.7

MR. WHITE: Okay. If I can just clarify, I think you mean a partial answer to 15?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. I'm sorry. That's exactly right.

MR. WHITE: I would not have an objection to that, subject to the possible need to request some protection for the open season package under some sort of a protective order simply because I don't know at this point whether there is confidentiality around that open season package.

If there's not and if it was completely made available on a public basis, then I would have no objection to that as well.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. For discussion's sake then I would move the Commission approve data request 12, 14, 16 through 19, deny 13, deny 15, except as it relates to providing a single uniform packet that provides the starting basis for negotiation and that any of those that would need to be subject to a confidentiality agreement would be.

Discussion? And this can be -- we'll be a little liberal here. Certainly if the parties want to weigh in because the motion's bad, let us know.

1 First Commissioners. Kolbeck.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I think that's a good motion. I think that's exactly what I have written down. The single uniform packet I think should be sufficient.

All of those other numbers that are being produced should be well sufficient to determine demand plus what's in the public domain. That should be very well adequate.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the motion with the exception that I'm curious about I don't see the relevance on number 19, the impact on domestic production, why that would be anything that we would be concerned with.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, and if it's important to you, I don't mind out taking out 19. I'd make it a friendly amendment. I was just trying to get to yes more than anything.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Sure. I just don't -- I agree fully. I think you articulated the motion well. It's just on that one I just don't see why South Dakota would bother with denying or approving a pipeline based upon the domestic oil production.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Blackburn.

MR. BLACKBURN: That's acceptable.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: With that, I'm happy to make

the friendly amendment to deny rather than approve request 19.

Other discussion?

Hearing none, we'd proceed to vote or -- yeah. We'll proceed to vote.

Hanson.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion carries 3-0.

With that, we'll proceed to request number 23, which deals with the identification of alternative routes.

Dakota Rural Action.

MR. BLACKBURN: As you said, request 23 relates to alternative routes. TransCanada has asserted that the question of alternatives is not jurisdictional to this Commission. We cannot see how that argument can stand because not only do the Commission's regulations require that the Commission look at alternative routes but also the Environmental Impact Statement being prepared for this project will have information for alternative routes in it. And, therefore, the Commission will consider alternative routes.

Dakota Rural Action's concerned that the evaluation of alternatives was not sufficient.

TransCanada provided their analysis of alternatives.

That is their opinion about alternatives. We believe there's more information on other routes that may have been considered related to alternatives and request information about other alternative routes that may or may not have been included by TransCanada in development of that analysis.

1.5

Now in terms of the burdensomeness, we're not looking at every single little bit of documentation that went into alternative development. For example, they may look at particular land uses or other sorts of things.

We're looking at a little bit higher elevation analysis of looking at identification of the different routes that were considered if there were any beyond what TransCanada provided. And so more general documents about the process that they developed for developing those alternatives.

We believe that there are possible routes outside of South Dakota that would remove the burden of this pipeline from South Dakotans entirely and that the Commission should look and ensure itself that this route is necessary. Because it does impose a burden on the landowners, and if there are alternatives that would be

superior to this alternative, the Commission -- that's relative to the Commission's decision and it should allow discovery on those.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Keystone.

1.3

1.8

2.2

MR. MOORE: I think Mr. Blackburn's argument is contrary to statute, and I would simply refer to 49-41B-36.

And, secondly, we've produced documents responsive to the request. That section of the presidential permit application describing the routing process has been produced. There is routing information that was submitted in the application, and as I listened to Mr. Blackburn's argument and read DRA's motion, I don't see any other specific documents that have been requested.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commission staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Staff takes the position it did on the first siting docket again and believes that the Commission does not have jurisdiction to dictate route. Thus, the requested material is irrelevant.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commissioner questions?

Advisor questions?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have a question,

Mr. Chairman. I understand that -- perfectly clear to me
that we cannot route a pipeline, and thank heavens for

1 that. But we can consider other routes, can we not? 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Smith's probably 3 the best one to answer that. But 36 says that the 4 chapter shall not be construed to be read as though the 5 Commission's got the ability to route or dictate a 6 location for an energy conversion facility or 7 transmission line. 8 But, I don't know. Mr. Smith, your --9 Yeah. I mean, again, it's one of MR. SMITH: 10 those oddities where we have a rule that's somewhat at 11 loggerheads with this particular statute. Or it's an 12 irony. I quess I'd put it that way. 13 You know, I don't know that zero consideration, 14 you know. The answer is no. You can't say you should 15 put it over here. I quess the bottom line would be is it 16 at least relevant to the extent that, you know, any weighing, I guess, of whether a particular project meets 17 18 the four standards or at least the three of the four. 19 And particularly those I guess on environmental and --20 COMMISSIONER HANSON: We can either state -- we 21 can either approve it, disapprove it, or approve it with

MR. SMITH: Conditions. That's it. You can't say, no, it should be over here. Now, you know, I mean, if there were a ridiculous -- you know, I think the

22

23

24

25

conditions.

reason for maybe the rule is that, you know, there's always some weighing involved. And if there was a very, very serious route selection discrepancy, I guess, you know, you might deny and say, well, it's just unreasonable or something like that.

But you can't route it and say, no, it should have been over here or it should be there or anything like that.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: It's an interesting situation where we then somewhat could present additional evidence showing a better route in order to dissuade us from approving it.

However, we get into that, and we could have 100 different presentations of that nature, could we not?

MR. SMITH: Yes. I will say that we did permit the introduction of evidence in the first Keystone proceeding by Interveners regarding a potential alternative route.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Certainly.

MR. SMITH: In that case we did that. But in terms of the -- I guess the one little thing you said or that Mr. Blackburn stated that is of concern to me I guess is Keystone has stated in their filing that's what their routing process was. It's a description of that.

And I got from you that you're asking them to go beyond

that and talk about not what their routing process was but what it might have been, you know. And is that --

MR. BLACKBURN: That's not correct, Mr. White -Mr. Smith. I am looking for information more detailed
about that routing process, not what it might have been
but what information they looked at in developing their
conclusory document about routing.

They may very well have looked at other routes. I don't know. They may have more information about the merits of those different routes. They have a conclusion that they filed with the Department of State. I presume there's more information beyond that conclusion, and I think the Commission should look deeper and allow discovery beyond mere conclusory statements about what TransCanada came up with from the data that they have on alternative routes.

You know, we're looking again for data, not for conclusions. They've provided their conclusions. We can get those other places. We want the information that they based it on.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Blackburn.

MR. BLACKBURN: And I believe the struggle too is that the environmental review process requires the Commission to consider alternatives, the state -- the Environmental Impact Statement process requires

1 | consideration of alternatives.

And one of the problems the Commission is likely to face is I talked to Brian Duggan at the Department of State, and he said they're likely not to have the Environmental Impact Statement out until November, maybe later than that. That means the Environment Impact Statement will come out after the Commission's hearing.

That means landowners and citizens will not have an opportunity to have any information about other alternatives before the Commission's proceeding that would normally be in the Environmental Impact Statement. So not only would we not have access to information through TransCanada, we wouldn't have the Environmental Impact Statement to look at alternatives either.

And I think that creates somewhat of a scheduling problem for the Commission as well. In the Keystone I proceeding the Environment Impact Statement came out before the Commission had its hearing. Here it's likely to come out afterwards so it won't be able to inform the Interveners in the proceeding.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Chairman, I think I'm clear on the issue from my perspective now.

I can see a very protracted hearing process if

we just went through a process of trying to ascertain
every foot that could be trekked through South Dakota.

And I think it makes a great deal of sense for us to
continue from the process of examining this from the
standpoint of either we approve it, disapprove it, or we

Certainly we can ask during the hearing process if we have questions about a particular route or something of that nature. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. You know, it's interesting the statutes don't say it's got to be the best route. It just says that this pipeline's got to be safe and consistent with the economic use of the area and not cause, you know, undue harm. So to a certain extent weighing of the various merits of different routes is not really considered in the statute other than to tell us not to do it -- or not not to do it but not to route the line specifically. So your points are well taken.

Other questions?

approve it with conditions.

If there are no questions, is there any action?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I move to

deny request 33, 34, and 35.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, point of clarification. Could you provide a little more information about why. Because there's a lot of fuzzy

language about whether it's jurisdictional or not jurisdictional and what the basis for that is so we understand whether we should even present information at all.

Because it's one thing to say, well, you can provide a little information if you want, but it's an entirely different thing for us to be able to have access to the information in the first place. If we don't have access to the information, then the theoretical right to provide discussion and alternatives does not help us.

And if it's really what's happening is that this is not -- to be jurisdictional, I think the Commission should be clear about whether Interveners are allowed to present information on alternatives.

And if we are allowed to present that information, we should also be allowed to discover that information. If we're not allowed to discover it because it's not jurisdictional, then the Commission should be clear that we should not present alternatives to the Commission and waste the Commission's time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You know, Mr. Blackburn, this is one of the many areas where I think this Commission has frustration. At least this Commissioner has frustration. Because as you know with the way the federal laws and rules are written, with the way the

state statutes are written, perhaps this Commission doesn't have as much discretion as it would like. So one concern I have is just looking at what the law tells us we can do and trying to apply that to this very real life situation.

I don't know exactly why the Commission allowed Mr. Rahn's testimony with the last pipeline. I don't -- I think we did it with an abundance of caution. You know, that we wanted to allow that sort of information in.

He didn't rely on information from the Applicant. He relied on his own believe and professional and academic credentials about what route would have been better.

I don't know that that information was particularly helpful to building a record and helping the Commission make a decision. I don't know.

Mr. Smith, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I made the motion on the basis that as what I had said when I made the motion, that in ascertaining whether the route is a good route or not, whether it's acceptable or not, it does not fall at least I believe on our shoulders to try to figure out whether or not there is a different acre of land or a slightly different

variance in the direction of that or if there's a major change in that pipeline that might be slightly better for -- for Keystone to run it. Our job is to ascertain whether there are problems with the actual route that they're asking for.

There may be 100 different routes that they can take through South Dakota. All of them could be good routes. One of them could be slightly better than any others. It's not up to us to try to search out the very best route from the standpoint of every single prairie dog and creek. Our job is to ascertain is there a problem with the actual route that they have presented to us.

If we see that, see a problem with it, then it's our job to deny or to have them take care of that problem. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MS. COLLIER: Mr. Chairman, in response the only thing that comes to mind, however, is how would you determine if there was a problem with a specific route if you have nothing to compare it to? If you only have one alternative -- and, yes, I certainly would agree with the Commissioner that, for example, if there was something that was clearly wrong that would pose some great hazard that would be clear and obvious, you would certainly get that simply by looking at the route.

But other things can only be done in comparison to something else. And that is perhaps my concern.

I don't know as far as the last time that this issue came up and that alternative route was proposed what the basis for that alternative proposal was. I don't know -- I wasn't part of that so I don't know what the -- the evidence was or how that was presented as an alternative route. But I do think there have to be some standards by which you compare things.

If you have one thing standing alone, either there is no comparison, there is no way of judging whether that is good or bad or inadequate. So I would just simply suggest there should be some basis on which to make the determination of whether there are problems with a specific route. And I don't know how you can do that beyond the clear and obvious dangers unless you compare it to something.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes. Commissioner Hanson and then Mr. Rislov.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: The alternative route for the Keystone Pipeline was presented by Interveners. And we received some information from the parties at that time.

Like I say, I don't believe that it's up to --

and I think that is far more appropriate than to have Keystone try to present 100 different ones and say pick the best one. From our standpoint, again -- well, I guess I should add during that particular process when we looked at the Keystone Pipeline there were changes made in the routing as we went through the process. So it's not a fixed and concrete at that juncture, as certainly those changes can still take place.

But the fact is that alternative routes were suggested by Interveners, not by Keystone.

MR. BLACKBURN: Commissioner Hanson, if I may, what we're trying to do is to collect factual information about all other alternative routes from the Applicant.

We're not asking the Applicant to do a theoretical analysis of all the possible routes out there. We believe they've already done an analysis of, you know, the alternative routes and they've provided a conclusory statement about which one they chose.

That doesn't mean there's not information and facts that would help Interveners find which alternative routes might exist and be reasonable. So we're not asking anything new. We're asking for more detail of what they've already done so that we can hopefully have the opportunity to present alternatives should they appear to be merited.

MR. RISLOV: This is Greg Rislov. And because it appears to deal with a comparison that will have to be reviewed during the case it struck me that my wife makes a pretty decent apple pie. I can taste it, and I know it's a decent apple pie. I have certain standards that are inherent to me. My mother makes a better one. I would make one I would throw out.

I can make that judgment without necessarily comparing every apple pie in South Dakota or the United States. The problem I have -- and I don't want to get into legal standards. I'm not an attorney. But it seems to me the Commissioners are trying to judge that comparative apple pie and whether or not it meets standards I guess to make it edible. Is it edible?

And, frankly, I understand what your problem is, but if we're going to go into every possible apple pie and taste it, you know, is that really where the Commission's jurisdiction lies?

I'll let you attorneys argue it. But, frankly, there's a real problem with developing the type of material and for the Commission to sit and make judgments on it beyond the standards and I'll compare them to rate cases fair and reasonable. Is it a reasonable standard you're approaching, or is it a perfect standard you're approaching? And what really is this designed to get at,

other than something beyond a reasonable standard? Just a thought.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think -- Ms. Collier's comments I think are right. I do think there is some value generally in comparison. I think that provides context. I think it provides framework.

The only reason I don't find that argument wholly compelling is that we're really -- we're making an incomplete comparison. And you've got a route that has been fully vetted from a hydrology perspective, from a archeological perspective, from a flora and fauna perspective, and you have some other routes that have not undergone guite the same testing.

I am nervous that comparing what hopefully in this process -- well, not hopefully, will need to be a fully vetted route in comparison -- in comparing it against others gives us an incomplete comparison that may lead the Commission into conclusions that are not indeed accurate.

I would agree wholeheartedly that if we had two routes that had both undergone a full vetting, that I would want to compare and contrast those routes because I do think it would provide context. I'm not sure that's the situation we have here.

And just one more thing. I mean, I appreciated

Mr. Rislov's analogy. I would just tweak it only by saying that I don't think this route has to be edible. I think the standard is higher than that. And I think Mr. Rislov would probably agree with that.

You know, edible is a low threshold. I think the burden of proof is rather a hefty in this instance. So tasty perhaps.

Other questions?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I just wanted to say that I think -- I understand your comments that you referenced, but in all reality there probably will never be a good route. There will always be people -- across the State of South Dakota there will always be one or two people who think there will always be a better route.

So I think that's one reason for the law. It's very, very clear in 49-41B-36, extremely clear, that we cannot do that route, we cannot change that route. So I think we have a motion on the floor, though, if I'm not mistaken.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, my -- my motion stands as I stated. I did not include the portion saying that we did not have jurisdiction because I believe that precludes us really from looking at additional information that may be presented to us for an alternative route, and I did not want to deny the

1 Interveners that opportunity to do that. 2 My problem with Mr. Blackburn's statement about 3 having Keystone present all of the additional information 4 on all routings that they considered, that opens up the 5 entire discussion then. If there's additional 6 information on another route, then it begins the entire 7 discussion from Interveners as to in order to properly 8 assess that in comparison with the other route then we have to look at all information pertaining to that route, 10 just as if it's being applied for at the same time. 11 So basically our challenge is doubled at that 12 juncture. And it just -- it does not make sense for us 13 to go through all of those hoops when, in fact, our job 14 is to ascertain whether the present route is satisfactory 15 or not. 16 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: All right. Commissioner 17 Kolbeck is right. There is a pending motion. 18 Further discussion on the motion. 19 Hearing none -- and the motion is to deny 20 request 23 --21 23. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes. 22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: 23. 23 Hanson. 24 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

Kolbeck.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:

25

1 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. The motion carries 3-0.

I think those are the data requests, but I'll look at the parties to see if there's anything I have missed, anything we have missed.

MR. BLACKBURN: No. Mr. Chairman, those are all the requests we had concerns with.

and the Commission voted on earlier dealt with the ERP, the Emergency Response Plan. We denied that data request. Part of me still feels like Ms. Collier's point was well taken that when we get to a draft point perhaps that document could be provided to those people who have entered into a protective order and have specifically asked for it.

Not even necessarily -- I don't know to the extent that that would be helpful to them in this process. But again to the extent we're concerned about the PHMSA process that may be of value to the broader national process.

So I would just stop and ask my colleagues or the parties if perhaps that would be an appropriate thing to request or order Keystone to do.

MR. KOENECKE: Commissioner, this is

Brett Koenecke. If I could respond, I'd really like a chance to learn more about the universe of information on the development of the ERP for this particular process before we'd respond to that. I think we've got time to do that. And if I could ask for your indulgence in that, I'd really appreciate a chance to find out more about exactly where we're at in the development, what the time line might be and come back.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think that's fair. I'll just leave it as a default in my mind that if we don't hear something from Keystone, that they will provide when they have not necessarily a final draft but something between a preliminary and a final draft, that they will provide that. Dakota Rural Action specifically asked for it and so that they — and staff would be provided a copy at that point. Unless we hear otherwise from you, I'll just sort of presume that's the default.

MR. KOENECKE: Thank you.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, the concern I think I would express is about the time. TransCanada has addressed that question. Because a draft may not be available until after the Commission's action.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I understand that, but I think -- I mean, if that's when it's done, that's when it's done. The concerns expressed by Commissioner Hanson

I agree with 100 percent. Dakota Rural Action's made similar concerns. We want an opportunity to have our voices heard at PHMSA. That opportunity may be after this particular regulatory process is concluded. I still think the ERP would be of assistance to all of us, even after that fact.

MR. BLACKBURN: Well, we still disagree that the information contained in that process would not be helpful to this Commission. We think it would be. But I understand the Commission has already denied that motion -- or denied the request.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I'm just trying to make sure that the agreements that you made that I agree with most, that we're able to make sure you get the information that is going to be helpful -- I mean, you spoke a lot about the PHMSA process so let's make sure you get the tools that will be beneficial to that process.

Other questions, issues?

MS. SEMMLER: It wasn't noticed to be decided here today but yesterday was the prefiled testimony extension time frame and nothing was filed, I don't believe. So I don't know if the Commission has the ability to address that today, if we need to change that procedural schedule around again.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, perhaps we can just do

some information gathering here. Again, I'd be reticent to take action not having it be noticed. But let's -- I mean, is there a reason -- should we expect that something will be late filed, or do we have any information from the parties?

1.3

MR. BLACKBURN: We assumed that our testimony would be based in large part on what we gathered or in part on what we gathered from TransCanada. So we can't draft things that -- we can't draft based on not knowing whether we get information or not.

We have greater clarity now about what access we have to information, and based on that clarity and also TransCanada's agreed to provide some additional information so we would need to have a chance to look at that information. We need to have a chance to evaluate whether it's worthwhile for us to present certain kinds of information or not or testify on certain issues or not. So, you know, we couldn't produce testimony without information.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, it has been the standard operating procedure of this Commission I think in most cases that someone would file their comments with the information they have. If the Commission made other information discoverable, but, I mean, additional comments could be filed after that.

I think it does put the process in a -- I mean, it -- it does affect the process with the fact that there are no comments filed, there were no comments filed at the deadline.

Other comments by anyone?

1.4

MS. SEMMLER: Maybe we'll communicate informally regarding a time frame that you think you can produce testimony, and the Commission may need to extend the deadline to accept such testimony should Dakota Rural Action choose to file it.

MR. BLACKBURN: And, Mr. Chairman, I would also note that because of the Environmental Impact Statement delay, likely the entire process -- the Commission as I understand it can't make a decision until they have the draft -- Final Environmental Impact Statement in front of them.

If the same schedule's applying between the date the Draft Environmental Impact Statement comes out and the final, that would be roughly four months between those documents, four or five months. That means the Federal Government is not going to complete its Environment Impact Statement until sometime in the spring. Therefore, there's not really any rush here because the Commission can't make a decision, as I understand it, until the DEIS is finished -- or until the

1 | final Environment Impact Statement is finished.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Blackburn, what leads you to believe that? I haven't been around a long time, but most of the siting cases we've ruled on, the Commission's ruling has been done prior to the completion of the federal EIS.

MR. BLACKBURN: You know, it is possible I am wrong. I understand how the Federal Government operates, and in terms of their Environment Impact Statements, they cannot make a decision until the final Environment Impact Statement is finished and approved.

Now the State of South Dakota doesn't have the same rules. They can make a decision before the Final Environmental Impact Statement is approved. It presents a problem that it appears the Commission is making a decision without the benefit of the environmental review because they don't have the final environmental review before them at the time they make the decision.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Ms. Semmler, did you get the information you were seeking?

MS. SEMMLER: Not really, but I don't know if we can get it. It doesn't sound like that will be made available to us.

MR. BLACKBURN: I didn't disagree we would be willing to talk about it. I just added the extra point

that the Commission should consider whether it wants to have a decision before any environmental information is presented to it.

2.4

And in terms of the exact schedule for how we do the testimony, I would like to see what information we get from TransCanada. I'd like to combine it all at one place and put the testimony in as we see appropriately.

I think it's a good subject for further discussion between Ms. Semmler and myself. I'm not prepared today to say what date would be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And that's fine. We'll let the parties work this out off line. I mean, if memory serves, the procedural schedule did have some potential hearing dates set aside.

MS. SEMMLER: It does. And it's frustrating those prior efforts made by staff and the Commission may have been futile.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Now I'm hearing one of the parties feels it's very important the Commission have a final EIS done prior to making a decision. Did anybody expect that was going to be done by December?

I mean, and if not, why wasn't that concern raised during the time we were doing scheduling? It is -- if we're going to take the time to do scheduling orders, then I think the kind of concerns that were

brought up by Dakota Rural Action would have been best raised at that time rather than now.

2.0

MR. BLACKBURN: I think that's a basic sense of my habit of law of thinking that the Commission would want to make a final decision after the Final Environmental Impact Statement out, that they would have that to inform --

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Did anybody expect that to be done by December? I've never heard we'd be done by December. So why did we all agree to hearing dates in December?

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Final Environmental Impact Statement was expected to be completed sometime in January or possibly February, and the Commission's final order on this I believe was scheduled for March. And that's what -- and that's roughly the order that things happened in the Keystone I proceeding.

The Final Environment Impact Statement was out before the Commission's final order in Keystone I. I assumed that the Commission would want to wait for its final decision until the Final Environment Impact Statement was out. I mean, that is a reasonable assumption to make.

MR. WHITE: Well, I'm not sure what the basis

for that assumption was. But the State Department doesn't publish indications of when it expects to issue the Final Environmental Impact Statement. And it was certainly not our expectation that there would necessarily be a Final EIS prior to the March 12-month run on the Commission's procedure.

There will, however, be a extensive Draft EIS available in the November time frame well in advance of the Commission's order date.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I mean, I think the concern,
Mr. Blackburn -- two of them. If it was expected to be
out in January or February and you say the Commission
would want before making its decision to see that, then
why did we agree to December hearing dates and a decision
that could have been done any number of weeks after that?

Second concern. And this is -- I know you wouldn't have any reason to know about the history of the Commission's siting cases over the last five years, but we do have a 12-month time frame. We would have been in violation of state law if we would have waited for the Big Stone II Final EIS, which did not come out for I feel like it was something like two years after the Commission's statutory limits for deciding -- for that case.

So maybe we just have a failure to communicate.

But I am disappointed that December hearing dates were agreed upon if it was not expected a Final EIS would be agreed upon by that time.

2.3

MR. SMITH: Actually I think the hearing date's in November.

I might note too for the record -- I'm just going to note this is our statute regarding the Environmental Impact Statement is permissive. It's pretty clear. And so is Chapter 34A-9, that this thing -- the statute, the relevant statute says "may." And our case law has consistently stated that in South Dakota.

You know, you look at the SDDS case or the Etsi Pipeline case, the Supreme Court in there was crystal clear that there is no obligation. There's no obligation in this state to have a Final EIS prior to rendering a decision or an EIS at all. It's not required. Usually agencies if they're -- like to have environmental information.

In this case I'm assuming we'll have a whole lot of it. But it is not necessary that the federal EIS be completed legally.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, we're not going to resolve this yet today. It's clear the parties have some discussion to do with regard to changing the time line.

```
1
              Unless there's any other business to come before
2
     the Commission today, is there a motion to adjourn?
 3
              COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: So moved.
 4
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Motion has been made.
     Proceed to vote.
 5
 6
              Hanson.
7
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
8
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.
9
              COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. Motion
10
11
     carries 3-0. Thanks very much.
12
              (The hearing is concluded at 11:53 a.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

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
10	had in the above-entitled matter on the 23rd day of
11	September, 2009, and that the attached is a true and
12	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 1st day of
14	October, 2009.
15	
16	
17	
18	Cheri McComsey Willer, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter
20	Certified Realtime Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

33:2, 50:7, 50:22, 51:10, 62:6, 62:11, 69:17, 80:2, 104:7, 115:8, 115:16, 120:9, 120:19, 131:21, 135:20, 136:4, 140:1, 140:13, 145:10, 146:14 agreed [4] - 69:7, 141:13, 147:2, 147:3 agreement [5] - 21:19, 26:16, 115:7, 118:10, 119:21 agreements [26] -16:25, 102:22, 107:15, 107:16, 107:20, 108:1, 108:2, 108:3, 108:5, 108:8, 108:13, 108:14, 108:17, 108:18, 108:20, 115:13, 115:15, 115:23, 115:24, 115:25, 116:2, 116:9, 117:14, 117:24, 118:14, 140:13 agricultural [1] - 10:7 ahead [9] - 3:23, 6:8, 32:21, 33:25, 34:22, 93:23, 102:16, 107:24, 107:25 Ailts [1] - 1:13 air[7] - 10:19, 19:23, 20:8, 20:16, 20:20, 21:1, 28:8 airtight [1] - 109:19 Alberta [2] - 96:6, 114:22 allow [14] - 3:12, 3:16, 3:20, 17:17, 29:2, 63:3, 71:18, 89:6, 107:21, 107:23, 118:23, 123:2, 126:13, 130:9 allowed [7] - 14:3, 68:10, 129:13, 129:15, 129:16, 129:17, 130:6 allowing [2] - 103:7, 106:6 almost [2] - 56:12, 59:24 alone [1] - 132:10 alternative [20] -121:13, 121:17, 121:21, 121:23, 121:25, 122:7, 122:12, 123:1,

125:18, 126:16, 131:21, 132:4, 132:5, 132:8, 132:21, 133:9, 133:13, 133:17, 133:20, 136:25 alternatives [15] -121:18, 122:2, 122:3, 122:4, 122:6, 122:19, 122:25, 126:24, 127:1, 127:10, 127:14, 129:10, 129:14, 129:19, 133:24 amenable [1] - 104:13 amendment [2] -120:16, 121:1 America [1] - 34:9 amount [11] - 23:8, 33:3, 38:2, 58:6, 67:19, 67:22, 76:10, 76:11, 83:24, 90:10, 109:25 amounts [2] - 67:20, 90:16 analogous [1] - 60:13 analogy [1] - 136:1 analyses [1] - 101:9 analysis [9] - 15:18, 15:19, 21:10, 98:13, 122:3, 122:9, 122:14, 133:15, 133:16 AND [1] - 1:5 annual [1] - 30:1 answer [12] - 13:22, 63:2, 63:6, 71:16, 77:1, 77:2, 97:18, 97:19, 116:4, 119:4, 124:3, 124:14 answered [2] - 40:21, 40:22 answers [2] - 105:3, 115:16 anticipate [1] - 90:1 anyway [1] - 71:25 Apologies [1] - 6:8 apologize [2] - 31:16, 72.9 appear [2] - 7:21, 133:25 appearance [1] - 28:7 APPEARANCES [1] appearing [5] - 1:18, 1:18, 1:19, 1:20, 1:21 apple [5] - 134:4, 134:5, 134:9,

134:13, 134:16

applicable [2] - 40:16, 56:17 Applicant [18] - 1:18, 1:19, 1:20, 5:14, 15:15, 19:1, 19:2, 19:5, 26:5, 30:8, 49:7, 85:25, 90:5, 100:5, 110:1, 130:12, 133:13, 133:14 Applicant's [2] - 5:25, 19:6 application [2] -123:10, 123:12 APPLICATION [1] -1:4 Application [14] -11:22, 11:23, 11:25, 15:22, 81:2, 96:8, 96:22, 96:25, 99:3, 100:6, 100:11, 103:19, 109:12, 110:22 applied [1] - 137:10 apply [2] - 32:25, 130:4 applying [1] - 142:17 appointed [1] - 149:8 appreciate [5] - 4:1, 6:9, 84:4, 139:6 appreciated [1] -135:25 approaching [2] -134:24, 134:25 appropriate [6] -29:10, 50:8, 106:5, 133:1, 138:23, 144:10 appropriately [2] -52:13, 144:7 approval [2] - 55:19, 65:3 approve [11] - 35:14, 51:21, 68:3, 68:4, 73:16, 119:17, 121:1, 124:21, 128:5, 128:6 approved [5] - 63:15, 65:19, 72:16, 143:11, 143:14 approving [2] -120:21, 125:12 Aquifer [2] - 54:1, 54:6 archeological [1] -135:11 Area [1] - 21:12 area [8] - 5:4, 16:11, 21:13, 29:7, 54:1,

60:23, 85:19, 128:13

Areas [1] - 16:9

134:11

attorneys [1] - 134:19

16:13, 16:15, 16:23, 17:18, 18:16, 35:17, 58:3, 63:23, 72:12, 72:13, 129:22 arguably [1] - 16:5 argue [4] - 6:12, 44:12, 48:9, 134:19 argued [2] - 4:6, 103:16 argues [4] - 53:3, 54:12, 95:16, 95:17 arguing [1] - 56:12 argument [15] - 15:6, 30:19, 40:18, 47:11, 48:3, 50:24, 56:6, 59:17, 64:24, 81:4, 103:10, 121:19, 123:5, 123:13, 135:7 arguments [6] - 3:14, 3:16, 4:5, 26:4, 50:9, 59:4 articulated [1] -120:19 ascertain [4] - 128:1, 131:3, 131:11, 137:14 ascertaining [1] -130:21 aside [2] - 7:10, 144:14 assays [1] - 86:22 asserted [1] - 121:17 assess [1] - 137:8 assessment [9] -19:17, 21:9, 21:21, 31:13, 88:18, 88:20, 90:8, 90:23, 93:8 assessments [1] -21:3 assistance [1] - 140:5 associated [3] -55:13, 59:15, 104:9 Association [2] -96:23, 97:1 assume [3] - 43:18, 45:7, 107:5 assumed [2] - 141:6, 145:21 assuming [4] - 20:3, 20:4, 20:7, 147:20 assumption [2] -145:24, 146:1 assumptions [1] -67:2 attached [2] - 93:7, 149:11 attorney [2] - 22:25,

areas [13] - 7:6, 16:7,

2 Austin [1] - 13:10 authority [8] - 30:17, 32:13, 53:5, 55:8, 57:10, 62:13, 111:10 avail [1] - 74:4 availability [1] - 31:12 available [16] - 33:9, 42:13, 43:17, 43:18, 52:22, 64:4, 67:8, 76:10, 89:23, 101:9, 101:15, 106:5, 119:14, 139:22, 143:23, 146:8 Avenue [1] - 2:3 avoid [1] - 78:7 aware [1] - 65:12 awful [2] - 66:20, 98:5 awkward [2] - 58:9, 65:8 Aye [25] - 22:10, 22:12, 35:21, 35:23, 47:2, 47:4, 52:3, 52:5, 70:9, 75:20, 75:22, 80:11, 80:13, 81:20, 81:22, 88:12, 88:14, 94:19, 94:21, 121:7, 121:9, 137:24, 138:1, 148:7, 148:9 aye [12] - 22:13, 35:24, 47:5, 52:6, 75:23, 80:14, 81:23, 88:15, 94:22, 121:10, 138:2, 148:10

В

background [1] -107:6 bad [5] - 53:17, 77:18, 78:16, 119:25, 132:12 balancing [1] - 111:17 bankers [1] - 7:3 base [3] - 10:20, 59:22, 87:17 based [11] - 30:6, 72:18, 96:7, 96:20. 109:15, 112:17, 120:21, 126:20, 141:7, 141:9, 141:12 Based [1] - 49:10 basic [4] - 35:2, 67:1, 82:7, 145:3 basis [12] - 30:1, 34:15, 106:23, 109:16, 109:18, 119:14, 119:20, 129:2, 130:20,

132:5, 132:13,
145:25
Bates [1] - 12:16 Bates-stamped [1] -
12:16
beans [1] - 61:7
bear [1] - 43:15
bearing [1] - 100:24 become [1] - 110:22
becomes [3] - 36:17,
37:16, 100:23
becoming [1] - 60:7
BEFORE [1] - 1:10
beginning [1] - 112:15 begins [1] - 137:6
behalf [7] - 1:18, 1:18,
1:20, 1:20, 1:21,
6:15, 73:10 behavior[1] - 58:12
believes [5] - 4:14,
48:2, 48:3, 100:7,
123:18
benchmarks [1] - 86:23
beneath [1] - 22:20
beneficial [1] - 140:17
benefit [3] - 39:13,
45:12, 143:16 best [7] - 50:9, 104:24,
124:3, 128:12,
131:10, 133:3, 145:1
better [10] - 53:17, 55:15, 103:13,
104:21, 125:11,
130:14, 131:2,
131:8, 134:6, 136:14
between [8] - 12:15, 58:24, 67:20, 76:22,
139:13, 142:17,
142:19, 144:9
beyond [14] - 14:7,
55:11, 55:22, 56:8, 92:19, 107:17,
118:1, 122:16,
126:14, 132:16,
134:22, 135:1 big [5] - 38:22, 39:3,
56:11, 69:12, 69:14
Big [3] - 11:21, 11:23,
125:25, 126:12, 126:14, 132:16, 134:22, 135:1 big [5] - 38:22, 39:3, 56:11, 69:12, 69:14 Big [3] - 11:21, 11:23, 146:21 binding [12] - 107:14, 107:20, 108:1, 108:3, 108:5, 108:7, 115:13, 115:14, 115:22, 116:9, 116:10, 117:14 bit [10] - 3:18, 46:2, 92:19, 93:12, 103:23, 104:5,
binding [12] - 107:14, 107:20, 108:1,
108:3, 108:5, 108:7,
115:13, 115:14,
115:22, 116:9, 116:10, 117:14
bit [10] - 3:18, 46:2,
92:19, 93:12,
103:23, 104:5,

114:11, 117:7,	blows [1] - 9:8
122:11, 122:14	Board [2] - 40:10,
bitumen [2] - 84:12,	46:18
86:19	Bob [1] - 1:15
black [3] - 11:18, 65:9,	bolts [1] - 52:25
112:17	border [4] - 33:21,
black-and-white [2] -	34:11, 95:20, 98
11:18, 65:9 Blackburn [47] - 1:20,	bother [2] - 12:1,
6:8, 8:16, 10:21,	120:21
22:17, 27:3, 28:18,	bottom [2] - 15:7, 124:15
29:9, 30:17, 34:3,	boxes [2] - 7:3, 8:1
34:24, 40:6, 41:7,	branch [1] - 34:24
42:8, 44:4, 44:21,	breadth [5] - 30:24
50:14, 50:22, 56:10,	31:13, 59:11, 59
61:12, 62:7, 68:9,	69:11
74:22, 85:3, 85:7,	break [1] - 75:25
85:20, 87:22, 90:13,	breathing [1] - 73:
90:24, 91:3, 101:6,	Brett [4] - 1:18, 18
103:15, 106:16,	59:21, 139:1
107:19, 109:7,	Brian [1] - 127:3
113:21, 116:8, 116:13, 117:3,	brief [3] - 28:21,
117:18, 120:23,	47:10, 83:7
125:22, 126:21,	briefs [1] - 32:22
127:21, 129:21,	bring [7] - 8:13, 10
143:2, 146:11	17:15, 23:23, 27
BLACKBURN [64] -	28:15, 97:25
3:24, 6:9, 8:17,	brings [1] - 88:17
10:22, 18:14, 20:2,	broad [11] - 14:13,
22:4, 22:18, 27:4,	25:3, 32:10, 44:1 44:12, 59:14, 59
29:11, 33:2, 35:1,	79:14, 103:14,
36:4, 42:13, 45:2,	104:3, 104:9
47:18, 50:16, 52:10,	broader [3] - 49:20
57:7, 61:13, 67:5,	111:10, 138:20
70:17, 74:23, 76:8,	broadly [3] - 10:17
80:19, 82:4, 85:22,	19:11, 30:5
87:23, 88:20, 90:14, 91:8, 92:18, 93:6,	brother[1] - 89:8
95:2, 100:3, 101:13,	brought [4] - 7:2,
104:17, 106:24,	43:15, 74:1, 145
107:20, 109:21,	build [3] - 10:8, 10
111:20, 112:21,	76:13
113:7, 114:14,	building [1] - 130:
114:19, 115:9,	Building [1] - 2:3
117:6, 117:23,	built [4] - 13:21,
118:11, 120:24,	13:25, 98:2, 108
121:16, 126:3,	bullet [1] - 9:12 bulletin [8] - 76:5,
126:22, 128:23,	76:12, 79:2, 79:3
133:11, 138:7,	79:4, 79:6, 79:21
139:19, 140:7,	80:3
141:6, 142:11, 143:7, 143:24,	burden [22] - 7:12,
145.7, 145.24, 145:3, 145:12	29:22, 29:24, 30
Blackburn's [9] - 15:1,	31:14, 39:12, 56
15:6, 19:15, 63:3,	99:10, 99:14,
93:16, 98:23, 123:5,	109:10, 109:13,
123:13, 137:2	109:22, 110:4,
blend [1] - 84:12	110:18, 110:21,
blow(4) 79:15	111:9, 111:11,

blow [1] - 78:15

```
border [4] - 33:21,
 34:11, 95:20, 98:10
bother [2] - 12:1,
 120:21
bottom [2] - 15:7,
 124:15
boxes [2] - 7:3, 8:19
branch [1] - 34:24
breadth [5] - 30:24,
 31:13, 59:11, 59:18,
 69:11
break [1] - 75:25
breathing [1] - 73:9
Brett [4] - 1:18, 18:9,
 59:21, 139:1
Brian [1] - 127:3
brief [3] - 28:21.
 47:10. 83:7
briefs [1] - 32:22
bring [7] - 8:13, 10:20,
 17:15, 23:23, 27:23,
 28:15, 97:25
brings [1] - 88:17
broad [11] - 14:13,
 25:3, 32:10, 44:10,
 44:12, 59:14, 59:15,
 79:14, 103:14,
 104:3, 104:9
broader [3] - 49:20.
 111:10, 138:20
broadly [3] - 10:17,
 19:11, 30:5
brother[1] - 89:8
brought [4] - 7:2,
 43:15, 74:1, 145:1
build [3] - 10:8, 10:11,
 76:13
building [1] - 130:16
Building [1] - 2:3
built [4] - 13:21,
 13:25, 98:2, 108:11
bullet [1] - 9:12
bulletin [8] - 76:5,
 76:12, 79:2, 79:3,
 79:4, 79:6, 79:21,
 80:3
burden [22] - 7:12,
 29:22, 29:24, 30:25,
 31:14, 39:12, 56:16,
 99:10, 99:14,
 109:10, 109:13,
 109:22, 110:4,
 110:18, 110:21,
 111:9, 111:11,
 111:18, 122:21,
```

122:24, 136:6 burdens [1] - 110:19 burdensome [14] -33:21, 45:7, 55:12, 62:24, 103:9, 103:11, 103:25, 104:3, 105:14, 105:21, 105:22, 105:23, 105:24, 117:10 burdensomeness [2] - 92:1, 122:10 buried [2] - 15:9, 22:20 burrow[1] - 115:5 burst [3] - 76:15, 76:20, 76:21 business [9] - 74:5, 101:13, 101:25, 113:10, 113:17, 113:20, 118:17, 118:18, 148:1 but-for[2] - 111:1 BY [1] - 1:4

C Caitlin [1] - 1:21 calculations [2] -64:23, 93:9 Canada [22] - 33:8, 33:18, 37:22, 37:23, 38:25, 45:15, 83:13, 84:6, 84:10, 85:25, 95:6, 95:13, 97:3, 105:7, 108:22, 111:22, 112:8, 114:16, 114:20, 114:21, 114:24, 115:10 Canadian [11] - 40:10, 40:13, 40:16, 42:4, 43:16, 43:20, 44:5, 83:25, 86:18, 96:23, 97:1 Canadians [2] - 39:9, 45:10 cancelled [1] - 95:14 cancelling [1] -115:15 cannot [9] - 64:9, 70:22, 98:10, 100:17, 121:19, 123:25, 136:17, 143:10 cap [6] - 96:25, 97:2, 102:9, 107:1, 107:3, 107:6 capable [1] - 4:25

capacity [1] - 114:24 Capitol [3] - 2:2, 2:3, 3:4 care [3] - 13:12, 38:20, 131:15 carries [12] - 22:14, 35:25, 47:6, 52:7, 75:24, 80:15, 81:24, 88:16, 94:23, 121:11, 138:3, 148:11 carry [1] - 59:18 case [40] - 3:9, 17:15, 17:19, 31:17, 32:15, 37:15, 60:6, 61:2, 65:11, 66:19, 67:17, 88:18, 88:20, 88:22, 89:2, 89:4, 89:12, 90:4, 90:9, 90:11, 90:18, 90:23, 91:22, 91:24, 93:8, 93:18, 93:19, 94:13, 100:4, 100:18, 108:11, 109:24, 125:20, 134:3, 146:24, 147:11, 147:13, 147:14, 147:20 cases [8] - 7:13, 30:20, 31:9, 32:11, 134:23, 141:22, 143:4, 146:18 catastrophic [1] -89:20 catch [1] - 9:9 category [2] - 49:17, 49:19 caused [4] - 8:14, 9:10, 10:13, 14:14 caution [1] - 130:8 centers [1] - 13:13 certain [16] - 9:9, 33:3, 43:2, 44:18, 64:21, 65:23, 74:13, 74:17, 74:20, 76:9, 82:18, 108:23, 128:14, 134:5, 141:16, 141:17 Certainly [3] - 119:24, 125:19, 128:7 certainly [16] - 8:7, 8:25, 13:19, 20:5, 20:21, 40:17, 44:23, 57:12, 72:4, 73:10, 103:14, 110:14, 131:21, 131:24, 133:7, 146:4 CERTIFICATE [1] -149:2 Certified [2] - 149:6,

149:19

CERTIFY[1] - 149:8 CHAIRMAN [166] -1:11, 1:11, 3:1, 6:5, 6:13, 7:19, 8:3, 10:20, 14:10, 15:13, 15:25, 16:3, 16:19, 17:9, 19:19, 21:17, 22:2, 22:5, 22:11, 22:13, 24:24, 26:2, 26:8, 30:2, 30:10, 31:21, 31:23, 32:17, 33:23, 34:16, 34:19, 34:22, 35:13, 35:22, 35:24, 39:24, 40:23, 41:2, 42:2, 42:8, 43:25, 46:11, 46:18, 46:23, 47:3, 47:5, 49:2, 50:2, 50:5, 50:13, 50:21, 51:19, 52:4, 52:6, 55:2, 55:24, 56:10, 59:5, 59:10, 59:17, 60:12, 61:3, 62:5, 63:8, 66:14, 68:1, 68:15, 68:25, 69:5, 70:4, 70:8, 70:10, 74:22, 75:2, 75:21, 75:23, 76:3, 79:18, 79:23, 80:7, 80:12, 80:14, 80:24, 81:9, 81:13, 81:16, 81:21, 81:23, 84:15, 85:17, 86:3, 86:25, 88:1, 88:9, 88:13, 88:15, 90:5, 90:12, 90:21, 91:4, 91:10, 92:2, 92:9, 93:11, 93:21, 94:3, 94:8, 94:10, 94:16, 94:20, 94:22, 98:7, 99:7, 101:6, 103:5, 104:11, 104:16, 106:9, 107:11, 107:18, 109:4, 113:21, 114:17, 114:25, 115:18, 116:1, 116:6, 116:19, 117:18, 118:6, 118:20, 119:5, 119:16, 120:14, 120:23, 120:25, 121:8, 121:10, 123:4, 123:16, 123:21, 124:2, 128:10, 129:21, 132:19, 135:3, 137:16, 137:22, 137:25, 138:2, 138:9, 139:9, 139:23, 140:12, 140:25, 141:20, 143:2, 143:19,

144:11, 144:18, 145:8, 146:10, 147:23, 148:4, 148:8, 148:10 Chairman [44] - 7:24, 14:11, 19:21, 25:1, 31:16, 34:18, 39:25, 49:3, 51:16, 52:10, 55:3, 58:19, 63:9, 66:12, 67:5, 69:17, 70:17, 70:24, 71:15, 74:21, 76:8, 78:24, 80:19, 85:22, 92:18, 99:18, 100:3, 104:17, 117:6, 120:9, 123:24, 127:23, 128:21, 128:23, 130:19, 130:20, 131:16, 131:17, 132:18, 136:20, 138:7, 139:19, 142:11, 145:12 challenge [3] -100:21, 103:19, 137:11 chance [6] - 39:6, 71:10, 139:2, 139:6, 141:14, 141:15 change [7] - 56:4, 64:16, 73:8, 73:16, 131:2, 136:17, 140:23 changed [2] - 99:2, 102:24 changes [6] - 64:5, 73:2, 73:5, 73:7, 133:5, 133:8 changing [1] - 147:25 chapter[1] - 124:4 Chapter [1] - 147:9 character [1] - 101:16 characteristics [2] -84:24, 85:9 characterization [1] -18:7 characterizes [1] -31:18 chart [2] - 91:6, 91:8 chase [1] - 113:22 chatting [1] - 107:13 check [4] - 3:11, 57:3, 77:13, 90:20 chemical [3] - 83:15, 83:25, 84:5 Cheri [2] - 1:24, 149:18

CHERI [1] - 149:5

choose [3] - 4:21,

104:23, 142:10

138:22

chooses [2] - 58:13, 58:15 chose [1] - 133:18 church [1] - 23:1 circuit [1] - 51:4 Circuit (1) - 51:11 circumstances [1] -51:12 cite [1] - 30:21 cited [1] - 30:18 citizen [2] - 57:25, 74:15 citizens [12] - 53:15, 53:20, 53:21, 54:18, 57:17, 57:22, 58:11, 64:15, 72:5, 75:1, 89:18, 127:8 City [5] - 13:10, 96:6, 96:13, 96:14, 99:6 claimed [2] - 23:7, 102:23 clarification [4] - 69:2, 73:2, 113:3, 128:24 clarify [3] - 49:11, 109:8, 119:3 clarity [5] - 6:10. 11:14, 36:8, 141:11, 141:12 clear [19] - 11:8, 41:15, 58:15, 61:25, 87:9, 94:5, 97:20, 103:9, 123:24, 127:23, 129:13, 129:19, 131:24, 132:16, 136:16, 147:9, 147:15, 147:24 clearly [3] - 4:23, 98:14, 131:23 climatic [1] - 23:11 Clipper [1] - 114:22 close [4] - 13:25, 21:18, 23:13, 33:15 closely [1] - 113:13 closer[4] - 10:21, 101:22, 117:1, 117:7 CMRP[1] - 28:21 co [3] - 1:18, 1:19, 1:21 co-counsel [3] - 1:18, 1:19, 1:21 coal [1] - 24:8 Coast [1] - 60:23 code [1] - 112:18 codes [2] - 40:16. 56:20 coffee [1] - 22:25 colleagues [5] - 3:6, 3:12, 32:19, 106:10,

collect [2] - 105:17, 133:12 collected [1] - 25:7 COLLIER [2] - 70:25, 131:17 Collier (1) - 1:21 Collier's [2] - 135:3, 138:12 colored [1] - 11:18 combine [1] - 144:6 comfortable [3] -60:15, 115:4, 115:20 comina [7] - 6:6, 27:6. 37:8, 50:15, 74:7, 92:20. 96:24 commencing [1] - 2:4 comment [17] - 19:16, 31:20, 51:10, 64:4, 65:14, 65:18, 68:16, 71:18, 71:24, 72:6, 74:17, 74:24, 74:25, 75:1, 99:19, 100:12, 107:18 commented [2] - 57:9, 57:12 commenting [2] -53:19, 69:22 comments [22] - 6:21, 7:25, 8:1, 16:2, 24:24, 32:21, 62:6, 64:5, 65:20, 69:18, 74:1, 96:15, 98:24, 103:24, 107:12, 135:4, 136:10, 141:22, 141:25, 142:3, 142:5 commercial [2] - 83:4, 115:13 commercially [1] -108:6 Commission [132] -3:2, 4:7, 4:9, 4:11, 4:13, 4:16, 4:20, 4:24, 5:2, 5:4, 6:10, 7:23, 13:16, 15:13, 18:11, 18:25, 25:21, 26:2, 32:6, 32:23, 35:14, 40:23, 45:11, 47:22, 47:25, 48:4, 48:11, 48:13, 50:6, 51:20, 52:13, 53:4, 53:8, 53:12, 53:18, 53:23, 54:4, 54:7, 54:14, 54:25, 55:23, 55:24, 56:4, 56:7, 56:9, 57:8, 57:10, 57:18, 58:3, 58:10, 58:11, 58:13, 58:16, 60:5, 62:3, 65:18,

73:19, 73:23, 74:15,

78:10, 79:7, 79:18, 79:22, 80:4, 80:21, 81:8, 82:16, 86:6, 90:12, 90:25, 91:11, 95:10, 95:17, 95:21, 95:23, 97:11, 97:19, 99:7, 99:9, 99:11, 101:2, 101:8, 102:2, 102:19, 106:8, 107:11, 109:14, 110:11, 110:17, 111:7, 116:20, 118:18, 118:22, 119:17, 121:19, 121:21, 121:24, 122:23, 123:1, 123:16, 123:19, 126:13, 126:24, 127:2, 127:16, 127:18, 129:12, 129:18, 129:20, 129:22, 130:1, 130:6, 130:17, 134:21, 135:18, 138:10, 140:9, 140:10, 140:22, 141:21, 141:23, 142:8, 142:13, 142:24, 143:15, 144:1, 144:16, 144:19, 145:4, 145:21, 146:12, 148:2 COMMISSION [3] -1:1, 1:10, 1:13 Commission's [24] -5:3, 14:6, 51:3, 54:15, 60:25, 96:2, 100:24, 103:3, 111:9, 121:20, 123:2, 124:5, 127:7, 127:10, 129:20, 134:18, 139:22, 143:4, 145:15, 145:20, 146:6, 146:9, 146:18, 146:23 **COMMISSIONER** [95] - 1:12, 19:21, 20:3, 20:17, 21:4, 21:7, 21:16, 22:10, 22:12, 26:10, 27:1, 35:21, 35:23, 44:1, 46:13, 46:21, 47:2, 47:4, 50:14, 50:19, 51:9, 51:16, 52:3, 52:5, 61:4, 61:14, 62:15, 63:9, 63:19, 64:7, 65:13, 65:21, 66:2, 66:12, 68:2, 69:1, 69:17, 70:7, 70:9,

70:13, 70:24, 71:15,
72:1, 72:4, 74:11,
75:20, 75:22, 79:25,
80:11, 80:13, 81:15,
81:20, 81:22, 87:1,
87:10, 87:15, 87:21,
87:25, 88:4, 88:12,
88:14, 91:13, 92:16,
93:15, 93:25, 94:5,
94:9, 94:15, 94:19, 94:21, 106:13,
107:10, 120:2,
120:9, 120:18,
121:7, 121:9,
123:23, 124:20,
125:9, 125:19,
126:21, 127:21,
128:21, 130:19,
132:18, 132:21,
136:9, 136:20,
137:21, 137:24,
138:1, 148:3, 148:7,
148:9
Commissioner [36] -
3:6, 3:24, 8:17,
15:23, 18:14, 19:20,
26:8, 26:20, 29:11,
31:19, 47:18, 59:20, 60:17, 63:8, 65:8,
69:6, 72:9, 87:8,
87:24, 90:22, 92:5,
92:9, 93:12, 93:13,
93:23, 106:13,
109:4, 118:22,
123:21, 129:23,
131:22, 132:19,
133:11, 137:16,
133:11, 137:16, 138:25, 139:25
Commissioners [8] -
3:25, 18:8, 43:25,
47:9, 51:5, 120:1,
130:18, 134:12
commitment [1] - 17:6
common [1] - 22:19
communicate [3] -
52:24, 142:6, 146:25
communication [6] - 28:24, 29:1, 29:3,
29:18, 33:15, 74:20 communities [7] -
13:7, 13:9, 13:19,
14:7, 42:21, 52:19,
54:9
companies [11] - 39:1,
76:12, 76:18, 76:19,
77:3, 77:19, 77:21,
78:3, 78:14, 85:5
company [5] - 5:16,
37:21, 39:8, 80:3,
105:16

company's [1] - 77:18 comparative [1] -134:13 compare [5] - 131:20, 132:9, 132:17, 134:22, 135:22 comparing [3] - 134:9, 135:14, 135:16 comparison [8] -132:1, 132:11, 134:2, 135:5, 135:9, 135:16, 135:17, 137:8 Compel [2] - 35:14, 51:21 compelling [1] - 135:8 compensation [1] -29:6 competitors (1) - 86:2 complete [4] - 64:16. 66:4, 76:15, 142:21 completed [11] - 3:15, 55:7, 55:22, 60:19, 63:17, 64:8, 64:11, 65:25, 79:9, 145:14, 147:22 completely [5] -18:10, 34:13, 59:2, 60:4, 119:13 completion [1] - 143:5 compliance [1] -78:11 complicated [1] -33:20 complied [2] - 53:6, 79.2 complies [1] - 70:1 comply [1] - 40:15 complying [2] - 77:25, 108:20 component [1] - 64:10 components [4] -51:25, 53:7, 83:19, 86:22 comports [1] - 18:9 composition [5] -82:1, 82:18, 83:15, 83:25, 84:5 compromise [8] -19:18, 50:12, 70:25, 71:7, 71:13, 87:20, 104:11, 114:4 concede [1] - 41:22 conceptual [1] - 24:13 concern [17] - 6:4, 18:17, 24:2, 36:5, 41:25, 57:13, 58:5, 69:19, 98:24, 115:24, 125:22,

130:3, 132:2,

139:19, 144:22, 146:10, 146:16 concerned [11] - 4:12, 22:19, 23:6, 38:19, 38:21, 48:14, 72:4, 83:15, 120:13, 122:1, 138:19 concerning [13] -14:14, 18:3, 25:4, 41:13, 41:16, 58:22, 58:25, 68:6, 68:13, 69:3, 79:14, 84:23, 91.22 concerns [9] - 5:5, 5:8, 57:5, 57:13, 70:2, 138:8, 139:25, 140:2, 144:25 concluded [2] - 140:4, 148:12 conclusion [2] -126:10, 126:12 conclusions [5] -42:23, 109:15, 126:18, 135:18 conclusory [5] -24:20, 112:25, 126:7, 126:14, 133:17 concrete [1] - 133:7 condition [6] - 62:1, 64:2, 65:17, 110:11, 111:8, 111:10 conditions [5] - 73:7, 110:12, 110:16. 124:22, 128:6 Conditions (1) -124:23 conducted [1] - 85:6 confess [1] - 73:17 confidence [1] -105:10 confidentiality [7] -16:14, 16:17, 16:25, 115:23, 115:25, 119:11, 119:21 conjunction [1] -68:17 connection [2] -40:13, 58:20 consequence [10] -16:7, 16:11, 16:13, 16:15, 16:16, 16:23, 18:16, 21:13, 54:1, 54:3 Consequence [2] -16:9, 21:12 consider [15] - 4:8, 4:21, 13:17, 47:23, 58:17, 65:20, 95:23, 99:11, 101:4,

102:19, 121:24, 124:1, 126:24, 144:1 considerably [1] -34:14 consideration [3] -110:6, 124:13, 127:1 considered (9) - 5:9. 52:13, 58:21, 100:16, 100:17, 122:6, 122:16, 128:16, 137:4 consistent [1] -128:13 consistently [1] -147:11 constituting [1] - 49:8 construct (1) - 102:24 CONSTRUCT [1] - 1:6 constructed [1] -98:10 construction [22] -9:23, 9:25, 26:25, 45:25, 56:22, 95:7, 96:1, 96:10, 96:12, 96:14, 96:17, 96:19, 97:6, 97:8, 102:22, 107:22, 107:25, 108:16, 111:25, 112:16, 113:15, 114:23 Construction [4] -24:16, 25:16, 26:21, 27:25 constructive [1] -104:7 construed [1] - 124:4 Consultative [4] -40:9, 41:23, 42:14, 44:19 consumers [1] - 39:10 consumption[1] -95:11 contained [2] - 18:5, 140:8 containing [1] - 49:6 contains [1] - 81:3 contaminate [1] -82:20 contents [2] - 56:3, 82:9 context [5] - 99:21, 99:23, 99:25, 135:6, 135:23 contingency [1] -66:11 contingency-wise [1] - 66:11 continue [2] - 74:15, 128:4 continued [1] - 108:9

continues (2) -108:21, 112:7 contractors [1] -52:23 contrary [1] - 123:6 contrast [1] - 135:22 control [10] - 15:3, 65:6, 76:13, 77:3, 77:12, 77:18, 77:24, 78:2, 78:19, 86:14 conversation [3] -58:24, 59:13, 103:13 conversations [1] -60:15 conversion [1] - 124:6 CONVERSION [1] -1:5 copied [1] - 11:18 copies [1] - 17:25 copy [5] - 17:24, 18:22, 55:5, 56:7, 139:15 core [3] - 24:1, 35:3, 113:17 corporate [23] - 5:18, 19:2, 19:7, 30:13, 32:6, 32:24, 33:1, 33:14, 33:15, 34:15, 35:16, 38:3, 38:6, 38:13, 40:4, 41:5, 41:11, 41:15, 41:25, 44:25, 86:4, 86:8, 86:9 correct [8] - 41:9, 94:11, 98:25, 102:9, 104:15, 105:11, 126:3, 149:12 Correct [3] - 22:1, 42:5, 99:5 correctly [1] - 65:23 corrosion [7] - 82:12, 82:23, 83:7, 83:10, 83:18, 84:13, 85:1 cost [3] - 37:1, 39:2, 39:11 costs [3] - 37:25, 39:5, 39:9 counsel [4] - 1:18, 1:19, 1:21, 16:23 counties [1] - 13:17 country [4] - 37:5, 39:13, 45:23 county [2] - 89:13, 89:19 COUNTY [1] - 149:3 couple [5] - 7:2, 8:19, 23:1, 109:6, 113:4 course [2] - 56:15, 73:1 court [4] - 48:19,

48:23, 51:4, 51:14 24:5, 24:9, 25:10, 51:18, 56:11, 75:10, 100:8, 100:11, 134:25 Court [2] - 51:11, 38:18, 46:14, 49:13, 128:3, 134:2 101:4, 101:7, 147:14 53:15, 57:17, 62:24, dealing [4] - 16:22, 101:10, 101:17, courts [1] - 49:24 63:4, 64:9, 64:15, 23:2, 44:13, 46:4 101:22, 101:24, 64:18, 69:19, 76:7, cover [20] - 22:16, deals [11] - 3:10. 102:19, 102:21, 80:1, 80:4, 80:18, 22:22, 23:17, 23:22, 22:15, 36:2, 47:16, 103:7, 104:10. 81:4, 82:3, 82:4, 23:24, 24:15, 24:19, 52:8, 76:5, 80:17, 105:8, 105:17, 24:23, 25:5, 25:20, 87:6, 88:19, 92:14, 82:1, 88:18, 94:25, 106:8, 106:15, 27:7, 27:16, 27:22, 95:1, 99:24, 104:14, 121:13 107:8, 107:15, 28:8, 28:15, 29:21, 104:19, 120:20, 108:9, 108:15, dealt[3] - 16:12, 38:1, 121:15, 122:1, 29:25, 33:10, 35:5, 138:10 108:21, 108:23, 122:21, 128:2, 91:17 debate [1] - 31:25 109:1, 109:2. covering [2] - 9:17, 131:7, 134:9, 109:15, 109:19, December [6] -36:18 136:13, 139:14, 110:3, 110:13, 144:21, 145:9, crash [1] - 108:9 140:1, 142:9, 111:21, 112:8, 145:10, 145:11, 143:12, 145:1, create [1] - 89:7 146:14, 147:1 113:23, 114:1, 147:12, 149:7. 114:15, 114:24, creates [1] - 127:15 decent [2] - 134:4, 149:13 115:11, 120:6 credentials [1] -134:5 **DAKOTA** [3] - 1:2, 1:5, demonstration [1] -130:13 decide [5] - 4:10, 14:6, 149.1 109:19 credulity [1] - 98:19 48:10, 63:25, 99:9 Dakotans [2] - 110:8, denial [1] - 110:10 creek [1] - 131:11 decided [3] - 11:10, 122:22 cropland [1] - 28:6 39:9, 140:19 denied [3] - 138:11, damage [13] - 8:14, 140:10, 140:11 deciding [1] - 146:23 cropping [1] - 35:8 9:6, 9:9, 9:19, 10:4, DENR[4] - 55:6, 60:6, decision [18] - 54:14, cross [2] - 31:6, 33:21 11:3, 11:4, 11:12, 74:19, 75:3 cross-examination[1] 71:21, 72:3, 123:2, 11:23, 14:14, 18:20, deny [15] - 35:17, - 31:6 130:17, 142:14, 35:8, 67:10 51:22, 75:11, 79:25, 142:24, 143:10, crossing [2] - 95:20, damages [5] - 9:21, 81:15, 109:15, 143:13, 143:16, 98:11 10:13, 47:16, 48:20, 109:18, 119:18, 143:18, 144:2, crossroads [1] -48:23 144:20, 145:5, 121:1, 125:4, 116:21 danger[1] - 13:1 128:22, 131:15, 145:22, 146:13, CRR [1] - 1:24 dangers [1] - 132:16 136:25, 137:19 146:14, 147:17 crude [23] - 8:14, darned [1] - 64:24 denying [2] - 111:2, decrease [1] - 97:2 14:15, 15:19, 19:23, data [20] - 37:8, 66:23, 120:21 decreased [3] - 95:5. 19:25, 20:16, 20:25, 81:5, 91:20, 105:6, Department [7] -97:14, 101:24 21:10, 76:19, 81:11, 107:6, 109:15, 72:14, 74:8, 95:18, decreasing [1] - 97:15 83:11, 83:13, 83:25, 114:5, 114:14, 98:11, 126:11, deep [3] - 23:20, 27:7, 84:6, 84:7, 84:10, 114:17, 114:19, 127:3, 146:1 30:1 84:11, 84:24, 86:13, department [2] -115:9, 115:10, 86:18, 86:20, 86:22, deeper [1] - 126:13 115:20, 117:9, 72:23, 73:5 87:13 default [2] - 139:10, 119:17, 126:15, deposits [1] - 24:8 Crude [1] - 20:2 139:17 126:17, 138:4, depth [15] - 22:22, defective [4] - 77:7, crudes [2] - 86:15, 138.11 23:17, 23:24, 24:15, 78:12, 78:21, 78:23 86:23 date [13] - 87:19, 96:1, 24:19, 24:23, 25:20, defined [3] - 16:9, crystal [1] - 147:14 96:10, 97:6, 97:8, 27:16, 27:22, 28:15, 19:25, 50:1 curious [1] - 120:10 97:12, 99:5, 110:13, 29:21, 29:24, 33:10, definitely [1] - 97:5 current [3] - 113:9, 112:1, 113:15, 34:6, 35:5 definition [3] - 45:2, 113:13, 117:19 142:17, 144:10, derived [4] - 92:23, 48:15, 54:2 custody [1] - 17:22 146:9 92:24, 93:18, 102:6 cut [3] - 33:24, 64:25, DEIS [1] - 142:25 date's [1] - 147:4 deriving [1] - 94:14 delay [1] - 142:13 113:22 Dated [1] - 149:13 described [1] - 24:17 delayed [2] - 95:14, cuts [3] - 30:25, 31:15, dates [4] - 144:14, describing [1] -97:9 65:10 145:10, 146:14, 123:10 demand [60] - 7:9, 147:1 description [1] -94:25, 95:7, 95:15, D days [1] - 66:4 125:24 95:21, 95:23, 95:24, deadline [2] - 142:4, descriptions [1] - 24:6 96:20, 97:5, 97:12, Dakota [56] - 1:20, 142:9 deserves [1] - 97:19 97:14, 97:15, 97:22, 1:22, 2:2, 2:3, 3:2, deal [13] - 3:9, 32:19, design [3] - 56:21, 98:2, 98:9, 98:13,

6:24, 7:12, 7:14, 8:9,

14:21, 15:20, 23:9,

37:23, 38:15, 38:24,

39:2, 50:8, 50:10,

detail [7] - 24:22, 42:22, 43:5, 67:24, 80:22, 107:3, 133:22 detailed [5] - 37:22. 77:16, 105:5, 107:1, 126:4 details [1] - 115:5 detective [1] - 77:21 detectors [1] - 27:7 determination [4] -50:20, 55:18, 96:20, 132:14 determine [10] -23:19, 27:7, 32:5, 37:23, 39:1, 95:18, 106:8, 109:23, 120:6, 131:19 determined [1] - 98:14 determines [1] - 89:15 develop [5] - 5:16, 37:12, 38:7, 85:13, 113:6 developed [9] - 5:15, 40:12, 57:21, 59:24, 60:7, 68:17, 96:4, 104:22, 122:18 developer [1] - 78:15 developers [1] -102:12 developing [4] -57:20, 122:18, 126:6, 134:20 development [11] -29:9, 54:19, 57:25, 60:3, 97:16, 102:13, 102:16, 122:8, 122:12, 139:3, 139:7 diameter [2] - 36:12, 38:23 dictate [5] - 61:10, 62:13, 62:14, 123:19, 124:5 difference [1] - 60:8 different [28] - 3:21, 4:6, 5:6, 5:22, 9:14, 20:4, 34:13, 43:5, 44:7, 47:7, 48:20, 52:14, 59:14, 60:4, 66:9, 82:19, 87:4, 110:12, 114:2. 122:15, 125:14, 126:10, 128:15, 129:7, 130:25, 131:6, 133:2 differently [2] - 20:1, 64:11 difficult [2] - 58:9, 117:13 difficulties [1] - 73:17

64:22, 80:17

designed [2] - 40:15,

98:17, 98:21, 99:12,

99:22, 99:24, 100:6,

diluted [1] - 86:19 direct [2] - 10:12, 28:24 directed [2] - 9:4, 104:8 direction [2] - 16:14, 131:1 directions [1] - 9:17 directly [1] - 81:3 disagree [10] - 8:23, 18:6, 51:6, 62:16, 85:3, 105:14, 106:6, 111:12, 140:7, 143:24 disagrees [2] - 21:21, disappointed[1] -147:1 disapprove [2] -124:21, 128:5 disaster [1] - 89:7 disclose [4] - 16:13, 17:6, 104:20, 104:23 disclosed [3] - 43:24, 45:6, 85:11 disclosure [1] - 89:4 disconnect [1] - 20:22 discover [2] - 129:16, 129:17 discoverable [5] -45:4, 103:8, 105:13, 111:13, 141:24 discovery [41] - 3:11, 3:15, 4:6, 5:12, 6:11, 6:18, 6:22, 8:2, 9:4, 10:16, 11:2, 11:7, 22:6, 30:13, 30:23, 31:10, 32:25, 33:5, 43:23, 43:24, 44:3, 46:15, 50:11, 50:17, 59:3, 67:4, 67:6, 67:12, 67:17, 84:3, 91:14, 91:21, 100:1, 105:22, 106:25, 109:23, 110:25, 111:6, 111:16, 123:3, 126:14 discrepancy [1] -125:3 discretion [2] - 33:4, 130:2 discuss [3] - 42:22, 85:19, 92:3 discussed [2] - 17:5, 21:12 discusses [1] - 52:20 discussing [2] - 6:18, 93:5 Discussion [2] -35:18, 119:23

discussion [26] - 22:7, 32:9, 35:13, 46:23, 51:24, 52:2, 67:4, 69:6, 69:16, 70:5, 75:17, 80:8, 81:17, 88:1, 88:9, 90:15, 93:22, 94:4, 94:16, 121:3, 129:10, 137:5, 137:7, 137:18, 144:9, 147:25 discussion's [2] -68:4, 119:16 discussions [2] -42:19, 72:24 dispute [1] - 8:12 disputes [1] - 4:7 dissuade [1] - 125:11 distance [6] - 9:8, 9:16, 10:18, 19:23, 20:9, 20:20 dive [1] - 50:23 DO [1] - 149:8 Docket [1] - 45:5 docket [3] - 56:1, 81:11, 123:18 dockets [1] - 62:21 document [56] - 6:23, 12:6, 12:18, 16:4, 16:6, 16:8, 16:18, 17:3, 19:10, 20:12, 20:23, 21:4, 21:12, 25:14, 26:23, 28:17, 28:25, 29:4, 30:4, 37:19, 38:12, 38:14, 40:2, 40:17, 42:4, 43:8, 49:25, 52:16, 52:17, 55:13, 68:23, 69:25, 70:15, 70:18, 70:20, 71:19, 72:22, 73:6, 73:7, 73:8, 73:9, 73:18, 74:2, 74:4, 79:12, 82:25, 84:17, 86:4, 86:7, 90:14, 91:24, 92:2, 92:7, 93:5, 126:7, 138:14 document's [1] -72:25 documentation [1] -122:11 documents [125] -5:21, 5:25, 6:1, 7:3, 7:6, 7:14, 7:15, 8:18, 9:1, 9:2, 11:16, 12:4, 12:13, 12:14, 14:14, 14:17, 14:18, 14:23, 15:4, 15:10, 15:12, 16:12, 17:18, 17:23, 18:4, 18:12, 19:5,

19:6, 19:8, 19:14, 20:14, 24:3, 24:11, 24:12, 24:13, 25:3, 25:4, 25:7, 25:13, 25:23, 25:25, 29:13, 33:13, 34:4, 34:7, 36:9, 38:9, 39:21, 40:4, 40:11, 40:25, 41:5, 41:12, 41:16, 41:18, 41:20, 41:25, 42:6, 42:16, 43:10, 43:13, 44:10, 44:15, 44:17, 44:18, 44:24, 45:3, 45:6, 46:19, 46:22, 49:6, 49:8, 49:13, 49:17, 49:18, 50:3, 50:15, 51:22, 55:12, 58:7, 58:8, 59:15, 61:16, 61:17, 68:5, 68:13, 68:17, 68:22, 69:3, 69:9, 69:24, 71:7, 73:18, 79:14, 79:20, 81:3, 81:6, 85:8, 85:14, 85:16, 85:20, 85:21, 85:23, 91:21, 91:25, 92:11, 92:13, 92:19, 92:25, 94:12, 103:14, 104:2, 104:9, 105:15, 113:4, 113:6, 113:8, 114:2, 122:17, 123:8, 123:14, 142:20 dog [1] - 131:11 dollar [2] - 98:18, 105:16 domain [2] - 46:22, 120:7 domains [1] - 65:5 domestic [2] - 120:12, 120:22 done [32] - 15:20, 19:11, 25:17, 26:13, 27:23, 29:21, 30:4, 34:13, 34:15, 38:1, 42:3, 45:11, 49:10, 54:13, 63:18, 63:19, 73:24, 85:1, 86:4, 97:25, 98:13, 132:1, 133:16, 133:23, 139:24, 139:25, 143:5, 144:20, 144:21, 145:9, 146:15 door[1] - 13:21 DOT [3] - 16:14, 16:16, 17:6

double [1] - 57:3

double-check [1] -

57:3 doubled [1] - 137:11 doubt [1] - 113:12 down [17] - 18:11, 20:19, 31:7, 32:14, 46:7, 71:14, 87:5, 95:9, 95:11, 97:22, 98:1, 109:10, 111:16, 111:17, 112:7, 112:8, 120:3 downturn [2] - 95:5, 101:24 DRA [20] - 3:19, 22:4, 22:18, 25:18, 26:10, 35:12, 36:3, 47:17, 48:1, 49:4, 49:5, 67:5, 68:5, 84:21, 84:22, 85:12, 87:19, 100:7, 101:12, 102:4 DRA's [4] - 26:23, 28:21, 49:4, 123:13 Draft [2] - 142:18, 146:7 draft [10] - 71:2, 71:8, 84:20, 138:13, 139:12, 139:13, 139:21, 141:9, 142:15 drafting [1] - 62:10 dramatic [4] - 28:7, 97:2, 102:9, 103:2 dramatically [2] -109:1, 111:23 drawn [1] - 51:14 dried [1] - 64:25 drop [1] - 108:21 dropping [3] - 109:1, 111:22, 111:23 due [1] - 25:5 Duggan [1] - 127:3 duly [1] - 149:8 duly-appointed [1] -149:8 during [8] - 35:7, 35:8, 54:19, 70:19, 128:7, 133:4, 134:3, 144:23 **DUSTIN** [1] - 1:11 Dusty [1] - 3:6 E

e-mail [1] - 33:22 early [1] - 6:25 earth [4] - 22:16, 25:5, 25:6, 34:5 earthquake [1] - 24:4 easement [1] - 37:14 easements [2] - 45:25, 46:1

13:17

end [11] - 4:19, 30:16,

36.6, 36.10, 56:14,

30:23, 31:10, 32:13,

East [1] - 2:3 easy [1] - 43:9 eat [1] - 61:7 economic [4] - 95:5, 101:24, 103:2, 128:13 economy [3] - 95:9, 112:7, 112:11 edges [1] - 77:9 edible [4] - 134:14, 136:2, 136:5 effect [9] - 10:24, 83:17, 84:25, 102:10, 103:2, 111:24, 111:25, 112:11, 112:12 effective [1] - 72:18 effectiveness [1] -5:23 effort [2] - 39:15, 48:7 efforts [3] - 26:24, 37:1, 144:16 eight[2] - 72:13, 114:2 EIS [9] - 143:6, 144:20, 146:5, 146:7, 146:21, 147:2, 147:16, 147:17, 147:21 either [13] - 7:13, 13:17, 21:1, 36:19, 37:25, 65:6, 77:6, 108:25, 124:20, 124:21, 127:14, 128:5, 132:10 elaborated [1] - 65:15 elephant [2] - 37:3, 38:22 elevation [1] - 122:14 Emergency [26] - 7:7, 52:11, 52:15, 53:1, 53:7, 54:12, 55:5, 55:16, 56:2, 57:16, 57:21, 57:25, 58:23, 59:16, 61:10, 61:11, 63:20, 64:10, 64:13, 67:12, 68:6, 68:13, 69:4, 72:11, 89:15, 138:11 emergency [3] -52:24, 53:10, 57:20 emphasize [1] - 33:2 employees [1] - 55:14 empowered [1] - 4:25 enable [1] - 89:18 encouraging [1] -

	1			
65:3, 109:8, 111:18	erosion [11] - 23:15,	execution [1] - 102:17	28:20, 60:11, 127:3	53:24, 54:2, 54:3 , 8
ends [3] - 31:16,	25:5, 26:14, 28:1,	Exhibit [2] - 12:10,	faces [1] - 110:17	54:5, 55:1, 55:8,
39:15, 86:20	28:3, 28:5, 28:6,	90:8	facilitate [1] - 44:22	55:20, 56:13, 56:17,
ENERGY [1] - 1:5	28:22, 29:4, 34:5,	exist [2] - 113:6,	facilitating [1] - 86:17	56:19, 57:8, 57:13,
energy [1] - 124:6	83:20	133:21	facilities [5] - 13:13,	57:14, 58:12, 71:5,
Energy [2] - 40:10,	ERP [31] - 52:9, 55:22,	existed [1] - 41:5	13:20, 14:2, 14:4,	76:9, 88:21, 88:25,
46:18	56:11, 58:25, 59:7,	existing [2] - 113:4,	65:7	98:9, 114:1, 129:25,
engaged [1] - 72:23	59:22, 59:24, 60:2,	113:7	FACILITY [1] - 1:5	143:6, 147:21
Engineering [1] -	60:14, 60:19, 60:24,	expect [6] - 38:5, 55:4,	facility [5] - 13:15,	Federal [18] - 53:16,
82:15	62:3, 62:11, 63:13,	57:22, 141:3,	99:21, 99:22,	53:21, 54:7, 54:16,
engineering [5] -	65:2, 65:3, 65:4,	144:21, 145:8	109:20, 124:6	54:23, 57:11, 57:24,
12:25, 19:9, 33:8,	65:24, 66:7, 66:23,	expectation [1] -	fact [16] - 15:1, 15:6,	61:17, 61:19, 62:8,
33:18, 33:19	67:2, 68:18, 68:19,	146:4	22:24, 52:16, 59:25,	62:20, 68:11, 68:18,
enlightening [1] -	68:23, 69:10, 72:21,	expected [5] - 5:20,	84:20, 88:22, 89:1,	68:20, 69:8, 82:15,
107:12	75:12, 138:10,	84:24, 145:13,	89:3, 102:15,	142:21, 143:8
enormous [1] - 89:7	139:3, 140:5	146:11, 147:2	104:24, 111:12,	feet [4] - 9:13, 9:24,
enormously [1] -	especially [1] - 28:6	expects [1] - 146:2	133:9, 137:13,	23:12, 36:13
55:12	essentially [6] - 4:5,	expedient [1] - 29:2	140:6, 142:2	felt [1] - 71:23
ensure [5] - 23:16,	39:10, 49:4, 77:15,	expediently [1] - 29:5	factor[1] - 80:17	FERC [5] - 82:15,
33:10, 52:18, 89:21,	77:16, 77:24	expensive [1] - 39:3	facts [3] - 42:22,	82:16, 82:22, 82:24,
122:23	Essentially [1] - 17:4	experience [2] - 5:21,	88:24, 133:20	83:1
entered [1] - 138:15	establish [1] - 17:20	19:13	factual [4] - 45:12,	few [4] - 3:13, 27:8,
entire [6] - 39:13,	Etsi [1] - 147:13	expert [2] - 15:20,	82:7, 88:21, 133:12	42:15, 106:9
39:15, 43:8, 137:5,	evaluate [1] - 141:15	85:12	failed [5] - 76:24,	field [1] - 76:23
137:6, 142:13	Evaluation [1] - 16:8	experts [1] - 48:21	77:10, 77:11, 78:3,	figure [4] - 8:7, 9:5,
entirely [4] - 48:20,	evaluation [1] - 122:2	explain [3] - 7:12,	78:20	12:18, 130:24
108:4, 122:22, 129:7	event [7] - 45:17, 51:13, 89:4, 89:19,	7:15, 100:9	fails [2] - 27:16, 70:11	figuring [1] - 29:20 file [4] - 14:12, 62:2,
entitled [3] - 2:2,	89:20, 89:23, 90:4	explanation [7] -	failure [3] - 77:11,	141:22, 142:10
116:23, 149:10	events [1] - 23:11	25:15, 97:14, 105:4,	100:7, 146:25	filed [12] - 47:9, 62:3,
entity [7] - 19:12, 41:5, 61:20, 86:5, 86:8,	evidence [8] - 4:18,	113:8, 115:1, 118:16	fair [6] - 38:2, 48:25, 83:24, 107:18,	62:22, 72:22, 72:25,
86:9, 86:10	4:19, 4:20, 37:8,	explicitly [1] - 55:20	134:23, 139:9	81:2, 126:11,
environment [1] - 21:2	43:15, 125:11,	export [1] - 114:24 express [1] - 139:20	Fair [1] - 86:3	140:21, 141:4,
Environment [9] -	125:16, 132:7	expressed [1] -	fairest [1] - 50:24	141:25, 142:3
72:14, 127:6,	evolving [1] - 113:18	139:25	fairly [5] - 33:14,	files [13] - 14:24, 19:1,
127:17, 142:22,	exact [2] - 89:4, 144:4	extend [1] - 142:8	38:14, 62:23, 107:2,	19:2, 25:3, 26:1,
143:1, 143:9,	Exactly [1] - 46:21	extension [1] - 140:21	117:11	38:3, 41:16, 45:8,
143:10, 145:19,	exactly [9] - 19:24,	extensive [2] - 92:6.	fall [4] - 44:15, 49:17,	45:13, 45:14, 58:8,
145:22	25:12, 31:17, 87:16,	146:7	49:19, 130:23	101:17, 105:15
environmental [7] -	89:24, 119:6, 120:3,	extent [24] - 4:15,	falls [1] - 108:22	filing [4] - 3:21, 15:8,
82:10, 124:19,	130:6, 139:7	11:7, 16:6, 18:17,	far [17] - 9:5, 9:19,	64:3, 125:23
126:23, 143:16,	examination [1] - 31:6	20:6, 29:9, 30:12,	10:9, 10:22, 12:24,	fill [1] - 43:3
143:17, 144:2,	examine [2] - 70:15,	32:25, 35:11, 40:6,	12:25, 13:2, 15:7,	filled [2] - 36:20, 38:1
147:18	116:21	40:11, 49:25, 55:19,	15:18, 18:20, 33:4,	filler [1] - 12:5
Environmental [13] -	examining [1] - 128:4	59:13, 84:22, 88:6,	42:14, 45:15, 47:20,	final [22] - 42:3, 42:22,
121:22, 126:25,	example [16] - 5:22,	90:24, 94:1, 106:2,	111:2, 132:3, 133:1	43:8, 43:14, 44:20,
127:5, 127:11,	5:24, 9:11, 13:10,	111:7, 124:16,	farm [1] - 35:8	60:24, 66:4, 69:25,
127:13, 142:12,	42:18, 52:20, 53:9,	128:14, 138:18,	farmers [5] - 10:7,	71:2, 71:9, 71:12,
142:15, 142:18,	53:24, 82:23, 89:5,	138:19	13:5, 23:2, 24:21,	139:12, 139:13,
143:14, 145:6,	89:13, 108:9,	extra [1] - 143:25	39:4	142:19, 143:1,
145:13, 146:3, 147:8	108:15, 110:13,	extremely [3] - 10:17,	farming [1] - 23:25	143:10, 143:17,
equipment [11] -	122:12, 131:22	59:15, 136:16	farmland [1] - 28:6	144:20, 145:5,
27:22, 29:14, 33:9,	Except [1] - 24:15	eyes [1] - 63:21	fast [1] - 84:13	145:15, 145:20, 145:22
34:12, 39:17, 52:21, 67:14, 67:10, 67:22	except [2] - 84:16,	_	fauna [1] - 135:11	Final [11] - 142:15,
67:14, 67:19, 67:22, 89:16, 89:22	119:18	F	February [2] - 145:14,	143:13, 145:5,
equitable [1] - 48:25	exception [1] - 120:10 exclude [1] - 106:15		146:12	145:13, 145:19,
erode [2] - 23:8, 28:10	Excuse [1] - 94:9	fabrication [2] - 77:7,	federal [37] - 5:6, 7:17,	145:22, 146:3,
erodes [1] - 22:23	excuse [1] - 94.9	78:6	9:23, 14:8, 52:14, 52:16, 53:2, 53:4,	146:5, 146:21,
erodible [1] - 23:10	90:6, 104:4	face [5] - 15:15, 26:5,	53:5, 53:11, 53:13,	147:2, 147:16
			30.0, 00.11, 00.10,	

finalize [1] - 66:5 finalized [2] - 66:3, 68:19 financial [2] - 43:6, 46:5 findings [1] - 109:14 fine [3] - 32:9, 32:10, 144:11 finished [5] - 70:21, 70:23, 142:25, 143:1, 143:11 fire [6] - 9:9, 9:21, 10:13, 10:23, 13:25 First [2] - 98:8, 120:1 first [22] - 3:21, 5:11, 6:1, 8:20, 13:24, 17:15, 17:19, 31:11, 56:1, 64:2, 66:19, 71:7, 71:23, 77:7, 81:11, 89:18, 96:5, 117:3, 118:21, 123:18, 125:16, 129:8 fits [1] - 9:25 five [2] - 142:20, 146:18 fix [1] - 28:15 fixed [2] - 27:17, 133:7 flat [1] - 112:9 flip[1] - 12:17 floor[1] - 136:18 flora [1] - 135:11 flow [3] - 66:20, 68:11, 87:17 flowing [2] - 61:16, 69:8 flows [2] - 68:24, 74:20 fly [1] - 28:2 flyover [1] - 23:19 flyovers [2] - 23:19, 28:23 focus [2] - 21:3, 92:13 focused [3] - 75:8, 90:3, 104:5 focusing [1] - 11:8 folks [1] - 6:6 follow [2] - 56:17, 59:5 foot [1] - 128:2 FOR [1] - 1:4 forecast [5] - 95:5, 97:15, 114:15, 114:21 forecasted [1] - 97:3 forecasts [6] - 105:18, 108:25, 114:20, 115:10, 115:11, 117:9 forget [1] - 20:1 form [4] - 20:13, 77:8,

77:10, 84:21 formal [1] - 72:2 forth [2] - 93:5, 93:6 forthcoming [1] -101:23 forums [1] - 5:6 four[8] - 56:16, 112:15, 112:22, 113:25, 124:18, 142:19, 142:20 four-part [1] - 56:16 four-year [3] - 112:15, 112:22, 113:25 frame [4] - 140:21, 142:7, 146:8, 146:19 framework [1] - 135:6 frankly [4] - 12:19, 47:19, 134:15, 134:19 free [1] - 10:7 friendly [2] - 120:16, 121:1 front [2] - 48:10, 142:15 fruition [1] - 112:7 frustrating [1] -144:15 frustration [3] - 86:11, 129:23, 129:24 full [4] - 7:3, 77:1, 82:10, 135:21 fully [4] - 59:24, 120:19, 135:10, 135:16 function [2] - 56:13, 57:1 fund [1] - 39:10 fundamentally [1] -85:2 futile [1] - 144:17 future [5] - 84:11, 102:14, 102:15, 108:19, 108:24 fuzzy [1] - 128:25

G

gain [1] - 31:5 gained [1] - 31:5 GARY [1] - 1:12 Gary [1] - 3:7 gas [3] - 13:11, 76:18, 78:14 gather [1] - 101:13 gathered [2] - 141:7, 141:8 gathering [2] - 101:12, 141:1 general [14] - 3:13,

101:20, 110:19, 122:17 General [1] - 102:3 generalized [1] -109:15 generally [4] - 43:19, 86:17, 89:17, 135:5 generated [1] - 19:14 generates [1] - 91:24 geologic [1] - 24:7 germane [2] - 32:20, 92:12 given [9] - 19:11, 25:24, 67:13, 74:6, 79:16, 85:9, 87:4, 87:6, 105:24 governed [2] - 55:20, 84:20 Government [16] -53:16, 53:22, 54:7, 54:16, 54:24, 57:11, 57:24, 61:17, 61:19, 62:8, 68:11, 68:19, 68:20, 69:8, 142:21, 143:8 government [7] - 17:7, 43:21, 44:5, 56:14, 56:25, 65:7, 68:24 Government's [1] -62:20 governments [1] -89:21 grandkids [1] - 38:24 grant [5] - 46:14, 68:3, 68:12, 91:14, 93:17 granted [3] - 98:11, 98:15 gravel [1] - 36:21 great [5] - 7:2, 38:15, 58:5, 128:3, 131:23 Great [1] - 3:17 greater [5] - 25:19, 25:23, 57:19, 84:13, 141:11 Greg [2] - 1:15, 134:1 ground [7] - 9:14, 9:16, 21:2, 22:21, 23:3, 37:15, 39:4 grounds [2] - 51:23, 51:25 grouts [1] - 36:21 guess [26] - 19:15, 27:2, 31:22, 34:1, 44:1, 46:13, 51:9, 68:2, 68:12, 69:2, 87:8, 87:10, 92:18, 109:8, 109:9,

4:4, 5:11, 6:20, 24:6,

24:7, 24:18, 30:6,

32:8, 83:3, 93:7,

109:16, 116:17, 124:12, 124:15, 124:17, 124:19, 125:3, 125:21, 125:23, 133:4, 134:14 guidance [1] - 51:7 Gulf [1] - 60:23 guys [1] - 116:19

Н

habit [2] - 47:8, 145:4 hand [3] - 103:17, 103:20, 117:12 Hanson [19] - 3:7, 22:9, 35:20, 47:1, 52:2, 63:8, 65:8, 70:6, 75:19, 80:10, 81:19, 88:11, 94:18, 121:6, 132:19, 133:11, 137:23, 139:25, 148:6 HANSON [54] - 1:12, 19:21, 20:3, 20:17, 21:4, 21:7, 21:16, 22:10, 35:21, 47:2, 51:16, 52:3, 63:9, 63:19, 64:7, 65:13, 65:21, 66:2, 66:12, 69:17, 70:7, 70:13, 70:24, 71:15, 72:1, 72:4, 74:11, 75:20, 80:11, 81:15, 81:20, 88:4, 88:12, 94:5, 94:9, 94:15, 94:19, 120:9, 120:18, 121:7, 123:23, 124:20, 125:9, 125:19, 126:21, 127:21, 128:21, 130:19, 132:18, 132:21, 136:20, 137:21, 137:24, 148:7 happy [3] - 11:15, 106:3, 120:25 hard [5] - 13:4, 44:13, 51:17, 56:11, 84:18 harder [1] - 65:9 harm [1] - 128:14 hazard [1] - 131:23 Hazardous [1] - 55:9 hazardous [1] - 13:11 HC[1] - 17:18 HCA [3] - 19:17, 91:16, 93:19 HCAs[1] - 21:22 head [1] - 20:22

headed [1] - 69:15 9 health [1] - 56:20 hear [6] - 5:1, 15:23, 20:3, 86:11, 139:11, 139:16 heard [7] - 5:8, 39:16, 81:4, 107:14, 116:8, 140:3, 145:9 Hearing [13] - 22:8, 35:19, 46:25, 52:2, 75:18, 80:9, 81:14, 81:18, 88:10, 93:23, 94:17, 121:4, 137:19 hearing [15] - 50:10, 50:20, 66:24, 99:11, 127:7, 127:18, 127:25, 128:7, 144:14, 144:18, 145:10, 146:14, 147:1, 147:4, 148:12 heart [2] - 54:9, 54:21 heartbreaking [1] -78:13 heavens [1] - 123:25 hefty [1] - 136:6 held [1] - 2:1 helicopter [4] - 23:18, 23:19, 28:2, 28:23 help [8] - 10:21, 13:5, 53:19, 58:11, 91:2, 103:15, 129:10, 133:20 helpful [13] - 6:17, 24:12, 60:10, 74:10, 79:15, 86:21, 118:11, 118:18, 130:16, 138:18, 140:9, 140:15 helping [1] - 130:16 HEREBY [1] - 149:8 hide [1] - 6:22 high [10] - 16:7, 16:11, 16:13, 16:15, 16:16, 16:23, 18:16, 21:13, 54:1, 54:3 High [2] - 16:9, 21:12 higher [2] - 122:14, 136:3 highlight [1] - 47:11 highly [1] - 23:9 history [1] - 146:17 Hoc [1] - 3:1 Hohn [2] - 17:11, 18:11 Hold [2] - 118:6, 118:7 hold [3] - 31:24, 32:1, 32:5

holding [1] - 71:12

homes [1] - 13:12

hole [1] - 9:13

honesty [1] - 116:3 hook [1] - 23:4 hoops [1] - 137:13 hope [4] - 66:17, 74:9, 98:3, 112:5 hopefully [4] - 36:13, 133:23, 135:14, 135:15 hoping [2] - 15:3, 25:12 horribly [1] - 117:12 hospital [1] - 13:21 hospitals [1] - 13:13 hour[1] - 22:25 hours [2] - 50:4, 68:22 house [1] - 105:8 houses [1] - 10:25 HP09-001 [1] - 1:5 humans [1] - 82:11 hundreds [2] - 9:12. 68:21 hurdle [1] - 103:9 hurricanes [1] - 57:22 hydrologic [1] - 67:2 hydrology [1] - 135:10 hydrotest [1] - 78:14 hypocritical [1] -105:1

ı

idea [6] - 11:22, 20:6, 27:11, 31:2, 71:10, 107:14 identification [2] -121:13, 122:15 identified [1] - 29:5 identify [3] - 16:15, 17:18, 94:12 II [3] - 11:21, 11:23, 146:21 illegible [1] - 12:7 imagine [4] - 44:13, 51:17, 77:4, 105:16 immediate [2] - 9:21, 10:12 impact [7] - 12:25, 95:4, 97:4, 97:6, 97:15, 101:24, 120:11 Impact [21] - 121:22, 126:25, 127:5, 127:6, 127:11, 127:14, 127:17, 142:12, 142:15, 142:18, 142:22, 143:1, 143:9, 143:10, 143:14, 145:6, 145:13,

implemented [1] -57:14 implementing [1] -53:18 implements [2] - 23:4, 54:17 important [8] - 4:9, 4:22, 45:10, 47:12, 75:12, 103:4, 120:14, 144:19 impose[1] - 122:24 imposed [1] - 13:8 IN [1] - 1:4 in-house [1] - 105:8 inadequacy [1] -71:24 inadequate [2] -58:11, 132:12 inappropriate [2] -51:8, 89:5 Incidentally [1] -85:18 include [9] - 9:21, 19:7, 35:16, 47:13, 54:6, 83:19, 100:5, 103:12, 136:21 included [7] - 24:4, 24:6, 24:8, 32:23, 111:5, 111:6, 122:8 including [1] - 11:4 income [1] - 35:9 incomplete [2] -135:9, 135:17 increase [1] - 83:18 indeed [1] - 135:18 index [3] - 12:6, 12:9, 105:20 indexed [1] - 14:19 indicated [2] - 25:15. 55:14 indicates [2] - 25:11, 90:9 indicating [1] - 108:25 indication [3] - 102:4, 108:18 indications [1] - 146:2 individual [1] - 8:2 individually [1] - 3:15 indulgence [1] - 139:5 industrial [1] - 13:15 industry [4] - 83:12, 101:19, 102:4,

145:19, 145:22,

impacts [10] - 11:5,

43:1, 43:6, 43:7,

36:15, 42:19, 42:20,

66:22, 82:11, 110:7

implementation [1] -

54:5

146:3, 147:8

106:23 industry's [2] -106:21, 107:8 inevitably [2] - 36:7, 109:11 influence [1] - 62:10 info [1] - 115:8 inform [2] - 127:20, 145:7 informally [1] - 142:6 information [144] -5:2, 7:2, 7:11, 11:1, 13:5, 15:16, 16:16, 16:24, 17:7, 17:12, 18:18, 18:19, 19:18, 19:22, 20:11, 20:19, 20:21, 20:24, 21:5, 21:14, 21:15, 21:24, 24:7, 25:12, 25:20, 28:11, 30:3, 34:12. 38:3, 38:9, 38:15, 45:12, 48:11, 54:11, 54:22, 55:21, 67:8, 68:9, 68:11, 69:8, 69:24, 76:10, 78:9, 78:20, 82:5, 82:7, 82:8, 83:23, 83:24, 84:2, 84:5, 84:7, 84:17, 87:5, 87:6, 87:9, 87:12, 87:19, 88:6, 89:12, 90:3, 90:6, 90:7, 91:7, 92:20, 94:6, 94:14, 95:3, 97:10, 97:12, 99:15, 100:1, 100:6, 100:8, 100:22, 100:24, 101:16, 102:1, 102:2, 102:6, 103:1, 103:7, 103:21, 105:2, 105:12, 105:17, 106:2, 106:3, 106:4, 106:7, 109:25, 110:22, 110:25, 111:3, 114:3, 114:9, 117:11, 117:13, 121:23, 122:5, 122:7, 123:11, 126:4, 126:6, 126:9, 126:12, 126:19, 127:9, 127:12, 128:25, 129:3, 129:6, 129:8, 129:9, 129:14, 129:16, 129:17, 130:9, 130:11, 130:15, 132:23, 133:12, 133:19, 136:24, 137:3, 137:6, 137:9, 139:2, 140:8,

140:14, 141:1, 141:5, 141:10, 141:12, 141:14, 141:15, 141:17, 141:19, 141:23, 141:24, 143:20, 144:2, 144:5, 147:19 information's [1] -15:9 inherent [1] - 134:6 initial [2] - 16:12, 116:14 Initiative [4] - 40:9, 41:23, 42:14, 44:19 input [4] - 57:19, 75:7, 75:13, 75:15 inputs [2] - 66:6, 66:23 inquire [3] - 33:8, 53:5, 53:12 inquiry [4] - 31:1, 42:1, 49:14, 72:13 inside [1] - 84:14 insisting [1] - 29:21 instance [2] - 25:17, 136:6 instead [4] - 5:18, 62:17, 95:17, 96:15 insufficient [2] - 7:13, 81:6 intend[1] - 84:8 intending [2] - 67:6, 67:8 intends [1] - 78:5 intent[1] - 108:18 interchange [2] -59:21, 60:9 interest [8] - 19:16, 20:8, 51:2, 73:11, 95:19, 98:16, 101:7, 109:2 interested [2] - 75:14, 92:15 interesting [2] - 125:9, 128:11 interests [1] - 54:24 interface [1] - 52:24 interfere (1) - 23:25 internal [13] - 37:20, 38:5, 38:13, 41:18, 41:20, 82:12, 82:23, 83:7, 83:10, 84:13, 84:23, 85:1, 85:7 Interrogatories [2] -104:8, 116:12 Interrogatory [8] -20:13, 25:14, 28:17, 29:12, 97:13, 104:6, 106:7, 113:11 interrupt[1] - 117:19

interrupting [1] -10 72:10 interruption [1] -116:7 interstate [1] - 99:23 intervene [1] - 63:5 Intervener [1] - 8:4 Interveners [18] -4:12, 17:18, 18:3, 60:16, 69:21, 70:14, 71:19, 74:3, 74:24, 116:23, 125:17, 127:20, 129:13, 132:22, 133:10, 133:20, 137:1, 137:7 intrastate [1] - 99:21 introduction [1] -125:16 investigate [1] - 95:21 investigated [1] -47:25 investigating [1] -79:3 investigation [3] -38:7, 78:10, 79:8 investment [1] - 98:20 involve [1] - 16:7 involved [11] - 4:23, 31:3, 33:4, 36:24, 37:21, 45:16, 57:23, 63:6, 74:9, 125:2 lowa [2] - 22:25, 45:23 irony [1] - 124:12 irrelevant [5] - 12:8. 100:20, 110:1, 110:22, 123:20 issue [62] - 6:1, 8:20, 11:3, 11:9, 13:8, 18:24, 22:18, 22:20, 26:21, 26:24, 27:18, 28:11, 29:10, 30:11, 31:2, 32:5, 32:7, 32:14, 32:19, 32:24, 37:4, 37:24, 38:4, 38:16, 38:17, 39:21, 44:23, 45:20, 47:19, 47:23, 49:23, 51:4, 51:11, 51:18, 52:11, 53:11, 54:14, 55:20, 58:4, 58:17, 76:9, 78:25, 79:3, 80:20, 80:23, 81:1, 81:12, 82:24, 88:21, 98:9, 98:14, 99:9, 99:10, 103:16, 106:2, 127:23, 132:4, 146:2 issues [33] - 4:8, 4:10, 4:13, 4:15, 4:17, 4:18, 4:24, 5:1, 6:3, 6:10, 6:11, 6:16, 7:1,

27:17, 28:18, 29:3, 29:8, 33:20, 35:2, 35:10, 35:11, 37:10, 37:12, 38:10, 39:2, 48:6, 53:24, 54:4, 55:18, 57:13, 60:25, 140:18, 141:17 issuing [1] - 79:1 item [2] - 3:8, 19:11 items [1] - 99:12 itself [12] - 5:17, 6:1, 13:17, 68:19, 68:23, 76:23, 77:6, 91:21, 92:22, 92:24, 95:20, 122:23

J

James [5] - 1:18, 1:19, 6:15, 54:1, 54:6 January [2] - 145:14, 146:12 jetting [1] - 9:16 Jim (6) - 15:24, 41:9. 49:11, 60:17, 98:25, 103:24 job [10] - 51:3, 53:17, 54:8, 56:24, 75:9, 131:3, 131:11, 131:15, 137:13 John [2] - 1:14, 61:23 Johnson [20] - 3:6, 3:24, 15:23, 22:13, 31:19, 35:24, 47:5, 52:6, 70:10, 75:23, 80:14, 81:23, 88:15, 91:2, 92:5, 94:22, 106:14, 121:10, 138:2, 148:10 JOHNSON [165] -1:11, 3:1, 6:5, 6:13, 7:19, 8:3, 10:20, 14:10, 15:13, 15:25, 16:3, 16:19, 17:9, 19:19, 21:17, 22:2, 22:5, 22:11, 22:13, 24:24, 26:2, 26:8, 30:2, 30:10, 31:21, 31:23, 32:17, 33:23, 34:16, 34:19, 34:22, 35:13, 35:22, 35:24, 39:24, 40:23, 41:2, 42:2, 42:8, 43:25, 46:11, 46:18, 46:23, 47:3, 47:5, 49:2, 50:2, 50:5, 50:13, 50:21, 51:19, 52:4, 52:6, 55:2, 55:24, 56:10, 59:5, 59:10, 59:17, 60:12, 61:3,

79:18, 79:23, 80:7, 80:12, 80:14, 80:24, 81:9, 81:13, 81:16, 81:21, 81:23, 84:15, 85:17, 86:3, 86:25, 88:1, 88:9, 88:13, 88:15, 90:5, 90:12, 90:21, 91:4, 91:10, 92:2, 92:9, 93:11, 93:21, 94:3, 94:8, 94:10, 94:16, 94:20, 94:22, 98:7, 99:7, 101:6, 103:5, 104:11, 104:16, 106:9, 107:11, 107:18, 109:4, 113:21, 114:17, 114:25, 115:18, 116:1, 116:6, 116:19, 117:18, 118:6, 118:20, 119:5, 119:16, 120:14, 120:23, 120:25, 121:8, 121:10, 123:4, 123:16, 123:21, 124:2, 128:10, 129:21, 132:19, 135:3, 137:16, 137:22, 137:25, 138:2, 138:9, 139:9, 139:23, 140:12, 140:25, 141:20, 143:2, 143:19, 144:11, 144:18, 145:8, 146:10, 147:23, 148:4, 148:8, 148:10 joins [1] - 8:4 joints [1] - 76:22 Joints [1] - 78:22 Jones [3] - 79:4, 87:3, 87:12 jowl [1] - 13:14 judge [1] - 134:12 judging [1] - 132:11 judgment [3] - 33:3, 36:23, 134:8 judgments [1] -

134:21

137:12

juncture [2] - 133:7,

jurisdiction [20] - 4:7,

47:20, 47:23, 48:7,

40:8

5:3, 7:17, 14:6,

62:5, 63:8, 66:14,

69:5, 70:4, 70:8,

68:1, 68:15, 68:25,

70:10, 74:22, 75:2,

75:21, 75:23, 76:3,

49:21, 56:9, 61:15, 63:10, 78:25, 79:17, 79:21, 79:22, 95:17, 96:2, 123:19, 134:18, 136:22 jurisdictional [19] -4:10, 4:14, 6:11, 48:2, 48:4, 48:9, 49:22, 52:12, 59:3, 80:25, 82:24, 95:2, 100:14, 100:16, 121:18, 129:1, 129:2, 129:12, 129:18 Justice [1] - 3:20 justify [2] - 102:21, 117:19

36:14, 36:17, 36:21, Κ 37:6, 37:23, 39:18, 42:19, 42:25, 43:2, 43:13, 45:8, 66:7, Kansas [2] - 45:24, 67:1, 67:9, 67:18, 98:1 82:18, 84:10, 85:3, Kara [2] - 1:14, 15:14 106:4, 110:21, keep [2] - 29:25, 47:13 141:16 key [5] - 3:22, 11:19, kitchen [1] - 11:11 57:17, 58:4, 91:23 Knadle [1] - 1:15 Keystone [77] - 3:9, knowing [5] - 51:12, 5:14, 5:16, 5:25, 89:9, 89:11, 89:13, 14:24, 16:12, 17:5, 141:9 19:12, 20:4, 24:16, Knowing [1] - 89:17 25:2, 25:22, 26:16, knowledge [1] - 42:11 28:25, 29:6, 30:3, KOENECKE [5] - 18:8, 30:7, 30:9, 33:7, 59:20, 72:9, 138:25, 40:1, 44:17, 48:1, 139:18 48:13, 53:24, 55:4, Koenecke [5] - 1:18, 55:14, 58:20, 58:21, 18:9, 59:21, 74:12, 58:24, 59:1, 59:22, 139:1 60:19, 60:22, 61:2, KOLBECK [42] - 1:11, 62:2, 63:17, 68:11, 22:12, 26:10, 27:1, 72:22, 74:3, 79:5, 35:23, 44:1, 46:13, 79:10, 80:21, 82:14, 46:21, 47:4, 50:14, 84:15, 84:23, 85:1, 50:19, 51:9, 52:5, 85:16, 86:3, 86:8, 61:4, 61:14, 62:15, 88:5, 94:6, 94:12, 68:2, 69:1, 70:9, 96:4, 98:7, 99:1, 75:22, 79:25, 80:13, 99:3, 101:11, 81:22, 87:1, 87:10, 104:12, 114:7, 87:15, 87:21, 87:25, 115:3, 115:19, 88:14, 91:13, 92:16, 118:24, 123:4, 93:15, 93:25, 94:21, 125:16, 125:23, 106:13, 107:10, 127:17, 131:3, 120:2, 121:9, 136:9, 132:22, 133:2, 138:1, 148:3, 148:9 133:5, 133:10, Kolbeck [22] - 3:7, 137:3, 138:24, 22:11, 26:9, 35:22, 139:11, 145:17, 47:3, 52:4, 62:5, 145:20 69:7, 70:8, 75:21, KEYSTONE [2] - 1:4, 80:12, 81:21, 88:13, 92:9, 93:12, 93:13, Keystone's [2] - 26:1, 94:20, 120:1, 121:8,

137:17, 137:25, 11 148:8 Kothari [1] - 87:3 KXL [2] - 14:16, 99:4

kind [34] - 4:25, 5:19,

18:18, 19:9, 23:15,

23:16, 27:4, 27:17,

28:10, 28:13, 29:14,

29:15, 36:20, 38:7,

52:22, 66:22, 67:22,

71:1, 71:13, 76:19,

84:18, 97:10, 98:20,

kinds [36] - 4:23, 4:24,

11:16, 13:13, 13:19,

5:22, 9:21, 10:23,

14:2, 14:3, 23:11,

24:7, 27:22, 33:9,

82:5, 83:11, 84:7,

104:23, 106:2,

111:17, 144:25

8:9, 10:25, 14:1,

L

lack [1] - 95:14 lacking [1] - 63:23 Land [4] - 40:9, 41:23, 42:14, 44:19 land [16] - 10:5, 13:8, 13:18, 24:6, 26:18, 27:6, 27:13, 27:23, 36:15, 37:13, 37:17, 38:20, 38:21, 38:23, 122:13, 130:25 landowner [5] - 29:1, 29:7, 37:13, 37:17, 112:21 landowners (31) -4:22, 5:1, 5:7, 9:18, 22:19, 23:2, 26:17, 27:14, 27:20, 28:25, 29:17, 29:19, 29:23, 29:25, 36:5, 36:8, 36:23, 37:2, 38:18, 39:12, 39:20, 49:1, 58:5, 71:10, 96:18, 97:20, 98:5, 103:4, 122:25, 127:8 Landowners [1] -27:11 landowners' [1] -27:13 language [3] - 24:16, 29:16, 129:1 large [7] - 10:1, 12:14, 37:2, 37:6, 96:20, 109:25, 141:7 larger [1] - 58:6 last [8] - 17:5, 17:10, 48:13, 65:21, 74:12, 130:7, 132:3, 146:18 late [3] - 60:22, 112:3, 141:4 law [24] - 52:16, 53:2, 53:4, 53:13, 54:17, 55:20, 75:3, 76:9, 78:1, 88:21, 88:25, 95:22, 98:10, 100:4, 101:5, 110:3, 110:23, 111:3, 112:18, 130:3, 136:15, 145:4, 146:20, 147:11 law's [2] - 53:5, 57:14 laws [4] - 53:18, 54:5,

56:17, 129:25

lawyer [1] - 48:21 lawyers [1] - 108:2 lead [1] - 135:18 leading [2] - 73:14, 73:19 leads [1] - 143:2 leak [3] - 20:25, 21:3 leaks [2] - 21:1, 21:10 leaning [1] - 103:7 learn [1] - 139:2 least [9] - 18:4, 49:16, 51:17, 71:10, 71:13, 124:16, 124:18, 129:23, 130:23 leave [4] - 58:18, 67:25, 118:4, 139:10 leaving [2] - 38:22, 116:20 left [4] - 26:6, 36:19, 50:10 legal [12] - 30:17, 31:25, 32:7, 37:11, 47:12, 49:23, 50:8, 50:24, 51:3, 112:25, 134:11 legally [1] - 147:22 legislature [3] - 72:10, 101:1, 111:4 legitimate [1] - 40:21 less [2] - 23:12, 108:2 letter [3] - 77:23, 79:6, 112:18 level [7] - 31:10, 48:23, 56:25, 67:14, 67:15, 67:24, 108:15 levels [1] - 56:14 liability [16] - 35:6, 47:16, 47:24, 48:6, 48:12, 48:14, 48:15, 48:16, 48:24, 49:6, 49:23, 50:9, 50:24, 51:3, 51:12, 51:14 liberal [1] - 119:24 lies [1] - 134:18 lieu [1] - 104:8 life [7] - 23:6, 29:2, 36:6, 36:11, 39:15, 83:17, 130:4 likely [6] - 22:21, 114:23, 127:2, 127:4, 127:19, 142:13 limit [2] - 68:12, 113:25 limited [6] - 5:4, 46:21, 76:11, 77:19, 77:20 limiting [1] - 32:15 limits [3] - 56:21, 59:2, 146:23

line [14] - 8:4, 42:21, 43:8, 43:19, 50:2, 61:19, 74:18, 96:8, 124:7, 124:15, 128:18, 139:8, 144:12, 147:25 lined [1] - 96:25 liquid [1] - 13:11 listen [1] - 71:25 Listen [1] - 116:19 listened [2] - 98:23, 123:12 live [1] - 38:20 living [2] - 73:6, 73:9 local [7] - 13:8, 13:24, 52:24, 56:17, 65:6, 89:18, 89:21 locate [1] - 42:18 located [3] - 25:25, 45:14, 89:16 location [9] - 16:13, 18:16, 21:13, 36:22, 66:7, 89:4, 89:9, 89:10, 124:6 locational [3] - 16:16, 19:17, 21:15 locations [1] - 21:22 loggerheads [1] -124:11 logically [1] - 70:22 long-term [1] - 97:5 longitudinal [1] -76:21 look [28] - 10:17, 11:19, 18:4, 30:17, 54:7, 58:10, 58:15, 61:7, 63:16, 67:6, 67:8, 71:7, 90:17, 91:5, 92:19, 107:9, 113:24, 113:25, 114:1, 121:21, 122:13, 122:23, 126:13, 127:14, 137:9, 138:5, 141:14, 147:13 looked [10] - 13:8, 43:5, 48:13, 53:23, 54:4, 57:8, 90:14, 126:6, 126:8, 133:5 looking [27] - 5:24, 13:4, 18:18, 18:19, 27:20, 29:12, 35:10, 39:20, 54:22, 60:11, 82:5, 84:21, 84:22, 85:8, 85:14, 90:2, 91:7, 104:1, 115:1, 122:11, 122:14, 122:15, 126:4, 126:17, 130:3, 131:25, 136:23

looks [2] - 27:11, 27:15 lose [3] - 22:16, 25:5, 62:7 loses [1] - 23:22 loss [1] - 28:8 lost [2] - 24:15, 24:23 Louisiana [2] - 46:1, 57:22 low [1] - 136:5 LP [1] - 1:4

M

mail [1] - 33:22 main [1] - 87:16 maintain [12] - 23:24, 24:19, 26:18, 28:25, 32:1, 35:4, 35:5, 38:21, 56:6, 65:13, 74:13, 74:16 maintained [2] -23:17, 24:22 maintaining [1] -29:24 major[1] - 131:1 majority [2] - 8:20, 71:4 man [1] - 68:21 manageable [1] -34:15 managed [2] - 78:6, 78:7 manner [1] - 79:5 maps [2] - 11:17, 11:18 March [3] - 60:21, 145:16, 146:5 marginally [1] - 9:3 market [1] - 113:9 market's [1] - 118:17 markets [3] - 113:13, 113:18, 113:19 massive [1] - 34:10 Material [1] - 55:9 material [14] - 12:20, 36:20, 43:17, 43:21, 43:24, 46:8, 46:9, 62:17, 71:14, 82:9, 83:11, 96:24, 123:20, 134:21 materials [6] - 16:7, 45:8, 46:16, 82:1, 82:5, 111:13 matter [19] - 2:2, 45:10, 48:4, 48:8, 49:22, 49:24, 51:15, 59:14, 65:3, 79:1,

79:8, 79:15, 79:16,

85:7, 86:13, 88:21, 88:24, 95:16, 149:10 MATTER [1] - 1:4 Matters [4] - 40:9, 41:23, 42:14, 44:19 matters [5] - 5:22, 33:16, 40:13, 59:19, 62:12 maximum [2] - 67:19, 67:21 MCCOMSEY [1] -149:5 McComsey [2] - 1:24, 149:18 meal [1] - 61:8 meal's [1] - 61:6 meals [1] - 56:20 mean [68] - 4:11, 11:24, 14:5, 15:19, 16:21, 16:23, 20:13, 21:17, 24:10, 26:23, 27:5, 27:6, 27:8, 29:19, 30:10, 30:11, 30:16, 32:12, 34:23, 39:19, 42:8, 43:9, 47:9, 47:13, 51:7, 56:12, 56:14, 56:15, 56:18, 56:23, 57:5, 59:5, 59:6, 59:17, 60:13, 62:6, 62:12, 63:11, 65:4, 69:7, 69:13, 77:15, 85:18, 90:22, 90:25, 92:3, 100:9, 100:10, 100:16, 102:17, 104:21, 104:25, 112:16, 116:19, 119:4, 124:9, 124:24, 133:19, 135:25, 139:24, 140:15, 141:3, 141:24, 142:1, 144:12, 144:22, 145:23, 146:10 meaning [3] - 63:14, 98:16, 100:13 meaningless [2] -100:23, 101:3 means [5] - 34:5, 86:16, 127:6, 127:8, 142:20 meant [1] - 99:4 mechanisms [1] -77:3 meet [3] - 56:20, 82:17, 99:16 Meeting [1] - 3:2 meeting [1] - 3:5

meets [3] - 76:14,

124:17, 134:13

member [1] - 18:12 12 memory [2] - 18:1, 144:12 mentioned [3] - 28:24, 83:6, 96:3 mere [2] - 102:15, 126:14 merely [1] - 28:12 merit [1] - 7:18 merited [1] - 133:25 merits [2] - 126:10, 128:15 metal [2] - 27:6, 77:6 metallurgy [1] - 77:6 methodology [6] -92:20, 93:1, 93:2, 93:4, 93:6, 94:14 methods [1] - 28:22 middle [1] - 107:5 Middle [2] - 54:1, 54:6 midterm [1] - 107:4 might [20] - 12:25, 34:13, 48:10, 65:20, 68:16, 78:23, 86:24, 91:20, 92:10, 102:7, 104:7, 112:13, 115:19, 125:4, 126:2, 126:5, 131:2, 133:21, 139:8, 147:6 miles [2] - 26:12, 34:8 mills [4] - 77:20, 78:6 mind [6] - 47:10, 114:8, 116:24, 120:15, 131:18, 139:10 mineral [1] - 83:19 minimal [1] - 82:18 minimum [2] - 22:22, 56:19 minutes [1] - 3:13 misplaced [1] - 57:6 missed [4] - 90:17. 90:19, 138:6 mistaken [1] - 136:19 Mitigation [4] - 24:17, 25:16, 26:22, 27:25 money [1] - 39:8 monitor [6] - 26:24, 27:13, 27:21, 28:22, 29:17, 34:6 monitoring [20] -23:16, 24:14, 25:20, 26:13, 27:4, 27:6, 27:10, 27:11, 27:15, 27:19, 28:12, 28:13, 29:15, 29:24, 33:9, 34:12, 34:13, 35:4, 35:15 Montana [1] - 24:5

months [2] - 142:19,

142:20 MOORE [23] - 6:14, 14:11, 25:1, 26:20, 28:16, 30:6, 34:18, 39:25, 41:9, 49:3, 49:20, 55:3, 58:19, 59:9, 59:12, 78:24, 80:25, 84:16, 90:6, 98:8, 99:18, 103:12, 123:5 Moore [11] - 1:18, 6:15, 7:19, 16:21, 30:2, 33:23, 34:17, 41:3, 44:12, 102:11, 103:6 Moore's [1] - 16:2 morning [3] - 3:4, 3:8, 6:14 most [9] - 15:7, 47:8, 67:21, 92:15, 97:12, 107:3, 140:13, 141:22, 143:4 mother[1] - 134:6 Motion [19] - 22:13, 35:14, 35:24, 47:5, 51:21, 52:6, 69:5, 75:23, 80:7, 80:14, 81:16, 81:23, 88:15, 93:21, 94:3, 94:22, 121:10, 148:4, 148:10 motion [42] - 8:10, 25:18, 32:18, 40:7, 46:12, 46:13, 46:24, 49:4, 69:2, 69:9, 69:13, 70:2, 70:11, 70:13, 72:6, 75:11, 80:8, 88:4, 88:8, 88:9, 91:13, 92:10, 93:12, 94:1, 94:11, 94:16, 120:3, 120:10, 120:19, 123:13, 130:20, 130:21, 136:18, 136:21, 137:17, 137:18, 137:19, 138:3, 138:9, 140:11, 148:2 motion's [1] - 119:25 motions [1] - 70:12 move [11] - 6:2, 22:5, 35:14, 47:15, 51:20, 68:4, 79:25, 81:15, 118:23, 119:17, 128:21 moved [1] - 148:3 movement [4] - 25:6, 34:5 moving [1] - 3:20 MR [161] - 3:24, 6:9,

16:4, 17:4, 17:14, 18:8, 18:14, 19:10, 20:2, 20:12, 20:25, 21:6, 21:9, 22:1, 22:4, 22:18, 25:1, 26:20, 27:4, 28:16, 29:11, 30:6, 30:16. 31:19, 31:22, 32:8, 33:2, 34:1, 34:18, 34:21, 34:23, 35:1, 36:4, 39:25, 41:9, 41:14, 42:5, 42:13, 44:9, 44:15, 45:1, 45:2, 47:18, 49:3, 49:16, 49:20, 50:4, 50:16, 52:10, 55:3, 57:7, 58:19, 59:9, 59:12, 59:20, 60:17, 61:13, 61:22, 61:25, 63:2, 63:18, 63:25, 64:20, 65:16, 66:1, 66:3, 66:17, 67:5, 68:16, 70:17, 71:22, 72:2, 72:9, 74:23, 76:8, 78:24, 80:19, 80:25, 82:4, 84:16, 85:22, 86:6, 87:8, 87:14, 87:18, 87:23, 88:20, 90:6, 90:14, 91:2, 91:5, 91:8, 91:9, 91:20, 92:5, 92:18, 93:4, 93:6, 95:2, 98:8, 99:5, 99:18, 100:3, 101:13, 103:12, 104:1, 104:15, 104:17, 106:24, 107:20, 109:6, 109:21, 111:12, 111:20, 112:13, 112:21, 112:24, 113:7, 114:14, 114:19, 115:9, 115:19, 116:3, 116:8, 117:6, 117:23, 118:5, 118:11, 119:3, 119:7, 120:24, 121:16, 123:5, 124:9, 124:23, 125:15, 125:20, 126:3, 126:22, 128:23, 133:11, 134:1, 138:7, 138:25, 139:18, 139:19, 140:7, 141:6, 142:11, 143:7, 143:24, 145:3, 145:12,

6:14, 8:17, 10:22,

14:11, 15:23, 16:1,

145:25, 147:4

MS [18] - 7:24, 15:14,
26:3, 40:24, 50:7,
55:25, 70:25, 79:19,
81:10, 85:15, 99:8,
107:13, 123:17,
131:17, 140:19,
142:6, 143:21,
144:15

multibillion [2] 98:18, 105:16

multiple [1] - 73:25

mushy [1] - 31:17

muster [1] - 64:18

mute [1] - 6:7

N

namely [1] - 65:6 narrow [4] - 35:11. 92:10, 111:2, 111:14 narrowed [1] - 110:20 narrower[1] - 92:25 narrowly [1] - 50:1 Nathan [1] - 1:16 national [3] - 95:19, 98:16, 138:21 National [2] - 40:10, 46.18 Natural [2] - 72:14, 74:9 natural [3] - 13:11, 76:18, 78:14 nature [5] - 70:2, 83:16, 113:11, 125:14, 128:9 nay [1] - 70:10 near [2] - 14:2, 14:3 nearby [1] - 90:1 nearly [2] - 6:17, 60:3 NEB [3] - 41:24, 42:6, 44:20 Nebraska [1] - 24:5 necessarily [14] -13:14, 61:10, 61:15, 64:17, 66:5, 87:1, 88:2, 97:23, 101:15, 112:6, 134:8, 138:17, 139:12, 146:5 necessary [8] - 48:22, 55:1, 64:6, 82:10, 82:11, 82:12, 122:24, 147:21 need [34] - 27:8, 27:22, 51:4, 65:13, 67:21, 67:23, 69:23, 69:25, 70:13, 73:18, 73:23, 75:4, 80:22,

95:25, 97:23, 98:13, 99:8, 101:4, 103:20, 112:12, 114:12, 114:18, 115:7, 116:21, 119:8, 119:21, 135:15, 140:23, 141:14, 141:15, 142:8 needed [5] - 11:14, 67:15, 67:19, 97:22 needs [8] - 25:23, 37:25, 54:19, 57:18, 63:17, 99:16, 106:8, 110:4 negotiation [1] -119:20 negotiations [1] -119:1 NEPA [1] - 98:12 nervous [1] - 135:14 nets [1] - 77:22 never[3] - 108:4, 136:11, 145:9 new [2] - 83:8, 133:22 next [4] - 13:21, 103:8, 103:9, 107:4 nine [1] - 72:13 nobody [1] - 100:12 Nobody [4] - 100:21, 100:22, 102:14 none [13] - 22:8, 24:13, 35:19, 46:25, 75:18, 80:9, 81:14, 81:18, 88:10, 93:23, 94:17, 121:4, 137:19 nonetheless [2] -78:17, 100:5 nonjurisdictional [3] -4:16, 81:12, 99:10 nonlegible [1] - 11:17 nonprivileged [3] -49:5, 49:7, 49:13 nonresponsive [1] -12:7 normally [2] - 71:1, 127:11 North [1] - 34:9 northern [5] - 97:23, 98:3, 102:20, 107:22, 108:10 Notary [2] - 149:7.

149:18

note [6] - 34:2,

103:15, 104:4,

notes [1] - 19:24

nother [1] - 52:12

nothing [9] - 6:22,

12:23, 15:17, 26:5,

142:12, 147:6, 147:7

88:4, 93:1, 95:7,

41:1, 72:20, 85:15, 13 131:20, 140:21 Nothing [1] - 90:12 noticed [3] - 3:5, 140:19, 141:2 November [3] - 127:5, 146:8, 147:5 number [32] - 7:20, 8:13, 22:6, 22:15, 24:25, 35:17, 36:1, 42:6, 46:14, 47:15, 72:12, 75:12, 75:16, 76:5, 77:19, 77:20, 80:1, 80:16, 81:25, 91:24, 92:21, 92:22, 92:24, 93:2, 93:10, 93:17, 95:13, 120:11, 121:12, 146:15 numbers [33] - 90:18, 93:7, 93:18, 100:20. 100:22, 100:23, 101:12, 101:14, 101:18, 101:19, 102:6, 102:8, 103:18, 103:21, 103:22, 104:19, 104:21, 104:23, 104:25, 105:6, 105:9, 106:18, 106:20, 106:21, 107:1, 107:9, 114:21, 120:5 numeric[1] - 8:11 nursing [1] - 13:12 nuts [1] - 52:25

0

object [3] - 15:11, 25:24, 40:2 objected [3] - 47:22. 67:3, 83:22 objection [9] - 5:12, 14:12, 15:1, 16:6, 25:9, 30:7, 62:1, 119:7, 119:15 objections [5] - 6:19, 6:24, 7:16, 47:21, 119:1 objects [1] - 3:19 obligated [1] - 29:17 obligation [5] - 25:22, 79:9, 91:19, 147:15 observation (2) -17:23, 112:17 observations [1] -28:1 obtained [1] - 16:16

obvious [2] - 131:24, 132:16 Obviously [2] - 5:6, 53:16 obviously [5] - 4:11, 9:13, 23:25, 58:3, 102:15 occupied [1] - 66:24 occur [3] - 24:14, 29:3, 89:13 occurred [2] - 16:10, 61:1 occurs [1] - 21:3 October [1] - 149:14 oddities [1] - 124:10 oddity [1] - 65:4 OF [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:1, 149:1, 149:3 offer [5] - 104:11, 106:17, 114:7, 114:11, 116:14 offering [4] - 42:12, 50:2, 51:22, 116:17 office [1] - 40:25 offices [1] - 18:11 often [2] - 27:23, 28:13 oil [63] - 8:14, 9:7, 9:8, 9:12, 9:15, 9:16, 9:17, 10:18, 10:24, 11:25, 14:15, 15:19, 19:13, 19:23, 19:25, 20:2, 20:16, 20:25, 21:10, 39:11, 47:24, 49:6, 52:18, 52:19, 54:9, 67:9, 67:20, 76:16, 76:19, 76:20, 81:11, 82:17, 82:19, 83:3, 83:12, 84:10, 84:19, 84:24, 85:4, 85:10, 86:9, 87:5, 88:7, 88:22, 88:23, 89:2, 90:10, 95:5, 95:10, 95:15, 97:3, 97:24, 97:25, 98:21, 100:10, 101:25, 108:19, 108:21, 108:22, 111:22, 120:22 oils [3] - 83:25, 84:6, 84:7 Oklahoma [2] - 96:5, 97:25 old [3] - 23:5, 83:9, 83:10 older [1] - 37:9 olive [1] - 34:24 on-line [3] - 42:21, 43:8, 43:19 once [6] - 17:7, 55:22,

56:7, 64:7, 68:19, 97:24 Once [1] - 36:5 One [4] - 7:6, 43:6, 70:25, 131:8 one [60] - 3:8, 3:19, 9:25, 12:7, 12:18, 16:1, 16:4, 18:23, 28:23, 30:11, 31:22, 32:18, 43:7, 47:19, 47:20, 48:19, 61:20, 64:2, 65:8, 65:9, 65:12, 65:16, 65:21, 66:17, 71:23, 72:23, 78:5, 79:22, 84:1, 90:22, 92:6, 97:7, 97:24, 99:12, 102:18, 103:6, 103:17, 106:24, 107:4, 109:17, 118:1, 120:20, 124:3, 124:9, 125:21, 127:2, 129:5, 129:22, 130:2, 131:20, 132:10, 133:3, 133:18, 134:6, 134:7, 135:25, 136:13, 136:15, 144:6, 144:18 one's [1] - 65:9 one-size-fits-all [1] -9:25 onerous [4] - 33:7, 33:12, 33:21, 117:10 ones [3] - 59:4, 78:3, 133:2 ongoing [2] - 46:4, 79:9 Onida [1] - 149:13 Open [1] - 69:5 open [7] - 31:24, 62:8, 62:20, 62:21, 117:15, 119:9, 119:11 opening [2] - 6:21, 7:25 opens [1] - 137:4 operate [3] - 5:17, 10:1, 10:2 operated [1] - 72:16 operates [2] - 34:9, 143:8 operating [11] - 5:21, 20:5, 29:2, 40:3, 40:5, 40:14, 41:12, 41:19, 54:20, 71:18, 141:21 operation [6] - 54:15,

57:2, 60:22, 65:24,

130:12

82:7, 111:24 operational [2] -36:11, 83:17 operations [2] - 24:1, 54:13 opinion [1] - 122:4 opportunity [22] -16:24, 17:11, 56:4, 57:19, 58:14, 65:18, 70:19, 71:11, 72:5, 73:10, 73:12, 74:14, 74:24, 74:25, 75:1, 106:11, 118:21, 127:9, 133:24, 137:1, 140:2, 140:3 opposed [1] - 69:14 opposing [1] - 16:23 opposite [1] - 109:22 options [3] - 36:18, 38:10, 43:1 order [29] - 3:3, 3:19, 3:21, 8:11, 17:15, 21:25, 32:1, 42:15, 42:22, 43:14, 44:20, 60:25, 62:2, 64:4, 70:14, 73:19, 73:20, 91:16, 93:19, 119:10, 125:11, 137:7, 138:15, 138:24, 145:15, 145:17, 145:20, 146:9 orders [1] - 144:25 organization [1] - 5:15 organize [1] - 12:20 organized [1] - 45:9 original [4] - 34:4, 44:11, 59:23, 72:23 originally [1] - 96:11 Otherwise [2] - 8:5, 101:5 otherwise [1] - 139:16 ought [1] - 31:7 outer [1] - 67:18 outside [3] - 17:7, 21:24, 122:21 overall [1] - 5:10 overly [2] - 103:9, 103:11 overreaching [1] -114:10 oversight [2] - 56:13, 57:1 overview [3] - 3:13, 4:4, 6:20 own [12] - 4:11, 10:9, 20:8, 28:21, 38:13, 53:18, 85:6, 85:13, 101:2, 105:8, 112:3,

ownership [1] - 39:7 owns [2] - 37:13, 37:14

Р

package [2] - 119:9, 119:12 packet [6] - 117:16, 117:25, 118:8, 118:25, 119:19, 120:4 page [9] - 12:17, 12:18, 15:7, 25:18, 40:7, 49:3, 50:1, 91:6 pages [4] - 12:15, 15:9, 60:7, 90:9 paid [1] - 39:10 painstakingly [1] -116:21 paper[1] - 12:15 paragraph [2] - 91:9, 110:6 parent [8] - 5:18, 19:2, 30:13, 33:1, 33:14, 33:15, 35:17, 37:21 parent's [1] - 19:7 Part [1] - 138:12 part [22] - 15:21, 43:24, 44:2, 44:3, 45:4, 51:2, 51:8, 55:15, 56:16, 68:3, 68:12, 70:16, 71:17, 96:20, 97:24, 98:12, 98:14, 99:14, 132:6, 141:7, 141:8 partial [2] - 118:24, 119:4 participate [3] - 5:8, 69:20, 69:22 participated [1] -41:23 participating [2] - 8:6, 53:19 participation [2] -40:9, 57:25 particular [39] - 5:4, 5:5, 6:18, 8:22, 9:2, 10:6, 14:12, 17:3, 17:11, 18:18, 19:11, 20:15, 25:10, 25:15, 28:4, 31:2, 32:4, 32:20, 35:11, 36:22, 38:16, 41:21, 45:5, 53:6, 58:21, 59:13, 80:23, 99:19, 100:19, 105:24, 109:10, 109:13,

122:13, 124:11, 14 124:17, 128:8, 133:4, 139:3, 140:4 particularly [6] - 33:7, 33:12, 48:14, 117:9, 124:19, 130:16 parties [16] - 3:12, 7:20, 21:8, 21:18, 47:7, 49:7, 50:25, 69:21, 119:24, 132:23, 138:5, 138:23, 141:5, 144:12, 144:19, 147:24 parts [3] - 23:9, 32:15, 37:5 party [3] - 3:20, 63:5, 105:24 pass [1] - 64:17 passes [1] - 61:20 past [5] - 53:23, 57:12, 58:25, 73:24, 83:12 path [1] - 31:8 Paul [1] - 1:20 pause [2] - 7:22, 91:11 pay (4) - 37:24, 39:8, 39:14, 48:21 paying [1] - 56:18 pays [2] - 27:16, 35:6 penalties [2] - 108:7, 115:14 pending [4] - 46:23, 93:12, 94:11, 137:17 People [1] - 75:7 people [11] - 12:14, 14:16, 17:22, 30:8, 56:18, 60:6, 62:10, 73:11, 136:12, 136:14, 138:14 per[1] - 56:7 percent [4] - 8:21, 62:6, 62:11, 140:1 perfect [1] - 134:24 perfectly [1] - 123:24 performance [1] -86:2 perhaps [15] - 3:12, 33:19, 34:20, 45:4, 51:19, 59:20, 90:16, 90:21, 105:19, 130:1, 132:2, 136:7, 138:13, 138:23, 140:25 Perhaps [2] - 102:24, 104:7 period [2] - 64:4, 68:7 permissive [1] - 147:8 permit [14] - 55:19, 73:20, 81:2, 98:11,

98:15, 109:16,

109:18, 110:10, 110:11, 111:2, 111:5, 111:8, 123:10, 125:15 PERMIT [1] - 1:5 permitted [1] - 114:22 permitting [1] -107:24 person [2] - 7:21, 103:6 personally [1] - 65:1 personnel [6] - 25:2, 52:22, 52:23, 52:25, 53:10, 67:15 perspective [6] -69:11, 75:2, 127:24, 135:10, 135:11, 135:12 pertained [1] - 79:10 pertaining [3] - 44:8, 69:10, 137:9 Petroleum [2] - 96:23, 97:1 phase [3] - 96:5, 96:6, 97:24 phases [1] - 96:4 PHMSA [41] - 16:15, 16:17, 17:6, 18:17, 56:3, 56:5, 56:8, 57:18, 60:1, 60:14, 62:4, 62:16, 63:10, 63:11, 63:15, 63:21, 64:3, 64:4, 64:12, 64:17, 65:3, 65:6, 65:18, 71:18, 72:3, 72:8, 73:16, 75:6, 75:7, 75:15, 77:13, 78:18, 78:25, 79:17, 79:21, 80:2, 138:20, 140:3, 140:16 phone [1] - 34:10 phones [1] - 6:7 physical [6] - 9:6, 9:9, 9:19, 10:12, 18:20, 43:7 pick [1] - 133:2 picture [1] - 69:14 pictures [2] - 9:11, 9:15 pie [5] - 134:4, 134:5, 134:9, 134:13, 134:16 piece [2] - 21:11, 100:23 Pierre [1] - 2:3 piles [1] - 12:15 pipe [32] - 25:6, 34:5, 36:7, 36:10, 36:12, 36:18, 36:25, 37:14, 37:16, 37:18, 37:25,

39:4, 39:5, 64:23, 76:14, 76:19, 76:20, 76:21, 76:23, 77:8, 77:10, 77:18, 77:20, 78:4, 78:5, 78:6, 78:12, 78:21, 78:22, 78:23, 80:17 PIPELINE [1] - 1:4 Pipeline [14] - 5:16, 23:3, 55:4, 55:9, 58:20, 72:22, 79:10, 79:11, 99:2, 99:3, 114:22, 132:22, 133:5, 147:14 pipeline [97] - 8:14, 9:6, 9:11, 9:14, 9:15, 9:20, 10:4, 10:10, 10:12, 10:14, 11:4, 11:12, 12:24, 12:25, 13:1, 13:22, 14:15, 18:20, 19:13, 20:5, 22:20, 22:23, 23:4, 23:7, 23:12, 23:20, 23:22, 24:18, 26:12, 26:25, 29:2, 30:1, 34:6, 34:8, 36:5, 36:15, 38:23, 39:7, 39:15, 43:3, 49:24, 54:20, 56:1, 59:23, 65:24, 66:4, 72:15, 72:16, 73:8, 78:12, 81:11, 82:2, 82:6, 82:8, 82:9, 82:13, 82:16, 82:20, 83:17, 84:19, 84:25, 85:10, 86:9, 87:5, 89:7, 95:7, 95:8, 95:19, 95:22, 95:25, 96:1, 96:3, 96:21, 97:5, 97:7, 97:13, 97:16, 97:21, 98:10, 98:16, 98:17, 98:22, 99:23, 101:22, 102:20, 103:3, 105:9, 109:3, 111:25, 112:1, 113:14, 120:21, 122:22, 123:25, 130:7, 131:2 pipeline's [1] - 128:12 Pipelines [1] - 22:24 pipelines [28] - 5:18, 9:10, 10:1, 11:24, 13:1, 13:12, 22:16, 23:5, 25:5, 36:2, 36:6, 37:6, 37:9, 41:17, 42:1, 42:20, 43:7, 46:3, 46:5, 76:13, 76:20, 83:8, 83:9, 83:10, 85:5, 86:2, 117:16

pipes [6] - 76:23, 77:22, 78:7, 78:8, 78:14, 84:14 place [17] - 3:5, 28:4, 36:19, 36:20, 45:16, 59:25, 72:17, 73:4, 73:14, 73:22, 76:14, 77:3, 77:5, 78:22, 129:8, 133:8, 144:7 places [4] - 33:19, 65:8, 73:25, 126:19 Plains [1] - 3:20 plan [9] - 27:10, 54:8, 54:19, 54:20, 57:2, 57:20, 58:14, 64:17, 66:10 Plan [30] - 7:8, 24:17, 25:16, 26:22, 27:25, 52:11, 52:15, 53:1, 53:7, 54:12, 55:6, 55:16, 56:2, 57:16, 57:21, 58:1, 58:23, 59:16, 61:10, 61:11, 63:20, 64:10, 64:13, 67:13, 68:7, 68:14, 69:4, 72:11, 89:15, 138:11 planning [7] - 27:5, 57:23, 66:23, 102:7, 109:3, 113:10, 113:14 plans [2] - 101:25, 112:6 Plant [2] - 11:22, 11:23 plant [2] - 12:1, 14:1 plate [1] - 77:9 plates [1] - 77:8 play [1] - 72:20 playing [2] - 56:13, 75:3 plead [1] - 92:6 plus [2] - 23:7, 120:7 point [28] - 8:3, 23:18, 28:20, 30:2, 32:11, 36:13, 37:7, 39:7, 64:6, 65:2, 71:1, 71:4, 83:4, 97:9, 98:2, 109:9, 109:17, 110:6, 112:14, 116:17, 118:25, 119:11, 128:23, 138:12, 138:13, 139:16, 143:25 points [4] - 47:12, 98:8, 106:25, 128:18 policy [5] - 37:20, 38:5, 38:6, 38:8,

38:13

pork [1] - 61:7

portion [2] - 90:7, 136:21 portions [1] - 16:9 pose [1] - 131:23 position [6] - 55:25, 79:19, 81:10, 86:12, 103:18, 123:17 possession [2] -44:25, 94:2 possible [12] - 7:1. 15:8, 39:19, 67:13. 71:6, 88:6, 97:22, 119:8, 122:20, 133:15, 134:16, 143:7 possibly [2] - 39:17, 145:14 posthearing [1] -73:21 potential [12] - 13:20, 14:14, 16:11, 21:10, 22:16, 25:4, 66:6, 67:9, 70:25, 82:11, 125:17, 144:13 potentially [3] - 10:11, 104:3, 113:24 Power [2] - 11:22, 11:23 power[1] - 11:25 powers [1] - 5:5 practicable [1] - 29:6 practical [5] - 27:18, 33:17, 36:4, 38:17, 112:10 practically [2] - 35:5, 54:22 prairie [1] - 131:10 precedent [1] - 37:15 preceding [1] - 43:11 precise [2] - 66:6, 89:10 precludes [1] - 136:23 predict [3] - 85:22, 102:14 preemption [4] - 7:17, 59:4, 64:21, 64:24 prefiled [1] - 140:20 preliminary [1] -139:13 preparation [9] -55:13, 58:22, 59:16, 68:6, 68:13, 68:18, 68:23, 69:4, 69:10 prepare [1] - 69:24 prepared (5) - 6:12. 71:3, 101:19. 121:22, 144:10 preparing [1] - 55:15 prepositioned [1] -89:25

prerogatives [1] - 46:81 5 present [11] - 36:13, 125:10, 129:3, 129:14, 129:15, 129:19, 133:2, 133:24, 137:3, 137:14, 141:16 presentations [1] -125:14 presented [7] - 64:14, 71:20, 131:12, 132:7, 132:22, 136:24, 144:3 presents [1] - 143:14 presidential [2] -98:15, 123:10 press [3] - 96:9, 96:12, 96:13 pressures [1] - 10:2 presumably [1] -108:12 presume [4] - 8:5, 101:9, 126:11, 139:17 pretty [4] - 22:19, 64:24, 134:4, 147:9 preventing [1] - 82:23 prevention [1] - 5:24 previous [2] - 16:21, 74:3 previously [1] - 74:9 primarily [2] - 45:15, 83:13 primary [4] - 6:4, 18:17, 52:16, 98:24 principally [1] - 28:24 privilege [1] - 49:18 probable [1] - 48:12 problem [21] - 30:22, 39:3, 46:4, 61:15, 77:15, 83:7, 83:8, 83:9, 102:5, 110:17, 117:21, 127:16, 131:12, 131:14, 131:16, 131:19, 134:10, 134:15, 134:20, 137:2, 143:15 problems [12] - 29:3, 36:14, 37:8, 37:10, 45:22, 73:4, 73:15, 82:12, 83:10, 127:2, 131:4, 132:14 procedural [3] -42:16, 140:24, 144:13 procedure [11] -17:20, 40:3, 40:5, 40:14, 41:12, 41:19, 48:16, 58:17, 71:18,

141:21, 146:6 procedures [1] - 79:20 Proceed [3] - 3:23. 116:7, 148:5 proceed [19] - 4:3, 5:11, 14:7, 22:8, 35:19, 36:1, 46:25, 70:5, 75:18, 80:9, 80:16, 81:18, 81:25, 88:10, 94:17, 94:24, 121:4, 121:5, 121:12 proceeding [31] -7:11, 12:3, 16:12, 17:5, 40:12, 42:7, 43:16, 44:24, 45:5, 45:17, 48:1, 48:13, 51:3, 53:25, 56:24, 60:13, 63:5, 70:21, 70:22, 79:15, 80:21, 100:25, 101:8, 103:3, 109:24, 110:2, 125:17, 127:10, 127:17, 127:20, 145:18 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:1 Proceedings [1] - 1:8 proceedings [7] -16:22, 40:19, 81:7, 87:4, 149:9, 149:12 process [63] - 24:18, 33:10, 37:22, 42:3, 42:10, 42:16, 43:8, 43:10, 43:11, 46:20, 48:24, 48:25, 57:20, 57:23, 57:24, 60:5, 62:9, 62:10, 62:19, 62:20, 65:14, 70:16, 70:19, 70:20, 71:1, 71:17, 72:2, 72:20, 72:21, 74:1, 74:12, 74:18, 75:7, 75:8, 75:9, 90:16, 98:12, 102:23, 122:18, 123:11, 125:24, 126:1, 126:5, 126:23, 126:25, 127:25, 128:1, 128:4, 128:7, 133:4, 133:6, 135:15, 138:19, 138:20, 138:21, 139:3, 140:4, 140:8, 140:16, 140:17, 142:1, 142:2, 142:13 processes [4] - 43:2, 53:19, 73:22, 74:6 procure [1] - 78:5 procured [1] - 78:4 produce [15] - 25:22,

26:17, 39:23, 68:5, 69:3, 82:6, 83:20, 85:12, 91:14, 94:12, 104:2, 104:12, 105:25, 141:18, 142:7 produced [34] - 7:1, 7:3, 7:6, 7:14, 14:20, 14:25, 15:2, 15:4, 15:11, 15:16, 16:5, 16:18, 19:8, 25:7, 25:13, 25:25, 40:2, 40:14, 41:19, 44:6, 44:16, 56:7, 70:18, 70:21, 70:22, 79:13, 81:1, 84:20, 90:8, 91:15, 99:14, 120:6, 123:8, 123:11 Producers [2] - 96:23, 97:1 producing [2] - 4:20, 62:24 product [7] - 42:2, 42:3, 42:10, 83:14, 83:16, 92:3 production [13] - 67:4, 95:6, 97:3, 100:10, 108:22, 111:22, 112:8, 114:16, 114:20, 114:21, 115:10, 120:12, 120:22 productive [1] - 6:20 Professional [2] -149:6, 149:19 professional [1] -130:12 profitability [1] -113:15 profitable [1] - 113:19 programs [1] - 5:24 prohibition [1] - 18:3 project [20] - 14:16, 16:10, 18:21, 30:9, 57:1, 59:23, 78:15, 96:10, 98:19, 102:1, 102:8, 102:11, 102:16, 102:24, 110:7, 110:13, 110:14, 112:12, 121:23, 124:17 PROJECT [1] - 1:6 projected [4] - 9:8, 10:18, 94:25, 96:20 projecting [1] - 10:24 projections [3] -105:7, 105:8, 114:15 projects [4] - 72:18, 95:12, 95:13, 102:13 promulgates [1] -

101:3 promulgation [1] -101:2 proof [14] - 56:16, 99:11, 99:14, 109:11, 109:13, 109:22, 110:4, 110:18, 110:19, 110:21, 111:9, 111:11, 136:6 propelled [1] - 21:1 proper [1] - 32:1 properly [1] - 137:7 property [2] - 37:3, 112:23 proponents [1] -102:12 proposal [1] - 132:5 proposed [5] - 4:5, 23:7, 73:19, 82:2, 132:4 Proposed [1] - 102:13 propounded [2] -6:23, 9:4 propped [1] - 45:22 propulsion [1] - 19:23 protect [8] - 13:9, 13:19, 14:7, 53:14, 53:20, 54:18, 54:24, 58:11 protected [1] - 52:19 protecting [2] - 54:9, 57:17 protection [1] - 119:9 protections [1] -53:12 protective [8] - 17:15, 21:25, 91:16, 93:19, 93:20, 119:10, 138:15 protocols [2] - 17:1, 17:2 protracted [1] -127:25 provide [33] - 5:2, 38:12, 44:23, 49:13, 55:5, 57:19, 58:14, 67:7, 84:2, 84:12, 86:22, 88:5, 92:20, 93:9, 105:9, 105:18, 105:20, 106:7, 107:2, 115:16, 116:14, 117:10, 117:13, 117:25, 118:24, 128:24, 129:6, 129:10, 135:23, 139:11, 139:14, 141:13 provided [39] - 7:10, 8:19, 11:18, 11:21,

84:4, 87:19, 90:7, 90:11, 91:17, 91:23, 99:15, 109:25, 117:16, 118:8, 118:12, 122:3, 122:17, 126:18, 133:17, 138:14, 139:15 Provided [1] - 45:2 provides [7] - 83:2, 101:21, 112:14, 118:25, 119:19, 135:5, 135:6 providing [7] - 4:25, 53:9, 55:22, 83:23, 116:16, 117:8, 119:19 provision [2] - 100:19, 109:13 provisions [3] - 13:18, 91:16, 93:20 proxy [1] - 62:9 psi [1] - 9:7 public [17] - 40:11, 42:4, 42:6, 42:10, 43:19, 45:3, 46:19, 46:22, 51:2, 57:19, 73:11, 74:25, 75:13, 102:3, 119:14, 120:7 Public [8] - 3:2, 25:21, 54:25, 55:23, 79:6, 81:7, 149:7, 149:18 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 publicly [2] - 101:9, 101:14 publish [1] - 146:2 PUC [13] - 40:19, 55:6, 55:18, 56:12, 59:2, 63:13, 63:14, 63:22, 71:11, 72:20, 74:19, 75:14, 99:3 PUC's [1] - 56:24 pumped [2] - 82:19, 82:20 pumping [1] - 14:1 purpose [4] - 5:15, 52:18, 98:13 purposes [5] - 10:9, 17:24, 39:18, 39:20, 59:2 pursue [1] - 98:20 put [16] - 52:21, 59:25, 62:22, 64:1, 65:17,

74:1, 77:13, 78:21,

12:13, 12:14, 15:10.

18:21, 21:14, 21:22,

21:24, 24:4, 37:19,

49:7, 53:13, 62:25.

78:19, 81:5, 82:14,

83:1, 83:24, 84:2,

100:10, 100:15, 16 100:18, 100:20, 124:12, 124:15, 142:1, 144:7 putting [2] - 48:7, 98:5 puzzled [1] - 20:17

Q

quality [11] - 8:25, 12:22, 76:13, 77:2, 77:11, 77:18, 77:24, 78:2, 78:18, 83:3, 101:15 quantity [2] - 12:21, 12:22 quarters [1] - 8:21 Questions [6] - 26:8. 41:2, 50:13, 79:23, 81:13, 85:17 questions [25] - 16:20, 19:19, 34:20, 43:25, 46:11, 52:12, 61:3, 66:16, 68:1, 79:24, 86:25, 88:2, 102:18, 104:6, 106:10, 106:12, 109:5, 113:5, 123:21, 123:22, 128:8, 128:19, 128:20, 136:8, 140:18 quickly [2] - 6:25, 92:3 quite [6] - 43:11, 87:8, 94:5, 95:12, 104:3, 135:13 quoted [1] - 28:21

R

Rahn's [1] - 130:7 rain [1] - 28:3 rains [1] - 26:13 raised [5] - 7:16, 30:7, 95:3, 144:23, 145:2 raises [1] - 52:11 ranch [1] - 35:9 ranchers [4] - 10:7, 13:6, 24:21, 39:4 ranching [1] - 23:25 range [5] - 67:13, 67:16, 67:18, 86:15, 86:23 rangeland [1] - 28:9 rate [3] - 92:3, 92:8, 134:22 rates [1] - 66:20 rather [8] - 21:1, 37:22, 71:6, 101:12, 118:9, 121:1, 136:6,

145:2 raw [2] - 92:21, 93:2 reach [4] - 16:11, 33:5, 36:6, 114:4 read [13] - 10:16, 11:2, 11:8, 11:10, 11:20, 32:22, 47:10, 47:14, 92:7, 108:24, 110:20, 123:13, 124:4 reading [3] - 12:2, 111:2, 111:14 ready [1] - 59:24 real [4] - 37:11, 115:23, 130:4, 134:20 reality [1] - 136:11 really [27] - 3:15, 7:12, 9:4, 11:5, 11:20, 12:1, 12:5, 13:21, 20:18, 26:3, 45:21, 51:4, 54:8, 54:21, 58:4, 79:15, 85:11, 128:16, 129:11, 134:17, 134:25, 135:8, 136:23, 139:1, 139:6 142:23, 143:21 realm [2] - 31:17, 44:4 Realtime [2] - 149:6, 149:19 reason [15] - 17:2, 17:4, 26:6, 65:16, 66:3, 85:2, 98:6, 101:11, 111:15, 111:19, 125:1, 135:7, 136:15, 141:3, 146:17 reasonable [9] - 9:22, 13:18, 61:21, 97:17, 133:21, 134:23, 135:1, 145:23 reasonableness [2] -31:13, 111:17 reasons [3] - 22:20, 31:22, 97:7 recalling [1] - 66:19 receive [1] - 17:8 received [2] - 38:4, 132:23 recent [2] - 15:7, 107:4 recently [3] - 38:25, 92:7 Recently [1] - 96:15 recess [1] - 76:2 recitation [1] - 18:9 reciting [1] - 47:8 reclaim [1] - 29:7 reclaimed [1] - 29:5

Reclamation [4] -24:17, 25:16, 26:22, 27:25 recognize [2] - 63:10, 74:14 recollect [1] - 65:23 recollection [7] -17:16, 17:21, 18:10, 18:13, 72:12, 73:3 record [2] - 130:16, 147:6 records [1] - 24:5 recover [1] - 48:23 recovery [2] - 48:17, 48:24 recurring [1] - 30:11 red [2] - 96:8, 96:25 redacted [2] - 18:21, 21:23 redefined [3] - 34:3, 34:11, 40:6 redrew [1] - 49:4 reduction [1] - 97:21 refer [1] - 123:6 referenced [1] -136:11 referencing [1] - 87:9 referred [2] - 26:22, 44:21 refined [2] - 83:14 reflect [1] - 63:11 refocus [1] - 41:17 regard [8] - 22:6, 24:25, 35:15, 51:21, 52:14, 53:21, 115:14, 147:25 regarding [7] - 46:20, 59:7, 85:7, 85:16, 125:17, 142:7, 147:7 regardless [2] -109:12, 112:25 Registered [2] -149:5, 149:19 regret[1] - 17:14 regular (1) - 27:8 regularly [1] - 33:13 regulate [1] - 82:16 regulated [2] - 56:2, 56:3 regulation [3] - 89:1, 95:22, 99:25 regulations [7] - 54:3, 56:8, 78:1, 101:2, 101:3, 111:4, 121:20 regulators [1] - 42:4 Regulatory [1] - 82:15 regulatory [5] - 37:22, 40:13, 100:19, 102:23, 140:4 rejected [1] - 116:13

relate [1] - 8:22 related [26] - 5:12, 5:23, 7:8, 8:14, 11:3, 11:11, 11:23, 12:23, 12:24, 40:5, 40:12, 41:12, 45:25, 46:7, 48:6, 55:17, 64:23, 76:9, 95:24, 95:25, 101:17, 105:17, 110:12, 110:15, 111:3, 122:6 relates [4] - 89:14, 93:17, 119:18, 121:16 relating [5] - 20:15, 34:4, 34:12, 37:20, 91:25 relationships [1] -74:16 relative [3] - 5:21, 46:16, 123:2 relatively [1] - 90:2 release [3] - 92:3, 92:8, 94:13 released [1] - 62:18 relevance [4] - 7:17, 40:18, 113:24, 120:11 relevancy [1] - 107:17 relevant [22] - 9:3, 12:3, 15:8, 15:22, 18:22, 24:11, 41:1, 43:14, 45:12, 48:11, 67:3, 81:7, 83:2, 85:19, 90:23, 102:1, 103:3, 105:12, 106:22, 109:24, 124:16, 147:10 relied [2] - 96:22, 130:12 relief [1] - 4:24 rely [1] - 130:11 remedial [1] - 43:2 remediation [3] -23:10, 35:15, 37:1 remedy [1] - 5:5 remember [1] - 87:12 remind [1] - 17:10 reminder [1] - 6:5 reminding [1] - 74:11 removal [1] - 36:25 remove [3] - 39:3, 43:4, 122:21 removed [2] - 36:21, 37:25 removing [1] - 39:5 render [1] - 109:14 rendering [1] - 147:16 replied [1] - 11:16

Report [2] - 96:23,

97:2 report [8] - 90:8, 97:1, 97:2, 101:20, 102:9, 107:1, 107:3, 107:6 Reported [1] - 1:24 Reporter [4] - 149:6, 149:19, 149:19 reporter [1] - 149:9 represent [1] - 73:11 representation [1] -63:4 representative [1] -86:20 representing [1] -23:1 request [113] - 3:15, 8:13, 8:22, 8:24, 9:4, 10:16, 11:2, 11:7, 11:11, 12:11, 14:13, 14:18, 14:24, 15:5, 20:1, 20:12, 20:15, 22:6, 24:25, 25:3, 25:8, 25:10, 25:14, 25:25, 28:17, 30:4, 30:8, 32:21, 34:3, 34:4, 34:10, 34:11, 35:15, 35:17, 36:1, 40:1, 40:7, 40:15, 40:20, 40:21, 41:6, 41:10, 41:17, 43:20, 44:9, 44:16, 46:14, 46:15, 47:15, 47:22, 49:5, 49:10, 49:15, 49:25, 50:11, 51:8, 51:20, 51:23, 52:1, 52:8, 55:11, 55:21, 59:3, 59:11, 59:15, 60:2, 61:9, 61:21, 67:7, 67:12, 67:17, 68:5, 75:12, 75:16, 76:5, 79:13, 79:14, 80:1, 80:16, 81:4, 81:25, 83:1, 83:23, 84:3, 84:17, 86:7, 86:17, 88:17, 91:14, 91:20, 91:21, 92:1, 93:17, 94:24, 114:2, 114:6, 115:22, 118:3, 118:23, 119:8, 119:17, 121:2, 121:12, 121:16, 122:6, 123:9, 128:22, 137:20, 138:12, 138:24, 140:11 Request [1] - 22:15 requested [3] - 53:25, 123:15, 123:20 requesting [1] - 54:11 requests [34] - 6:18,

6:23, 7:5, 7:8, 8:2, 17 8:12, 30:14, 30:23, 32:25, 49:5, 58:22, 59:7, 71:5, 100:1, 101:8, 103:11, 103:14, 103:25, 104:1, 104:2, 104:6, 104:9, 104:12, 105:22, 111:16, 113:5, 114:2, 114:5, 114:18, 115:20, 116:22, 117:2, 138:4, 138:8 require [5] - 57:11, 57:15, 100:7, 111:5, 121:20 required [14] - 22:21, 23:23, 27:10, 39:1, 52:15, 53:1, 53:13, 55:6, 67:23, 94:6, 99:12, 108:16, 110:3, 147:17 requirement [4] -16:17, 73:18, 82:17, requirements [9] -13:9, 52:14, 55:1, 56:5, 57:9, 76:13, 82:18, 82:22, 99:16 requires [6] - 95:22, 95:23, 100:5, 110:6, 126:23, 126:25 research [3] - 38:7, 45:19, 63:7 reserve [1] - 8:1 resolution [1] - 44:22 resolve [3] - 18:23, 58:9, 147:24 resolved [1] - 6:25 resources [4] - 48:17, 53:9, 89:22, 89:25 Resources [2] - 72:15, 74.9 respect [11] - 7:7, 7:16, 21:10, 60:4, 64:21, 66:8, 72:21, 86:11, 102:11, 115:22, 116:12 respond [14] - 28:16, 50:1, 52:22, 59:7, 67:16, 84:18, 89:23, 100:3, 104:7, 113:16, 115:19, 118:21, 139:1, 139:4 responded [7] - 47:20, 58:21, 79:5, 80:3, 80:4, 103:20 responder [1] - 13:24 responders [1] - 89:18 responding [3] -

11:13, 71:4, 115:20 response [23] - 7:7, 19:15, 20:14, 24:3, 25:7, 25:11, 26:23, 34:25, 40:14, 49:15, 53:10, 57:20, 61:24, 67:23, 79:13, 84:3, 87:18, 89:25, 90:13, 90:19, 106:6, 116:18, 131:17 Response [26] - 7:7, 52:11, 52:15, 53:1, 53:7, 54:12, 55:5, 55:16, 56:2, 57:16, 57:21, 58:1, 58:23, 59:16, 61:10, 61:11, 63:20, 64:10, 64:13, 67:13, 68:6, 68:14, 69:4, 72:11, 89:15, 138:11 responses [4] - 6:19. 7:13, 116:15, 116:16 responsibility [1] -37:18 responsible [2] - 16:5, 29:20 responsive [21] -12:10, 14:18, 14:20, 14:24, 15:4, 15:17, 19:14, 20:15, 25:3, 25:13, 26:6, 29:13, 40:17, 41:6, 49:12, 59:21, 79:13, 81:3, 82:25, 86:10, 123:9 responsiveness [1] -9:1 restate [1] - 94:10 result [8] - 19:18, 28:14, 37:1, 49:14, 109:8, 110:10, 111:1 reticent [1] - 141:1 revert [1] - 37:17 review [12] - 16:24, 17:12, 17:24, 18:12, 50:16, 63:14, 70:20, 82:10, 85:24, 126:23, 143:16, 143:17 reviewed [4] - 14:19, 52:13, 80:21, 134:3 reviewing [2] - 49:18, 58:14 revisions [1] - 75:4 ridiculous [1] - 124:25 rights [1] - 36:24 Risk [2] - 16:8, 21:11 risk [7] - 13:20, 19:17, 21:9, 21:21, 90:8 risks [2] - 10:23, 23:14 Rislov [4] - 1:15,

RISLOV[1] - 134:1 Rislov's [1] - 136:1 Robert [1] - 79:4 Rolayne [1] - 1:13 role [4] - 54:16, 75:3, 79:1, 114:1 roll [1] - 77:8 room [2] - 117:3, 117:4 roughly [2] - 142:19, 145:17 Roughly [1] - 61:13 route [38] - 36:5, 36:16, 73:8, 122:23, 123:19, 123:25, 124:5, 125:3, 125:6, 125:11, 125:18, 128:8, 128:12, 128:17, 130:13, 130:22, 131:4, 131:10, 131:12, 131:19, 131:25, 132:4, 132:8, 132:15, 132:21, 135:9, 135:16, 136:2, 136:12, 136:14, 136:17, 136:25, 137:6, 137:8, 137:9, 137:14 routes [24] - 121:14, 121:17, 121:21, 121:23, 121:25, 122:5, 122:7, 122:15, 122:20, 124:1, 126:8, 126:10, 126:16, 128:15, 131:6, 131:8, 133:9, 133:13, 133:15, 133:17, 133:21, 135:12, 135:21, 135:22 routing [7] - 123:10, 123:11, 125:24, 126:1, 126:5, 126:7, 133:6 routings [1] - 137:4 RPR [1] - 1:24 rule [5] - 4:16, 32:14, 99:19, 124:10, 125:1 Rule [1] - 99:17 ruled [1] - 143:4 rules [2] - 129:25, 143:13 Rules [1] - 99:13 ruling [5] - 30:12, 32:10, 48:5, 58:16,

143:5

run [3] - 85:5, 131:3,

132:20, 134:1, 136:4

146:6 running [1] - 38:23 rupture [5] - 8:15, 9:6, 9:10, 9:15, 14:15 ruptures [1] - 9:20 Rural [32] - 1:20, 1:22, 6:24, 7:12, 7:14, 8:10, 14:21, 15:20, 25:10, 46:14, 49:14, 62:24, 63:4, 76:7, 80:1, 80:4, 80:18, 81:4, 82:3, 82:4, 87:6, 88:19, 92:14, 95:1, 104:14, 104:19, 121:15, 122:1, 139:14, 140:1, 142:9, 145:1 rush [1] - 142:23

S

sabotage [1] - 89:6 safe [1] - 128:13 safety [6] - 22:20, 36:14, 56:21, 77:22, 82:16, 83:4 Safety [1] - 55:9 sake [3] - 35:13, 68:4, 119:16 sands [2] - 85:4, 95:13 satisfactory [4] -63:16, 63:21, 137:14 satisfy [1] - 72:11 saw [1] - 90:15 scaling [1] - 114:6 scenario [2] - 67:17, 90:11 schedule [6] - 99:1, 112:2, 112:11, 140:24, 144:4, 144:13 schedule's [1] -142:17 scheduled [1] -145:16 scheduling [4] -98:25, 127:16, 144:23, 144:24 scope [11] - 5:12, 19:4, 44:10, 44:16, 48:16, 50:17, 59:10, 59:12, 59:18, 69:11, 109:23 SDDS [1] - 147:13 seams [1] - 76:21 search [8] - 19:10, 19:13, 25:2, 35:16, 41:15, 49:11, 86:4,

131:9

searched [2] - 34:7, 41:4 season [3] - 117:15, 119:9, 119:12 Second [2] - 98:18, 146:16 second [6] - 31:24, 32:2, 96:6, 110:5, 110:6, 118:6 secondly [1] - 123:8 section [3] - 109:12, 111:15, 123:9 Section [3] - 91:5, 110:21, 112:14 sections [1] - 18:22 see [40] - 7:20, 7:22, 8:18, 12:24, 19:23, 21:20, 28:2, 28:8, 33:12, 33:13, 53:13, 60:8, 65:2, 68:8, 69:9, 69:23, 69:25, 70:1, 72:7, 73:17, 73:23, 74:6, 90:18, 91:7, 91:11, 105:6, 106:1, 115:3, 118:5, 120:11, 120:20, 121:19, 123:14, 127:25, 131:14, 138:5, 144:5, 144:7, 146:13 seeing [4] - 19:16, 61:16, 61:19, 68:10 seek [1] - 34:11 seeking [5] - 7:15, 11:1, 18:16, 36:9, 143:20 seem [3] - 12:2, 15:18, 24:11 sees [1] - 8:5 segment [8] - 96:13, 96:14, 98:2, 98:3, 99:6, 102:20, 107:22, 108:10 segments [1] - 78:23 Select [1] - 86:18 selection[1] - 125:3 self [3] - 38:14, 116:15, 118:15 self-serving [3] -38:14, 116:15, 118:15 semi [1] - 83:14 semi-refined [1] -83:14 Semmler [5] - 1:14, 15:14, 100:13, 143:19, 144:9 SEMMLER [16] - 7:24, 15:14, 26:3, 40:24,

50:7, 55:25, 79:19,

81:10, 85:15, 99:8, 18 107:13, 123:17, 140:19, 142:6, 143:21, 144:15 send [1] - 43:21 sense [17] - 3:22, 22:19, 24:13, 32:4, 33:17, 66:11, 75:5, 77:17, 83:3, 99:20, 99:25, 103:13, 105:20, 113:10, 128:3, 137:12, 145:3 sensitive [2] - 89:3, 89:12 sent [1] - 77:23 separating [1] - 12:15 September [4] - 1:8, 2:4, 3:3, 149:11 series [1] - 7:8 serious [1] - 125:3 served [2] - 6:24, 56:20 serves [1] - 144:13 serving [3] - 38:14, 116:15, 118:15 set [14] - 5:19, 9:24, 37:11, 39:10, 46:5, 51:14, 52:12, 73:17, 92:25, 93:4, 93:6, 110:19, 144:14 setback [4] - 9:23, 9:25, 13:11, 14:8 setbacks [5] - 9:5, 11:9, 12:23, 13:6 sets [1] - 67:18 setting [1] - 21:5 settling [1] - 26:15 setup [1] - 5:15 Several [1] - 98:8 several [1] - 49:12 shall [3] - 28:25, 29:5, 124:4 shape [1] - 77:9 shared [2] - 21:7, 21:11 shield [1] - 32:7 shift[1] - 26:14 ship [3] - 84:8, 108:19, 108:21 shipped [2] - 85:4, 98:21 shipper [12] - 107:15, 107:20, 108:17, 108:18, 109:1, 109:2, 115:13, 115:23, 116:4, 116:9, 117:14, 118:10 shippers [12] - 84:9,

86:14, 102:22,

108:12, 108:19, 108:24, 113:16, 115:25, 118:1, 118:9, 119:1 shipping [3] - 107:16, 108:1, 118:13 short[1] - 76:2 shorthand [2] - 149:9 shot [1] - 9:12 shoulders [1] - 130:24 showed [1] - 97:2 showing [4] - 20:23, 25:24, 31:11, 125:11 shows [1] - 20:20 side [4] - 3:13, 61:19, 62:20, 102:13 sides [1] - 103:16 silent [1] - 51:6 similar [7] - 62:1, 76:19, 77:4, 78:3, 79:19, 80:20, 140:2 Similarly [1] - 72:25 simple [3] - 9:18, 111:20, 111:21 simplified [1] - 18:15 simply [9] - 38:4, 42:21, 74:13, 89:1, 106:6, 119:10, 123:6, 131:25, 132:13 single [8] - 12:6, 16:18, 37:19, 118:25, 119:19, 120:4, 122:11, 131:10 sink [1] - 11:11 sit[1] - 134:21 site [1] - 56:20 siting [5] - 16:22, 56:2, 123:18, 143:4, 146:18 situation [10] - 17:3, 58:9, 61:1, 75:10, 77:14, 100:9, 103:2, 125:10, 130:5, 135:24 size [2] - 9:25, 67:9 slid [1] - 96:10 slide [1] - 77:22 slides [1] - 24:6 slightly [3] - 130:25, 131:2, 131:8 slowly [1] - 28:10 small [3] - 11:19, 13:20, 67:20 **smaller**[1] - 37:9 Smith [15] - 1:14, 17:13, 18:9, 30:15, 32:3, 33:3, 44:2, 61:23, 66:13, 71:16,

109:21, 124:8, 126:4, 127:22, 130:18 SMITH [27] - 17:14, 30:16, 32:8, 34:21, 34:23, 44:9, 45:1, 61:22, 63:2, 63:18, 63:25, 64:20, 65:16, 66:1, 66:3, 66:17, 71:22, 72:2, 109:6, 111:12, 112:13, 112:24, 124:9, 124:23, 125:15, 125:20, 147:4 Smith's [1] - 124:2 sneak [1] - 78:6 socioeconomic [2] -110:7, 110:15 soil [12] - 22:23, 23:8, 23:12, 23:20, 23:24, 25:5, 27:7, 28:8, 28:10, 28:15, 28:22, 34:4 soils [1] - 23:10 sold [1] - 106:16 sole [1] - 54:9 solely [1] - 109:23 Solem [1] - 1:16 solid [1] - 36:20 someone [2] - 73:15, 141:22 someplace [1] - 62:25 sometime [3] - 60:19, 142:22, 145:14 sometimes [1] - 53:16 Sometimes [1] - 53:17 somewhat [9] - 9:3, 24:12, 32:15, 58:9, 66:8, 89:14, 124:10, 125:10, 127:15 somewhere [4] - 15:9, 20:20, 43:17, 74:18 Sorry [1] - 116:6 sorry [2] - 117:18, 119:5 sort [20] - 3:18, 6:20, 9:24, 21:5, 21:17, 32:4, 32:10, 47:7, 49:8, 50:21, 84:23, 86:20, 86:23, 103:8, 103:15, 104:5, 119:9, 130:9, 139:17 sorts [3] - 10:25, 27:24, 122:13 sought [1] - 100:1 sound [1] - 143:22 sounded [1] - 113:5 sounds [1] - 50:11 sour[1] - 83:19

SOUTH (3) - 1:2, 1:5, 149:1 South [26] - 2:2, 2:3, 3:2, 23:9, 24:5, 24:9, 38:18, 53:15, 57:17, 64:9, 64:15, 64:18, 69:19, 99:24, 110:8, 120:20, 122:21, 122:22, 128:2, 131:7, 134:9, 136:13, 143:12, 147:12, 149:7, 149:13 speaking [1] - 6:7 special [2] - 39:10, 81:2 specific [18] - 13:5. 21:22, 31:7, 42:11, 49:15, 72:13, 79:5, 84:17, 92:11, 94:6, 103:24, 104:6, 104:8, 114:17, 116:4, 123:14, 131:19, 132:15 specifically [8] - 32:3, 32:20, 41:7, 60:20, 86:12, 128:18, 138:15, 139:14 specifications [1] -64:22 specifics [2] - 47:11, 84:18 spectrum [1] - 86:21 spectrums [1] - 88:7 speed [1] - 56:21 spend [1] - 4:13 spent[1] - 11:12 spewed [1] - 9:12 spill [24] - 5:23, 15:19, 16:10, 21:9, 48:18, 48:20, 49:6, 49:24, 52:19, 52:21, 52:23, 88:18, 88:20, 88:22, 89:2, 90:4, 90:18, 90:23, 91:22, 91:24, 93:8, 93:18, 93:19 spilled [2] - 89:25, 90:10 spills [7] - 11:25, 47:24, 54:10, 67:9, 67:14, 67:16, 76:16 splashes [1] - 65:5 spokespeople [2] -96:16, 112:3 spot [2] - 30:24, 60:13 spread [2] - 9:20, 10:23 Spring [1] - 26:13 spring [2] - 73:20,

142:23

sources [1] - 82:19

SS (1) - 149:2 staff [34] - 7:23, 15:13, 15:14, 18:8, 18:12, 26:2, 26:3, 33:8, 33:18, 33:19, 40:23, 40:24, 50:6, 55:24, 58:22, 58:25, 59:14, 59:22, 60:5, 60:16, 61:5, 66:21, 73:1, 73:5, 73:9, 73:12, 79:18, 90:12, 99:7, 107:11, 123:16, 139:15, 144:16 STAFF [1] - 1:13 Staff [10] - 7:25, 26:6. 55:25, 74:23, 79:19. 81:9, 81:10, 85:15, 99:8, 123:17 stage (1) - 60:3 stamped [1] - 12:16 stance [1] - 117:20 stand [2] - 69:2, 121:19 standard [10] - 42:10, 54:2, 71:17, 105:22, 110:25, 134:23, 134:24, 135:1, 136:3, 141:21 standards (10) -56:22, 76:15, 78:7, 78:8, 124:18, 132:9, 134:5, 134:11, 134:14, 134:22 standing [1] - 132:10 standpoint [6] - 64:14, 69:22, 112:25, 128:5, 131:10, 133:3 stands [3] - 69:9, 118:4, 136:21 stapled [1] - 12:16 Start (1) - 99:5 start [20] - 54:13, 56:24, 96:1, 96:10, 96:12, 96:14, 96:16, 96:19, 97:6, 97:8, 97:21, 102:21, 102:23, 110:13, 110:14, 110:15, 112:1, 112:2, 113:15, 114:23 started [2] - 12:18, 62:7 starting [2] - 118:25, 119:20 starts [1] - 54:15 State [16] - 2:2, 3:4, 63:22, 64:8, 64:15, 65:7, 69:19, 72:17, 95:18, 98:11, 126:11, 127:4,

136:13, 143:12, 19 146:1, 149:7 state [31] - 9:15, 23:9, 25:9, 53:9, 53:10, 53:14, 53:20, 53:21, 54:24, 55:6, 56:17, 63:16, 64:9, 64:13, 72:5, 73:11, 75:3, 75:9, 89:20, 95:22, 99:22, 110:16, 113:25, 116:9, 124:20, 126:24, 130:1, 146:20, 147:16 STATE [2] - 1:2, 149:1 state's [1] - 46:8 statement (2) -133:18. 137:2 Statement [20] -121:22, 126:25, 127:5, 127:7, 127:11, 127:14, 127:17, 142:12, 142:15, 142:18, 142:22, 143:1, 143:11, 143:14, 145:6, 145:13, 145:19, 145:23, 146:3, 147:8 Statements [1] - 143:9 statements [5] -24:20, 49:6, 96:9, 102:3, 126:14 States 151 - 40:16. 45:21, 112:9, 115:11, 134:10 station [2] - 13:25, 14:1 statute [21] - 45:23, 45:24, 55:7, 64:21, 72:11, 72:17, 74:8, 75:4, 75:10, 99:13, 99:17, 100:15, 100:18, 112:14, 113:25, 123:6, 124:11, 128:16, 147:7, 147:10 statutes [2] - 128:11, 130:1 statutory [1] - 146:23 stay [1] - 97:22 stays [1] - 112:9 steel [5] - 37:14, 77:8, 77:9, 77:20, 78:5 Steel [4] - 96:6, 96:13, 96:14, 99:6 step [1] - 93:11 Steve [1] - 3:7 STEVE [1] - 1:11

still [8] - 36:7, 69:2,

112:2, 118:15,
133:8, 138:12,
140:4, 140:7
Stone [3] - 11:21,
11:23, 146:21
stop [3] - 46:17,
110:24, 138:22
stops [1] - 73:25
storm [1] - 28:3
strains [1] - 98:19
streams [2] - 43:6,
66:20
strength [1] - 64:23
strictly [1] - 72:3
stringent [1] - 16:25
strong [1] - 74:14
struck[1] - 134:3
structure [6] - 4:1,
5:10, 46:5, 72:7, 86:10
structures [4] - 5:19,
10:8, 77:25, 78:2
struggle [1] - 126:22
stuck [3] - 37:2, 39:5,
39:12
study [7] - 24:8, 37:22,
44:5, 44:8, 84:23,
85:2, 85:7
stuff [2] - 64:24, 85:24
subject [34] - 3:11,
7:5, 16:6, 16:14,
16:17, 16:24, 17:21,
30:13, 30:19, 30:20,
30:22, 30:23, 31:11,
31:13, 43:23, 48:4,
48:6, 59:1, 63:14,
65:24, 73:7, 85:12,
91:15, 91:25, 93:19,
98:9, 111:6, 112:13,
115:24, 119:8, 119:21, 144:8
subject-tos [5] -
30:20, 30:22, 30:23,
31:11, 31:13
submit [1] - 103:18
submitted [7] - 55:8,
59:25, 60:14, 60:25,
72:14, 99:2, 123:12
submitting [1] - 71:9
substance [2] - 20:6,
20:9
substances [1] - 20:4
substantial [1] - 23:8
successful [1] -
102:17
suddenly [1] - 34:3
suffice [1] - 50:15
sufficient [15] - 50:17,
50:18, 87:22, 87:24,
98:3, 98:5, 102:20,
1

102:21, 106:17, 107:21, 107:23, 114:8, 120:4, 120:6, 122.2 suggest [2] - 6:1, 132:13 suggested [3] - 4:2, 112:3, 133:10 SULLY [1] - 149:3 summary [3] - 24:20, 47:10, 107:2 summertime [1] - 35:8 Suncor[1] - 86:19 superior [1] - 123:1 supplement [1] - 55:1 supplies [2] - 11:4, 14:2 supply [1] - 46:15 support [3] - 41:18, 62:5, 70:3 supporting [1] - 42:16 suppose [2] - 12:13, 43:21 supposed [3] - 22:21, 57:2, 105:24 Supreme [1] - 147:14 surface [3] - 11:5, 22:24, 23:13 surprised [2] - 20:18, 29:13 surrounding [2] -50:9, 79:20 syn [3] - 83:13, 84:11, 86:20 synthetic [1] - 86:19 system [1] - 5:16 systems [1] - 78:19

T

table (1) - 115:3 tailored [1] - 66:8 talks [2] - 10:18, 40:7 tangentially [1] -55:17 tar[1] - 95:13 tariff [6] - 82:15, 82:17, 82:22, 83:1, 84:20, 85:11 taste [2] - 134:4, 134:17 tasty [1] - 136:7 technical [1] - 48:15 technology [1] - 27:21 telecommunications [1] - 39:17 telephone [4] - 1:19, 6:6, 7:22, 33:22 temperatures [1] -

tendency [2] - 50:22, 101:7 term [2] - 97:5, 112:15 terminus [1] - 99:23 terms [22] - 4:4, 5:10. 6:22, 8:24, 8:25, 10:12, 24:18, 33:4, 72:2, 108:3, 108:13, 110:4, 113:14, 113:15, 113:16, 115:13, 117:14, 118:13, 122:10, 125:21, 143:9, 144:4 test [1] - 56:16 tested [1] - 76:20 testify [1] - 141:17 testimony [18] - 4:17, 4:19, 4:20, 15:21, 28:19, 29:10, 48:8, 66:20, 67:7, 85:12, 130:7, 140:20, 141:6, 141:18, 142:8, 142:9, 144:5, 144:7 testing [1] - 135:13 Texas [7] - 13:10, 46:1, 46:3, 46:6, 96:5, 97:25, 98:1 THE [7] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:5, 1:6, 1:10 themselves [3] -29:18, 74:4, 104:22 theoretical [3] - 90:15, 129:9, 133:14 theoretically [1] -108:11 Therefore [2] - 110:3, 142:23 therefore [6] - 38:8, 48:1, 53:4, 95:20, 104:25, 121:24 They've [3] - 80:3, 80:4, 126:18 they've [4] - 96:9. 133:16, 133:17, 133:23 thinking [2] - 85:18, 145:4 thinks [1] - 15:21 third [1] - 23:21 Thirdly [1] - 98:23 thorough [1] - 78:10 thoughts [2] - 30:15, 115:18 thousands [4] - 15:9, 26:12, 60:7, 68:22

10:2

template [1] - 8:10

tenant [1] - 29:1

tend [1] - 22:24

threatened [1] - 10:11 three [5] - 8:21, 35:2. 49:17, 51:21, 124:18 three-quarters [1] -8:21 threshold [2] - 14:8, 136:5 threw [1] - 34:23 throughout [2] - 29:1, 86:4 throw [4] - 21:20, 68:3, 115:2, 134:7 Tillquist [1] - 66:21 timely [1] - 7:1 timing [4] - 60:3, 60:9, 72:18, 95:6 TO [1] - 1:6 today [11] - 3:10, 7:4, 41:7, 50:8, 63:7, 98:24, 140:20, 140:23, 144:10, 147:24, 148:2 together [2] - 77:10, 117:7 took [8] - 12:12, 12:19, 30:17, 42:10, 55:25, 73:12, 149:9 tools [1] - 140:16 tooth [1] - 13:14 top [3] - 25:18, 66:15, 91:6 TOP [1] - 41:21 topic [1] - 31:25 topics [1] - 34:8 tos [5] - 30:20, 30:22, 30:23, 31:11, 31:13 totally [3] - 14:5, 106:15, 106:16 touch [1] - 34:8 toward [1] - 103:7 track [3] - 30:1, 46:6, 66:18 tracking [2] - 101:22, 113:13 TRANSCANADA[1] -1.4 TransCanada [124] -3:9, 4:5, 4:12, 5:13, 5:14, 5:25, 6:13, 6:15, 6:22, 6:24, 7:6, 7:10, 7:14, 7:16, 8:19, 8:23, 11:10, 14:10, 14:12, 14:22, 19:3, 19:12, 23:16, 24:4, 24:24, 25:19, 25:22, 26:24, 29:22, 29:23, 31:1, 33:7, 34:9, 37:19, 38:12, 39:6, 39:21, 39:24, 40:1, 40:3, 40:5,

40:8, 40:15, 41:18, 20 41:22, 43:12, 43:18, 43:22, 44:6, 44:18, 45:13, 45:16, 46:10, 46:15, 47:21, 47:24, 48:3, 48:8, 48:16, 49:2, 49:10, 51:22, 53:3, 53:25, 54:12, 55:2, 56:1, 60:15, 61:16, 62:25, 69:3, 71:8, 77:4, 77:23, 78:4, 78:11, 78:21, 79:2, 80:24, 82:25, 83:6, 83:22, 84:15, 85:6, 85:25, 87:2, 91:19, 94:1, 94:9, 95:3, 95:16, 96:3, 96:16, 96:22, 98:20, 100:8, 101:16, 101:21, 102:10, 102:22, 103:17. 103:21, 104:19, 105:3, 105:10. 106:19, 108:17, 112:1, 113:9, 113:12, 115:18, 117:10, 118:12, 118:16, 121:17, 122:3, 122:8, 122:16, 126:15, 127:13, 139:20, 141:8, 144:6 TransCanada's [22] -5:21, 5:23, 19:7, 37:21, 38:3, 40:8, 40:25, 41:12, 44:25, 52:23, 58:8, 59:6, 65:6, 78:19, 96:8, 102:7, 106:16, 106:20, 107:23, 108:6, 110:18, 141:13 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1 Transcript[1] - 1:8 transcription [1] -149:12 transfer [1] - 39:7 transmission [1] -124.7 TRANSMISSION [1] -1:5 transport [3] - 39:11, 82:6, 82:9 transported [11] -82:2, 83:12, 83:13, 83:16, 84:19, 84:25, 85:5, 85:10, 86:13, 86:15, 86:24 travel [4] - 19:23, 20:9, 20:16, 20:20

treat [2] - 3:19, 53:25 treatment [1] - 14:1 trekked [1] - 128:2 tremendous [1] - 60:8 trouble [2] - 98:6, 103:23 truckloads [1] - 106:1 true [1] - 149:11 trust [2] - 27:19, 29:25 try [9] - 12:5, 12:19. 45:19, 94:10, 113:22, 116:22, 130:24, 131:9, 133:2 trying [11] - 9:5, 11:14, 41:8, 77:1, 95:4, 120:16, 128:1, 130:4, 133:12, 134:12, 140:12 turning [1] - 17:17 tweak [2] - 93:13, two [15] - 7:5, 43:6, 49:17, 84:1, 86:18, 87:13, 87:16, 88:7, 96:4, 97:9, 135:20, 136:13, 146:11, 146:22 type [5] - 13:15, 51:15, 65:7, 86:12, 134:20 types [7] - 86:18, 86:22, 87:9, 87:13, 87:16, 87:17, 88:7 typically [2] - 10:3, 20:25

U

U.S [2] - 78:7, 95:11 ultimate [1] - 95:25 ultimately [2] - 49:23, 79:16 **UNDER**[1] - 1:5 under [8] - 8:12, 10:6, 10:13, 17:22, 61:14, 98:12, 112:14, 119:9 undergone [2] -135:13, 135:21 underground [2] -36:13, 38:22 understood [2] -27:21, 99:20 undertake [1] - 44:23 undertaken [1] - 43:2 Undoubtedly [1] -12:22 undue [1] - 128:14 unduly [3] - 45:7, 105:14, 105:23

unfortunate [1] -

11:12 unfortunately [1] -11:10 uniform [7] - 116:2, 117:24, 117:25, 118:8, 118:25, 119:19, 120:4 uniformity [1] - 118:13 United [5] - 40:16, 45:21, 112:9, 115:11, 134:10 universe [1] - 139:2 Unless [3] - 70:4, 139:16, 148:1 unless [2] - 77:1. 132:16 unreasonable [2] -118:3, 125:5 up [33] - 3:22, 4:19, 5:19, 8:13, 9:7, 30:12, 30:24, 31:16, 31:24, 37:5, 37:8, 39:10, 42:12, 43:20, 45:22, 46:5, 48:10, 50:2, 51:14, 51:22, 59:5, 73:17, 76:4, 91:1, 97:9, 97:12, 109:11, 126:15, 131:9, 132:4, 132:25, 137:4, 145:1 up-to-date [1] - 97:12 update [1] - 100:8 useful [4] - 11:20, 36:6, 43:16, 92:22 usefulness [1] -111:18 uses [1] - 122:13 **UTILITIES** [2] - 1:1, 1.10 utilities [1] - 26:11 Utilities [6] - 3:2, 25:21, 54:25, 55:23, 79:6, 81:8

V

utility [3] - 37:13,

37:14, 46:1

utter[1] - 18:2

valid [1] - 90:23
value [6] - 15:15, 26:5,
116:10, 116:16,
135:5, 138:20
values [1] - 4:11
variance [1] - 131:1
variancy [1] - 116:5
variety [2] - 57:12,
77:24
various [1] - 128:15

vary [2] - 110:12, 116:2 vehicle [1] - 56:21 verify [2] - 56:18, 56:19 version [3] - 71:2, 71:9, 71:13 versus [1] - 111:18 vetted [2] - 135:10, 135:16 vetting (1) - 135:21 VICE [1] - 1:11 view [3] - 49:21, 83:4, 83:5 violation [3] - 101:5, 110:23, 146:20 visiting [1] - 22:25 visual [1] - 28:1 voices [1] - 140:3 volume [10] - 7:2, 8:24, 21:10, 89:12, 90:4, 90:10, 92:14, 94:13 voluminous [1] -117:12 vote [13] - 22:8, 35:19, 46:25, 51:5, 70:5, 75:18, 80:9, 81:18, 88:10, 94:17, 121:4, 121:5, 148:5 voted [1] - 138:10 votes [13] - 22:13, 35:24, 47:5, 52:6, 70:10, 75:23, 80:14, 81:23, 88:15, 94:22, 121:10, 138:2, 148:10 vulnerable [1] - 13:19

W

wade [1] - 50:23 wage [1] - 56:19 wait [2] - 50:19, 145:21 waited [1] - 146:20 wants [3] - 14:22, 29:9, 144:1 warranted [1] - 55:21 Washington [1] - 9:15 waste [1] - 129:20 water [5] - 11:4, 11:5, 14:1, 83:20 wavelength [1] -106:14 ways [2] - 5:7, 77:24 web [4] - 42:13, 62:22, 76:4, 76:10 website [2] - 102:25,

weeks [2] - 23:1, 146:15 weigh [4] - 54:18, 57:13, 58:4, 119:25 weighing [3] - 124:17, 125:2, 128:15 weight [2] - 54:18. 59:18 weld [2] - 76:23, 77:9 welding [2] - 77:7, 77:10 Western [1] - 86:18 western [1] - 38:18 whatnot [1] - 89:16 whereby [1] - 62:10 White [25] - 1:19, 15:24, 15:25, 16:21, 17:17, 21:23, 31:21, 31:23, 33:24, 41:9, 44:11, 49:11, 60:17, 61:23, 68:25, 92:2, 98:25, 103:12, 104:12, 116:1, 117:4, 118:7, 118:20, 126:3 WHITE [41] - 15:23, 16:1, 16:4, 17:4, 19:10, 20:12, 20:25, 21:6, 21:9, 22:1, 31:19, 31:22, 34:1, 41:14, 42:5, 44:15, 49:16, 50:4, 60:17, 61:25, 68:16, 86:6, 87:8, 87:14, 87:18, 91:2, 91:5, 91:9, 91:20, 92:5, 93:4, 99:5, 104:1, 104:15, 115:19, 116:3, 116:8, 118:5, 119:3, 119:7, 145:25 white [6] - 11:18, 12:15, 37:2, 38:22, 65:9 whole [10] - 10:17, 10:20, 11:8, 26:4, 32:13, 39:14, 52:11, 66:24, 116:16, 147:20 wholeheartedly [1] -135:20 wholly [1] - 135:8 Wiest[1] - 1:13 wife [1] - 134;3

Williams [1] - 23:2

87:20, 117:1, 143:25

willing [4] - 59:6.

wind [1] - 109:11

window [1] - 112:22

winnowing [1] - 71:14

107:23

wise [1] - 66:11 wish [1] - 104:20 wishing [1] - 114:3 withdrawing [1] -108:8 withstanding [1] -81:1 WITTLER [1] - 149:5 Wittler [2] - 1:24, 149:18 wonder [2] - 16:1, 30:10 wonders [1] - 30:11 word [3] - 78:22, 107:8, 108:6 words [3] - 11:19, 77:16, 78:23 works [1] - 23:11 world [1] - 77:20 worried [2] - 23:4, 78:18 worst [17] - 67:17, 88:18, 88:20, 88:22, 89:2, 89:4, 89:12, 90:4, 90:11, 90:18, 90:23, 91:22, 91:24, 93:8, 93:18, 93:19, 94:13 worst-case [16] -67:17, 88:18, 88:20, 89:2, 89:4, 89:12, 90:4, 90:11, 90:18, 90:23, 91:22, 91:24, 93:8, 93:18, 93:19, 94:13 worthwhile [1] -141:16 Wow [1] - 72:1 written [4] - 20:19, 120:3, 129:25, 130:1

Χ

XL_[7] - 1:6, 3:9, 30:9, 60:19, 60:22, 79:11, 96:4 Xs_[1] - 62:14

Υ

year [5] - 55:15, 107:5, 112:15, 112:22, 113:25 years [7] - 23:7, 23:8, 27:8, 37:3, 97:9, 146:18, 146:22 yesterday [1] - 140:20 Ys [1] - 62:14 Ζ

zero [1] - 124:13 zone [2] - 10:3, 13:1 zoning [3] - 10:6, 10:7, 13:9