1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION HP14-001
5	OF TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, LP FOR ORDER ACCEPTING CERTIFICATION
6	OF PERMIT ISSUED IN DOCKET HP09-001 TO CONSTRUCT THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE
7	=======================================
8	Transcript of Proceedings
9	June 11, 2015
10	=======================================
11	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
12	CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN
13	KRISTIE FIEGEN, VICE CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER (telephonically)
14	COMMISSION STAFF
15	John Smith
16	Kristen Edwards Greg Rislov
17	Darren Kearney Joy Lashley
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, Room 413, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 11th day of June, 2015. 

CHAIRMAN NELSON: HP14-001, In the Matter of the Petition of TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP For Order Accepting Certification of Permit Issued in Docket HP09-001 to Construct the Keystone XL Pipeline.

2.3

And we have four different motions that we're going to deal with today. And we are going to I think probably take these in the order in which they are listed.

The first that we have listed is Yankton Sioux
Tribe's and Indigenous Environmental Network's Motion to
Preclude Improper Relief or in the Alternative to Amend
Findings of Fact.

Ms. Baker, are you taking this one?

MS. BAKER: Yes, Commissioner, I am.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Go ahead.

MS. BAKER: Thank you.

The basis for this request is really straightforward. We're simply asking the Commission to preclude certain relief, specifically pertaining to the Findings of Fact because that relief is not available under the law.

I'd like to note that the motion does not address the conditions, nor does it argue whether certification is proper. It's simply asking the PUC to amend its -- I'm sorry. I'd ask the PUC not to amend its

earlier Findings because that kind of relief is prohibited by law.

2.3

In 2010 in Docket HP09-001 the Commission issued an Amended Final Decision and Order that contained 115 Findings of Fact. The instant proceeding is based on Keystone's request for certification, that the proposed project continues to meet those decisions on which the 09-001 permit was granted.

So that means that this proceeding is governed by and limited in scope to 49-41B-27, which does not authorize the PUC to amend an earlier decision.

The Findings of Fact are part of the Amended

Final Decision and Order, and any changes to those

Findings would constitute an amendment to the Order.

South Dakota laws do not permit the PUC to amend a

Decision after a timely application for the rehearing or reconsideration, which TransCanada has not filed.

Despite the lack of statutory authority for this kind of relief, both Keystone and the PUC have taken actions that suggest that the Findings are, in fact, up for consideration, specifically the Findings enumerated in Keystone's Table of Proposed Changes attached to Appendix C to the Petition.

Amendment of Findings have been raised in the proceeding by both the Commission and by Keystone. In

Keystone's reply in support of its motion to defend its scope of discovery the relief requested was limitational discovery that was narrowly tailored to the scope of proceedings, including the changes that affect Findings as identified in TransCanada's Petition.

2.3

There's no reason Keystone would seek to include Findings of Fact and discovery or include to proposed changes in its position unless it intended the Commission to adopt them. So clearly TransCanada came into this proceeding with the intent of having those Findings amended, as shown by its Appendix C to this Petition.

The Commission agreed with Keystone in its Order of December 17, 2014, granting Keystone's motion and limiting discovery to the 50 Permit Conditions and the proposed changes to the Finding of Facts identified in Keystone's Tracking Table.

The Commission itself used the phrase "proposed changes" which indicates that the Commission viewed them as relief sought by Keystone.

There's nothing in the statutes or regulations that prohibits the Commission from issuing the ruling that's requested by Yankton and Indigenous Environmental Network in this motion. It's perfectly permissible and in the interest and efficiency and clarity of the proceedings that the PUC issue a decision on this

matter.

2.3

Now should the Commission find against that initial request and should the Commission find that the Findings are at issue and can be amended, the movants would request the alternative relief that Findings

No. 113 and 114 be amended as described in the motion.

Those requests are explained and support is provided in detail in that motion, but briefly Finding 113 should be amended if amendment is permissible because TransCanada failed to fulfill all four requirements of its burden of proof under 49-41B-22.

Specifically, it failed to provide due consideration to the views of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, which is an effective local unit of government pursuant to 49-41B-22 Subsection 4.

Yankton Sioux Tribe is a sovereign nation. It is also a local unit of government. And it's also an interested party in this proceeding. These terms are not mutually exclusive. Yankton qualifies as all three, and it has rights specific too each of those three statuses.

We're not talking here about the federal consultation requirement as Keystone discussed in its reply but the South Dakota State law requirement that due consideration be given to the views of local units of

government under 49-41B-22(4).

2.3

In addition, with respect to Finding No. 114, we'd request that that Finding be amended because Keystone failed to meet its burden of proof.

First, as just previously stated, it failed to meet the burden with respect to 49-41B-22(4) regarding local units of government.

In addition, based on the Tracking Table of Changes, the PUC's decision was based on incomplete and inaccurate information. The Findings represent the key basis for the Commission's Decision. That's the purpose of having findings. That's why it's statutorily required that findings be incorporated in a decision and that the function they serve is to illustrate the reason, the facts on which the decision was based.

So if those facts have changed, then it's very possible that the Commission would have issued a different ruling at that time.

This is not a suggestion that the Commission should have somehow known in 2010 what the conditions would be in 2015. Rather, it's a logical conclusion that if the conditions -- if the circumstances have changed such that the Findings of Fact no longer apply, such that the basis of the Decision no longer applies, then the basis of the Decision wasn't adequate for the Decision

```
1
     reached, and the burden of proof should be based on the
2
     Findings of Fact as they stand when the pipeline is
 3
     constructed rather than four years ago before -- before
 4
     they changed and TransCanada proposed these new changes.
 5
              Again, this is just alternative relief requested
 6
     in the event the Commission finds against our initial
7
     request, which is that the relief of amendment of the
8
     permit -- of the permit findings, excuse me, be precluded
     because they're not allowed as a matter of law.
10
              Thank you.
11
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                 Thank you.
12
              I'm going to go through the Intervenors to see
13
     if any of them have anything that needs to be added.
14
              Those on the phone line. Mr. Blackburn?
15
              MR. BLACKBURN: Yes.
                                    Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
16
     BOLD Nebraska supports the motion.
17
              Thank you.
18
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                 Thank you.
19
              Ms. Zephier.
20
              MS. ZEPHIER:
                            Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
21
              Cheyenne Sioux Tribe is also in support of
22
     this motion that Yankton Sioux Tribe and Indigenous
2.3
     Environmental Network have made.
2.4
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                 Thank you.
25
              Any Intervenors in the room have anything to
```

```
2
              MR. ELLISON: Briefly, Bruce Ellison for Dakota
     Rural Action.
 3
 4
              We do join in the motion, at least as far as
 5
     state law does not allow for the amendments that are
 6
     being proposed by TransCanada. We do not join in the
7
     second part of relief requested by the motion because we
8
     don't believe there's authority of this Commission to do
     so.
10
              Thank you.
11
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
12
              MR. RAPPOLD: Good morning, Commissioners.
13
     Matt Rappold on behalf of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.
14
              We support Yankton in this motion as well so far
15
     as state law does not permit the Commission to amend
16
     Findings of Fact. We would rest on that.
17
              Thank you.
18
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
19
              MR. CAPOSSELA: Good morning. Peter Capossela
20
     from the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.
21
              No argument other than to express support for
22
     the motion.
2.3
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
24
              MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you.
25
              MS. CRAVEN: Good morning. I'm Kimberly Craven
```

add?

1

with the Indigenous Environmental Network. We are parties to the motion, and we urge your support of it.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

And let me just say to all of the Intervenors, thank you for your brevity of your comments.

TransCanada.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Commissioner. James Moore on behalf of Keystone.

I don't fundamentally disagree that amendment of Findings in the underlying docket are not appropriate in this certification document.

As we wrote in our response, I think I question whether an order on this motion is necessary or appropriate, just given the fact that Keystone has not proposed the amendment of any Findings. And the suggestion that because we offered a Tracking Table of Changes in connection with the Certification Petition that we've asked the Commission to amend the Findings is not accurate.

We expect that the Tracking Table forms the basis for discussion at the evidentiary hearing about whether Keystone can continue to meet the conditions on which the permit was granted, which is the statutory inquiry mandated by 49-41B-27.

1 And to the extent that the motion at all 2 contravenes that understanding or is in conflict with 3 that understanding, we opposed it. But we did not oppose 4 it because we think that the Commission has the authority or should amend the Findings of Fact in the underlying 5 6 docket. 7 We expect that there will be findings and 8 conclusions entered in this certification docket in connection with the Petition for Certification.

So that's all I have, unless you have questions.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Ms. Baker, any rebuttal?

MS. BAKER: Just briefly. Based on the conduct of Keystone and of the Commission, particularly the characterization of these changes as proposed changes, it does give the appearance that Keystone and the Commission are considering amendments, and that's why this relief has been sought.

Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Questions from the Commission.

Hearing none, is there a motion?

Commissioner Fiegen.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman, in HP14-001

25 move that the Commission deny the Motion to Preclude or

1 Amend. 2 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Discussion on the motion. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You know, when I read this 3 4 and listen to the testimony I don't believe this is an 5 appropriate motion because the Findings of Fact has not 6 been asked to be changed by the Applicant. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion. 8 I would simply say I'm going to support the As I have listened to folks this morning and my 10 own view in how this case is playing out, I'm not sure 11 any of us are that far apart here on this. And so I 12 think denying the motion at this point is the appropriate 13 thing to do at this juncture, given the fact that I don't 14 think we're all that far apart. 15 Other discussion? 16 Hearing none, all those in favor of denying the 17 motion will vote aye. Those opposed, nay. 18 Commissioner Hanson. 19 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 20 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen. 21 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye. 22 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. 2.3 The motion is denied. CHAIRMAN NELSON: That brings us to Keystone's 24 25 Motion to Exclude Testimony of Richard Kuprewicz.

Did I pronounce that properly?

MR. RAPPOLD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Rappold.

2.3

MR. RAPPOLD: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: With that, Keystone.

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. James
Moore on behalf of Keystone.

I don't want to repeat the written arguments that have been made in support of the motion, but essentially I want to caution the Commission from getting off track based on some of the written arguments that have been made with respect to the motion.

The basis for the motion is simply federal preemption and the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction. And as we read the prefiled testimony of Mr. Kuprewicz, it addressed three principal issues. One is routing due to landslide risk, two is the placement and number of valves on the pipeline, and, thirdly, was the conduct of a risk assessment that was done.

And our position is that all of those issues are either preempted under federal law by the Pipeline Safety Act or that the Commission does not have statutory jurisdiction because of the statutory prohibition on routing that is contained in SDCL Chapter 49-41B.

And I think the important point to make for the

purposes of argument today is we're not suggesting that the Commission cannot require that Keystone comply with federal law or with provisions of the Pipeline Safety Act or with regulations imposed by PHMSA or with the 59 Special Conditions imposed by PHMSA as part of its permit and that it's -- and we're not suggesting that that can't be considered as part of the certification proceeding. But it can only be considered to the extent that the Commission can look at those issues and not trample on the purview of PHMSA as the federal regulator with responsibility for enforcing compliance with the Pipeline Safety Act or the 59 Special Conditions.

2.3

So I think it's appropriate that in Condition

No. 1 that the Commission has required compliance with

federal law, but at the end of the day I think that it is

the role of PHMSA to determine whether Keystone is in

compliance with the 59 Special Conditions. And I don't

think that the evidentiary hearing that we're going to

have should be about specifically is Keystone in

compliance with one of these conditions.

If PHMSA were to determine that Keystone was not in compliance with one of the conditions at some future point, the permit allows the Commission to take action based on that, but that's different from the Commission sitting as a regulatory body and determining what we

think are matters of federal law that are preempted by
statute.

So that's the basis for the motion. It's essentially intended to make sure that we don't spend time at the evidentiary hearing discussing and presenting testimony about matters ultimately over which the Commission lacks jurisdiction.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Mr. Rappold for Rosebud.

MR. RAPPOLD: Yes, sir. Just a moment.

Thank you, Commissioners. Matt Rappold on behalf of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

We're here again today because Keystone wants to limit the evidence that the Intervenors present regarding their ability to certify that they're still able to maintain the conditions upon which the facility was granted five years ago.

They want to limit that evidence and testimony while preserving their own right to present testimony and evidence on the same subjects that they claim are preempted by federal law under the Pipeline Safety Act.

Now there's no question that the Pipeline Safety
Act preempts any state action that would attempt to
implement higher safety standards than what exists under

the Pipeline Safety Act and the implementing regulations.

2.3

What we are seeking to do is to provide evidence and testimony that directly relates to Keystone's ability to meet these conditions. As the Commission is well aware, compliance with the Pipeline Safety Act and its regulations is a condition of this permit, without a doubt. There's no question.

There is also no question -- I don't believe there's any doubt on the record that the Commission has taken any action to require Keystone to comply with higher safety standards and regulations for siting of this pipeline.

And a couple of things before we get into the meat of the argument, so to speak. Procedurally, what we're looking at here is the admission of expert testimony. And expert testimony is governed by South Dakota Codified Law 19-5-2 and Rules of Evidence 702. It deals with the admission of expert testimony.

So there's two issues to address. First, is the evidence relevant, and does it assist the trier of fact in understanding or deciding the issues before it?

Preemption is an argument, a doctrine, that would be used to say, Commissioners, with all due respect, you can't do something. You can't require us to

comply with higher safety standards than what federal law requires. Because that action, if that happened on the part of the Commissioners or the Commission or a local Government as well through a passing of an ordinance or a resolution, that would be preempted.

2.3

But we're not talking about that. We're talking about a certification proceeding where Keystone has the burden to show that they still have the ability based on the conditions of your permit to satisfy the requirements of the permit. Satisfying the requirements of that permit requires satisfying that they're still able to show that they can comply with all applicable laws and regulations. This isn't about preemption. This is about their ability to comply.

Specifically -- so we would -- because the motion has not been properly brought, as we have outlined in our first response, we'd ask the Commission to deny the motion on those grounds and give us the opportunity to actually present the testimony properly under the Rules of Civil Procedure at the trial on this matter.

Keystone has not in their motion made any attempt to attack the credibility of the witness. They have not made any attempt to challenge his qualifications as a witness in this particular matter and on this particular subject matter.

They've had ample opportunity to do that. We've filed with them initially and on the PUC website a resume, very thorough, and a list of publications and all other work that Mr. Kuprewicz has engaged in over all of the years that qualify him as an expert witness.

2.3

Those are part of the record here today, and our initial responsive filing we've got RST Exhibit No. 2, which is Richard Kuprewicz's CV. We've got RST 3, which is the Report. RST Exhibit 4, which is a letter from PHMSA, which interestingly enough, kind of clarified a little bit to TransCanada the role of state and local governments in the overall process for ensuring that pipeline safety and routing is done properly throughout the nation consistent with uniform standards. This isn't the first time they've presented this argument. It probably won't be the last.

We've also filed in response RST Exhibit 5, which is a direct testimony of Heidi Tillquist, and RST Exhibit 6, which is the direct testimony of Meera -- I don't know how to say the last name -- Kothari. I don't know if that's how you say it or not.

The reason that I bring these last two exhibits are is that these two exhibits, direct testimony, provide testimony that's based on the same subject matter that they don't want us to present testimony on. Their

witnesses reach one conclusion about similar subjects and in this case almost exactly similar subjects, exactly identical subjects. Our witness reaches a different conclusion.

But yet on the grounds of preemption they don't want you to hear what our witness has to say about the safety of this pipeline route. But they'll gladly introduce their own testimony on the same subject that they claim are preempted by federal law.

Does that make any sense?

2.3

You're familiar with this docket obviously.

You've considered, you've required the party to show that they have the ability to comply with all rules and regulations. Show the ability, demonstrate to us that you have the ability to comply with all rules and regulations.

No. 3, Amended Permit Condition 3 specifically requires that Keystone adopt and follow the recommendations from the Final Environmental Impact Statement. That includes the 59 additional PHMSA Special Conditions as it applies to the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

So even though those 59 conditions weren't actually considered and demonstrated in the underlying hearing, by virtue of operation of law they are now part

of Keystone's requirements, and they have the burden to show that they have the ability to comply with those requirements.

2.3

Richard Kuprewicz's testimony specifically addresses the ability to comply with Condition No. 32.

What I'd like to go to is -- I believe it's on page 5 of Keystone's response to our response to their motion. And on page 5 I think they stated it pretty good. "At issue is whether Keystone can continue to meet the permit conditions today." That's the issue.

They said it. We agree with it. Everybody agrees with it. You're nodding your head up and down, and it's my understanding that that means you agree with it too.

On the same grounds of preemption they want to eliminate 95 percent of what is in Richard Kuprewicz's testimony, and they want to keep the 5 percent that they like. They want you to hear that on the same grounds that they're asking you to exclude the rest of this. Keep this. Even though it's preempted, keep it. We like it. This other stuff, we don't like it. That's preempted. You can't hear that.

The law doesn't work that way. That's not fair. That's not due process, and that's not how this system operates.

You guys get to decide whose testimony is more credible, who you're going to believe. You're the finder of fact. Not me. Not any other lawyer in this room.

Not Keystone, and certainly not a foreign corporation.

You are the finder of fact. This is your house. These are your rules, and we all have to follow them.

2.3

So let's look at Amended Condition No. 1 from the permit. Must comply with all relevant laws including the Pipeline Safety Act and its implementing regulations. We have that. Testimony addresses that.

Amended Condition No. 3, comply with and implement recommendations of the Final Environmental Impact Statement when issued. The Final Environmental Impact Statement contains 57 -- I'm sorry. 59 conditions that weren't a part of this docket, and now they are.

Keystone never had to address -- they never had to put on evidence to address these conditions. Maybe some of them were addressed in the underlying docket, but as a whole, they've never had to demonstrate it. Now they do.

So in our supplemental response I took a little extra time to specifically tell you how the report addresses those conditions, specifically No. 32.

For visual purposes here's the original Order,
Amended Permit Conditions, the requirement that they

- 1 follow recommendations from PHMSA. And here's what's
- 2 Appendix B. Now the actual -- this is 57 conditions.
- 3 | Two additional conditions were added, and the entire
- 4 document is Appendix Z. I didn't print that out.
- 5 But for visual purposes 57 plus 2 is right here.
- 6 | 59 minus 2 is right here. And now it goes there, and
- 7 that's where we are.
- 8 Our supplemental response we provided three
- 9 exhibits, 1, 2, and 3. Exhibit No. 1 is 49 CFR 194.105,
- 10 Worst-Case Discharge, compliance with which is a
- 11 requirement. Exhibit No. 2, 49 CFR 195.260, Valve
- 12 Locations. And Exhibit No. 3 is Condition No. 32, Main
- 13 Line and Check Valve Control.
- Now if you notice on Exhibit No. 3, Keystone
- 15 | must design and install main line block valves and check
- 16 valves on the Keystone XL system based on the worst-case
- 17 discharge as calculated by 49 CFR 194.105, which is
- 18 | this one, and must locate valves in accordance with
- 19 49 CFR 195.260, which is this one, and by taking into
- 20 consideration elevation, population, and environmentally
- 21 | sensitive locations to minimize the consequences of a
- 22 release from the pipeline. And then it gets into valve
- 23 | locations, spacing, and that sort of thing.
- 24 And there's some other requirements in 32, but
- 25 I'm going to focus on the things that I already talked

about.

2.3

The report examines Keystone's ability to comply with PHMSA Special Permit Condition No. 32. And even though it didn't actually say it, that also addresses Keystone's ability to comply with Amended Permit Condition No. 3 for the reasons that I already said.

In the Tracking Table of Changes Keystone makes reference to Appendix Z and understands that they have to comply with it. They've submitted testimony on it. I imagine they'll submit more through the direct examination and cross that's at the hearing. But they understand that they have to comply, and they understand that you have the jurisdictional authority to investigate and receive testimony to determine their ability to comply with the law.

You do it all the time. This isn't anything new. You had a hearing five days on this issue when you granted the original permit. And you took testimony of these very issues that they now claim are preempted.

The testimony -- CFR 194.105 requires

TransCanada -- each operator shall determine the

worst-case discharge for each of its response zones and

provide the methodology, including calculations used to

arrive at the volume. The worst-case discharge is the

largest volume in barrels, cubic meters of the following,

and then there's four different ways to figure that out.

2.3

That's what they have to show, that in calculating their worst-case discharge scenario they've complied with the requirements of 194.105. Our witness's testimony talks about that.

It requires them to locate those valves. A valve must be installed at each of the following locations: On the suction end, the discharge end of a pump station, in a manner that permits isolation of pump station equipment in the event of an emergency. Sub B, on each line entering or leaving a breakout storage tank area, in a manner that permits isolation of the tank area from other facilities. Subsection 3 -- or, I mean, C, rather, on each main line at locations along the pipeline system that will minimize damage or pollution from accidental hazardous liquid discharge as appropriate for the terrain in open country.

Now the evidence reflects that over 200 miles of this pipeline that's routed already in South Dakota, mind you, at the location they chose -- they chose this location. You guys didn't tell them to put it there because you can't. You guys didn't tell them to put it somewhere else because you can't. We understand that. They chose this location. Not anyone else.

They put -- they decided to put a 36-inch

pipeline in over 200 miles of land that's been designated as high landslide risk area. And you took testimony on this under the initial document. Now they have an additional requirement to meet. The testimony examines their ability to do that.

2.3

It just happens to reach a different conclusion than their witnesses reached. Therefore, the evidence is relevant to helping you make a decision as to whether or not the conditions can still be satisfied. That's why it's relevant.

I think you need to pay particular attention to the phrase "as appropriate for the terrain in open country" when we get to the trial to determine if that's satisfied.

Testimony also attacks the methods chosen by Keystone to calculate worst-case discharge scenario as is required by the CFR. We're allowed to do that. We're allowed to present evidence that challenges what the other party says. Just like they're allowed to do it to challenge what we're saying.

What the report concludes with an opinion is that based on the location, the type of this pipeline, it's not possible to properly valve it, considering the location of the pipeline.

The valving must be adequate to minimize damage

or pollution from accidental hazardous liquid discharge as appropriate for the terrain in open country.

2.3

The testimony also starts with an assumption.

And I don't know if you guys have looked at the testimony or not.

Assuming -- assuming that pump stations have bypass arrangements -- this is on page 10 -- with check valves and remotely operated valving, assuming that all the conditions are met. It's not stating that TransCanada has met the burden to establish that all of the conditions are met through their design in valving locations. This is just saying assuming. Assuming that that happens. Because it hasn't happened yet.

Assuming that that happens becomes clear that the proposed TransCanada valving is seriously inadequate for a high thorough -- large diameter pipeline in a location of considerable elevation changes.

That's relevant to the issue before you, and in my opinion, I think it helps the finder of fact to understand the issue before it and to reach a decision.

Just some of the Findings of Fact that address issues that are similar to this that already exist in the current docket. 101, comply with CFR 195 that requires Keystone to conduct internal inspection of the pipe if ground movement takes place. It's already a requirement.

You have the ability. You've already exercised that ability to examine whether or not they can meet that condition. That was five years ago.

2.3

You know what the certification statute says.

You have to reexamine that ability. They have to tell

you that we still have the ability, and they have to put

on evidence and prove it.

97, requires an emergency response plan to be prepared as required by federal regulations and submitted it to the PUC at the exact same time you send it to PHMSA.

No. 102 finding deals with high consequence areas and Integrity Management Plan. Those are federal regulations. Those are federal requirements.

One of the Staff witnesses, who was Jennifer Hudson, testified at the original proceeding, testified that planning and preparation for the Integrity Management Plan were fully compliant with PHMSA regulations. There's a Finding of Fact that indicates that you considered it and you resolved the issue at that time and you weren't concerned with whether or not you were preempted by federal law and pipeline safety rules. You understand that it's an integrated system, and your role is in assuring that things are carried out properly.

No. 107, you made a Finding that the project will not pose a serious threat to the socio-economic conditions, will not substantially impair the health, safety, or welfare or unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region.

2.3

That's a law that they have to comply with.

This permit that they have, it almost creates a presumption. You've created a presumption for them by granting the permit that they can comply with everything and if this pipeline is constructed in a fashion that complies with the rules, it will satisfy the requirements of the law, which I just read.

That presumption carries forward today, and it carries forward into the future after a pipeline is operational. Because you have the jurisdictional authority to investigate and determine if people are not complying with the conditions of your permit. You have the authority to suspend permits for noncompliance. You have the authority to revoke permits for noncompliance with your rules.

One of your rules say you have to comply with federal law.

Finding 113 is basically the same as 107.

Conclusion of Law No. 5 addresses compliance with SDCL 49-41B-22. So does No. 6. So does No. 7. And

No. 8 you've concluded that Keystone met its burden to comply with 49-41B-22, which they kind of make light of their continued requirement to comply with that law in their response to our response.

2.3

2.4

No. 9 you issued a Conclusions of Law that said you have the authority to revoke or suspend for failure to comply with terms or conditions of the permit. That means that you have the ability to investigate whether or not someone is in compliance or noncompliance with the terms of your permit, regardless of who is the final arbitrator on compliance with federal regulations.

If a pipeline company does not comply with federal law, there's two remedies there. One is the Federal Government can prosecute them civilly for failing to comply. Number two is the Federal Government can prosecute them criminally for failing to comply with federal laws as it relates to the requirements of pipeline safety.

That doesn't in any way hinder your ability to determine if someone has complied with your permit or to determine if they have the continued ability to demonstrate their compliance, which is what we're talking about here today.

To say that you wouldn't have the authority to investigate and determine compliance on these issues

borders on absurd.

2.3

We're not talking about establishment or enforcement of pipeline safety regulations. We're not talking about that. Because you guys haven't done that. There's nothing in the record that would indicate you have. We're talking about the ability to determine compliance.

No. 16 you reached a conclusion of law, said you have the authority -- the Public Utilities Commission has the authority to impose conditions on the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. And that includes federal law.

Some of the Permit Conditions, No. 34 requires compliance with 49 CFR 195, high consequence areas.

No. 36 requires an emergency response plan to be filed with PHMSA as required by 49 CFR 194, 195.402, 195.452 and file it with the PUC at the exact same time.

No. 3 I've already addressed, Amended Permit Condition No. 3. They have to comply and implement recommendations from the Final Environmental Impact Statement. That includes the Special Conditions.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Rappold, I'm going to just interrupt.

I think we pretty much get the idea of your argument. If you've got anything that you haven't

1 | covered that we absolutely need to know, go ahead.

2.3

MR. RAPPOLD: I wanted to get into the rest of the testimony that they've already offered through the website just to show how many more witnesses would be speaking to the very same issues that we want to talk about.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can you just click through those? I mean, I think -- we get the idea. We understand your argument.

Is that fair, Commissioner Fiegen?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: (Nods head.)

MR. RAPPOLD: Corey Goulet would talk about compliance with the PHMSA recommendations. John Schmidt would testify about similar requirements.

I don't believe this one does.

Meera Kothari I already mentioned. "In general I can testify to design and construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline and PHMSA compliance." They want to put evidence on about that. They understand that they have to. They understand that it's not preempted and you have the ability to look at it and examine it and you're required by law to do so.

We have those same rights. They just don't want to hear what we have to say. And we would ask you to deny their motion.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

I'm going to go down again the list of

Intervenors that are on the telephone line. This is not
your motion, but if there's anything you need to add,

I'll give you the opportunity.

Ms. Baker.

2.3

MS. BAKER: Thank you, Commissioners. The Yankton Sioux Tribe would like to express its support for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe's position and ask that this motion be denied. It is in the best interest of all the parties, of the Commission, and of the State of South Dakota that the Commission have as much access to evidence as possible in making its decision. And to deny this motion will ensure that that relevant evidence comes in.

So, again, we support the position of Rosebud. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Mr. Blackburn.

MR. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to point out that TransCanada -- I'd like to speak in support of the motion and point out specifically that TransCanada seeks to include evidence of its compliance with PHMSA's regulation. Particularly, the evidence of the prefiled testimony of Ms. Kothari, question 8. The

answer to the question is "As a result of withdrawing the special permit application, Keystone will build the Keystone Pipeline as proposed -- (Inaudible)

2.3

(Discussion off the record)

MR. BLACKBURN: The answer to the question is

"As a result of withdrawing the special permit

application, Keystone will build the Keystone XL Pipeline

using the as-proposed high-strength steel API 5L grade

X70M steel with a nominal wall thickness of 0.465 inches,

and will operate the pipeline at a lower pressure of

1,307 psig to comply with the internal pressure and

design requirements in accordance with Federal Code of

Regulation Title 49 CFR 195.106." That's the end of the

quote.

And there is additional allegations in there.

I'd point out that the sentence I quoted -- in the sentence I quoted TransCanada is alleging compliance with federal law. If you're just able to allege compliance with federal law in its testimony, then the Commission should also allow testimony related to the potential noncompliance of federal law.

And we think that what's good for the goose is good for the gander here. And, in addition, as

Mr. Rappold pointed out, there are other allegations in this testimony with TransCanada compliance with federal

1 law. So, therefore, if TransCanada is allowed to include 2 that testimony, then the Intervenors should be allowed to 3 include testimony showing it is not in compliance with federal law. 4 5 So thank you. I'll leave my comments at that. 6 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 7 Ms. Zephier. 8 MS. ZEPHIER: Thank you. Cheyenne River would like to go on record 10 supporting Rosebud's motion simply just for the reason 11 that the evidence regarding the pipeline possibly being constructed on movable soils or shale along the Cheyenne 12 13 River directly affects or could affect the only source of 14

potable water for about 20,000 residents who live in Ziebach and Dewey Counties on the Cheyenne River Reservation who depend on that drinking source. those reasons we support Rosebud's motion.

> CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Bob Gough has joined us on the phone. Anything to add?

MR. GOUGH: Yes. InterTribal COUP also supports this motion and particularly because we see that some of that shifting ground issue may actually impinge and change over the years with a changing climate, which I know the Commission is not going to be allowing

testimony on. However, I think that we support this, and
we would request the Commission to deny the motion of
TransCanada.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Are there any of the Intervenors in the room that want to weigh in?

And, Mr. Rappold, I'd ask that maybe you move off to the side.

MR. ELLISON: Bruce Ellison on behalf of Dakota Rural Action. Certainly want to join in the arguments of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe against TransCanada's motion.

Unless this agency is without authority to exercise its responsibilities to protect South Dakota from this proposed construction project, then TransCanada's motion must be denied.

There have been a lot of changes since the Final Order and Amended Conditions were put out by this Commission. They have been largely discussed. The 59 regulations, PHMSA, the FSEIS, which has a lot of criticism and discussion about the pipeline proposals, as were viewed by you, and the Findings of Fact and Amended Conditions were made.

And by withdrawing the Special Permit with PHMSA it really puts this thing almost back to the beginning.

I mean, TransCanada really should be filing a new petition. But since they haven't done that, we would submit that it's incumbent upon this Commission to take a serious and hard look at all of the evidence that may be available as to whether TransCanada can and is able and has shown that it is willing to comply with conditions.

2.3

And there's a lot of evidence to the contrary to that. Mr. Kuprewicz adds to that discussion and to that evidence. And I can't remember if Mr. Rappold mentioned another witness they had is Ms. Tillquist. Her whole testimony is about risk assessment, which is in part what Mr. Kuprewicz is talking about.

While this Commission cannot say you should have this route somewhere else, you can say no. You can say we are not going to grant this recertification because the route that has been chosen under the conditions even as they are set will not properly protect our land and our water and our future in a way that we feel comfortable enough to allow.

So you can say no. And then they can refile a new application, perhaps come in with an area that isn't nearly 200 miles of high slip slope risk. I mean, this is about one of the worst places that they could have routed a pipeline. And you can say no.

Look at the criticism of the FSEIS, and you'll see that a lot of those concerns are really there and/or being raised.

That's all we have. Thank you for your time. We would ask that you deny TransCanada's motions to exclude.

Thank you.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Any other Intervenors?

Mr. Capossela.

MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

I think the Motion to Exclude Kuprewicz, as well as the motion -- the next motion on the docket, the next two motions on the docket, take just too narrow of a view of what the Commission's authority is in this proceeding and are urging the Commission to pigeonhole issues in a manner that I think is inappropriate.

I think the granting of the motion -- were the Commission to grant the motion, in some respects it would be inconsistent with the rulings on some of the discovery motions earlier in the proceeding where the parties were seeking discovery on the same issues and the Commission determined that it was appropriate for there to be discovery on these very issues.

Relevancy for discovery purposes is not the same thing as relevancy for the evidentiary hearing, but it's not that different either. There's another link or two in the chain, but these are the issues that relate to the construction of the pipeline, the certification that they continue to meet the conditions.

And for those reasons, in addition to those that have been espoused by Mr. Rappold and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe respectfully requests the denial of TransCanada's Motion to Exclude Mr. Kuprewicz.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Others.

2.3

2.4

MS. CRAVEN: Kimberly Craven here on behalf of the Indigenous Environmental Network. And we also support the position of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, and we urge the Commission to deny TransCanada's Motion to Exclude this Expert Witness Testimony.

We think it's very important to the proceedings that the full risk assessment and what dangers the pipeline might pose in the recertification process be fully aired. We think it's important to the people of South Dakota.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

```
1
              Mr. Dorr, did you want to add something?
2
              MR. DORR: Gary Dorr, individual Intervenor.
 3
              I have a question for the Commission. This is
 4
    more to note I quess for the record. What's the time
 5
     limit for providing testimony today?
 6
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm not sure there is a time
7
     limit.
8
              MR. DORR: I'm just wondering why you cut
    Mr. Rappold off. Because I was interesting in hearing
10
    what he had to say. If there's a time limit, I would
11
     like us all to know what that is.
12
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Dorr, I'm not going to get
13
     into an argument. There is no time limit. But if you
14
    were listening to what I stated, it's the fact that I
15
     felt he had covered his argument, and I was understanding
16
    his legal argument as it applied to his motion.
17
              MR. DORR: So there is no time limit? Is that
18
    yes or no?
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: There is no time limit but --
20
              MR. DORR: There is no argument then. There's
21
    no issue.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: -- if anyone is going beyond
22
2.3
    where we think they need to go and we understood their
24
    argument, for the sake of all of us and moving this
25
     along, I'm going to respectfully ask that they wrap it
```

```
1
     up.
2
              Now do you have anything to add to this --
                        The second note, for the record, is
 3
              MR. DORR:
4
     if I come up here and caution the Commission on their
5
    actions, I think you're going to -- you're going to tell
 6
    me that's not my place to do it. Is that correct?
7
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Just continue with your
8
    statement, please.
              MR. DORR: Okay then. Why are you allowing
10
    Mr. Moore to come up here and caution you about actions
    you're going to take today? I'm pretty sure if I say
11
12
     that you're going to tell me, Mr. Dorr, you're out of
13
     line.
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Dorr, do you have anything
15
    to add as it relates to this motion?
16
              MR. DORR: Those were for this motion, the
17
    testimony on this motion.
18
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
19
              MR. DORR: I'd just like it noted for the
20
    record.
21
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
                                            Thank you.
22
              Let's go to staff, who I apologize for missing
2.3
     last time.
24
              MS. EDWARDS: I certainly won't complain. Thank
25
          Kristen Edwards for staff.
```

Portions of Kuprewicz's testimony on rerouting the pipeline are clearly irrelevant and should be excluded. As we discussed in our Brief, it's not clear that all of it should be excluded at this time. Any of the testimony on requiring bad locations to be more restrictive than what is required by federal law is irrelevant since the Commission does not have authority over this matter due to federal preemption.

The operative issue would be whether it's more restrictive so it wouldn't necessarily apply to all testimony submitted in this docket. It would be testimony specifically more restrictive than federal law.

Staff offers the suggestion that the remainder of Kuprewicz's testimony could be objected to during the hearing, at which time all parties would have the ability to argue their case for either excluding or including the testimony, and Rosebud would have the opportunity to lay appropriate foundation, specifically as it relates to 49-41B-27.

However, we would maintain that any testimony only relating to 49-41B-22 would be irrelevant as that was specifically for the permit hearing and not relevant in this docket.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

1 Keystone, your opportunity for rebuttal.

And, Mr. Rappold, I'm going to ask that you just move back.

Thank you.

2.3

MR. MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of points.

One is I don't think that the characterization that we're seeking to admit evidence on the same subjects that we're asking be excluded by this motion is accurate.

We have not offered any direct testimony with respect to landslide risk. We have not offered direct testimony with respect to the issue of the propriety of conducting a historical risk assessment versus the kind of risk assessment that Mr. Kuprewicz says should have been done already with respect to this pipeline. We have not offered direct testimony with respect to the issue of valve placement.

So I think the argument and the characterization that we're -- that we're being unfair about those issues is inaccurate.

Secondly, to the extent that Mr. Rappold says that the issue is our ability to comply with conditions and that if we're offering testimony about that, they're entitled to rebut that, I think again you have to look to

the specific testimony offered by Mr. Kuprewicz.

2.3

Mr. Kuprewicz has not said with respect to valve placement that we're not in compliance with Condition No. 32. He said that he disagrees with the valve placement. Those are entirely different matters. And to the extent that what he has said is he disagrees and he thinks that as a result the pipeline can't be safely routed, he's raised issues that are beyond your statutory jurisdiction with respect to the route and clearly within the province of PHMSA to the extent that Keystone is required to comply with Condition 32 as imposed by PHMSA.

So it's very hard to consider this motion in the abstract, which is why we were very particular about the precise testimony Mr. Kuprewicz offered and our basis for objecting to it.

And, lastly, as I think you probably understand, the basis for the motion is simply a legal argument based on preemption and jurisdiction. We're not here to challenge Mr. Kuprewicz's qualifications. We're not here to contend that he could not appropriately be qualified as an expert witness, but rather that his particular testimony is improper given the limits of the Commission's jurisdiction.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

2.3

2 Questions from the Commission.

Hearing no questions, it's time for motions.

And I'm going to lead off.

In HP14-001, in the matter of Keystone's Motion to Exclude Testimony from Richard Kuprewicz, I move to grant the motion only to the extent that the testimony deals with the issue of rerouting and deny the entirety of the rest of the motion.

Discussion on my motion.

Let me say to Mr. Rappold, your supplemental filing yesterday was helpful to me.

MR. RAPPOLD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Up to that point, I mean, I was wrestling with everything that had been presented on both sides. I had pretty much arrived at the place that you were at with your supplemental filing yesterday, and that helped confirm where I've ultimately come down.

I believe there may be portions of

Mr. Kuprewicz's testimony that may, in fact, be relevant
to the question that we all agree we have to answer,
whether or not Keystone can continue to comply with the
conditions that have been added to the permit.

Are there portions of his written testimony that are not relevant to that? I think that case has been

made also. And so in making this motion I would say to Mr. Rappold and, frankly, all of the opponents -- well, and to Keystone also, that when we get to hearing testimony needs to be focused on and restricted to the question at hand: Can Keystone continue to meet the conditions that have been attached to the permit? And if testimony strays from that, we may entertain questions to preclude at that time.

MR. RAPPOLD: That's understood.

2.3

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I think from your filing yesterday I got that. I got the fact that you were understanding that.

And so but I wanted to state that clearly for everybody so that we understand this is not going to be a wide ranging thing when we get to the hearing but that as of now I think we need to move forward and deny everything.

Now why did I grant the portion on rerouting?

We all understand we don't have the authority to order a reroute. And so there's no sense wasting our time on that particular question.

Additional discussion on the motion.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your motion. I probably would have denied the whole deal and dealt with it completely at the evidentiary hearing.

But you're absolutely right on the rerouting. That will probably be thrown out at the evidentiary hearing anyway and objected to, and the Commission probably would rule that we will not hear that type of evidence. So that's fine we do that today.

I think this gives us an opportunity to listen to the evidence at the hearing, listen to the objections, and give everybody the ability to bring testimony that's going to be relevant. And there may be some evidence that we do object -- or is objected to, and we will rule in that favor.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Additional discussion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: This is Commissioner

Hanson. I would echo the statements that were made by

Commissioner Fiegen.

I would have moved to grant the motion in its entirety, but I can certainly see the wisdom in what you're pursuing here, and I will be supporting the motion.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You meant like deny the motion in its entirety; correct? Or to grant?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Grant a portion, deny

25 | the --

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Just so that -- my goal was to maybe just deny the whole motion today. But I appreciate what Commissioner Nelson has brought.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Oh, so I misunderstood what you said then. So I would have granted Keystone's motion in its entirety.

So Commissioner Nelson's motion is a compromise of the -- of you and I, and it sounds like it's the only one that's going to pass today.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate the clarification where the three of us are at.

Any further discussion?

2.3

I want to make one other point. And I'm going to stray a little bit from the issue at hand. And I want to say to Mr. Dorr, you've seen the motion that I've made. I think the thing that you need to understand is that when we come in here we've read all of the written filings, and that helps to inform us as to the legal positions that the lawyers are going to argue.

And so it's not entirely on the oral arguments, but we've read the written filings and are prepared when we come into the room.

Additional discussion on the motion?

Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, which is to grant only to the extent that the testimony

```
1
     applies or would relate to rerouting and to deny the
     entirety of the rest of the motion -- all those in favor
2
 3
     will vote aye. Those opposed, nay.
 4
              Commissioner Hanson.
 5
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Aye.
 6
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
7
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN:
                                    Fiegen votes aye.
8
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. The motion
     carries.
10
              MR. RAPPOLD: Thank you, Commissioners.
11
              MR. ELLISON: Mr. Commissioners and
12
    Ms. Commissioner, can I have a point of clarification?
13
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Certainly.
14
              MR. ELLISON: Bruce Ellison, Dakota Rural
15
     Action.
16
              I understand what has been said, that evidence
17
     will not be allowed about rerouting the line. Does your
18
     ruling preclude evidence about based upon what has
19
     happened since 2010, evidence as to the inappropriateness
     of the route that TransCanada has chosen?
20
21
              Because, again, as in my arguments before I had
22
     mentioned that -- and I understand you can't say we want
2.3
     you to do this different route, but you can say no.
24
              And that's my point of clarification is not that
25
     a better area is better -- another is better, but that
```

```
this area isn't good based upon things that have happened
2
     since 2010.
 3
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think anything related to
 4
     the siting of the route itself is beyond our
     jurisdiction.
 6
              MR. ELLISON: Yeah. I understand that changing
7
     the route would be beyond your jurisdiction. But
8
     approving this route or raising problems with it.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Let me say this. Again, we
10
     are only looking at can the company continue to meet the
11
     conditions upon which the permit was issued?
12
              And so if you have testimony that relates to
13
     that question, I think that's open.
14
              MR. ELLISON: Even if it's about the route as it
15
     exists as proposed by TransCanada?
16
              MR. SMITH: I think so.
17
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yeah.
18
              MR. ELLISON: Thank you for the clarification.
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
20
              I appreciate that. Because this is going to get
21
     sticky as we go forward so if we deal with it now, I
22
     appreciate that.
2.3
                      (A short recess is taken)
24
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: We are back on-line, and I
25
     believe that we are ready to go.
```

We are dealing now with Keystone's Motion to Preclude Consideration of aboriginal title or usufructuary rights.

Mr. Taylor.

2.3

MR. TAYLOR: Usufructuary. It's an English expression.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm going to interrupt. I looked it up, and I wrote down the actual pronunciation of it so we must be using different dictionaries. I will readily admit it's a new word for me. So anything any of the parties can do to enlighten me, go ahead.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioners.

Keystone brought this motion having in mind essentially what you said at the end of the last motion, and that is that this process is limited in scope. And there are things to talk about, and there are things that are beyond the scope of this hearing.

In the course of discovery and the exchange of discovery and some of the papers that have been filed by the parties, excluding some of the intervention papers, some of the issues that have been raised are aboriginal land rights and usufructuary rights, relating primarily total Indian Tribes' interests in the land across which the Keystone Pipeline is proposed to be constructed.

Aboriginal title is a concept that the U.S.

Supreme Court first addressed in 1955. And the concept of the title is that aboriginal peoples lived within an area and that a title to the land was created by virtue of the fact that they lived there.

2.3

In 1955 in Tee-Hit-Ton case the U.S. Supreme Court that says the United States exercised its dominion over tribal properties, in our case in the 1850s and '60s that the aboriginal title was extinguished as a matter of law.

Usufructuary rights are slightly different. The concept of usufructuary rights is tied really to the Magna Carta. The peasant had a usufructuary right to live in the house on the baron's property and to apply his trade. The king at the same time had a usufructuary right on the land that he seated to the baron for his baronetcy.

Usufructuary rights are followed in the civil law in the United States, and the concept is is that it is a right created in favor of a person who is not the owner of the land.

Mr. Capossela in his reply briefing describes the rights created by the National Historic Preservation Act and the Graves Reparations Act as perhaps usufructuary rights. Reasonably good examples of what a usufructuary right can be.

The reason we brought this motion is two-fold. First of all, no court in the United States, no State Court -- no Federal Court, no State Court has said that there are usufructuary rights that arose out of the treaties that were between the Tribes that are parties to this action and the United States in 1851 and 1868. No court has ever said that.

2.3

What the courts have said is that the Treaty of 1851, which created a large tract that basically embodies all of South Dakota as Indian land, and the Treaty of 1868, which pulled back the boundaries of that 1851 treaty, and the subsequent acts of Congress, which pulled back the boundaries of the reservations in South Dakota as we now know them, all were within the rights of Congress to do.

The courts have said that as a consequence of the actions of Congress, whether or not you agree with the propriety of the actions, whether it was fair, whether it was nice, whether it was unreasonable, it was legal, and that as a consequence when the land outside of the boundaries of the reservations in South Dakota was returned to the public domain, typically around the turn of the last century, that all title rights, whether they're usufructuary, whether they're aboriginal title, or whether they are fee simple title as we think of them

now, in the Tribes are terminated.

2.3

The fact is is the proposed Keystone Pipeline route does not cross any reservation property, does not cross any land held in trust by the United States for a Tribe, and does not cross any property owned by a Tribe. It crosses only land which is in the public domain and which has been in the public domain for more than 100 years. The vast majority of it was titled through the Homestead Acts and the predecessors of the private citizens of the State of South Dakota who own it now.

No South Dakota court has said that the Tribes have any right to exercise any form of dominion or jurisdiction over that property, save only those two federal statutes that speak to the issue of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Graves Reparations Act. There are a handful of other federal statutes that create potential involvement.

So our purpose in making this motion is for a determination that those issues are not properly before this Commission. They're substantive law questions.

You know, you should know that there are at least six U.S. Supreme Court opinions that have been rendered that have to do with tribal land interests in South Dakota, dealing with the boundaries of reservations, dealing with reservation --

For example, the Borland case that deals with whether or not the land that was taken by the construction of the Oahe Reservoir, who had jurisdiction over hunting rights. There's been a U.S. Supreme Court case that deals with the boundaries of the Rosebud Reservation to determine whether or not the session, when the Rosebud Reservation shrank by Congressional action, whether or not the Rosebud Tribe preserved any land rights outside of the borders of the present boundary.

It is our view that if usufructuary and aboriginal title issues are to be tried, they certainly are not to be tried in this court.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm going to interrupt.

Whoever's on the phone, you might want to put your phone on mute. We're getting some interesting noises. Shall we say that the court reporter's having a tough time transcribing.

Go ahead, Mr. Taylor.

2.3

MR. TAYLOR: If there are usufructuary rights and aboriginal title rights, those are substantive law questions.

The questions are do those rights exist? If they exist, to what extent to they survive abrogation of the treaties. The PUC isn't a court and cannot exercise jurisdiction to decide those judicial issues. To say

1 nothing of whether or not the State Courts even have jurisdiction to decide those issues.

I think it's very telling that if you look at the six or seven U.S. Supreme Court cases that deal with the reservations in South Dakota or if you look at the dozens of Supreme Court cases that deal with reservations across the United States, you will not find a single one that had its genesis in a Public Utilities Commission proceeding. You'll find many cases where the Tribe sued the Government, the Government sued the Tribes to resolve these issues.

So it's our view that, first of all, you have no jurisdiction to hear these things, and even if there is jurisdiction to hear them, there are no usufructuary rights that are in application. And we believe that any testimony or any evidence offered in support of an argument that you should do something because of usufructuary rights or because of aboriginal land titles is wholly and totally inappropriate.

Thank you.

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

I'm going to go to Mr. Capossela first. appropriate for you to lead off on this?

> MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you. Yes.

We'll let you lead off, and CHAIRMAN NELSON:

then we'll go to the other Intervenors.

2.3

2.4

MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In fact, pursuant to prior practice, the tribal attorneys consulted before the hearing, and fortunately or unfortunately I was nominated to bat leadoff. So thank you for that.

I would begin by pointing out in the audience with me is Mr. Doug Provost. He's the director of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Department of Water Resources responsible for managing water and implementing the water quality program under Clean Water Act on the reservation.

He's also a former Tribal Council representative from the Bear Soldier District. That's McLaughlin South Dakota. And he represented on the Tribal Council about 4,000 South Dakotans on the Standing Rock Reservation prior to his current position. And now he manages the water.

He's one of the witnesses who has prefiled testimony expressing concerns in some respects on the potential impacts of the certification with water rights, including off-reservation water rights. And so he's one of the South Dakotans whose voices may be stifled were the motion to be granted.

The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe respectfully requests that the motion be denied. I'm going to try to

cover three points.

2.3

Firstly, the motion itself contains language that is misleading, perhaps even inaccurate, definitely overstating the point that I think that TransCanada is trying to make. There's a lot of terminology in the motion and the supporting documents for the motion which do not accurately portray what they're being used to portray, and I'll discuss that.

The second point that we'd try to make today is to define the aboriginal territory, which -- of the Sioux Nation, which is Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is a constituent Tribe and just to show the Commission what we're talking about. Because I'm not sure that that has been done in the motion.

And then, thirdly, to describe what rights exist in that territory and why those rights exist. And so that's what we're going to try to do in responding to the motion and ask that it be denied.

The rules of procedure require that a motion state with particularity the grounds therefor and the relief requested. And the terminology that's used intermingling both in the motion and briefs as well as in oral argument this morning does not accurately convey what things mean.

Aboriginal rights, treaty rights, abrogation,

termination, these are terms of art in Indian law. They have meaning. They have different things. And to the notion that rights in South Dakota of the Tribes have been "terminated" is just simply wrong as a matter of federal law.

2.3

There are rights of Tribes that have -- that their tribal status was terminated by Congress in the 1950s. When Congress began an experiment to see what would happen to Indian people -- a feeling that there's too much community stuff going on, there's too much tribally owned land, there's too much community owned micro enterprises, and that folks on the reservations perhaps would be better off if the Tribes were eliminated and that they could make a go of it on their own.

And that happened to many Tribes in the United States. And in our Brief we cited a Congressional Committee Report on the termination of certain Tribes.

Now some of the legislation actually during the termination era gave the State of South Dakota the opportunity to expand its authority over the reservations as a possible first step toward termination. And in a case that's cited in our Brief, Rosebud Sioux Tribe versus State of South Dakota, the Eighth Circuit determined that South Dakota did not accept that first

step toward termination by referendum vote actually.

2.3

There was a referendum vote in the early 1960s.

Nothing in South Dakota with respect to tribal rights has been "terminated," and the good people of South Dakota made sure of that by referendum vote.

But the jumbling of terminology in the motion is to the extent that I think the motion fails to comply with the basic Rule of Civil Procedure that it states with particularity the grounds therefor, as well as the request for relief.

These terms are just -- they're being thrown around, I think, to convince the Commission that nothing off reservation, current present day reservations -- I think that's really the point of the motion, as best as I can figure it out. Because these terms are used interchangeably and erroneously.

I think the point of the motion is the Tribes have no rights outside of the reservation. I think that would be -- at least if they captioned the motion that way, it would pass muster for the Rules of Civil Procedure.

But to say you can't consider aboriginal title or usufructuary rights, it doesn't make it exactly clear what they're asking for, and then the justification for that also is unclear.

One of the things I think that's worth pointing out also is there's a certain irony in contending that evidence cannot be advanced and testimony cannot be introduced at the evidentiary hearing because the PUC is not a court and these are big issues and it's not within the PUC's jurisdiction to decide the issues.

2.3

By filing the motion and making that request TransCanada is asking you to decide the issues against the Tribes. So there's a certain irony underlying the motion. The Tribes are not asking the Public Utilities Commission to adjudicate any aboriginal rights or claims or treaty rights or claims. And those two things are different, but you wouldn't know by the motion.

TransCanada is saying at the same time in the same breath the PUC cannot adjudicate these issues, but really they're asking you to do so by taking them off the table completely. And I think that's a significant right there demonstration of some of the problems with the motion itself.

Let me try to clarify what some of this terminology means and how it applies, as I think TransCanada did accurately in some respects express what aboriginal rights are. These are the possessory and the resource rights that native communities had prior to contact with Westerners.

They were here first. They lived here. They moved around. They used the resources of the land and the water to live and to prosper. And those are the aboriginal rights.

2.3

Now then the treaty era unfolded in the 19th Century, and some of these rights were reduced to treaty and were codified by the United States. And some weren't.

But aboriginal rights and treaty rights are different things. Treaty rights are codified. They're in documents passed by Congress in treaties.

Aboriginal rights were never reduced to writing. These were the rights that the native people had prior to contact.

Some treaties fully codified some Tribes' aboriginal rights, and some treaties didn't. So they're concentric circles that have an overlap but do not completely overlap. One wouldn't understand any of that by reading the motion.

And it's even more complicated than that. There are express treaty rights, the words in the treaty, and then there are implied treaty rights. It doesn't say anything in the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty about water rights, for example. It just doesn't say that. It's not in there. But there's discussion about the reservations

being a permanent homeland.

2.3

There are many things in the treaty that would lead one to believe that in order for the Tribe to survive on the reservation identified in the treaty that they need water rights and, in fact, the courts have recognized water rights. And the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is actually in a multiyear process of discussing the precise nature of the Tribe's water rights with the State of South Dakota and the State of North Dakota and the Federal Government.

And, interestingly, one of the big issues on water rights in those discussions are changes in the operation of the Shadehill Dam in Perkins County that is not located in any reservation. It's a dam that locks the Grand River just upstream from the Standing Rock Reservation. It's five miles outside of the reservation boundary.

And the Grand River runs through the reservation, but because the river is blocked just off the reservation boundary, that affects the flows in the river obviously and the Tribe's ability to use the water. So there may be changes in the operation of a dam outside of the Standing Rock Reservation per an agreement between the State and the Tribe and the Feds off reservation because the Tribe has water rights in a river system that

transcends the reservation boundaries.

2.3

The Tribe's water rights may have points of diversion outside of the reservation. The Tribe may have a right under federal law to take water from the Missouri River or tributaries to the Missouri River outside of the current reservation boundaries for use inside the reservation boundaries.

That's an example of rights that all Tribes or many Tribes have under federal law that transcend the reservation boundaries that exist today.

TransCanada cited with respect to aboriginal rights the Tee-Hit-Ton case as to the power of Congress or the authority that Congress has assumed to take action with respect to aboriginal rights.

But the Tee-Hit-Ton case is very fact specific.

It's a case in Alaska. And the Alaska Natives -- I won't go too far on this, but if they have any treaties, it might be with Russia. It's not with the United States.

They have a different history, and that history is really important as relating to these issues of aboriginal rights and treaty rights. But they're not the same.

Okay. What happened for the Sioux Nation? The Tribes entered the 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty. It did not create an Indian reservation. It did define the

aboriginal rights of the Sioux Nation, extending from the Big Horn Mountains to the west, the Republican River of Kansas to the south, the Yellowstone and the Missouri to the north, and for some of the Dakota bands of the Sioux Nation all the way over past the Big Sioux River in eastern South Dakota and Minnesota.

2.3

2.4

That was in the 1851 Treaty. As TransCanada explained this morning, the subsequent 1868 Treaty, that created a reservation, the Great Sioux Reservation, comprising all of present day western South Dakota, including the Missouri River. The east bank of the Missouri River is the treaty boundary.

That was -- that was -- in 1877 the Black Hills was removed from the reservation. So the western boundary was moved over. And then in 1889 the reservations were broken up from what was left of the Great Sioux Reservation and there were payments made but those payments were disputed.

The thing went to court, the Black Hills Land Claim. And in 1980 the Supreme Court awarded the Sioux Nation 108 million, which the Sioux Nation did not accept and purports that there is a claim on the title to the Black Hills, to that taking in 1877 of the Black Hills. That's what happened.

Now in the course of 70 years of litigation the

Indian Claims Commission, the Commission established by Congress for the purpose of making recommendations to address outstanding claims, defined the aboriginal rights of the Sioux Nation and we cited that and that was ultimately affirmed by the Supreme Court.

2.3

Now in a Reply Brief there was a little bit of argument that I thought could have been presented a little more tastefully that we somehow misportrayed the import of the Sioux Nation case and messed up the cites.

But actually the version of the Indian Claims

Commission Reporter that I looked at didn't have page

numbers. It had cites for where the -- the cites, but it

didn't have page numbers. So I kind of counted. You

know, if it's supposed to begin on this page, then maybe

the definition of aboriginal rights is on this page.

But what's significant is that on that page they didn't define aboriginal rights. They talked about the treaty.

Well, TransCanada doesn't know aboriginal rights when they see it because those treaty rights -- those aboriginal rights that were adjudicated by the Indian Claims Commission were codified in the 1851 Treaty. Sometimes the treaty contains the aboriginal rights for the Tribes, and sometimes it doesn't.

So treaty rights and aboriginal rights, they

```
1
     overlap. But you wouldn't know it by the motion because
2
     these terms are just thrown around willy-nilly.
 3
              But what are the aboriginal boundaries that
 4
     we're talking about?
                          Do they even overlap with the
 5
     pipeline that was discussed this morning?
 6
              And, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to
7
     make reference to a map. I was -- for better or worse, I
8
     was in office in the Bureau of Indian Affairs in
     Washington, D.C. last week in the realty office, the
10
     realty branch chief for the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
11
     And this map was hanging on her wall. And I looked at it
12
     and I --
13
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Please don't tell me you
14
     swiped the map from the Federal Government.
15
              MR. CAPOSSELA: I won't tell you.
16
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                And I interrupted for another
17
     reason.
18
              Commissioner Hanson, they do have a map that
19
     they're going to hold up, but my understanding is that
20
     they will describe it sufficiently for your benefit.
21
              MR. CAPOSSELA: I'll do my best.
                                                 Thank you.
22
     This is a map --
2.3
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: If you would grab one of those
24
     mics. over there and just pull it up on top over there.
25
              MR. CAPOSSELA:
                              Thank you.
```

This is a map of the aboriginal territory adjudicated by the Indian Claims Commission for every Tribe in the United States. And there are different colors.

2.3

The biggest and the most pronounced is in blue in the middle of the United States in the Upper Plains.

And it says Sioux. And this is a map of the aboriginal territory of the Sioux Nation hanging on the walls of the Federal Government today.

Aboriginal rights are not something that existed a long time ago but no longer exist today. And I thought -- and I asked why does the Bureau of Indian Affairs have this map on the wall today? And before I swiped the map the realty chief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs responded because the rules for the acquisition of land by Tribes are different if a Tribe buys land inside or outside of its aboriginal territory.

So we need to know what rules to follow if a Tribe wants to buy a tract of land. And the rules are different for the Sioux Nation if they want to buy land here in Wyoming or if they want to buy land up within their aboriginal territory.

Now in the fine print of the map it reads "This map has been prepared under the direction of the Indian Claims Commission as part of its final report. This map

portrays the results of cases before the U.S. Indian Claims Commission or U.S. Court of Claims in which an Indian Tribe proved its original tribal occupancy of a tract within the continental United States."

2.3

So I don't think there's any need to quib over what page in the Indians Claims Commission Reporter the rights of the Sioux -- the aboriginal boundaries of the Sioux Nation were adjudicated because we brought the map so you can see for yourself. And it's much of South Dakota, parts of North Dakota, parts of Wyoming, and into Minnesota for the eastern bands.

So those are the boundaries respected by the Federal Government, put together by the Federal Government, as adjudicated by the Indian Claims Commission. And in the case of the Sioux Nation, the Indian Claims Commission Findings were affirmed by the Court of Claims and by the U.S. Supreme Court.

And so there was kind of a suggestion the

Indian Claims Commission recited and said it was affirmed

by the Supreme Court. Well, it was affirmed by the

Supreme Court. There's no reason to argue slight of hand

about that. First it was affirmed by the Court of

Claims. Then it was affirmed by the Supreme Court.

Well, why does it matter? What rights are being claimed in the blue area for the Sioux Nation that may

I not exist outside the blue area in the Upper Plains?

2.3

And, you know, I thought how can I best describe it so on a human level people might understand? And to me the best example here in -- is Bear Butte State Park. And if you've ever visited Bear Butte State Park, Bear Butte is central to the Creation story for the Lakotas.

And if you go to the top far corner of the parking area and you hike up a trail, you'll begin to see -- like they look like little bags. They're very, very tiny bags. And what they are are tobacco ties. They're tobacco tied in little bags.

And then you follow the trail, and then there's ribbons. And then there's an area with an alter. And the Lakota people, because Bear Butte State Park is in the blue area, have a right that I don't have. And that's a right to go and engage in religious ceremonies at that alter area within the boundaries of Bear Butte State Park.

And if a South Dakota Game, Fish & Parks ranger were to tell me or any non-Lakota person, sorry, you don't have the right to pray there, we're closed, I would have to leave or I would get in trouble. That is not true for a Lakota person. They have the right.

And at a certain time of the year many Lakotas

go to Bear Butte State Park and exercise their rights within the aboriginal territory and they go on vision quests and they stay out there all night or for a few days with no food or water, and that's a part of their religious practices. And they have a right under federal law because it's within their aboriginal boundaries.

2.3

And that's a right that many South Dakotans fully get because Bear Butte is such a cool place, and so many people go and visit.

That's an example of an aboriginal -- of a right that Lakota people have because it's within the aboriginal boundaries that have been adjudicated and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

There was discussion this morning on the motion for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe's expert of there being other testimony in the record touching on many of the very same issues. And I think that's the case here also.

When Ms. Paige Olson testifies for staff on behalf of the Historic Preservation Office she references the National Historic Preservation Act as being the foundation for historic preservation work by the South Dakota State Historical Society. That same act requires consideration of "traditional cultural properties of Tribes" as being included in the act.

Those traditional cultural properties of the

Tribes almost by definition are not found outside of the aboriginal areas of the Tribes, unless there was something going on with intermarriage or trading horses or something like that.

2.3

But the aboriginal rights are written into many statutes and executive orders. And since the pipeline route does cut through the aboriginal territory of the Sioux Nation, of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe as adjudicated up and held by the U.S. Supreme Court, testimony has been filed by Standing Rock expressing concerns with how certification of the permanent conditions — of continued compliance with the permit conditions may affect those rights.

Now these issues -- the Commission may not find these issues to be determinative, to be the main issue in this proceeding, but it's competent evidence. It's relevant evidence because the conditions incorporate federal law, and these are rights of the Tribes under federal law.

So concerns on the use of water, even were there to be no release, but if there's water that is being withdrawn for hydrostatic testing and other construction from the Grand River or other tributaries of the Missouri River, that may affect water rights being negotiated right now with the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

in the State of South Dakota.

2.3

It doesn't mean it's a determinative issue. The Commission has discretion to give it whatever weight it sees fit. But to absolve itself of consideration of these important issues seems inconsistent with the regulations and the statute underlying the fact-finding authority of the Commission.

And these rights, they range from historic preservation, ownership of human remains in the blue area, literally ownership of remains where Tribes have rights. If remains are uncovered due to construction in certain areas, the Tribes actually have the ownership right. That's their ancestors to repatriate and bring it back to the reservation.

And there's an unanticipated discoveries plan in the record that TransCanada has agreed to with the State Department and the SHPO. That wouldn't exist if these aboriginal rights didn't exist, if this map didn't exist. Congress would not have recognized those rights of the Tribes.

So the notion that, oh, the courts have torn up the treaty and created smaller reservations and that's the way it is, it's much more complicated than that. And unlike TransCanada, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe is not asking the Commission to adjudicate any of it, but

instead hear evidence on concerns of South Dakota community leaders such as Doug Provost [phonetic] and others with their concerns and the concerns of their constituents as it relates to these off-reservation rights or claims.

2.3

Now a challenge has been made, I guess. No court has ever found that the Indian Tribes have rights outside of the current reservation boundaries in South Dakota.

I would like to point out a case called Yankton Sioux Tribe versus Army Corps of Engineers, which is reported at 83 F. Supp. 2d 1047. And on page 1,048 of the case Judge Piersol in Sioux Falls wrote that "The court failed to affect the removal and burial of all the bodies in cemetery." I'm referring to White Swan Cemetery south of Chamberlain, South Dakota. When Corps of Engineers releases water from Fort Randall Dam literally excavated a cemetery.

Now that cemetery was within the original boundaries of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, but those boundaries and some of the litigation that was referenced by TransCanada -- that cemetery was probably outside of the boundaries at the time of that court case because of dispute over the reservation boundaries.

In Federal Court a federal judge recognizing the

right of Tribes and actually issuing an injunction against the Federal Government from taking action that would harm that cemetery and those human remains outside of the reservation boundary.

2.3

2.4

More recently in a case which is not reported because it's just a Circuit Court thing in Rapid City, but on March 26, 2015, the Rapid City Journal reported -- and I'm quoting from the headline, "In symbolic case Native American man beats fishing without license charge."

This didn't make the Reporter. We're not going to find it in the law library. But a Native American back in March went fishing without a license because he wanted to make a point that's really not that dissimilar from the point I'm trying to make this morning. And he got cited by the Game, Fish & Parks, but the judge let him go.

These are not rights that were abrogated or terminated 100 years ago or last year or last March. These are rights that exist -- that are recognized by the Federal Government in a wide variety of federal laws, and in many respects different rules apply to the Sioux Nation inside the blue area and outside the blue area.

And what the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and other

- Tribes are asking for, I believe, is the right to explain that, to hear the voice of the Indian people, and the concerns as it relates to the certification of the permit, not only within the existing reservation boundaries but within their aboriginal area, which they do hold very dear.
- 7 And so thank you, Commission.
- 8 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

2.3

- I'm going to go down, again, the list of
  Intervenor attorneys if anyone has anything to add. My
  fear, Mr. Capossela, is I think you've done a good job
  representing your fellow tribal attorneys, and they might
  call on you again.
- MR. CAPOSSELA: We'll see. I'll be available.

  Thank you.
- 16 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Ms. Baker.
  - MS. BAKER: Thank you, Commissioners. I would like to point out just at the outset a couple of misrepresentations that were made in Keystone's Reply regarding Yankton's Response just so as to not mislead the Commission in any way.
  - The Yankton Sioux Tribe did concede that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to adjudicate land rights, but the rest of that sentence actually says that for the purposes other than its own determination on permit

certification the Commission just as clearly does have authority to take those claims and rights into account when it makes the certification determination. So we're in no way conceding that the Commission doesn't have authority to consider these issues.

2.3

In addition, Keystone alleged that we said there are no cases that's on aboriginal title to the land where the pipeline is proposed to be constructed. And, in fact, I'd like first to speak to the case cited by TransCanada where they discuss lands that are on the east side of the Missouri River. And the reason I'd like to talk to that case is because that case only involved land on the east side of the Missouri River.

The Yankton Sioux Tribe actually had land rights, property rights and treaty rights, both on the east and west side of the river. On the east side there was a subsequent treaty that relinquished those claims, and the current reservation is on the east side of the river. But on the west side of the river directly where the pipeline is going to go, the Yankton Sioux Tribe was a party to that 1848 Ft. Laramie Treaty that

Mr. Capossela spoke about and I'm sure you'll hear a bit more about as we go on through this issue.

And in a case called Sioux Tribe vs. the United States, Docket 74 in the Court of Federal Claims,

that case addressed the 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty. And it said -- it was citing a previous decision from 1965 and saying that the Indian Claims Commission ruled that the 1851 Treaty of Ft. Laramie recognized the title of the Sioux or Dakota Nation to approximately 50 million acres of land situated west of the Missouri River in what are now the State of North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Montana.

2.3

The Court of Federal Claims and the Indian Claims Commission have actually recognized title to that 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty area. And just for clarification, because TransCanada has sort of singled Yankton out due to its unique history, Yankton is considered part of that 1851 Treaty, and in that same case I was just citing from they reference a 1970 Opinion from the Indian Claims Commission which ruled that the Sioux or Dakota Nation in the Fort Laramie Treaty included only the Teton and Yankton divisions of the Sioux.

Teton would encompass the other tribal parties that are involved here and then Yankton as well was a party to that Treaty. So Yankton very much has an interest in that 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty and its territory.

Later on in that Court of Claims case from 1974

the Court states that "In many decisions dealing with the Treaty of Ft. Laramie, it has been held that the Treaty of Ft. Laramie was not a treaty which took any lands from the Indians but which was instead a treaty which recognized the title certain signatory Tribes on the basis of the territory which they used and occupied."

2.3

So there is language out there, plenty of language out there, stating that title has been found in that 1851 Treaty territory, which is where the pipeline would go, in these Lakota and Dakota Tribes.

And if you'll give me just one second, please.

As far as usufructuary rights, courts have found repeatedly that there are both aboriginal and treaty recognized title and rights, which Mr. Capossela spoke to. And usufructuary rights do not necessarily require that the Tribe have title to the land.

So here we're talking about different rights even in that title which the Tribes do have. And those usufructuary rights exist by virtue of treaty. And they exist even after executive orders or acts of Congress might diminish the land base that was reserved by that treaty, provided that the act of Congress or the executive order doesn't specifically, expressly divest the Tribe of its usufructuary rights.

So when that '51 Treaty territory was

diminished, was taken unilaterally by the United States, and Tribes were forced onto smaller areas of property their usufructuary rights weren't diminished. The usufructuary rights continued in that whole original vast stretch of land because they were not expressly abrogated through the subsequent acts.

2.3

And those are the rights that we're concerned about here, and those are the rights that we simply would like the Commission to have an opportunity to hear about. And the impacts on those rights should certainly be of interest to the Commission and are relevant to these proceedings.

And I'd also like to make one point about the route and siting issue that's been brought up. And I know the Commissioner has spoken about this a little bit in between, I guess, agenda items. But I'd like to point out that the case cited by Keystone which was actually first cited by Yankton does, in fact, very much apply to transmission facilities like the one at issue.

In the Nebraska Public Power District that involved a trans-state transmission facility, yes, which is defined as an electric transmission line and its associated facilities which originates outside the State of South Dakota, crosses the states and terminates outside of the date of South Dakota and which

transmission line and associated facilities deliver electric power and energy at 25 percent or less of the design capacity as such line and facilities for use in the State of South Dakota.

2.3

Now that is a very specific definition. And the reason that this is an issue is because TransCanada was trying to distinguish that case from our situation here by saying, well, that was just a trans-state transmission line, and this is just a regular transmission line.

But a trans-state transmission facility is simply a specific type of transmission facility. It's just as subject to 49-41B-36 so long as it has a design of more than 115 kilovolts. And that's based on the definition of transmission facilities.

And in that case, in Nebraska Public Power District, the facility at issue was a 500-kilovolt electric transmission line, which means it's well over the 115 kilovolt level to make it qualify as a transmission facility.

So the language of 49-41B-36 did apply in that Nebraska Public Power District's case, and it was taken into consideration when the Commission said that it could not take the particular action without violating the route specific requirement and that -- excuse me. And that the Public Utilities Commission does have rights to

deny a permit on the grounds of its route.

2.3

It does not have the right to reroute or to suggest or recommend a new route, but it does have the right within its authority to deny a permit based on the route.

And there's other language in that same case that actually says It is reasoned that the PUC does not have authority to grant general variance would violate the PUC's route-specific requirements, would deny parties an opportunity to assess the proposed route, and would place the PUC in a potential dilemma -- and here's the important language -- of granting a permit that was not route specific which violates its rules and precedence or violates SDCL 49-41B-36.

So TransCanada claimed that 49-41B-36 did not apply in that case, and clearly it did, as that was one of the concerns that was addressed by the South Dakota Supreme Court in this case.

So essentially Nebraska Public Power District does stand for the fact that the Commission does have authority to take into consideration factors that relate to a route specifically and that it can deny a permit based on the route. It simply cannot reroute or propose a new route for a facility.

And with that I will just say that Yankton

strongly opposes the motion and requests that the Commission deny it in the interest of allowing crucial testimony about rights of South Dakotans. And the fact that those rights may not be etched in stone or in a law book spelled out very specifically somewhere doesn't mean they don't exist. They've been acknowledged through courts time and again, and the Commission should take them into account in its decision.

Thank you.

2.3

10 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Blackburn, anything to 11 add?

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, point of clarification. You had mentioned that you were going to allow all the tribal representatives to speak first, and if that's still the case, I would --

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that was before I understood that they had nominated Mr. Capossela to be their spokesperson. So at this point I'm just going down the list.

MR. BLACKBURN: Okay. I'm sorry about that. I just have a quick brief statement.

Final Permit Condition 1 states that Keystone shall "Keystone shall comply with all applicable laws and regulations in its construction and operation of the project." Such law is not limited to express statutes

and regulations.

2.3

In Minnesota the Millelacs Band,
M-I-L-E-L-A-C-S Band, of Chippewa Indians, the U.S.
Supreme Court in 1999 unanimously held that the Chippewa
Tribe's rights to hunt, fish, and gather in Minnesota's
territory severed the right to use the land from formal
title to the land. By so doing the U.S. Government
vested the Chippewa with off-reservation usufructuary
property rights that could not be lawfully taken from
them without Congressional authorization.

Depending on the wording of the treaty, Tribes may have a property right in off-reservation resources that cannot be taken by Government action, except by due process of law, as they would be in any other taking context.

Moreover, states have no authority to condemn these federally granted property rights. Although the Supreme Court analysis in the Millelacs opinion arose in the context of treaties related to Tribes in Minnesota and Wisconsin, the implications of the Supreme Court's reasoning are much broader. The Supreme Court's analysis is applicable to any treaty in which U.S. treaty negotiators induced native people to give up formal title to land while promising the right to live off the land in a traditional way.

Just one more bit here. These property rights will vary from state to state, tribe to tribe, and treaty The existence of usufructuary properties to treaty. right is now firmly established in law. These rights must be respected in regulation and management activity that might diminish them. These off-reservation usufructuary property rights will have to be accommodated after the Millelacs decision not only in Minnesota but also in every state in which usufructuary rights have not been abrogated by the U.S. Congress. Due process protections under the U.S. Constitution are applicable to the usufructuary property rights to the same extent as any other taking of private property. So, therefore, the taking of any usufructuary rights in South Dakota must be done by due process of law, and such takings cannot be accomplished by the State of South Dakota.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Ms. Zephier.

MS. ZEPHIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You have read all the briefing. Cheyenne River completely agrees with everything that Standing Rock and Yankton have said thus far, as well as Dakota Rural Action.

The only thing I guess I would like to say is

that, you know, we took a little bit of a different approach on this, and, you know, we looked at this as, you know, we're not asking -- Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe has not asked the PUC to adjudicate any tribal claims regarding aboriginal usufructuary rights.

2.3

This is not a case like -- Keystone cited

West River Electric. No one's asking the PUC for any
declaratory ruling as to those rights. We really just
want to be able to submit testimony that will aid you,
Commission members, in your deliberations and allow you
to be as fully informed as possible.

Keystone in its Brief jumped right into the merits of the claim, which I think Standing Rock,
Mr. Capossela, has done a good job of responding to, and we completely agree with everything he says. You know, but then Keystone goes into their Brief and says, you know, that the Commission's consideration or disposition of these cases is beyond its jurisdiction, you know, we think they're correct with that. This is beyond -- the PUC deciding issues of aboriginal rights is beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission.

That's another reason why this motion should be denied and this evidence should be allowed in. Again, no one is asking them to do that.

Also in Keystone's Brief they had mentioned --

or argued that, in effect, these Tribes -- us Tribes are asking you, Commissioners, to reroute the pipeline.

That's baseless overreaching, as we discussed in the prior motion, the Kuprewicz motion.

2.3

So, you know, I don't -- they're arguing that the PUC doesn't have jurisdiction. Yes. The PUC, we believe, does not have jurisdiction to decide these kind of questions and, therefore, the Government should be allowed in.

If there is more of a PUC should not admit this evidence because it's irrelevant, you know, in general I think the only way evidence should be excluded is if it's irrelevant or otherwise inadmissible.

If that is what Keystone is really arguing, they haven't met their burden of proof on that. This evidence is potentially material, relevant, competent to some of the positions that Yankton Sioux Tribe may be taking at the upcoming hearing.

So a blanket exclusion of that evidence is simply inappropriate at this time. And all of this -- you know, any evidence related to this should be allowed in to be able to more fully inform the Commission on any of these questions that may come up. And for that reason the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe strongly opposes this motion made by Keystone.

```
1
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
2
              Mr. Gough, anything to add?
              MR. GOUGH: Commissioner, thank you.
 3
 4
              InterTribal supports the Tribe's position on
     this and seeks to have the dismissal of TransCanada's
5
 6
     motion.
7
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                 Thank you.
8
              Any Intervenors in the room?
              Mr. Rappold.
10
              MR. RAPPOLD: Thank you, Commissioners.
                                                        Matt
     Rappold on behalf of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe. I'll keep
11
12
     this brief.
13
              I just want to go on record stating that the
14
     Rosebud Sioux Tribe supports the other parties, the other
15
     tribal Intervenors, and the other parties in their
16
     opposition to Keystone's Motion to Preclude Testimony as
17
     it relates to aboriginal rights and usu -- you know what
18
     I'm trying to say.
19
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                 We do.
20
              MR. RAPPOLD:
                            Thank you.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
21
                                 Thank you.
22
              Others?
2.3
              Ms. Craven.
24
              MS. CRAVEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and other
25
     Commission members. Kimberly Craven from the Indigenous
```

1 Environmental Network, and I would like to echo what 2 Mr. Rappold just said. We joined and support the Tribes in their --3 4 sorry. I just lost my whole train of thought. Anyway we urge you to deny Keystone's motion to keep out the 6 important tribal testimony that is relevant to this 7 proceeding. 8 Thank you. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 10 Any others? 11 Yes. Mr. Dorr. 12 MR. DORR: Gary Dorr, individual Intervenor. I'd just like to point out a couple of things here. 13 14 Under the isolated tract fact, the Rosebud Sioux 15 Tribe actually can turn Mellette County into reservation 16 That's the special status that this man had talked 17 about with the realty. So that is still something that's 18 still on the table. So the Tribes do have consideration 19 here. 20 Also an affirmation of the treaty rights, Lavetta Elk v. United States was heard on April 29, 2009, 21 22 in Rapid City in the United States Court of Federal 2.3 Claims. She was sexually abused by an army recruiter,

and she filed a claim under the -- Federal Court claim

under the Bad Man clause of the 1868 Treaty, and she won.

2.4

25

1 The court affirmed that the treaty rights of the 2 Tribes under the 1868 Treaty are still in effect, are 3 still valid. They are not static. They changed. As the 4 person talked about fishing, the fishing methods have 5 changed also. So the treaty is not a static document. 6 It is -- I mean, it grows with the use and expansion of 7 the relationship between the states and the Tribes. 8 So I think that the treaty rights do need to be -- and usufructuary rights are still current, and it 10 does directly apply to the first Amended Condition, which 11 Keystone shall comply with all applicable laws. Because the 1868 Treaty is codified under 15 Stat. 635. It's 12 13 been made into a law. It's not just a treaty. It's a 14 law. 15 And the courts -- and we have heard today and 16 I've just told that you -- have affirmed that treaty 17 rights and usufructuary rights are still current, are still valid. 18 19 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Staff. 20 21 MS. EDWARDS: Thank you. Kristen Edwards for 22 staff. 2.3 Staff did not take a position on this motion. 24 There was some mention about whether or not certain

testimony offered by Staff would be subject to this

25

1 | motion if it were granted.

2.3

I don't believe that's really on the table at this time, as specific offerings of testimony aren't to be decided on today. But if that does come up at a later time, we'd be prepared to discuss it then.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Keystone, rebuttal.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner.

Rhetorically I'd ask this question: If there are usufructuary and aboriginal title issues to be decided, where were the Tribes five years ago when we first heard this case? And what has changed in the intervening five years? Nothing.

Five years ago this Commission adopted

Finding 1, that Keystone will comply with all laws.

We're not making any contention that somehow there are laws that we are exempt from complying with in our certification proceeding.

Secondly, this Commission adopted Condition 43. Condition 43 says that we have to abide by the Graves Reparation Act, the Repatriation Act. We have to abide by the National Historic Act. We have to follow the unanticipated discoveries provisions that are contained in all of the support documents. None of that has

changed.

2.3

In our Tracking Table we said we will comply with all of those things. They are all future reaching, and it is absolutely our intention to comply with all of those things.

So the issue of are there new or different or are there land rights that the Tribes may advance in this hearing is well beyond the issue of certification. If there are legal rights to land interests that TransCanada has not dealt with, that the Tribes can advance -- this is not the forum for that. The forum for that is in Federal or State Court. It's in Federal Court by statute.

Let me give you an example. This is a 2009 federal decision. The caption is Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Yankton Sioux Tribe, et cetera, vs. the United States of America and TransCanada Keystone Pipeline LP. Decided by Judge Kornmann, U.S. District Court Judge in Aberdeen over the first Keystone Pipeline.

Here's what Judge Kornmann said. "It is critical to note that the proposed project," that is the base Keystone Pipeline, "the proposed project at no point crosses the boundaries of any present-day reservations in South Dakota. The proposed pipeline, although running in part through lands previously seated to the

1 United States, will be located exclusively on land that 2 was restored to the public domain."

2.3

Then Judge Kornmann cites all the famous U.S.

Supreme Court cases. Then he concludes by saying "When the Tribes seated the land in question back to the United States it lost the right of absolute use and occupation of the lands conveyed and, therefore, the Tribe no longer has the incidental power to regulate the use of the lands by non-Indians."

And he concludes by citing South Dakota vs.

Borland, U.S. Supreme Court case involving Cheyenne River and the Oahe Reservoir that I spoke to this morning.

The plain facts are if there is a forum for the Tribes to challenge the right of the Keystone project to negotiate with a landowner and acquire an easement to cross his property, if the Tribes claim that they have an unprotected property right in that property, this is not the place to assert that. The place to assert that is in State or Federal Court.

Nothing has changed with Condition 1 or Condition 43. We fully intend to comply with those. So there's no issue to try here about those.

What would the Tribes have? Would the Tribes come in and offer testimony about funerary issues, about cultural heritage issues? That's the essence of what

they're talking about. And would the Tribes then say that somehow the Findings made in the 2010 hearing that they say this morning cannot be amended, would they then say that those Findings should be amended?

2.3

Should there be new Findings made, Findings to the end, that what happened in 2010 in the process that this Commission followed was not appropriate?

Certainly not. That's not their intention. What is their intention?

Plain facts are, these issues are dealt with in Condition 1 and Condition 43. If there is some violation going forward, there's a forum for dealing with that violation going forward. They can come back here, and they can ask you to suspend the permit. They can go to court as they did in 2009 and attempt to adjoin the construction of the project.

A couple of points raised by Mr. Capossela in his interesting and animated explanation. I waited for you to give him the Miranda Warning with respect to stealing the map. But I guess he said he appropriated it.

Water rights. Water rights. He speaks about water rights. There is a federal doctrine that has to do with tribal water rights called the Winters Doctrine.

The Winters Doctrine, the genesis of it is in a U.S.

Supreme Court case in 1909 or '6 called the Winters case, and it says that the Tribes do have water rights.

2.3

The Tribe's water rights are different from the notion of water rights as we know them in South Dakota. But if the Tribe wants to assert that the taking of water from one of the tributaries of the Missouri River for proof testing the integrity of the pipeline is an invasion of their water rights, they have every right to do that before the Water Management Board in the State of South Dakota.

Or if they think that their water rights are not regulated or protected or subject to the jurisdiction of the Water Management Board, of which I've appeared dozens of times, then they can go to court and seek to protect their rights either in the Federal or State Court system, whichever is their choice.

The Millelacs case -- the Millelacs case cited by Mr. Blackburn makes my point precisely. The Millelacs case arose out of a long debate over fishing rights on Millelacs in Minnesota. And the U.S. Supreme Court carefully studied the treaty that the Chippewa signed that seated their territory around Millelacs to determine if in that session they gave up the right to fish on the lake and if they were subject to regulation by the state.

They examined the treaty. And that's what goes on in the Federal Court systems. Careful examination is made of the treaties to determine what they meant.

2.3

2.4

The case that Yankton Sioux doesn't like in the Indian Claims Commission was a case sued out for that very purpose, to determine what was the aboriginal territory of the Yankton Sioux Tribe. And the Indian Claims Commission determined it was all east of the Missouri River, that it started at a point down here that's now called North Bend just south here on Highway 34 that ran up through Highmore and then down to Sioux River and back to the Missouri and back up here.

I didn't make those decisions. Those decisions were made by the Indian Court of Claims -- I'm sorry. The Indian Claims Commission.

The Bad Man clause that Mr. Dorr refers to has absolutely no application. Has absolutely no application. The Elk case that he talks about is a case that -- the treaty says that the U.S. Government will give reparations for the acts of the bad men within the scope of the reservation.

The plain facts are this Commission protected what Indian tribal rights there are, if there are any, in Condition 1 and Condition 43. And Keystone makes no contention that anything has happened in the intervening

five years that changed those conditions.

2.3

2.4

If the Tribes felt that the 2010 Decision somehow was an abrogation of their rights or an invasion of their rights, the Federal Courthouse is down the street and it's been there all five years since the 2010 decision was made and no one was taken any action to do anything.

We think it is entirely appropriate that the issue of tribal land rights whether you characterize them as aboriginal title, whether you characterize them as aboriginal territory -- and I know the distinctions between aboriginal title and aboriginal territory.

I've practiced law in the state for 43 years.

When I was a second year law student I was hired by

Professor Lehman in the summer of my second year. A

grant that he received from the Indian Claims -- from the

Department of the Interior to research Indian

jurisdiction. I've been doing this for 43 years. I

understand those distinctions.

Those distinctions do not belong here. They belong in the Federal Court system. If there are any issues to be taken up, they should not be heard and should not be argued here.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Questions from the Commission.

1 Hearing no questions, are there motions? 2 I will move in HP14-001 in the matter of 3 Keystone's Motion to Preclude Consideration of Aboriginal 4 Title or Usufructuary Rights that we grant the motion. 5 Discussion on the motion to grant. 6 Let me say first to Mr. Capossela, I greatly appreciated your presentation. I learned some history 7 8 that I probably should have learned a long time ago, and I appreciate that greatly. 10 But having said that, I think Mr. Taylor is 11 absolutely right. If there are any of these kind of 12 issues that linger around what we are doing, Federal 13 Court is the place for those and not in front of the 14 Public Utilities Commission and, hence, my motion to 15 grant. 16 Other discussion on the motion. 17 Hearing none, all those in favor will --18 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes, Commissioner Hanson. 19 20 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I fully 21 I was pausing to see whether or not Commissioner 22 Fiegen wished to say something. 2.3 I fully agree that it is totally appropriate 24 that any concern regarding these issues should be held in

25

Federal Court.

1 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 2 Additional discussion? 3 Hearing none, all those in favor will vote aye. 4 Those opposed, nay. 5 Commissioner Hanson. 6 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 7 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen. 8 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. 10 Motion carries. 11 That brings us to the last motion of the day. 12 This is Keystone's Motion to Preclude Testimony Regarding 13 Mni Wiconi Pipeline Easements. 14 Keystone. 15 Thank you, Commissioners. MR. TAYLOR: 16 Early in these proceedings Mr. Dorr advanced the 17 argument that Keystone needed the permission of the 18 Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System in order to 19 effectuate crossings of the Mni Wiconi Pipelines. 20 Brief I told you the history of Mni Wiconi enacted by 21 Congress. 22 The land that underlies the Mni Wiconi where the 2.3 easements are for the pipelines is held in trust by the 24 United States. The statute that created the Mni Wiconi 25 Pipeline directed that the pipelines be held in trust,

the land.

2.3

The Keystone Pipeline crosses the Mni Wiconi in two places; once in Haakon County in the Hostutler property and again in Jones County on the Dahlke-Mann property.

The United States obtained an easement from Hostutler and obtained an easement from Dahlke-Mann to construct the pipelines. The easements are nonexclusive.

The law of South Dakota says that a nonexclusive easement, a junior easement holder or the landowner can make use of the easement property so long as the use he makes is not disruptive of the senior easement holder.

Keystone acquired easements from both landowners. Keystone immediately began discussions with the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation is the designee of the Government of the United States to manage the trust responsibility for the Mni Wiconi Pipeline.

The Bureau of Reclamation in the course of those discussions establish criteria that govern the crossing, engineering criteria, engineering criteria that were discussed and negotiated at length with Keystone and were discussed and negotiated at length with the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System and its consulting engineers.

The Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System, which is a political subdivision of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, refused to meet with and discuss the crossings with Keystone.

2.3

The reason they refused is is because in 2010 the Oglala Sioux Tribe adopted a resolution prohibiting discussions between the water system and the Keystone Pipeline. So the BOR was the intermediary.

The BOR concluded those discussions, arrived at engineering standards for the crossing, and sent those engineering standards to the Department of State and said to the Department of State when you make your record of decision on the efficacy of the Keystone Pipeline and, in effect, the record decision on the Presidential Permit we request that you require that the crossing be accomplished according to these criteria and engineering standards.

In my eye it is absolutely no different than

Keystone negotiating with a private landowner to

effectuate a crossing of a water line that a private land

owned, a tile line that a private landowner owned, a road

that a private landowner owned.

When resolution is made between the landowner and Keystone and everybody is satisfied it's not your business. It's the business of the landowner and the

business of the pipeline company. And that is exactly and precisely what happened in this case.

The fact that the land -- the fact that the easements are held in trust for the Tribes does not change the character of the ownership.

The Tribes are not without remedy. If the Tribes believe that the Bureau of Reclamation abused its trust responsibility, the laws of the United States, the Indian Tucker Act and the Administrative Procedures Act provide a remedy for them.

They can sue for damages, sue for injunction, but they have no voice before the Public Utilities

Commission to regulate those two crossings, and it is not an issue before the Public Utilities Commission whether or not Keystone was required to obtain the permission of the Tribes.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Dorr.

MR. DORR: Gary Dorr.

Mr. Taylor made reference to the fact that

Keystone was negotiating with Oglala Sioux Rural Water

Supply System. That in itself speaks volumes. That's

what was supposed to be happening.

The Tribes asked for TransCanada to do -- say this is your pipeline going left to right and Keystone's

going to come through down the center. The Tribes asked for a workaround on each side of the water line so that if there was a break underneath the water line, that the water could be routed around it to prevent that from stopping water service.

2.3

TransCanada politely refused to do that. So that's not in negotiation. There was no compromise ever reached. So there are various and multiple reasons for why negotiations broke down between TransCanada and Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System is a political entity, but it is also the name of this system as noted in Public Law 100-516. It's a system.

Could I grab something real quick?

Public Law 100-516 states that the system started at Ft. Pierre at the intake from the river behind the dam and goes to the reservation. It doesn't magically change into nontribal water and then go back into tribal water along the way.

The system -- if you will look at the part of my discovery and part of my testimony, I submitted those easements from the United States. The easement language states that the Oglala Sioux Rural Water System will supply water to the West River Lyman Jones system.

This is not West River Lyman Jones property.

This is the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System. And we call it the Mni Wiconi. It was called the Mni Wiconi Water Project, but the lines that go to the reservation are called the Oglala Sioux Rural Water System. So the system starts at the intake, and they go all the way to the reservation.

2.3

This system serves 90,475 Indians on the four reservations where this water goes to. Those are citizens of the State of South Dakota. They deserve to know that the easement process that's going on here is within the bounds of legal -- other regulations.

Okay. And the system is -- this is a unique system for this area. It's held in trust. The system is held in trust. The land isn't necessarily held in trust. And that's what he's talking about. We don't dispute that.

But it hasn't been studied yet either. In the Public Law 100-516 they did not dispute the fact that it could be called non-Indian Country, but they didn't say that it was going to be called non-Indian country, the land underneath where the pipeline is at. That question has never been solved.

But we know for now that the system is held in trust. So the pipe system consists of your PVC or your steel pipe, your cathode protection system which is

underneath the pipe to prevent the pipe from rusting on the steel pipe. And it also is going to include the engineering of the bed that is decompacted where the pipeline lays.

2.3

And this pipeline lays in clay. That's why it's important for -- that's why the considerations went into the negotiations. Because the Tribes did not want the water line disturbed.

If there's a leak, then the clay and the oil and the liquids that are in the Keystone Pipeline can expand that clay and can ruin the water line system. That's why the consideration for the easement and the permission is key.

Now this is part of the FEIS in 2010, and this is part of the FSEIS in 2013. Mr. Taylor has said that the -- that Keystone has negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation and come to an agreement on what the crossing will be on the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

In 2010 the report put out by the Bureau of Reclamation on the crossing criteria stated you have to have the permission -- let's see here. 2010.
"TransCanada shall receive Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System and the Reclamation's review and approval of crossing specifications and drawings prior to starting work."

In 2013 someone got to the documents. Someone changed it, and that was taken out. But what was left in here was a paragraph, Interruption of service during Keystone XL construction. TransCanada shall make provisions acceptable to Reclamation and Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System for any activity conducted by TransCanada that causes water service in the OSRWS Core system pipeline to be interrupted during construction.

2.3

Whoever changed this still didn't take out the fact that the permission is needed from the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System. That system includes four Tribes: The Cheyenne River Sioux, Lower Brule, Rosebud, and the Oglala Tribes. They are all part of the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

The fact that this is part of this is not a -this is not yet a Federal Court issue. This is again
making sure that TransCanada follows through with the
conditions that have been set forth. This was never
contested before today. It's a part of the record. This
is what Bureau of Reclamation stated are its standards
for crossing the pipelines, the water pipelines.

The fact that we're going to Federal Court or whatever, that doesn't matter. What happens right now, this is what's on the record. And TransCanada is saying they got permission. They have an agreement.

It's not an agreement. This is what their criteria is, and the criteria is they still have to consult and get permission from the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

2.3

2.4

Another thing that's notable is in this report they provided maps, the Bureau of Reclamation. And one of these maps shows that it's Oglala Sioux Tribe. It labels it as OST. It's not on this. I don't have it with me. The printer wouldn't print right. But these are held in trust for the Tribes.

Now when you say that we don't own the land on the reservation, I don't think you would say that. We own land on the reservations, but it's held in trust. We are the beneficiary title holders to that land. We are the beneficiary title holders to the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

It's the same thing in this case where we don't necessarily own it, but it's held in trust for us. We have a beneficiary interest in that. As a beneficiary interest holder in this pipeline it is incumbent upon this Commission to make sure that every avenue is being pursued to make sure that the easements are being done properly.

There are 90,475 Indians who get their water, their sole source of clean drinking water, from this

pipeline. This easement is extremely important, the process to make sure the easement was done properly. And the Bureau of Reclamation has made that case here, that the permission is needed from the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System.

2.3

I don't know how much more simple I can break this down. And so that's basically what I have to say about it, and I hope that you will consider the fact that if this is -- if it's correct, if Keystone has done everything correct, then that will come out in the hearings. And I don't think anybody's going to be prejudiced by having it included as part of the hearings.

If, however, this is not included and there are going to be people who are prejudiced because, as I have stated before, when the water lines -- actually the core pipeline goes through and then you have a distribution or a branch line, as Mr. Taylor and I were going back and forth about, where that stops, now you start with a private line half a mile out to your cattle tank. And that's why I asked for every single easement agreement for every crossing of every water line.

Mr. Taylor has given me two for the core lines.

He has a -- an agreement with West River Lyman Jones for crossing their distribution lines. But I know for a fact

that he is crossing private lines to cattle tanks. One
of them is an Intervenor in this process. That's why I
asked for that to be part of the discovery. That's what
I'd like to bring out in this process hopefully.

So I hope that you'll take this into consideration. And the fact that all of these issues, all of these lead to the fact that if we can verify that it's done in an ethical manner, objective manner, by the letter of the law, then I think that's what we need to do.

But to deny us the fact to be able to question that I think would prejudice those 90,475 people who receive water from these two sources of water pipeline.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

I'm going to go to the telephones. Are there any of the Intervenors that need to add anything to this matter that are on the telephone?

Not hearing a response there. We'll go to the meeting room.

Mr. Rappold, do you want to add something?

MR. RAPPOLD: Yes, sir.

I kind of got used to raising my hand a long time ago. Matt Rappold on behalf of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe.

We support Mr. Dorr in his opposition to

2.3

2.4

TransCanada's Motion to Exclude any Testimony or Evidence as it relates to the Mni Wiconi Pipeline and any rights or obligations that they may have that attaches to that.

2.3

What I'd like to say at this point is any federal undertaking that has the possibility to impact tribal rights requires government-to-government consultation. As has been discussed and I think is understood and generally agreed upon by everyone in the room, the Mni Wiconi system is placed in trust.

The Secretary of the Interior is the person and/or individual and agency that's responsible for carrying out those duties that attach because of the trust relationship.

On the ground, so to speak, the Bureau of Indian Affairs handles those activities on a regular basis as far as the trust responsibilities that the Federal Government has.

So this is an undertaking, as I think we all agree, that may affect tribal rights. It would trigger government-to-government consultation.

Now we've got Interrogatories that indicate that Keystone's had absolutely no communication with the Bureau of Indian Affairs regarding the operation and construction of the pipeline.

We're not saying that Keystone is responsible

for government-to-government consultations. Obviously they're not a government. But government-to-government consultations have not taken place on whether or not Keystone can properly cross the Mni Wiconi Pipeline.

Interrogatories indicate that there's been no communication with the BIA about this project. Had the government-to-government consultations taken place,

Keystone would have been at the very least informed of those consultations and the discussions that were taking place regarding what they want to do.

And we can draw that conclusion that they would have at least been informed because they're the ones that want to build the pipeline. They're the ones that are taking the action that could affect the tribal rights. For that purpose we believe that it is relevant -- a discussion of this issue is relevant evidence to help the Commission determine whether or not Keystone has complied and maintains the ability to continue to apply with all applicable rules and laws in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Any others in the hearing room?

Mr. Capossela.

MR. CAPOSSELA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Briefly.

2.3

The contention that there's no difference between the crossing of the Mni Wiconi Pipeline to say an individual pipeline to a rural home site or a pasture tap, strange credulity.

We have three South Dakota Tribes. And we talk about property rights as being a bundle of sticks.

Sometimes you own the whole bundle, and it's your home.

And sometimes you just have a couple of sticks, and you might have an easement -- a driveway across your neighbor's property or the like.

Here we have three South Dakota Tribes that have sticks in the bundle. We have the United States also having sticks in the bundle. That's why the BOR criteria are part of the record in the first place. So this is considerably a different situation than a garden variety crossing and easement by a landowner. This is quite different.

The motion seems to be a little superfluous. I know that TransCanada has the right to file the motion.

But it's really unclear what governmental interest on the state -- on the part of the State is advanced by excluding consideration of potential impact of the recertification on the Mni Wiconi Project. Especially in the fact that so many Indians are served by the project,

as well as non-Indian people.

2.3

2.4

And the background of Mni Wiconi did not include the Tribes. And residents, communities, and livestock operators in western South Dakota for years have been trying to get federal assistance for rural water development because of the poor ground water quality in several of those counties.

And because of the costs involved and the comparatively -- these very rural areas, comparatively small population in the communities, the high cost and the small number of folks served, Congress refused to approve it until the idea came up by Senator Daschle to include the reservations in the project.

So the Tribe's participation helped get the project approved in the first instance. So I think their role in this should really be respected.

And something that happened to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe earlier in the week is the Oglala Sioux Tribe reached out and asked if we would -- if I today would ask the Commission to briefly hear a statement from a utilities director from the Oglala Sioux Tribe. And a gentleman named Robert Pille is here this morning and with your indulgence would like to make a brief statement.

And so on behalf of the Standing Rock Sioux

```
1
     Tribe, I'm making that request, which was first forwarded
 2
     by the Oglalas.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: You know, I'm going to grant a
 3
 4
     little bit of leeway if you promise me it's a brief
 5
     statement.
 6
              MR. CAPOSSELA: I am going to give him such a
7
     dirty look when he comes up to make sure he's brief,
8
     accordingly.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you. Go ahead.
10
              MR. CAPOSSELA: I'll introduce Mr. Robert Pille
11
     of the Oglala Sioux Tribe.
12
              MR. TAYLOR: I just want the record to note an
13
     objection --
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Let's get it on the recording,
15
     Mr. Taylor.
              MR. TAYLOR:
16
                          The Rules of Civil Procedure don't
17
     allow for this. I understand your leniency but I'm
18
     obligated to make an objection and I'll just make an
19
     objection for the record.
20
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Thank you.
21
              MR. PILLE:
                          Thank you, Commission, for the
22
     opportunity to speak here. My name is Robert Pille.
                                                            I'm
2.3
     a member of the Oglala Sioux Tribe. I'm also a
24
     representative of our utilities. My Tribe is the owner
25
     and operate of the Mni Wiconi Pipeline. The Oglala Sioux
```

Tribe needs our voice of concern added to these matters.

Besides what was stated, our election process was going on during the time of intervention last October. This is why we're not able to be listed as Intervenors. Please don't mistake our lack of participation as a reduced concern for these issues.

If I understand correctly, DOR and TransCanada have yet to get approval from the Oglala Sioux Tribe for those crossings. The crossings of the Mni Wiconi specifications or the criteria has not been approved by the Tribe. Our tribal departments are yet to determine whether their requirements are acceptable and adequate.

This evidence is very relevant as this water line serves tribal and nontribal members throughout western South Dakota and the future reaches of the Mni Wiconi Pipeline as well. We need this information permitted.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. And I appreciate your brevity of the statement.

Thank you.

2.3

2.4

Any other Intervenors that need to weigh in on this that are in the room?

If not, staff.

MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Kristen Edwards for

staff.

2.3

Staff did not take a position on this motion.

Staff is unsure what relief the Commission could provide based upon the testimony submitted by Mr. Dorr other than what Keystone's already really required to do by the conditions, but beyond that we don't take a position.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Taylor, rebuttal.

MR. TAYLOR: You know, Mr. Dorr kind of moves the ball a little bit in the course of his -- moved the target a little bit in the course of his discussions and his briefing.

My initial motion was aimed at the idea that there doesn't need to be any litigation before this Commission over whether or not the permission of the Oglala Sioux Tribe is required to make the two crossings of the Mni Wiconi Pipeline. And that's the argument I've advanced from the beginning.

There is no legal obligation on the part of TransCanada to obtain the permission of the Oglala Sioux Tribe or the Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System. And that's what I think this discussion is about, or at least what I intended it to be about.

There's no question that the Mni Wiconi Project is a fascinating exercise of Congressional discretion led

by Senator Tim Johnson who was a year behind me in law school and been my friend most of my life.

2.3

2.4

Congress established the water system that serves three Tribes and about one-third of the population of western South Dakota north of the Interstate and some piece of the population of western South Dakota south of the Interstate.

In a three-cornered -- I guess a five-cornered partnership between three Tribes, the Government of the United States, and the Lyman Jones Rural Water System, which is a classical independent rural water system just like every other water system in South Dakota, we, Keystone, has successfully negotiated an agreement with the Lyman Jones Rural Water System to cross all of their distribution lines. The contract is -- can be made of record if that's necessary.

The Department of the Interior in April of 2013 writing to Genevieve Walker in the U.S. Department of State -- this is an exhibit to my Supplemental Affidavit -- says Reclamation will issue TransCanada a letter of acknowledgment of the easement crossing, including the crossing criteria as terms and conditions.

The reason that the Bureau of Reclamation will do that is because the Bureau of Reclamation for all practical purposes is the owner of these crossings as the

trustee holding the crossings in trust responsibility for the Tribes.

2.3

2.4

It starts there, and it stops there. Now is there some distinction that was made between the original EIS and the FEIS?

The distinction is in the EIS it said something about the Oglala Sioux Tribe must be consulted and consent. There are the stack of resolutions that the Oglala Sioux Tribe passed opposed to the Keystone Pipeline.

I know about this stuff. I was the Keystone representative. Mr. Moore and I and Lou Thompson were the representatives who met with all the Tribes in 2010 in Rapid City for a lengthy meeting among which water issues were discussed. I must not have been very successful in that meeting because shortly afterwards each one of the Tribes adopted a resolution opposed to the Keystone Pipeline.

Because of the first nations policy of
TransCanada, out of respect for the Tribes when the
resolutions were adopted TransCanada ended the efforts to
negotiate, discuss, meet with, or otherwise accommodate
the Tribes. Not out of spite. Out of respect.

So that happens in 2011. 2013 the additional -- the Supplemental EIS is filed, and as Mr. Dorr points

out, it no longer contains that line. Obviously it could not contain that line because the Tribes refused to speak to Keystone. I could give you these resolutions. Some of them are relatively vehement.

2.3

2.4

So here we are. We have done everything that's required to be done. We have spoken to the Bureau of Reclamation. We've resolved crossing criteria. I know as a matter of absolute fact that the Bureau of Reclamation discussed the crossing criteria with the Oglala Sioux Rural Water System's engineering firm in Rapid City. I saw some of the correspondence.

The proposal that came to the Keystone Pipeline to build these two workarounds, two additional pipelines to supplement the Mni Wiconi lines, didn't come from the Oglala Sioux Tribe. I was the representative of Keystone. It came to me from the Bureau of Reclamation. Did not come from the Tribes.

I engaged Keystone's appropriate authorities after that, and we came to the conclusion that it was not the workable resolution.

Now there's no mystery in one utility crossing another. There is no -- nothing unusual about an oil pipeline crossing a water line.

Commissioner Hanson remembers the discussions in the 2009 hearing, and those of us who were around in 2007

when the base Keystone Pipeline was heard before this
Commission remember Curt Hohn who was at that time the
president and chief operating officer of -- help me,
John. I can't remember.

MR. SMITH: WEB.

2.3

2.4

MR. TAYLOR: WEB. We all are aware of the fact that the South Dakota State University undertook a big study and extensive study on how crossing should be effectuated and the influence of plastic pipe. None of this is mysterious, and this crossing criteria meets all of its requirements. It's simply not a matter at issue for the Commission.

And the matter that's not in issue is is the Oglala Sioux Tribe's permission required. That's all we're interested in.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.

Questions from the Commission.

Mr. Taylor, one question for you. I went through I imagine it was the attachments perhaps to your Affidavit.

Do I understand correctly that where you're proposing to cross these main water lines that the -- you're going to use more robust pipe where those crossings are?

MR. TAYLOR: I know that the one in Jones County

```
1
     will be an HGD. It goes underneath old Highway 16,
2
     starts on the Iverson property, underneath old 16 into
     the Dahlke-Mann property underneath the pipeline,
 3
 4
    Mni Wiconi, out on the other side. I can't remember if
    it contains the heavier duty pipe or not.
 6
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. That's what I thought I
7
     read. And I didn't realize that was going to be part of
8
     it. We'll probably talk about it when we get together in
     July.
10
              MR. TAYLOR: If that's what you said and it's in
11
    my Affidavit, it's accurate. I just can't simply
12
     confirm.
13
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Any other questions for
14
    Mr. Taylor?
15
              If not, I've got a couple of questions for
16
    Mr. Dorr. Gary, if you'd come back up.
              Am I understanding you correctly that you
17
18
    believe that the Oglala Sioux Water System has absolute
19
    veto authority over the Keystone project if it's going to
20
     cross their water system? Is that correct?
21
              MR. DORR: I don't think -- I'm not prepared to
```

I talked to the Great Plains Regional Director

it's Oglala Rural Water Supply System and Bureau of

say whether it's veto authority. Because it's both --

22

2.3

2.4

Reclamation.

in North Dakota, and I asked him, I said, have you 2 provided permission for TransCanada to cross the Mni Wiconi water line? And he said We can't. That's not our 3 4 place. That's up to the Department of State. He said 5 physically I cannot -- I cannot give permission for them 6 to do it. 7 I said So it's legal? They can just go through 8 it? He said No. It's not legal. I'm not saying that. He said It's up to the Federal Government to make that 10 decision. From his part. Now for the Tribe's part, 11 Oglala Sioux Rural Water Supply System and the Bureau of Reclamation have to provide permission. 12 13 CHAIRMAN NELSON: So then if Oglala Sioux Water 14 System does not provide permission, they veto the 15 project. 16 Is that what you're saying? 17 MR. DORR: I guess for all intents and purposes, 18 that would probably be it. 19 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Second question I've got, did 20 I understand correctly that you said it is an open 21 question as to whether or not the land underneath the 22 pipeline is or is not now Indian Country? 2.3 MR. DORR: Yeah. I guess that was a 24 misstatement on my part.

CHAIRMAN NELSON:

Do you think that statement

25

```
1
     would be a surprise to the fee landowners that own that
2
     property?
                              I'm talking about the right of
 3
              MR. DORR:
                        No.
 4
     way, the actual right of way. Not just under the pipe
     but. --
5
 6
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes.
7
              MR. DORR: That has not been decided.
8
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Do you think that would be a
     surprise to the landowners that own the land?
10
              MR. DORR: It would. But the United States
11
     still has not resolved that question. It's still up in
12
     the air. They made a point of saying that in the law,
13
     Public Law 100-516.
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: No further questions.
15
              Any further questions?
16
              Gary, thank you.
17
              Motions.
18
              I will move in HP14-001 that we grant Keystone's
19
     Motion to Preclude Testimony Regarding Mni Wiconi
     Pipeline Easements.
20
              Discussion on the motion.
21
22
              I guess in my mind it's pretty simple.
2.3
     easements are property rights, and if there's an issue
24
     with a property right, I think the court system is where
25
     that needs to be resolved. Not in front of the
```

```
Commission. To me it's that simple.
 1
 2
              Other discussion.
              Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion
 3
 4
     to grant will say aye. Those opposed, nay.
 5
              Commissioner Hanson.
 6
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                     Aye.
 7
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
 8
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye.
10
              Motion carries.
11
              I believe that brings us to the end of the
12
     business we have at hand today.
13
               (The proceeding concluded at 1:03 p.m.)
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 11th day of June,
11	2015, and that the attached is a true and correct
12	transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 26th day of
14	June, 2015.
15	
16	
17	
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler,
19	Notary Public and Registered Professional Reporter
20	Certified Realtime Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•	<b>195.260</b> [2] - 22:11,	4	9	<b>abstract</b> [1] - 43:14 1
	22:19	_	-	<b>absurd</b> [1] - 30:1
1 <b>. . . . . . . . . .</b>	<b>195.402</b> [1] - 30:16	4 045 400		abused [2] - 88:23,
<b>'51</b> [1] - 78:25	<b>195.452</b> [1] - 30:16	<b>4</b> [2] - 6:15, 18:9	<b>9</b> <sub>[1]</sub> - 29:5	101:7
<b>'60s</b> [1] - 51:7	<b>1950s</b> [1] - 58:8	<b>4,000</b> [1] - 56:15	<b>90,475</b> [3] - 103:7,	accept [2] - 58:25,
	<b>1955</b> [2] - 51:1, 51:5	<b>413</b> [1] - 2:3	106:24, 108:12	64:22
0	<b>1960s</b> [1] - 59:2	<b>43</b> [7] - 90:20, 90:21,	<b>95</b> [1] - 20:16	acceptable [2] -
	<b>1965</b> [1] - 77:2	92:21, 93:11, 95:24,	<b>97</b> [1] - 27:8	105:5, 114:12
<b>0.465</b> [1] - 33:9	<b>1970</b> [1] - 77:15	96:13, 96:18		accepting [1] - 3:3
<b>09-001</b> [1] - 4:8	<b>1974</b> [1] - 77:25	<b>49</b> [7] - 22:9, 22:11,	Α	<b>ACCEPTING</b> [1] - 1:5
09-001 [1] - 4.0	<b>1980</b> [1] - 64:20	22:17, 22:19, 30:14,		access [1] - 32:12
1	<b>1999</b> [1] - 83:4	30:16, 33:13	<b>Aberdeen</b> [1] - 91:19	accidental [2] - 24:16,
ı	<b>19th</b> [1] - 61:5	<b>49-41B</b> [1] - 13:24	abide [2] - 90:21,	26:1
	<b>1:03</b> [1] - 123:13	<b>49-41B-22</b> [5] - 6:11,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	accommodate [1] -
<b>1</b> [9] - 14:14, 21:7,		6:15, 28:25, 29:2,	90:22	117:22
22:9, 82:22, 90:16,	2	41:21	ability [27] - 15:16,	accommodated [1] -
92:20, 93:11, 95:24		<b>49-41B-22(4</b> [1] - 7:6	16:4, 17:8, 17:14,	84:7
<b>1,048</b> [1] - 73:12		49-41B-22(4) [1] - 7:1	19:13, 19:14, 19:15,	accomplished [2] -
<b>1,307</b> [1] - 33:11	<b>2</b> [5] - 18:7, 22:5, 22:6,	<b>49-41B-27</b> [3] - 4:10,	20:2, 20:5, 23:2,	84:16, 100:16
<b>10</b> [1] - 26:7	22:9, 22:11	10:25, 41:19	23:5, 23:14, 25:5,	accordance [2] -
<b>100</b> [2] - 53:8, 74:19	<b>20,000</b> [1] - 34:14	<b>49-41B-36</b> [4] - 80:12,	27:1, 27:2, 27:5,	22:18, 33:12
<b>100-516</b> [4] - 102:13,	<b>200</b> [3] - 24:18, 25:1,	80:20, 81:14, 81:15	27:6, 29:8, 29:19,	according [1] - 100:16
102:15, 103:18,	36:23		29:21, 30:6, 31:21,	accordingly [1] -
122:13, 103:10,	<b>2007</b> [1] - 118:25	5	41:15, 42:23, 46:8,	113:8
<b>101</b> [1] - 26:23	<b>2009</b> [4] - 88:21,		62:21, 110:18	account [2] - 76:2,
<b>102</b> [1] - 27:12	91:14, 93:15, 118:25		<b>able</b> [8] - 15:16, 17:11,	82:8
<b>1047</b> [1] - 73:12	<b>2010</b> [13] - 4:3, 7:20,	<b>5</b> [5] - 18:17, 20:7,	33:18, 36:5, 85:9,	accurate [3] - 10:20,
<b>104</b> 7 [1] - 73.12 <b>107</b> [2] - 28:1, 28:23	48:19, 49:2, 93:2,	20:8, 20:17, 28:24	86:22, 108:11, 114:4	42:10, 120:11
• • •	93:6, 96:2, 96:5,	<b>50</b> [2] - 5:14, 77:5	<b>aboriginal</b> [57] - 50:2,	accurately [3] - 57:7,
<b>108</b> [1] - 64:21	100:5, 104:14,	<b>500</b> [1] - 2:3	50:21, 50:25, 51:2,	57:23, 60:22
<b>11</b> [1] - 1:9	104:19, 104:21,	500-kilovolt [1] -	51:8, 52:24, 54:11,	
<b>113</b> [3] - 6:6, 6:9,	117:13	80:16	54:20, 55:18, 57:10,	acknowledged [1] - 82:6
28:23	<b>2011</b> [1] - 117:24	<b>57</b> [3] - 21:14, 22:2,	57:25, 59:22, 60:11,	
<b>114</b> [2] - 6:6, 7:2	<b>2013</b> [4] - 104:15,	22:5	60:23, 61:4, 61:9,	acknowledgment [1] -
<b>115</b> [3] - 4:4, 80:13,	105:1, 116:17,	<b>59</b> [8] - 14:5, 14:12,	61:12, 61:16, 63:11,	116:21
80:18	117:24	14:17, 19:20, 19:23,	63:14, 63:21, 64:1,	acquire [1] - 92:15
<b>11th</b> [2] - 2:4, 124:10	<b>2014</b> [1] - 5:13	21:14, 22:6, 35:19	65:3, 65:15, 65:17,	acquired [1] - 99:14
<b>15</b> [1] - 89:12	<b>2015</b> [6] - 1:9, 2:4,	<b>5L</b> [1] - 33:8	65:19, 65:21, 65:23,	acquisition [1] - 67:15
<b>16</b> [3] - 30:8, 120:1,	7:21, 74:7, 124:11,		65:25, 66:3, 67:1,	acres [1] - 77:5
120:2	124:14	6	67:7, 67:10, 67:17,	act [5] - 70:22, 70:24,
<b>17</b> [1] - 5:13	<b>25</b> [1] - 80:2		67:22, 68:7, 70:2,	78:22, 90:22
<b>1848</b> [1] - 76:21	<b>26</b> [1] - 74:7		70:6, 70:10, 70:12,	Act [17] - 13:22, 14:3,
<b>1850s</b> [1] - 51:7	<b>26th</b> [1] - 124:13	<b>6</b> [3] - 18:19, 28:25,	71:2, 71:5, 71:7,	14:12, 15:22, 15:24,
<b>1851</b> [12] - 52:6, 52:9,	<b>26</b> (1) - 124.13 <b>29</b> [1] - 88:21	94:1	72:18, 75:5, 76:7,	16:1, 16:6, 21:9,
52:11, 63:24, 64:7,	<b>2d</b> [1] - 73:12	<b>635</b> [1] - 89:12	78:13, 85:5, 85:20,	51:23, 53:15, 56:11,
65:22, 77:1, 77:4,	<b>2u</b> [1] - 13.12		87:17, 90:11, 95:6,	70:20, 90:23, 101:9
77:11, 77:14, 77:23,		7	96:10, 96:11, 96:12,	action [12] - 14:23,
78:9	3		97:3	15:24, 16:11, 17:2,
<b>1868</b> [7] - 52:6, 52:11,		7 (4) 28:25	above-entitled [2] -	52:6, 54:7, 63:13,
61:23, 64:8, 88:25,	<b>3</b> [11] - 18:8, 19:17,	<b>7</b> [1] - 28:25	2:2, 124:10	74:2, 80:23, 83:13,
89:2, 89:12	21:11, 22:9, 22:12,	<b>70</b> [1] - 64:25	abrogated [3] - 74:18,	96:6, 110:14
<b>1877</b> [2] - 64:13, 64:23	22:14, 23:6, 24:13,	<b>702</b> [1] - 16:19	79:5, 84:10	<b>Action</b> [4] - 9:3, 35:11,
<b>1889</b> [1] - 64:15	30:18, 30:19	<b>74</b> [1] - 76:25	abrogation [3] -	48:15, 84:24
<b>19-5-2</b> [1] - 16:18	<b>32</b> [7] - 20:5, 21:23,		54:23, 57:25, 96:3	actions [5] - 4:20,
<b>1909</b> [1] - 94:1	22:12, 22:24, 23:3,	8	absolute [3] - 92:6,	40:5, 40:10, 52:17,
<b>194</b> [1] - 30:16	43:4, 43:11		118:8, 120:18	52:18
<b>194.105</b> [4] - 22:9,	<b>34</b> [2] - 30:13, 95:11	<b>8</b> [2] - 29:1, 32:25	absolutely [8] - 31:1,	activities [1] - 109:15
22:17, 23:20, 24:4	<b>36</b> [1] - 30:15	<b>83</b> [1] - 73:12	46:1, 91:4, 95:17,	activity [2] - 84:5,
<b>195</b> [2] - 26:23, 30:14		00 [1] - 10.12	97:11, 100:18,	105:6
<b>195.106</b> [1] - 33:13	<b>36-inch</b> [1] - 24:25		109:22	acts [5] - 52:12, 53:9,
			absolve [1] - 72:4	78:20, 79:6, 95:20
	1	1	1	1

actual [3] - 22:2, 50:8, 122:4 add [11] - 9:1, 32:4, 34:20, 39:1, 40:2, 40:15, 75:10, 82:11, 87:2, 108:16, 108:20 added [4] - 8:13, 22:3, 44:23, 114:1 addition [5] - 7:2, 7:8, 33:23, 38:7, 76:6 additional [11] - 12:7, 19:20, 22:3, 25:4, 33:15, 45:22, 46:12, 47:23, 98:2, 117:24, address [6] - 3:23, 16:20, 21:16, 21:17, 26:21, 65:3 addressed [6] - 13:16, 21:18, 30:18, 51:1, 77:1, 81:17 addresses [5] - 20:5, 21:10, 21:23, 23:4, 28:24 adds [1] - 36:9 adequate [3] - 7:25, 25:25, 114:12 adjoin [1] - 93:15 adjudicate [5] - 60:11, 60:15, 72:25, 75:23, 85:4 adjudicated [6] -65:21, 67:2, 68:8, 68:14, 70:12, 71:9 Administrative [1] -101:9 admission [2] - 16:16, 16:19 admit [3] - 42:8, 50:10, 86:10 adopt [2] - 5:9, 19:18 adopted [5] - 90:15, 90:20, 100:6, 117:17, 117:21 advance [2] - 91:7, 91:10 advanced [4] - 60:3, 98:16, 111:22, 115:18 Affairs [6] - 66:8, 66:10. 67:13. 67:15. 109:15, 109:23 affect [7] - 5:4, 34:13, 71:13, 71:24, 73:14, 109:19, 110:14 affects [2] - 34:13, 62:20 Affidavit [3] - 116:20, 119:20, 120:11 affirmation [1] - 88:20

affirmed [9] - 65:5, 68:16, 68:19, 68:20, 68:22, 68:23, 70:13, 89:1. 89:16 afterwards [1] -117:16 agency [2] - 35:13, 109:11 agenda [1] - 79:16 ago [9] - 8:3, 15:18, 27:3, 67:11, 74:19, 90:12, 90:15, 97:8, 108:23 agree [8] - 20:11, 20:13, 44:21, 52:17, 85:15, 97:21, 97:23, 109:19 agreed [3] - 5:12, 72:16, 109:8 agreement [7] - 62:23, 104:17, 105:25, 106:1, 107:21, 107:24, 116:13 agrees [2] - 20:12, 84:22 ahead [5] - 3:15, 31:1, 50:11, 54:18, 113:9 aid [1] - 85:9 aimed [1] - 115:13 air [1] - 122:12 aired [1] - 38:22 Alaska 121 - 63:16 allegations [2] -33:15, 33:24 allege [1] - 33:18 alleged [1] - 76:6 alleging [1] - 33:17 allow [6] - 9:5, 33:20, 36:20, 82:14, 85:10, 113:17 allowed [10] - 8:9, 25:17, 25:18, 25:19, 34:1, 34:2, 48:17, 85:23, 86:9, 86:21 allowing [3] - 34:25, 40:9, 82:2 allows [1] - 14:23 almost [4] - 19:2, 28:7, 35:25, 71:1 alter [2] - 69:14, 69:18 alternative [3] - 3:11, 6:5, 8:5 amend [9] - 3:11, 3:25, 4:11, 4:15, 9:15, 10:19, 11:5, amended [12] - 4:4, 5:11, 6:4, 6:6, 6:9, 7:3, 19:17, 21:25,

23:5, 30:18, 93:3,

93:4 Amended [6] - 4:12, 21:7, 21:11, 35:18, 35:22. 89:10 amendment [6] - 4:14, 4:24, 6:9, 8:7, 10:10, 10:16 amendments [2] - 9:5, 11:17 America [1] - 91:17 American [2] - 74:9, 74:12 ample [1] - 18:1 analysis [2] - 83:18, 83:21 ancestors [1] - 72:13 animated [1] - 93:18 answer [3] - 33:1, 33:5, 44:21 anyway [2] - 46:2, 88:4 apart [2] - 12:11, 12:14 **API** [1] - 33:8 apologize [1] - 40:22 appearance [1] -11:16 appeared [1] - 94:13 Appendix [5] - 4:23, 5:11, 22:2, 22:4, 23.8 applicable [6] - 17:12, 82:23, 83:22, 84:11, 89:11, 110:19 applicant [1] - 12:6 application [7] - 4:16, 33:2, 33:7, 36:22, 55:15, 95:17, 95:18 applied [1] - 39:16 applies [4] - 7:24, 19:21, 48:1, 60:21 apply [9] - 7:23, 41:10, 51:13, 74:22, 79:18, 80:20, 81:16, 89:10, 110.18 appointed [1] - 124:8 appreciate [7] - 45:23, 47:3, 47:10, 49:20, 49:22, 97:9, 114:19 appreciated [1] - 97:7 approach [1] - 85:2 appropriate [15] -10:11, 10:15, 12:5, 12:12, 14:13, 24:16, 25:12, 26:2, 37:24, 41:18, 55:23, 93:7, 96:8, 97:23, 118:18 appropriated [1] -93:20

appropriately [1] -

43:21 approval [2] - 104:23, 114:8 approve [1] - 112:12 approved [2] - 112:15, 114:10 approving [1] - 49:8 April [2] - 88:21, 116:17 arbitrator [1] - 29:11 area [19] - 24:12, 25:2, 36:22, 48:25, 49:1, 51:3, 68:25, 69:1, 69:9, 69:14, 69:16, 69:18, 72:10, 74:23, 74:24, 75:5, 77:11, 103:13 areas [6] - 27:13, 30:14, 71:2, 72:12, 79:2, 112:9 argue [4] - 3:23, 41:16, 47:19, 68:21 argued [2] - 86:1, 96:23 arguing [2] - 86:5, 86:14 argument [19] - 9:21, 14:1, 16:15, 16:23, 18:15, 30:25, 31:9, 39:13, 39:15, 39:16, 39:20, 39:24, 42:19, 43:18, 55:17, 57:23, 65:7, 98:17, 115:17 arguments [5] - 13:8, 13:11, 35:11, 47:20, 48:21 Army [1] - 73:11 army [1] - 88:23 arose [3] - 52:4, 83:18, 94:19 arrangements [1] -26:7 arrive [1] - 23:24 arrived [2] - 44:16, 100:9 art [1] - 58:1 as-proposed [1] -33:8 assert [3] - 92:18, 94:5 assess [1] - 81:10 assessment [5] -13:19, 36:12, 38:20, 42:14, 42:15 assist [1] - 16:21 assistance [1] - 112:5 associated [2] -79:23, 80:1 assumed [1] - 63:13 assuming [6] - 26:6,

26:8, 26:12, 26:14

**assumption** [1] - 26:3 2 assuring [1] - 27:24 attach [1] - 109:12 attached [3] - 4:22, 45:6, 124:11 attaches [1] - 109:3 attachments [1] -119:19 attack [1] - 17:22 attacks [1] - 25:15 attempt [4] - 15:24, 17:22, 17:23, 93:15 attention [1] - 25:11 attorneys [3] - 56:4, 75:10, 75:12 **audience** [1] - 56:7 authorities [1] -118:18 authority [26] - 4:18, 9:8, 11:4, 23:13, 28:16, 28:18, 28:19, 29:6, 29:24, 30:9, 30:10, 35:13, 37:16, 41:7, 45:19, 58:21, 63:13, 72:7, 76:2, 76:5, 81:4, 81:8, 81:21, 83:16, 120:19, 120:22 authorization [1] -83:10 authorize [1] - 4:11 available [3] - 3:20, 36:5, 75:14 avenue [1] - 106:21 Avenue [1] - 2:3 awarded [1] - 64:20 aware [2] - 16:6, 119:6 ave [16] - 12:17, 12:19, 12:21. 12:22. 48:3. 48:5, 48:7, 48:8, 98:3, 98:6, 98:8, 98:9, 123:4, 123:6, 123:8, 123:9

#### В

background [1] 112:2
bad [2] - 41:5, 95:20
Bad [2] - 88:25, 95:16
bags [3] - 69:10,
69:11, 69:12
Baker [4] - 3:13,
11:12, 32:6, 75:16
BAKER [5] - 3:14,
3:16, 11:13, 32:7,
75:17
ball [1] - 115:10
Band [1] - 83:2

band [1] - 83:3 bands [2] - 64:4, 68:11 bank [1] - 64:11 baron [1] - 51:15 baron's [1] - 51:13 baronetcy [1] - 51:16 barrels [1] - 23:25 base [3] - 78:21, 91:22, 119:1 based [19] - 4:5, 7:8, 7:9, 7:15, 8:1, 11:13, 13:11, 14:24, 17:8, 18:24, 22:16, 25:22, 43:18, 48:18, 49:1, 80:13, 81:4, 81:23, 115:4 **baseless** [1] - 86:3 **basic** [1] - 59:8 basis [11] - 3:17, 7:11, 7:24, 7:25, 10:22, 13:13, 15:3, 43:15, 43:18, 78:6, 109:15 bat [1] - 56:5 Bear [8] - 56:13, 69:4, 69:5, 69:6, 69:15, 69:18, 70:1, 70:8 beats [1] - 74:9 becomes [1] - 26:14 **bed** [1] - 104:3 **BEFORE** [1] - 1:11 began [2] - 58:8, 99:15 begin [3] - 56:7, 65:14, 69:9 beginning [2] - 35:25, 115:18 behalf [10] - 9:13, 10:9, 13:7, 15:13, 35:10, 38:14, 70:19, 87:11, 108:23, 112:25 behind [2] - 102:16, 116:1 belong [2] - 96:20, 96:21 Bend [1] - 95:10 beneficiary [4] -106:14, 106:15, 106:19 benefit [1] - 66:20 best [5] - 32:10, 59:14, 66:21, 69:2, 69:4 better [5] - 48:25, 58:13, 66:7 between [11] - 52:5, 62:23, 79:16, 89:7, 96:12, 100:7, 100:23, 102:9, 111:3, 116:9, 117:4

beyond [10] - 39:22, 43:8, 49:4, 49:7, 50:17, 85:18, 85:19, 85:20, 91:8, 115:6 **BIA** [1] - 110:6 big [3] - 60:5, 62:11, 119.7 Big [2] - 64:2, 64:5 biggest [1] - 67:5 bit [10] - 18:11, 47:14, 65:6, 76:22, 79:15, 84:1, 85:1, 113:4, 115:10, 115:11 Black [4] - 64:13, 64:19, 64:23 Blackburn [4] - 8:14, 32:19, 82:10, 94:18 BLACKBURN [5] -8:15, 32:20, 33:5, 82:12, 82:20 blanket [1] - 86:19 block [1] - 22:15 blocked [1] - 62:19 blue [7] - 67:5, 68:25, 69:1, 69:16, 72:9, 74:23 Board [2] - 94:9, 94:13 Bob [1] - 34:19 **bodies** [1] - 73:15 **body** [1] - 14:25 **BOLD** [1] - 8:16 book [1] - 82:5 BOR [3] - 100:8, 100:9, 111:14 borders [2] - 30:1, 54.9 Borland [2] - 54:1, 92:11 boundaries [22] -52:11, 52:13, 52:21, 53:24, 54:5, 63:1, 63:6, 63:7, 63:10, 66:3, 68:7, 68:12, 69:18, 70:6, 70:12, 73:8, 73:20, 73:21, 73:23, 73:24, 75:5, 91.23 boundary [6] - 54:9, 62:17, 62:20, 64:12, 64:15, 74:4 bounds [1] - 103:11 branch [2] - 66:10, 107:18 break [2] - 102:3, 107:6 breakout [1] - 24:11 breath [1] - 60:15

brevity [2] - 10:6,

114:20

Brief [1] - 65:6

brief [12] - 41:3, 58:16, 58:23, 82:21, 85:12, 85:16, 85:25, 87:12, 98:20. 112:23. 113:4, 113:7 **briefing** [3] - 51:21, 84:21, 115:12 briefly [5] - 6:8, 9:2, 11:13, 111:1, 112:20 **briefs** [1] - 57:22 bring [4] - 18:22, 46:8, 72:13, 108:4 brings [3] - 12:24, 98:11, 123:11 broader [1] - 83:21 broke [1] - 102:9 broken [1] - 64:16 brought [6] - 17:16, 47:3, 50:13, 52:1, 68:8, 79:14 Bruce [3] - 9:2, 35:10, 48:14 Brule [1] - 105:12 build [4] - 33:2, 33:7, 110:13, 118:13 **Building** [1] - 2:3 bundle [4] - 111:7, 111:8, 111:13, 111:14 burden [9] - 6:11, 7:4, 7:6, 8:1, 17:8, 20:1, 26:10, 29:1, 86:15 Bureau [22] - 66:8, 66:10, 67:12, 67:14, 99:16, 99:20, 101:7, 104:16, 104:19, 105:20, 106:6, 107:3, 109:14, 109:23, 116:23, 116:24, 118:6, 118:8, 118:16, 120:23, 121:11 burial [1] - 73:14 business [4] - 100:25, 101:1, 123:12 Butte [7] - 69:4, 69:5, 69:6, 69:15, 69:18, 70:1, 70:8 buy [3] - 67:19, 67:20, 67:21 buys [1] - 67:16 **bypass** [1] - 26:7

#### С

calculate [1] - 25:16 calculated [1] - 22:17 calculating [1] - 24:3 calculations [1] -

23:23 cannot [12] - 14:2, 36:14, 54:24, 60:3, 60:15, 81:23, 83:13, 84:15, 93:3, 121:5 capacity [1] - 80:3 Capitol [2] - 2:2, 2:3 CAPOSSELA [12] -9:19, 9:24, 37:11, 55:24, 56:2, 66:15, 66:21, 66:25, 75:14, 110:25, 113:6, 113:10 Capossela [12] - 9:19, 37:10, 51:21, 55:22, 75:11, 76:22, 78:14, 82:17, 85:14, 93:17, 97:6, 110:24 caption [1] - 91:15 captioned [1] - 59:19 careful [1] - 95:2 carefully [1] - 94:21 carried [1] - 27:24 carries [5] - 28:13, 28:14, 48:9, 98:10, 123:10 carrying [1] - 109:12 Carta [1] - 51:12 case [56] - 12:10, 19:2, 22:10, 22:16, 23:22, 23:24, 24:3, 25:16, 41:16. 44:25. 51:5. 51:7. 54:1. 54:5. 58:23, 63:12, 63:15, 63:16, 65:9, 68:15, 70:17, 73:10, 73:13, 73:23, 74:5, 74:8, 76:9, 76:12, 76:24, 77:1, 77:15, 77:25, 79:17, 80:7, 80:15, 80:21, 81:6, 81:16, 81:18, 82:15, 85:6, 90:13, 92:11, 94:1, 94:17, 94:19, 95:4, 95:5, 95:18, 101:2, 106:17, 107:3 cases [7] - 55:4, 55:6, 55:9, 68:1, 76:7, 85:18, 92:4 cathode [1] - 103:25 cattle [2] - 107:20, 108:1 causes [1] - 105:7 caution [3] - 13:10, 40:4, 40:10 cemetery [5] - 73:15, 73:18, 73:19, 73:22, 74:3 Cemetery [1] - 73:16 center [1] - 102:1

central [1] - 69:6 Century [1] - 61:6 century [1] - 52:23 ceremonies [1] -69:17 certain [8] - 3:19, 58:18, 60:2, 60:9, 69:25, 72:12, 78:5, 89:24 certainly [8] - 21:4, 35:11, 40:24, 46:19, 48:13, 54:11, 79:10, CERTIFICATE [1] -124:2 **CERTIFICATION** [1] -1:5 Certification [1] - 11:9 certification [17] - 3:3, 3:24, 4:6, 10:12, 10:18, 11:8, 14:7, 17:7, 27:4, 38:5, 56:20, 71:11, 75:3, 76:1, 76:3, 90:19, 91:8 Certified [2] - 124:6, 124:19 certify [1] - 15:16 **CERTIFY** [1] - 124:8 cetera [1] - 91:16 **CFR** [10] - 22:9, 22:11, 22:17, 22:19, 23:20, 25:17. 26:23. 30:14. 30:16, 33:13 chain [1] - 38:4 chair [1] - 32:20 Chairman [16] - 8:15, 8:20, 11:24, 13:6, 37:11, 42:5, 45:23, 46:13, 56:2, 66:6, 82:12, 84:20, 87:24, 97:18, 97:20, 110:25 CHAIRMAN [98] -1:12, 1:12, 3:1, 3:15, 8:11, 8:18, 8:24, 9:11, 9:18, 9:23, 10:4, 11:11, 11:20, 12:2, 12:7, 12:20, 12:22, 12:24, 13:3, 13:5, 15:9, 30:22, 31:7, 32:1, 32:18, 34:6, 34:18, 35:5, 37:8, 38:12, 38:25, 39:6, 39:12, 39:19, 39:22, 40:7, 40:14, 40:18, 40:21, 41:25, 44:1, 44:14, 45:10, 46:12, 46:14, 47:10, 48:6, 48:8, 48:13, 49:3, 49:9, 49:17,

49:19, 49:24, 50:7, COMMISSIONER [21] 23:9, 23:12, 23:15, choice [1] - 94:16 clearly [6] - 5:9, 41:2, 54:13, 55:21, 55:25, chose [3] - 24:20, 43:9, 45:13, 76:1, - 1:13, 11:24, 12:3, 26:23, 28:6, 28:9, 66:13, 66:16, 66:23, 81:16 12:19, 12:21, 31:11, 28:21, 29:2, 29:3, 24.24 75:8, 75:16, 82:10, 45:23, 46:13, 46:15, 29:7, 29:12, 29:15, click [1] - 31:7 chosen [3] - 25:15, 82:16, 84:18, 87:1, 36:17, 48:20 climate [1] - 34:24 46:22. 46:24. 47:1. 29:16, 30:19, 33:11, 87:7, 87:19, 87:21, CHRIS [1] - 1:12 closed [1] - 69:22 47:4. 48:5. 48:7. 36:6, 42:23, 43:11, 88:9, 89:19, 90:7, 97:18. 97:20. 98:6. 44:22, 59:7, 82:23, circles [1] - 61:17 code [1] - 33:12 96:25. 97:19. 98:1. 98:8, 123:6, 123:8 89:11. 90:16. 91:2. Circuit [2] - 58:24, codified [5] - 61:7, 98:7, 98:9, 101:18, 91:4, 92:21 Commissioner [24] -61:10, 61:15, 65:22, 74:6 108:14, 110:22, 3:14, 10:8, 11:23, complying [2] - 28:17, circumstances [1] -89:12 113:3, 113:9, 12:18, 12:20, 31:10, 90:18 Codified [1] - 16:18 7.22 113:14, 113:20, 46:15, 46:17, 47:3, **comprising** [1] - 64:10 cited [10] - 58:16, colors [1] - 67:4 114:19, 115:8, 47:7, 48:4, 48:6, compromise [2] -58:23, 63:11, 65:4, comfortable [1] -119:16, 120:6, 47:7, 102:7 48:12, 66:18, 79:15, 74:16, 76:9, 79:17, 36:20 120:13, 121:13, 87:3, 90:9, 97:19, concede [1] - 75:22 79:18, 85:6, 94:17 comments [2] - 10:6, 121:19, 121:25, 97:21, 98:5, 98:7, conceding [1] - 76:4 cites [4] - 65:9, 65:12, 34:5 122:6, 122:8, 118:24, 123:5, 123:7 **concentric** [1] - 61:17 92:3 Commission [111] -122:14, 123:7, 123:9 Commissioners [13] concept [4] - 50:25, citing [3] - 77:2, 3:18, 4:3, 4:25, 5:8, challenge [5] - 17:23, 9:12, 15:12, 16:24, 51:1, 51:11, 51:18 77:15, 92:10 5:12, 5:17, 5:18, 25:20, 43:20, 73:6, 17:3, 32:7, 37:12, concern [3] - 97:24, citizens [2] - 53:10, 5:21, 6:2, 6:3, 7:17, 92.14 48:10, 48:11, 50:12, 114:1, 114:6 103:9 7:19, 8:6, 9:8, 9:15, challenges [1] - 25:18 75:17, 86:2, 87:10, concerned [2] - 27:21, City [5] - 74:6, 74:7, 10:19, 11:4, 11:14, Chamberlain [1] -98:15 88:22, 117:14, 11:16, 11:21, 11:25, 79:7 73:16 committee [1] - 58:17 118:11 13:10, 13:22, 14:2, concerns [9] - 37:2, change [3] - 34:24, communication [2] -Civil [3] - 17:20, 14:9, 14:14, 14:23, 56:19, 71:11, 71:20, 101:5, 102:18 109:22, 110:6 14:24, 15:7, 16:5, 73:1, 73:3, 75:3, 59:20, 113:16 changed [12] - 7:16, communities [3] civil [2] - 51:17, 59:8 16:10, 17:3, 17:17, 81:17 7:22, 8:4, 12:6, 89:3, 60:24, 112:3, 112:10 civilly [1] - 29:14 30:9, 32:11, 32:12, concluded [3] - 29:1, community [3] -89:5, 90:13, 91:1, claim [9] - 15:21, 19:9, 33:19, 34:25, 35:2, 100:9, 123:13 92:20, 96:1, 105:2, 58:10, 58:11, 73:2 35:19, 36:3, 36:14, concludes [3] - 25:21, 23:19, 64:20, 64:22, 105:9 company [3] - 29:12, 37:17, 37:20, 37:23, 92:4, 92:10 85:13, 88:24, 92:16 changes [13] - 4:13, 49:10, 101:1 38:17, 39:3, 40:4, conclusion [8] - 7:21, claimed [2] - 68:25, 4:22, 5:4, 5:8, 5:15, 41:7, 44:2, 46:3, comparatively [2] -19:1, 19:4, 25:6, 81:15 5:18, 8:4, 11:15, 53:20, 55:8, 57:12, 112:9 28:24, 30:8, 110:11, Claims [20] - 65:1, 26:17, 35:17, 62:12, 59:12, 60:11, 65:1, competent [2] - 71:16, 118:19 65:10, 65:22, 67:2, 62.22 65:11, 65:22, 67:2, 86:16 conclusions [1] - 11:8 67:25, 68:2, 68:14, Changes [3] - 7:9, 67:25, 68:2, 68:6, complain [1] - 40:24 Conclusions [1] -68:16, 68:19, 68:23, 10:18, 23:7 68:15, 68:16, 68:19, completely [5] -29.5 76:25, 77:3, 77:10, changing [2] - 34:24, 71:14, 72:3, 72:7, 45:25, 60:17, 61:18, condemn [1] - 83:16 77:16, 88:23, 95:5, 49:6 72:25, 75:7, 75:21, 84:22, 85:15 95:8, 95:14, 95:15 **condition** [6] - 16:7, Chapter [1] - 13:24 75:23, 76:1, 76:4, compliance [23] -19:17, 23:6, 27:3, claims [12] - 60:11, character [1] - 101:5 77:3, 77:10, 77:16, 14:11, 14:14, 14:17, 60:12, 65:3, 68:6, 30:19, 43:11 characterization [3] -79:9, 79:11, 80:22, 14:20, 14:22, 16:6, 68:17, 73:5, 76:2, Condition [17] - 14:13, 11:15, 42:7, 42:19 80:25, 81:20, 82:2, 22:10, 28:24, 29:9, 20:5, 21:7, 21:11, 76:17, 77:9, 77:25, characterize [2] -82:7, 85:10, 85:21, 29:11. 29:22. 29:25. 22:12, 23:3, 43:3, 85:4, 96:16 86:22, 87:25, 90:15, 96:9, 96:10 30:7, 30:14, 31:13, 82:22, 89:10, 90:20, clarification [6] -90:20, 93:7, 95:5, charge [1] - 74:10 31:18, 32:23, 33:17, 47:11, 48:12, 48:24, 90:21, 92:20, 92:21, check [3] - 22:13, 95:8, 95:15, 95:22, 33:18, 33:25, 34:3, 93:11, 95:24 49:18, 77:12, 82:13 96:25, 97:14, 22:15, 26:7 43:3, 71:12 clarified [1] - 18:10 conditions [40] - 3:23, 101:13, 101:14, compliant [1] - 27:18 Cheri [2] - 1:24, 5:14, 7:20, 7:22, clarify [1] - 60:20 106:21, 110:17, complicated [2] -124:18 10:23, 14:20, 14:22, clarity [1] - 5:24 112:20, 113:21, 61:20, 72:23 CHERI [1] - 124:5 15:17, 16:5, 17:9, classical [1] - 116:11 115:3, 115:15, Cheyenne [9] - 8:21, complied [3] - 24:4, 19:23, 20:10, 21:14, clause [2] - 88:25, 119:2, 119:12, 34:9, 34:12, 34:15, 29:20, 110:17 21:17, 21:23, 21:25, 95:16 119:17, 123:1 84:21, 85:3, 86:24, complies [1] - 28:11 22:2, 22:3, 25:9, clay [3] - 104:5, 104:9, COMMISSION [3] -92:11, 105:12 comply [39] - 14:2, 26:9, 26:11, 28:3, 104:11 1:1, 1:11, 1:14 16:11, 17:1, 17:12, chief [3] - 66:10, 28:17, 29:7, 30:10, clean [1] - 106:25 Commission's [5] -67:14, 119:3 17:14, 19:13, 19:15, 30:13, 36:7, 36:17, Clean [1] - 56:11 7:11, 13:14, 37:16, Chippewa [4] - 83:3, 20:2, 20:5, 21:8, 38:6, 42:23, 44:23, clear [3] - 26:14, 41:3, 43:24, 85:17 83:4, 83:8, 94:21 21:11, 23:2, 23:5, 45:6, 49:11, 71:12, 59:23

71:13, 71:17, 96:1, 105:18, 115:6, 116:22 Conditions [7] - 14:5, 14:12. 14:17. 19:21. 30:21, 35:18, 35:23 conduct [3] - 11:13, 13:19, 26:24 conducted [1] - 105:6 conducting [1] - 42:14 confirm [2] - 44:18, 120:12 conflict [1] - 11:2 Congress [16] - 52:12, 52:15, 52:17, 58:7, 58:8, 61:11, 63:12, 63:13, 65:2, 72:19, 78:20, 78:22, 84:10, 98:21, 112:11, 116:3 Congressional [4] -54:7, 58:17, 83:10, 115.25 connection [2] -10:18, 11:9 consent [1] - 117:8 consequence [4] -27:12, 30:14, 52:16, 52:20 consequences [1] -22:21 consider [4] - 43:13, 59:22, 76:5, 107:8 considerable [1] -26:17 considerably [1] -111:16 consideration [15] -4:21, 6:13, 6:25, 22:20, 50:2, 70:23, 72:4, 80:22, 81:21, 85:17, 88:18, 97:3, 104:12, 108:6, 111:23 considerations [1] -104:6 considered [6] - 14:7, 14:8, 19:12, 19:24, 27:20, 77:14 considering [2] -11:17, 25:23 consistent [1] - 18:14 consists [1] - 103:24 constituent [1] - 57:12 constituents [1] - 73:4 constitute [1] - 4:14 Constitution [1] -84:11 construct [2] - 3:4, 99:8 CONSTRUCT [1] - 1:6

constructed [5] - 8:3, 28:10, 34:12, 50:24, 76:8 construction [13] -30:10, 31:17, 35:15, 38:5, 54:3, 71:22, 72:11, 82:24, 93:16, 105:4, 105:8, 109:24, 110:19 consult [1] - 106:3 consultation [3] -6:23, 109:7, 109:20 consultations [4] -110:1, 110:3, 110:7, 110:9 consulted [2] - 56:4, 117:7 consulting [1] - 99:25 contact [2] - 60:25, 61:14 contain [1] - 118:2 contained [3] - 4:4, 13:24, 90:24 contains [5] - 21:14, 57:2, 65:23, 118:1, 120:5 contend [1] - 43:21 contending [1] - 60:2 contention [3] - 90:17, 95:25, 111:2 contested [1] - 105:19 context [2] - 83:15, 83:19 continental [1] - 68:4 continue [8] - 10:23, 20:9, 38:6, 40:7, 44:22, 45:5, 49:10, 110:18 continued [4] - 29:3, 29:21, 71:12, 79:4 continues [1] - 4:7 contract [1] - 116:15 contrary [1] - 36:8 contravenes [1] - 11:2 control [1] - 22:13 convey [1] - 57:23 conveyed [1] - 92:7 convince [1] - 59:12 cool [1] - 70:8 Core [1] - 105:7 core [2] - 107:16, 107:23 Corey [1] - 31:12 corner [1] - 69:8 cornered [2] - 116:8 corporation [1] - 21:4 Corps [2] - 73:11, correct [7] - 40:6,

107:10, 120:20, 124:11 correctly [4] - 114:7, 119:21, 120:17, 121.20 correspondence [1] -118:11 cost [1] - 112:10 costs [1] - 112:8 Council [2] - 56:12, 56:14 counted [1] - 65:13 Counties [1] - 34:15 counties [1] - 112:7 country [4] - 24:17, 25:13, 26:2, 103:20 Country [2] - 103:19, 121:22 County [5] - 62:13, 88:15, 99:3, 99:4, 119:25 **COUNTY** [1] - 124:3 COUP [1] - 34:21 couple [7] - 16:14, 42:6, 75:18, 88:13, 93:17, 111:9, 120:15 course [5] - 50:18, 64:25, 99:20, 115:10, 115:11 Court [42] - 51:1, 51:6, 52:3, 53:22, 54:4, 55:4, 55:6, 64:20, 65:5, 68:2, 68:17, 68:20, 68:21, 68:22, 68:23, 70:13, 71:9, 73:25, 74:6, 81:18, 83:4, 83:18, 88:22, 88:24, 91:12, 91:19, 92:4, 92:11, 92:19, 94:1, 94:15, 94:20, 95:2, 95:14, 96:21, 97:13, 97:25, 105:16, 105:22 court [20] - 52:2, 52:7, 53:11, 54:12, 54:16, 54:24, 60:5, 64:19, 68:17, 73:7, 73:14, 73:23, 76:25, 77:9, 77:25, 78:1, 89:1, 93:15, 94:14, 122:24 Court's [2] - 83:20, 83:21 courthouse [1] - 96:4 Courts [1] - 55:1 courts [7] - 52:8, 52:16, 62:5, 72:21, 78:12, 82:7, 89:15 cover [1] - 57:1 covered [2] - 31:1,

39:15

46:23, 85:19, 107:9,

**CRAVEN** [3] - 9:25, 38:14, 87:24 Craven [4] - 9:25, 38:14, 87:23, 87:25 create [2] - 53:16, 63:25 created [8] - 28:8, 51:3, 51:19, 51:22, 52:9, 64:9, 72:22, 98:24 creates [1] - 28:7 creation [1] - 69:6 credibility [1] - 17:22 credible [1] - 21:2 credulity [1] - 111:5 criminally [1] - 29:16 criteria [13] - 99:21, 99:22, 100:16, 104:20, 106:2, 111:14, 114:10, 116:22, 118:7, 118:9, 119:10 critical [1] - 91:21 criticism [2] - 35:21, 37:1 cross [10] - 23:11, 53:3, 53:4, 53:5, 92:16, 110:4, 116:14, 119:22, 120:20, 121:2 crosses [4] - 53:6, 79:24, 91:23, 99:2 crossing [21] - 99:21, 100:10. 100:15. 100:20, 104:17, 104:20, 104:24. 105:21, 107:22, 107:25, 108:1, 111:3, 111:17, 116:21, 116:22, 118:7, 118:9, 118:21, 118:23, 119:8, 119:10 crossings [9] - 98:19, 100:3, 101:13, 114:9, 115:16, 116:25, 117:1, 119:24 CRR [1] - 1:24 crucial [1] - 82:2 cubic [1] - 23:25 cultural [3] - 70:23, 70:25, 92:25 current [8] - 26:23, 56:16, 59:13, 63:6, 73:8, 76:18, 89:9, 89:17 Curt [1] - 119:2

cut [2] - 39:8, 71:7

CV [1] - 18:8

**D.C** [1] - 66:9 Dahlke [3] - 99:4, 99:7, 120:3 Dahlke-Mann [3] -99:4, 99:7, 120:3 Dakota [67] - 2:2, 2:4, 4:15, 6:24, 9:2, 16:18, 24:19, 32:12, 35:10, 35:14, 38:23, 48:14, 52:10, 52:13, 52:21, 53:10, 53:11, 53:24, 55:5, 56:14, 58:3, 58:20, 58:24, 58:25, 59:3, 59:4, 62:9, 64:4, 64:6, 64:10, 68:10, 69:20, 70:22, 72:1, 73:1, 73:9. 73:16. 77:5. 77:7, 77:17, 78:10, 79:24, 79:25, 80:4, 81:17, 84:14, 84:16, 84:23, 91:24, 92:10, 94:4, 94:10, 99:10, 103:9, 111:6, 111:12, 112:4, 114:15, 116:5, 116:6, 116:12, 119:7, 121:1, 124:7, 124:13 **DAKOTA** [2] - 1:2, 124:1 **Dakotans** [4] - 56:15, 56:22, 70:7, 82:3 Dam [1] - 62:13 dam [4] - 62:14, 62:22, 73:17, 102:17 damage [2] - 24:15, 25:25 damages [1] - 101:11 dangers [1] - 38:20 Darren [1] - 1:16 **Daschle** [1] - 112:12 date [1] - 79:25 Dated [1] - 124:13 days [2] - 23:17, 70:4 deal [5] - 3:6, 45:24, 49:21, 55:4, 55:6 dealing [5] - 50:1, 53:24, 53:25, 78:1, 93.12 deals [5] - 16:19, 27:12, 44:8, 54:1, 54.5 dealt [3] - 45:25, 91:10, 93:10 dear [1] - 75:6 **debate** [1] - 94:19

December [1] - 5:13 decide [6] - 21:1, 54:25, 55:2, 60:6, 60:8, 86:7 decided [5] - 24:25, 90:4, 90:12, 91:18, 122.7 deciding [2] - 16:22, 85:20 decision [22] - 4:4, 4:11, 5:25, 7:9, 7:11, 7:13, 7:15, 7:24, 7:25, 25:8, 26:20, 32:13, 77:2, 82:8, 84:8, 91:15, 96:2, 96:6, 100:13, 100:14, 121:10 Decision [2] - 4:13, 4.16 decisions [4] - 4:7, 78:1, 95:13 declaratory [1] - 85:8 decompacted [1] -104:3 defend [1] - 5:1 define [3] - 57:10, 63:25, 65:17 defined [2] - 65:3, 79:22 definitely [1] - 57:3 definition [4] - 65:15, 71:1. 80:5. 80:14 deliberations [1] -85:10 deliver [1] - 80:1 demonstrate [3] -19:14, 21:19, 29:22 demonstrated [1] -19:24 demonstration [1] -60:18 denial [1] - 38:10 denied [7] - 12:23, 32:10, 35:16, 45:24, 56:25, 57:18, 85:23 deny [20] - 11:25, 17:17, 31:25, 32:13, 35:2, 37:5, 38:17, 44:8, 45:16, 46:22, 46:24, 47:2, 48:1, 81:1, 81:4, 81:9, 81:22, 82:2, 88:5, 108:11 denying [2] - 12:12, 12:16 Department [6] -96:17, 100:11, 100:12, 116:17, 116:18, 121:4 department [2] - 56:9,

72:17 departments [1] -114:11 describe [3] - 57:15, 66:20.69:2 described [1] - 6:6 describes [1] - 51:21 deserve [1] - 103:9 design [6] - 22:15, 26:11, 31:17, 33:12, 80:3, 80:12 designated [1] - 25:1 designee [1] - 99:17 despite [1] - 4:18 detail [1] - 6:8 determination [3] -53:19, 75:25, 76:3 determinative [2] -71:15, 72:2 determine [16] -14:16, 14:21, 23:14, 23:21, 25:13, 28:16, 29:20, 29:21, 29:25, 30:6, 54:6, 94:23, 95:3, 95:6, 110:17, 114:11 determined [3] -37:24, 58:25, 95:8 determining [1] -14:25 development [2] -28:5, 112:6 **Dewey** [1] - 34:15 diameter [1] - 26:16 dictionaries [1] - 50:9 difference [1] - 111:2 different [26] - 3:5, 7:18, 14:24, 19:3, 24:1, 25:6, 38:3, 43:5, 48:23, 50:9, 51:10, 58:2, 60:13, 61:10, 63:19, 67:3, 67:16, 67:20, 74:22, 78:17, 85:1, 91:6, 94:3, 100:18, 111:16, 111:18 dilemma [1] - 81:11 diminish [2] - 78:21, 84.6 diminished [2] - 79:1, 79:3 direct [7] - 18:18, 18:19, 18:23, 23:10, 42:11, 42:12, 42:17 directed [1] - 98:25 direction [1] - 67:24 directly [4] - 16:4, 34:13. 76:19. 89:10 director [3] - 56:8,

112:21, 120:25

dirty [1] - 113:7 disturbed [1] - 104:8 disagree [1] - 10:10 disagrees [2] - 43:4, 43.6 discharge [9] - 22:10, 22:17, 23:22, 23:24, 24:3, 24:8, 24:16, 25:16, 26:1 discoveries [2] -72:15, 90:24 discovery [12] - 5:2, 5:3, 5:7, 5:14, 37:21, 37:23, 37:25, 38:1, 50:18, 50:19, 102:21, 108:3 discretion [2] - 72:3, 115:25 discuss [5] - 57:8, 76:10, 90:5, 100:3, 117:22 discussed [10] - 6:23, 35:19, 41:3, 66:5, 86:3, 99:23, 99:24, 109:7, 117:15, 118:9 discussing [2] - 15:5, 62:7 **Discussion** [1] - 33:4 discussion [20] -10:22, 12:2, 12:7, 12:15, 35:21, 36:9, 44:10, 45:22, 46:12, 47:12, 47:23, 61:25, 70:14, 97:5, 97:16, 98:2, 110:16, 115:22, 122:21, 123:2 discussions [8] -62:12, 99:15, 99:21, 100:7, 100:9, 110:9, 115:11, 118:24 dismissal [1] - 87:5 disposition [1] - 85:17 dispute [3] - 73:24, 103:15, 103:18 disputed [1] - 64:18 disruptive [1] - 99:13 dissimilar [1] - 74:14 distinction [2] - 117:4, 117:6 distinctions [3] -96:11, 96:19, 96:20 distinguish [1] - 80:7 distribution [3] -107:17, 107:25, 116:15 District [3] - 56:13, 81:19, 91:18 district [2] - 79:20, 80:16 district's [1] - 80:21

diversion [1] - 63:3 divest [1] - 78:23 divisions [1] - 77:18 **DO**[1] - 124:8 docket [14] - 3:4, 4:3, 10:11, 11:6, 11:8, 19:11, 21:15, 21:18, 26:23, 37:14, 37:15, 41:11, 41:23, 76:25 **DOCKET** [1] - 1:5 Doctrine [2] - 93:24, 93:25 doctrine [2] - 16:23, 93:23 document [4] - 10:12, 22:4, 25:3, 89:5 documents [4] - 57:6, 61:11, 90:25, 105:1 domain [4] - 52:22, 53:6, 53:7, 92:2 dominion [2] - 51:6, 53:12 done [15] - 13:19, 18:13, 30:4, 36:2, 42:16, 57:14, 75:11, 84:15, 85:14, 106:22, 107:2, 107:9, 108:8, 118:5, 118:6 **DOR** [1] - 114:7 Dorr [17] - 39:1, 39:2, 39:12, 40:12, 40:14, 47:15, 88:11, 88:12, 95:16, 98:16, 101:18, 101:19, 108:25, 115:4, 115:9, 117:25, 120:16 DORR [16] - 39:2, 39:8, 39:17, 39:20, 40:3, 40:9, 40:16, 40:19, 88:12, 101:19, 120:21, 121:17, 121:23, 122:3, 122:7, 122:10 doubt [2] - 16:8, 16:10 Doug [2] - 56:8, 73:2 down [12] - 20:12, 32:2, 44:18, 50:8, 75:9, 82:18, 95:9, 95:11, 96:4, 102:1, 102:9, 107:7 dozens [2] - 55:6, 94:13 draw [1] - 110:11 drawings [1] - 104:24 drinking [2] - 34:16, 106:25 driveway [1] - 111:10

due [11] - 6:12, 6:24, 13:17, 16:24, 20:24, 41:8, 72:11, 77:13, 83:13, 84:10, 84:15 duly [1] - 124:8 duly-appointed [1] -124:8 during [5] - 41:14, 58:19, 105:3, 105:8, 114:3 duties [1] - 109:12 duty [1] - 120:5

#### Ε

early [2] - 59:2, 98:16 easement [16] - 92:15, 99:6, 99:7, 99:11, 99:12, 99:13, 102:22, 103:10, 104:12, 107:1, 107:2, 107:21, 111:10, 111:17, 116:21 easements [9] - 98:13, 98:23, 99:8, 99:14, 101:4, 102:22, 106:22, 122:20, 122:23 East [1] - 2:3 east [7] - 64:11, 76:10, 76:13, 76:16, 76:18, 95.8 eastern [2] - 64:6, 68:11 echo [2] - 46:16, 88:1 economic [1] - 28:2 EDWARDS [3] - 40:24, 89:21, 114:25 Edwards [4] - 1:15, 40:25, 89:21, 114:25 effect [3] - 86:1, 89:2, 100:14 effective [1] - 6:14 effectuate [2] - 98:19, 100:20 effectuated [1] - 119:9 efficacy [1] - 100:13 efficiency [1] - 5:24 efforts [1] - 117:21 Eighth [1] - 58:24 EIS [3] - 117:5, 117:6, 117:25 either [5] - 13:21, 38:3, 41:16, 94:15, 103:17 election [1] - 114:2 Electric [1] - 85:7 electric [3] - 79:22,

80:2, 80:17	22:20	<b>exclude</b> [6] - 20:19,	<b>extensive</b> [1] - 119:8	fashion [1] - 28:10
elevation [2] - 22:20,	equipment [1] - 24:10	37:6, 37:13, 38:10,	extent [10] - 11:1,	favor [8] - 12:16,
26:17	era [2] - 58:20, 61:5	38:18, 109:1	14:8, 42:22, 43:6,	46:11, 47:24, 48:2,
eliminate [1] - 20:16	erroneously [1] -	excluded [4] - 41:3,	43:10, 44:7, 47:25,	51:19, 97:17, 98:3,
eliminated [1] - 58:13	59:16	41:4, 42:9, 86:12	54:23, 59:7, 84:12	123:3
<b>Elk</b> [2] - 88:21, 95:18	especially [1] - 111:24	excluding [3] - 41:16,	extinguished [1] -	fear [1] - 75:11
• •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • •		
<b>ELLISON</b> [7] - 9:2,	espoused [1] - 38:8	50:20, 111:23	51:8	Federal [23] - 29:14,
35:10, 48:11, 48:14,	<b>essence</b> [1] - 92:25	<b>exclusion</b> [1] - 86:19	extra [1] - 21:22	29:15, 52:3, 62:10,
49:6, 49:14, 49:18	essentially [4] - 13:10,	<b>exclusive</b> [1] - 6:19	extremely [1] - 107:1	66:14, 67:9, 68:13,
Ellison [3] - 9:2,	15:4, 50:14, 81:19	exclusively [1] - 92:1	<b>eye</b> [1] - 100:18	73:25, 74:2, 74:21,
35:10, 48:14	establish [2] - 26:10,	excuse [2] - 8:8, 80:24		88:22, 91:12, 92:19,
embodies [1] - 52:9	99:21	executive [3] - 71:6,	F	94:15, 95:2, 96:21,
emergency [3] -	established [3] - 65:1,	78:20, 78:23	-	97:12, 97:25,
24:10, 27:8, 30:15	84:4, 116:3	exempt [1] - 90:18		105:16, 105:22,
enacted [1] - 98:20	establishment [1] -	exercise [5] - 35:14,	facilities [6] - 24:13,	109:16, 121:9
encompass [1] -	30:2	53:12, 54:24, 70:1,	79:19, 79:23, 80:1,	federal [47] - 6:22,
77:20		115:25	80:3, 80:14	13:13, 13:21, 14:3,
	et [1] - 91:16		facility [7] - 15:17,	14:10, 14:15, 15:1,
end [7] - 14:15, 24:8,	etched [1] - 82:4	exercised [2] - 27:1,	79:21, 80:10, 80:11,	15:22, 17:1, 19:9,
33:13, 50:14, 93:6,	ethical [1] - 108:8	51:6	80:16, 80:19, 81:24	
123:11	event [2] - 8:6, 24:10	exhibit [1] - 116:19	fact [37] - 4:20, 10:15,	27:9, 27:13, 27:14,
ended [1] - 117:21	evidence [40] - 15:15,	Exhibit [8] - 18:7,	12:13, 16:21, 21:3,	27:22, 28:22, 29:11,
energy [1] - 80:2	15:19, 15:21, 16:3,	18:9, 18:17, 18:19,		29:13, 29:17, 30:12,
enforcement [1] - 30:3	16:21, 21:17, 24:18,	22:9, 22:11, 22:12,	21:5, 26:19, 27:19,	33:12, 33:18, 33:19,
enforcing [1] - 14:11	25:7, 25:18, 27:7,	22:14	39:14, 44:20, 45:11,	33:21, 33:25, 34:4,
engage [1] - 69:17	31:19, 32:13, 32:14,	exhibits [3] - 18:22,	51:4, 53:2, 56:3,	41:6, 41:8, 41:12,
engaged [2] - 18:4,	32:23, 32:24, 34:11,	18:23, 22:9	62:5, 63:15, 72:6,	53:14, 53:16, 58:5,
• • • • •	36:4, 36:8, 36:10,	exist [15] - 26:22,	76:9, 79:18, 81:20,	63:4, 63:9, 70:5,
118:18		1	82:3, 88:14, 101:3,	71:18, 71:19, 73:25,
engineering [7] -	42:8, 46:4, 46:7,	54:22, 54:23, 57:15,	101:20, 103:18,	74:21, 76:25, 77:9,
99:22, 100:10,	46:9, 48:16, 48:18,	57:16, 63:10, 67:11,	105:10, 105:15,	88:24, 91:12, 91:15,
100:11, 100:16,	48:19, 55:16, 60:3,	69:1, 72:17, 72:18,	105:22, 107:8,	1
104:3, 118:10	71:16, 71:17, 73:1,	74:20, 78:19, 78:20,	107:25, 108:6,	93:23, 96:4, 109:5,
Engineers [2] - 73:11,	85:23, 86:11, 86:12,	82:6	108:7, 108:11,	112:5
73:17	86:15, 86:19, 86:21,	existed [1] - 67:10		federally [1] - 83:17
engineers [1] - 99:25	109:1, 110:16,	<b>existence</b> [1] - 84:3	111:25, 118:8, 119:6	Feds [1] - 62:24
English [1] - 50:5	114:13	existing [1] - 75:4	Fact [12] - 3:12, 3:20,	fee [2] - 52:25, 122:1
enlighten [1] - 50:11	Evidence [1] - 16:18	exists [2] - 15:25,	4:5, 4:12, 5:7, 7:23,	FEIS [2] - 104:14,
	evidentiary [7] -	49:15	8:2, 9:16, 11:5, 12:5,	117:5
ensure [1] - 32:14	10:22, 14:18, 15:5,		26:21, 35:22	fellow [1] - 75:12
ensuring [1] - 18:12		expand [2] - 58:21,	fact-finding [1] - 72:6	<b>felt</b> [2] - 39:15, 96:2
entered [2] - 11:8,	38:2, 45:25, 46:2,	104:10	factors [1] - 81:21	few [1] - 70:3
63:24	60:4	<b>expansion</b> [1] - 89:6	facts [6] - 5:15, 7:15,	1
entering [1] - 24:11	exact [2] - 27:10,	expect [2] - 10:21,	7:16, 92:13, 93:10,	Fiegen [12] - 11:23,
enterprises [1] - 58:12	30:17	11:7	95:22	12:20, 12:21, 31:10,
entertain [1] - 45:7	exactly [4] - 19:2,	experiment [1] - 58:8	failed [5] - 6:10, 6:12,	46:17, 48:6, 48:7,
entire [1] - 22:3	59:23, 101:1	expert [7] - 16:16,		97:22, 98:7, 98:8,
entirely [3] - 43:5,	examination [2] -	16:17, 16:19, 18:5,	7:4, 7:5, 73:14	123:7, 123:8
47:20, 96:8	23:11, 95:2	38:18, 43:22, 70:15	failing [2] - 29:14,	FIEGEN [11] - 1:12,
•	examine [2] - 27:2,	explain [1] - 75:1	29:16	11:24, 12:3, 12:21,
entirety [5] - 44:8,	31:21	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	fails [1] - 59:7	31:11, 45:23, 46:22,
46:19, 46:23, 47:6,	examined [1] - 95:1	<b>explained</b> [2] - 6:7,	failure [1] - 29:6	47:1, 48:7, 98:8,
48:2		64:8	fair [3] - 20:23, 31:10,	123:8
entitled [3] - 2:2,	examines [2] - 23:2,	explanation [1] -	52:18	figure [2] - 24:1, 59:15
42:25, 124:10	25:4	93:18	Falls [1] - 73:13	
entity [1] - 102:12	example [6] - 54:1,	express [5] - 9:21,	familiar [1] - 19:11	file [2] - 30:17, 111:20
• • •	61:24, 63:8, 69:4,	32:8, 60:22, 61:21,		filed [8] - 4:17, 18:2,
enumerated [1] - 4:21	70:10, 91:14	82:25	famous [1] - 92:3	18:17, 30:15, 50:19,
			far [9] - 9:4, 9:14,	71:10, 88:24, 117:25
environmental [5] -	examples [1] - 51:24	expressina [2] -		
<b>environmental</b> [5] - 19:19, 19:22, 21:12,	•	expressing [2] - 56:19 71:10	12:11, 12:14, 63:17,	filing [6] - 18:7, 36:1,
<b>environmental</b> [5] - 19:19, 19:22, 21:12, 21:13, 30:20	excavated [1] - 73:18	56:19, 71:10	69:8, 78:12, 84:23,	<b>filing</b> [6] - 18:7, 36:1, 44:12, 44:17, 45:10,
environmental [5] - 19:19, 19:22, 21:12, 21:13, 30:20 Environmental [6] -	excavated [1] - 73:18 except [1] - 83:13	56:19, 71:10 expression [1] - 50:6		<b>-</b>
environmental [5] - 19:19, 19:22, 21:12, 21:13, 30:20 Environmental [6] - 3:10, 5:22, 8:23,	excavated [1] - 73:18 except [1] - 83:13 exchange [1] - 50:18	56:19, 71:10 expression [1] - 50:6 expressly [2] - 78:23,	69:8, 78:12, 84:23,	44:12, 44:17, 45:10, 60:7
21:13, 30:20 Environmental [6] -	excavated [1] - 73:18 except [1] - 83:13	56:19, 71:10 expression [1] - 50:6	69:8, 78:12, 84:23, 109:16	44:12, 44:17, 45:10,

final [9] - 4:4, 19:19, 19:21, 21:12, 21:13, 29:10, 30:20, 35:17, 67:25 Final [2] - 4:13, 82:22 finder [3] - 21:2, 21:5, 26:19 Findings [11] - 3:12, 3:20, 4:5, 4:12, 7:23, 8:2, 9:16, 11:5, 12:5, 26:21, 35:22 findings [23] - 4:1, 4:14, 4:20, 4:21, 4:24, 5:4, 5:7, 5:10, 6:4, 6:5, 7:10, 7:12, 7:13, 8:8, 10:11, 10:16, 10:19, 11:7, 68:16, 93:2, 93:4, fine [2] - 46:5, 67:23 firm [1] - 118:10 firmly [1] - 84:4 first [24] - 3:9, 7:5, 16:20, 17:17, 18:15, 51:1, 52:2, 55:12, 55:22, 58:22, 58:25, 61:1, 68:22, 76:9, 79:18, 82:14, 89:10, 90:13, 91:19, 97:6, 111:15, 112:15, 113:1, 117:19 firstly [1] - 57:2 fish [2] - 83:5, 94:24 Fish [2] - 69:20, 74:16 fishing [5] - 74:9, 74:13, 89:4, 94:19 fit [1] - 72:4 five [10] - 15:18, 23:17, 27:3, 62:16, 90:12, 90:14, 90:15, 96:1, 96:5, 116:8 five-cornered [1] -116.8 flows [1] - 62:20 focus [1] - 22:25 focused [1] - 45:4 fold [1] - 52:1 **folks** [3] - 12:9, 58:12, 112:11 follow [6] - 19:18, 21:6, 22:1, 67:18, 69:13, 90:23 **followed** [2] - 51:17, 93:7 following [2] - 23:25, 24:7 follows [1] - 105:17 food [1] - 70:4 FOR [1] - 1:5

forced [1] - 79:2

foreign [1] - 21:4 form [1] - 53:12 formal [2] - 83:6, 83:23 former [1] - 56:12 forms [1] - 10:21 Fort [7] - 61:23, 63:24, 73:17, 77:1, 77:11, 77:17, 77:23 forth [2] - 105:18, 107:19 fortunately [1] - 56:4 forum [4] - 91:11, 92:13. 93:12 forward [6] - 28:13, 28:14, 45:16, 49:21, 93:12, 93:13 forwarded [1] - 113:1 foundation [2] -41:18, 70:21 four [6] - 3:5, 6:10, 8:3, 24:1, 103:7, 105:11 frankly [1] - 45:2 friend [1] - 116:2 front [2] - 97:13, 122:25 **FSEIS** [3] - 35:20, 37:1, 104:15 Ft [5] - 76:21, 77:4, 78:2, 78:3, 102:16 fulfill [1] - 6:10 full [1] - 38:20 fully [9] - 27:18, 38:22, 61:15, 70:8, 85:11, 86:22, 92:21, 97:20, 97:23 function [1] - 7:14 fundamentally [1] -10:10 funerary [1] - 92:24 future [5] - 14:22, 28:14, 36:19, 91:3,

#### G

114:15

46:18, 46:23, 46:24, 47:25, 81:8, 96:16, Game [2] - 69:20, 97:4, 97:5, 97:15, 74:16 113:3, 122:18, 123:4 gander [1] - 33:23 granted [8] - 4:8, garden [1] - 111:16 10:24, 15:18, 23:18, **Gary** [5] - 39:2, 88:12, 47:5, 56:23, 83:17, 101:19, 120:16, 90:1 122:16 **granting** [4] - 5:13, **GARY** [1] - 1:13 28:9, 37:19, 81:12 gather [1] - 83:5 graves [1] - 90:21 general [3] - 31:16, Graves [2] - 51:23, 81:8. 86:11 53:15 generally [1] - 109:8 **Great** [3] - 64:9, 64:17, 120:25
greatly [2] - 97:6, 97:9
Greg [1] - 1:16
ground [4] - 26:25,
34:23, 109:14, 112:6
grounds [7] - 17:18,
19:5, 20:15, 20:18,
57:20, 59:9, 81:1
grows [1] - 89:6
guess [9] - 39:4, 73:6,
79:16, 84:25, 93:20,
116:8, 121:17,
121:23, 122:22
guys [5] - 21:1, 24:21,
24:22, 26:4, 30:4

genesis [2] - 55:8,

Genevieve [1] -

gentleman [1] -

gladly [1] - 19:7

goose [1] - 33:22

GOUGH [2] - 34:21,

Gough [2] - 34:19,

Goulet [1] - 31:12

govern [1] - 99:21

governed [2] - 4:9,

government [15] -

109:6, 109:20,

Government [20] -

6:14, 6:17, 7:1, 7:7,

110:1, 110:2, 110:7

17:4, 29:14, 29:15,

55:10, 62:10, 66:14,

67:9, 68:13, 68:14,

74:2, 74:21, 83:7,

83:13, 86:8, 95:19,

99:17, 109:17,

116:9, 121:9

government-to-

109:6. 109:20.

governmental [1] -

governments [1] -

grab [2] - 66:23,

grade [1] - 33:8

62:18, 71:23

Grand [3] - 62:15,

grant [16] - 36:16,

37:20, 44:7, 45:18,

111:21

18:12

102:14

government [5] -

110:1, 110:2, 110:7

goal [1] - 47:1

87:3

87:2

16:17

given [5] - 6:25, 10:15,

12:13, 43:23, 107:23

93:25

116:18

112:22

Н Haakon [1] - 99:3 half [1] - 107:20 hand [5] - 45:5, 47:14, 68:21, 108:22, 123:12 handful [1] - 53:16 handles [1] - 109:15 hanging [2] - 66:11, 67:8 HANSON [11] - 1:13, 12:19, 46:13, 46:15, 46:24, 47:4, 48:5, 97:18, 97:20, 98:6, 123:6 Hanson [8] - 12:18, 46:16, 48:4, 66:18, 97:19, 98:5, 118:24, 123:5 hard [2] - 36:4, 43:13 harm [1] - 74:3 hazardous [2] - 24:16, 26:1 head [2] - 20:12, 31:11 headline [1] - 74:8 health [1] - 28:3 hear [12] - 19:6, 20:18, 20:22, 31:24, 46:4, 55:13, 55:14, 73:1, 75:2, 76:22, 79:9, 112:20 heard [5] - 88:21, 89:15, 90:13, 96:22, 119:1 hearing [32] - 10:22, 11:22, 12:16, 14:18, 15:5, 19:25, 23:11, 23:17, 38:2, 39:9, 41:15, 41:22, 44:3, 45:3, 45:15, 45:25, 46:2, 46:7, 47:24, 50:17, 56:4, 60:4,

86:18, 91:8, 93:2, 97:1, 97:17, 98:3, 108:18, 110:23, 118:25, 123:3 hearings [2] - 107:11, 107:13 heavier [1] - 120:5 Heidi [1] - 18:18 held [16] - 2:1, 53:4, 71:9, 78:2, 83:4, 97:24, 98:23, 98:25, 101:4, 103:13, 103:14, 103:23, 106:10, 106:13, 106:18 help [2] - 110:16, 119:3 helped [2] - 44:18, 112:14 helpful [1] - 44:12 helping [1] - 25:8 helps [2] - 26:19, 47:18 hence [1] - 97:14 **HEREBY** [1] - 124:8 heritage [1] - 92:25 HGD [1] - 120:1 high [7] - 25:2, 26:16, 27:12, 30:14, 33:8, 36:23, 112:10 high-strength [1] -33:8 higher [3] - 15:25, 16:12, 17:1 **Highmore** [1] - 95:11 Highway [2] - 95:11, 120:1 hike [1] - 69:9 Hills [4] - 64:13, 64:19, 64:23, 64:24 hinder[1] - 29:19 hired [1] - 96:14 Historic [5] - 51:22, 53:15, 70:19, 70:20, 90:23  $\textbf{historic}~ \text{\small{[2]}-70:21},$ 72:8 historical [1] - 42:14 Historical [1] - 70:22 history [5] - 63:19, 77:13, 97:7, 98:20 Hit [3] - 51:5, 63:12, 63:15 Hohn [1] - 119:2 hold [2] - 66:19, 75:6 holder [3] - 99:11,

99:13, 106:20

106:15

holders [2] - 106:14,

holding [1] - 117:1

home [2] - 111:4, 111:8 homeland [1] - 62:1 homestead [1] - 53:9 hope [2] - 107:8, 108:5 hopefully [1] - 108:4 Horn [1] - 64:2 horses [1] - 71:3 Hostutler [2] - 99:3, 99:7 house [2] - 21:5, 51:13 HP09-001 [3] - 1:5, 3:4. 4:3 HP14-001 [6] - 1:4, 3:1, 11:24, 44:5, 97:2, 122:18 Hudson [1] - 27:16 human [3] - 69:3, 72:9, 74:3 hunt [1] - 83:5 hunting [1] - 54:4 hydrostatic [1] - 71:22

I

idea [4] - 30:24, 31:8, 112:12, 115:13 identical [1] - 19:3 identified [3] - 5:5, 5:15, 62:4 illustrate [1] - 7:14 imagine [2] - 23:10, 119:19 immediately [1] -99:15 impact [7] - 19:19, 19:22, 21:13, 21:14, 30:20, 109:5, 111:23 impacts [2] - 56:20, 79:10 impair [1] - 28:3 impinge [1] - 34:23 implement [3] - 15:25, 21:12, 30:19 implementing [3] -16:1, 21:9, 56:10 implications [1] -83:20 implied [1] - 61:22 import [1] - 65:9 important [9] - 13:25, 38:19, 38:22, 63:20, 72:5, 81:12, 88:6, 104:6, 107:1 impose [1] - 30:10 imposed [3] - 14:4,

14:5, 43:11

37:18, 55:19, 86:20 inappropriateness [1] - 48:19 **Inaudible** [1] - 33:3 inches [1] - 33:9 incidental [1] - 92:8 include [8] - 5:6, 5:7, 32:23, 34:1, 34:3, 104:2, 112:2, 112:13 included [4] - 70:24, 77:18, 107:12, 107:14 includes [4] - 19:20, 30:12, 30:21, 105:11 including [7] - 5:4, 21:8, 23:23, 41:16, 56:21, 64:11, 116:22 incomplete [1] - 7:9 inconsistent [2] -37:21, 72:5 incorporate [1] -71:17 incorporated [1] -7:13 incumbent [2] - 36:3, 106:20 independent [1] -116:11 Indian [38] - 50:23, 52:10, 58:1, 58:9, 63:25, 65:1, 65:10, 65:21, 66:8, 66:10, 67:2, 67:12, 67:14, 67:24, 68:1, 68:3, 68:14, 68:16, 68:19, 73:7, 75:2, 77:3, 77:9, 77:16, 95:5, 95:7, 95:14, 95:15, 95:23, 96:16, 96:17, 101:9, 103:19, 103:20, 109:14, 109:23. 112:1. 121:22 Indians [7] - 68:6, 78:4, 83:3, 92:9, 103:7, 106:24, 111:25 indicate [3] - 30:5, 109:21, 110:5 indicates [2] - 5:18, 27:19

improper [2] - 3:11,

inaccurate [3] - 7:10,

inadequate [1] - 26:15

**IN** [2] - 1:4, 1:5

42:21, 57:3

inadmissible [1] -

inappropriate [3] -

43:23

86:13

Indigenous [6] - 3:10, 5:22, 8:22, 10:1, 38:15, 87:25 individual [4] - 39:2, 88:12, 109:11, 111:4 induced [1] - 83:23 indulgence [1] -112:23 influence [1] - 119:9 inform [2] - 47:18, 86:22 information [2] - 7:10, 114:16 informed 131 - 85:11. 110:8. 110:12 initial [5] - 6:3, 8:6, 18:7, 25:3, 115:13 injunction [2] - 74:1, 101:11 inquiry [1] - 10:25 inside [3] - 63:6, 67:17, 74:23 inspection [1] - 26:24 install [1] - 22:15 installed [1] - 24:7 instance [1] - 112:15 instant [1] - 4:5 instead [2] - 73:1, 78.4 intake [2] - 102:16, 103:5 integrated [1] - 27:23 integrity [1] - 94:7 Integrity [2] - 27:13, 27:17 intend [1] - 92:21 intended [3] - 5:8, 15:4, 115:23 intent [1] - 5:10 intention [3] - 91:4, 93:8, 93:9 intents [1] - 121:17 interchangeably [1] -59:16 interest [8] - 5:24, 32:10, 77:23, 79:11, 82:2, 106:19, 106:20, 111:21 interested [2] - 6:18, 119:15 interesting [3] - 39:9, 54:15, 93:18 interestingly [2] -18:10, 62:11 interests [3] - 50:23, 53:23, 91:9 interfere [1] - 28:4 Interior [1] - 109:10 interior [2] - 96:17,

116:17

33:11 Interrogatories [2] -109:21, 110:5 interrupt [3] - 30:23, 50:7, 54:13 interrupted [2] -66:16, 105:8 interruption [1] -105:3 Interstate [2] - 116:5, 116.7 InterTribal [2] - 34:21, 87:4 intervening [2] -90:14, 95:25 Intervenor [4] - 39:2, 75:10, 88:12, 108:2 Intervenors [14] -8:12, 8:25, 10:5, 15:15, 32:3, 34:2, 35:6, 37:9, 56:1, 87:8, 87:15, 108:16, 114:5, 114:22 intervention [2] -50:20. 114:3 introduce [2] - 19:8. 113:10 introduced [1] - 60:4 invasion [2] - 94:8, 96:3 investigate [4] -23:13, 28:16, 29:8, 29:25 involved [4] - 76:12, 77:21, 79:21, 112:8 involvement [1] -53:17 involving [1] - 92:11 irony [2] - 60:2, 60:9 irrelevant [5] - 41:2, 41:7, 41:21, 86:11, 86:13 isolated [1] - 88:14 isolation [2] - 24:9, 24:12 issue [35] - 5:25, 6:4, 20:9, 20:10, 23:17, 26:18, 26:20, 27:20, 34:23, 39:21, 41:9, 42:13, 42:17, 42:23, 44:8, 47:14, 53:14, 71:15, 72:2, 76:23, 79:14, 79:19, 80:6,

intermarriage [1] -

intermediary [1] -

intermingling [1] -

71:3

100:8

57:22

80:16, 91:6, 91:8, 92:22, 96:9, 101:14, 105:16, 110:16, 116:20, 119:11, 119:13, 122:23 issued [6] - 3:3, 4:3, 7:17, 21:13, 29:5, internal [2] - 26:24, 49:11 **ISSUED** [1] - 1:5 issues [43] - 13:16, 13:20, 14:9, 16:20, 16:22, 23:19, 26:22, 29:25, 31:5, 37:17, 37:23, 37:25, 38:4, 42:20, 43:8, 50:21, 53:19, 54:11, 54:25, 55:2, 55:11, 60:5, 60:6, 60:8, 60:15, 62:11, 63:20, 70:17, 71:14, 71:15, 72:5, 76:5, 85:20, 90:11, 92:24, 92:25, 93:10, 96:22, 97:12, 97:24, 108:6, 114:6, 117:15 issuing [2] - 5:21, 74:1 items [1] - 79:16 itself [6] - 5:17, 49:4, 57:2, 60:19, 72:4, 101:22 Iverson [1] - 120:2

# J

James [2] - 10:8, 13:6 Jennifer [1] - 27:15 job [2] - 75:11, 85:14 **John** [3] - 1:15, 31:13, 119:4 Johnson [1] - 116:1 join [3] - 9:4, 9:6, 35:11 joined [2] - 34:19, 88:3 Jones [7] - 99:4, 102:24, 102:25, 107:24, 116:10, 116:14, 119:25 Journal [1] - 74:7 Joy [1] - 1:17 Judge [4] - 73:13, 91:18, 91:20, 92:3 judge [3] - 73:25, 74:16, 91:19 judicial [1] - 54:25 July [1] - 120:9 jumbling [1] - 59:6 jumped [1] - 85:12 juncture [1] - 12:13

June [4] - 1:9, 2:4, 124:10, 124:14 junior [1] - 99:11 jurisdiction [22] -13:15, 13:23, 15:7, 43:9, 43:19, 43:24, 49:5, 49:7, 53:13, 54:3, 54:25, 55:2, 55:13, 55:14, 60:6, 75:23, 85:18, 85:21, 86:6, 86:7, 94:12, 96:18 jurisdictional [2] -23:13, 28:15 justification [1] -

#### Κ

59:24

**Kansas** [1] - 64:3 Kearney [1] - 1:16 keep [5] - 20:17, 20:20, 87:11, 88:5 key [2] - 7:10, 104:13 **KEYSTONE** [2] - 1:4, 1:6 Keystone [94] - 3:2, 3:4, 4:19, 4:25, 5:6, 5:12, 5:19, 6:23, 7:4, 10:9, 10:15, 10:23, 11:14, 11:16, 13:5, 13:7, 14:2, 14:16, 14:19, 14:21, 15:14, 16:11, 17:7, 17:21, 19:18, 20:9, 21:4, 21:16, 22:14, 22:16, 23:7, 25:16, 26:24, 29:1, 31:17, 33:2, 33:3, 33:7, 42:1, 43:10, 44:22, 45:3, 45:5, 50:13, 50:24, 53:2, 76:6, 79:17, 82:22, 82:23, 85:6, 85:12, 85:16, 86:14, 86:25, 89:11, 90:8, 90:16, 91:17, 91:19, 91:22, 92:14, 95:24, 98:14, 98:17, 99:2, 99:14, 99:15, 99:23, 100:4, 100:7, 100:13, 100:19, 100:24, 101:15, 101:21, 104:10, 104:16, 105:4, 107:9, 109:25, 110:4, 110:8, 110:17, 116:13, 117:9, 117:11, 117:18, 118:3, 118:12, 118:16,

Keystone's [25] - 4:6, 4:22, 5:1, 5:13, 5:16, 12:24, 16:4, 20:1, 20:7. 23:2. 23:5. 44:5, 47:5, 50:1, 75:19, 85:25, 87:16, 88:5, 97:3, 98:12, 101:25, 109:22, 115:5, 118:18, 122:18 kilovolt [1] - 80:18 kilovolts [1] - 80:13 Kimberly [3] - 9:25, 38:14, 87:25 kind [11] - 4:1, 4:19, 18:10, 29:2, 42:14, 65:13, 68:18, 86:7, 97:11, 108:22, 115:9 king [1] - 51:14 known [1] - 7:20 Kornmann [3] - 91:18, 91:20, 92:3 Kothari [3] - 18:20, 31:16, 32:25 Kristen [4] - 1:15, 40:25, 89:21, 114:25 **KRISTIE** [1] - 1:12 Kuprewicz [13] -12:25, 13:16, 18:4, 36:9, 36:13, 37:13, 38:11, 42:15, 43:1, 43:2, 43:15, 44:6, 86:4 Kuprewicz's [7] -18:8, 20:4, 20:16, 41:1, 41:14, 43:20, 44:20

119:1, 120:19

## L

labels [1] - 106:8 lack [2] - 4:18, 114:5 lacks [2] - 15:7, 75:23 lake [1] - 94:24 **Lakota** [5] - 69:15, 69:21, 69:24, 70:11, 78:10 Lakotas [2] - 69:7, 69:25 land [52] - 25:1, 36:18, 50:22, 50:23, 51:3, 51:15, 51:20, 52:10, 52:20, 53:4, 53:6, 53:23, 54:2, 54:8, 55:18, 58:11, 61:2, 64:19, 67:16, 67:19, 67:20, 67:21, 75:23, 76:7, 76:12, 76:14,

96:9, 98:22, 99:1, 100:20, 101:3, 103:14, 103:21, 106:11. 106:13. 106:14, 121:21, 122:9 landowner [8] - 92:15, 99:11, 100:19, 100:21, 100:22, 100:23, 100:25, 111:17 landowners [3] -99:15, 122:1, 122:9 lands [5] - 76:10, 78:3, 91:25, 92:7, 92:9 landslide [3] - 13:17, 25:2, 42:12 language [7] - 57:2, 78:7, 78:8, 80:20, 81:6, 81:12, 102:22 Laramie [10] - 61:23, 63:24, 76:21, 77:1, 77:4, 77:11, 77:17, 77:23, 78:2, 78:3 large [2] - 26:16, 52:9 largely [1] - 35:19 largest [1] - 23:25 Lashley [1] - 1:17 last [11] - 18:16, 18:20, 18:22, 40:23, 50:14, 52:23, 66:9, 74:19, 98:11, 114:3 lastly [1] - 43:17 Lavetta [1] - 88:21 law [60] - 3:21, 4:2, 6:24, 8:9, 9:5, 9:15, 13:21, 14:3, 14:15, 15:1, 15:22, 17:1, 19:9, 19:25, 20:23, 23:15, 27:22, 28:6, 28:12, 28:22, 28:24, 29:3, 29:13, 30:8, 30:12, 31:22, 33:18, 33:19, 33:21, 34:1, 34:4, 41:6, 41:12, 51:9, 51:18, 53:20, 54:20, 58:1, 58:5, 63:4, 63:9, 70:6, 71:18, 71:19, 74:12, 82:4, 82:25, 83:14, 84:4, 84:15, 89:13, 89:14, 96:13, 96:14, 99:10, 102:13, 102:15, 108:9, 116:1, 122:12 **Law** [4] - 16:18, 29:5,

77:6, 78:16, 78:21,

83:24, 88:16, 91:7,

79:5, 83:6, 83:7,

91:9, 92:1, 92:5,

103:18, 122:13 lawfully [1] - 83:9 laws [11] - 4:15, 17:12, 21:8, 29:17, 74:21, 82:23, 89:11, 90:16, 90:18, 101:8, 110:19 lawyer [1] - 21:3 lawyers [1] - 47:19 lay [1] - 41:17 lays [2] - 104:4, 104:5 lead [5] - 44:4, 55:23, 55:25, 62:3, 108:7 leaders [1] - 73:2 leadoff [1] - 56:5 leak [1] - 104:9 learned [2] - 97:7, 97:8 least [6] - 9:4, 53:22, 59:19, 110:8, 110:12, 115:22 leave [2] - 34:5, 69:23 leaving [1] - 24:11 led [1] - 115:25 leeway [1] - 113:4 left [3] - 64:16, 101:25, 105:2 legal [9] - 39:16, 43:18, 47:18, 52:20, 91:9, 103:11, 115:19, 121:7, 121:8 legislation [1] - 58:19 Lehman [1] - 96:15 length [2] - 99:23, 99:24 lengthy [1] - 117:14 leniency [1] - 113:17 less [1] - 80:2 letter [3] - 18:9, 108:9, 116.21 **level** [2] - 69:3, 80:18 **library** [1] - 74:12 license [2] - 74:9, 74:13 life [1] - 116:2 light [1] - 29:2 limit [8] - 15:15, 15:19, 39:5, 39:7, 39:10, 39:13, 39:17, 39:19 limitational [1] - 5:2 limited [3] - 4:10, 50:15, 82:25 limiting [1] - 5:14 limits [1] - 43:23 line [29] - 8:14, 22:13, 22:15, 24:11, 24:14, 32:3, 40:13, 48:17, 49:24, 79:22, 80:1, 80:3, 80:9, 80:17, 100:20, 100:21,

102:2, 102:3, 104:8,

104:11, 107:18, 10 107:20, 107:22, 114:14, 118:1, 118:2, 118:23, 121:3 lines 181 - 103:3. 107:16, 107:23, 107:25. 108:1. 116:15, 118:14, 119:22 linger [1] - 97:12 link [1] - 38:3 liquid [2] - 24:16, 26:1 liquids [1] - 104:10 list [4] - 18:3, 32:2, 75:9, 82:19 listed [3] - 3:8, 3:9, 114:4 listen [3] - 12:4, 46:6, 46:7 listened [1] - 12:9 listening [1] - 39:14 literally [2] - 72:10, 73:18 litigation [3] - 64:25, 73:21, 115:14 live [4] - 34:14, 51:13, 61:3, 83:24 lived [3] - 51:2, 51:4, 61:1 livestock [1] - 112:3 local [6] - 6:14, 6:17, 6:25, 7:7, 17:3, 18:11 locate [2] - 22:18, 24:6 located [2] - 62:14, 92:1 location [6] - 24:20, 24:21, 24:24, 25:22, 25:24, 26:17 locations [7] - 22:12, 22:21, 22:23, 24:8, 24:14, 26:12, 41:5 locks [1] - 62:14 logical [1] - 7:21 look [11] - 14:9, 21:7, 31:21, 36:4, 37:1, 42:25, 55:3, 55:5, 69:10, 102:20, 113:7 looked [5] - 26:4, 50:8, 65:11, 66:11, 85:2 looking [2] - 16:16, 49:10 lost [2] - 88:4, 92:6 Lou [1] - 117:12 lower [1] - 33:10 Lower [1] - 105:12 **LP** [3] - 1:5, 3:2, 91:18 **Lyman** [5] - 102:24, 102:25, 107:24,

116:10, 116:14

#### M

magically [1] - 102:18 Magna [1] - 51:12 main [5] - 22:12, 22:15, 24:14, 71:15, 119.22 maintain [2] - 15:17, 41.20 maintains [1] - 110:18 maintenance [2] -30:11, 110:20 majority [1] - 53:8 Man [2] - 88:25, 95:16 man [2] - 74:9, 88:16 manage [1] - 99:18 Management [4] -27:13, 27:18, 94:9, 94:13 management [1] -84:5 manages [1] - 56:17 managing [1] - 56:10 mandated [1] - 10:25 Mann [3] - 99:4, 99:7, 120:3 manner [5] - 24:9, 24:12, 37:18, 108:8 map [15] - 66:7, 66:11, 66:14, 66:18, 66:22, 67:1, 67:7, 67:13, 67:14, 67:23, 67:24, 67:25, 68:8, 72:18, 93:20 maps [2] - 106:6, 106:7 March [3] - 74:7, 74:13, 74:19 material [1] - 86:16 Matt [4] - 9:13, 15:12, 87:10, 108:23 MATTER [1] - 1:4 matter [20] - 2:2, 3:1, 6:1, 8:9, 17:20, 17:24, 17:25, 18:24, 41:8, 44:5, 51:8, 58:4, 68:24, 97:2, 105:23, 108:17, 118:8, 119:11, 119:13, 124:10 matters [4] - 15:1, 15:6, 43:5, 114:1 MCCOMSEY [1] -124:5 McComsey [2] - 1:24, 124:18

McLaughlin [1] -

56:13 mean [10] - 24:13, 31:8, 36:1, 36:23, 44:14. 57:24. 72:2. 82:5, 89:6, 122:22 meaning [1] - 58:2 means [5] - 4:9, 20:13, 29:8, 60:21, 80:17 meant [2] - 46:22, 95:3 meat [1] - 16:15 Meera [2] - 18:19, 31:16 meet [13] - 4:7, 7:4, 7:6, 10:23, 16:5, 20:9, 25:4, 27:2, 38:6, 45:5, 49:10, 100:3, 117:22 meeting [3] - 108:19, 117:14, 117:16 meets [1] - 119:10 Mellette [1] - 88:15 member [1] - 113:23 members [3] - 85:10, 87:25, 114:14 men [1] - 95:20 mention [1] - 89:24 mentioned [5] - 31:16, 36:10, 48:22, 82:13, 85:25 merits [1] - 85:13 messed [1] - 65:9 met [6] - 26:9, 26:10, 26:11, 29:1, 86:15, 117:13 meters [1] - 23:25 methodology [1] -23:23 methods [2] - 25:15, 89:4 micro [1] - 58:12 mics [1] - 66:24 middle [1] - 67:6 might [8] - 38:21, 54:14, 63:18, 69:3, 75:12, 78:21, 84:6, 111:10 mile [1] - 107:20 miles [4] - 24:18, 25:1, 36:23, 62:16 Millelacs [8] - 83:2, 83:18, 84:8, 94:17, 94:18, 94:20, 94:22 MILLELACS [1] - 83:3 million [2] - 64:21, 77:5 mind [3] - 24:19,

50:13, 122:22

24:15, 25:25

minimize [3] - 22:21,

Minnesota [6] - 64:6, 68:11, 83:2, 83:19, 84:8, 94:20 Minnesota's [1] - 83:5 minus [1] - 22:6 Miranda [1] - 93:19 mislead [1] - 75:20 misleading [1] - 57:3 misportrayed [1] -65.8 misrepresentations [1] - 75:19 missing [1] - 40:22 Missouri [12] - 63:4, 63:5, 64:3, 64:11, 64:12, 71:24, 76:11, 76:13, 77:6, 94:6, 95:9, 95:12 misstatement [1] -121:24 mistake [1] - 114:5 misunderstood [1] -47:4 Mni [24] - 98:13, 98:19, 98:20, 98:22, 98:24, 99:2, 99:18, 103:2, 109:2, 109:9, 110:4, 111:3, 111:24, 112:2, 113:25, 114:9, 114:16, 115:17, 115:24. 118:14. 120:4, 121:2, 122:19 moment [1] - 15:11 Montana [1] - 77:8 **MOORE** [3] - 10:8, 13:6, 42:5 Moore [4] - 10:9, 13:7, 40:10, 117:12 moreover [1] - 83:16 morning [12] - 9:12, 9:19, 9:25, 12:9, 57:23, 64:8, 66:5, 70:14, 74:15, 92:12, 93:3, 112:22 most [2] - 67:5, 116:2 Motion [9] - 3:10, 11:25, 12:25, 44:5, 50:1, 87:16, 97:3, 98:12, 122:19 motion [120] - 3:22, 5:1, 5:13, 5:23, 6:6, 6:8, 8:16, 8:22, 9:4, 9:7, 9:14, 9:22, 10:2, 10:14, 11:1, 11:22, 12:2, 12:5, 12:9, 12:12, 12:17, 12:23, 13:9, 13:12, 13:13, 15:3, 17:16, 17:18, 17:21, 20:8, 31:25,

37:19, 37:20, 38:10, 38:17, 39:16, 40:15, 40:16, 40:17, 42:9, 43:13. 43:18. 44:7. 44:9, 44:10, 45:1, 45:22, 45:24, 46:18, 46:21, 46:23, 47:2, 47:6, 47:7, 47:15, 47:23, 47:24, 48:2, 48:8, 50:13, 50:14, 52:1, 53:18, 56:23, 56:25, 57:2, 57:6, 57:14, 57:18, 57:19, 57:22, 59:6, 59:7, 59:14, 59:17, 59:19, 60:7, 60:10, 60:13, 60:19, 61:19, 66:1, 70:14, 82:1, 85:22, 86:4, 86:25, 87:6, 88:5, 89:23, 90:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:14, 97:16, 98:10, 98:11, 109:1, 111:19, 111:20, 115:2, 115:13, 122:21, 123:3, 123:10 motions [7] - 3:5, 37:5, 37:15, 37:22, 44:3, 97:1, 122:17 Mountains [1] - 64:2 movable [1] - 34:12 movants [1] - 6:4 move [7] - 11:25, 35:8, 42:3, 44:6, 45:16, 97:2. 122:18 moved [4] - 46:18, 61:2, 64:15, 115:10 movement [1] - 26:25 **moves** [1] - 115:9 moving [1] - 39:24 MR [71] - 8:15, 9:2, 9:12, 9:19, 9:24, 10:8, 13:2, 13:4, 13:6, 15:11, 31:2, 31:12, 32:20, 33:5, 34:21, 35:10, 37:11, 39:2, 39:8, 39:17, 39:20, 40:3, 40:9, 40:16, 40:19, 42:5, 44:13, 45:9, 48:10, 48:11, 48:14, 49:6, 49:14, 49:16, 49:18, 50:5, 50:12, 54:19, 55:24, 56:2, 66:15, 66:21, 66:25, 75:14, 82:12, 82:20, 87:3,

32:4, 32:10, 32:14,

34:22, 35:2, 35:12,

32:22, 34:10, 34:17,

35:16, 37:13, 37:14,

87:10, 87:20, 88:12, 11 90:9, 98:15, 101:19, 108:21, 110:25, 113:6, 113:10, 113:12, 113:16, 113:21, 115:9, 119:5, 119:6, 119:25. 120:10. 120:21, 121:17, 121:23, 122:3, 122:7, 122:10 **MS** [14] - 3:14, 3:16, 8:20, 9:25, 11:13, 32:7, 34:8, 38:14, 40:24, 75:17, 84:20, 87:24, 89:21, 114:25 multiple [1] - 102:8 multiyear [1] - 62:7 must [11] - 21:8, 22:15, 22:18, 24:7, 25:25, 35:16, 50:9, 84:5, 84:14, 117:7, 117:15 muster [1] - 59:20 mute [1] - 54:15 mutually [1] - 6:19 mysterious [1] -119:10 mystery [1] - 118:21

#### Ν

name [3] - 18:20, 102:12, 113:22 named [1] - 112:22 narrow [1] - 37:15 **narrowly** [1] - 5:3 Nation [17] - 57:11, 63:23, 64:1, 64:5, 64:21, 65:4, 65:9, 67:8, 67:20, 68:8, 68:15, 68:25, 71:8, 74:23, 77:5, 77:17 nation [2] - 6:16, 18:14 National [4] - 51:22, 53:14, 70:20, 90:23 nations [1] - 117:19 Native [2] - 74:9, 74:12 native [3] - 60:24, 61:13, 83:23 Natives [1] - 63:16 nature [1] - 62:8 nay [4] - 12:17, 48:3, 98:4, 123:4 nearly [1] - 36:23 Nebraska [6] - 8:16, 77:7, 79:20, 80:15,

80:21, 81:19 necessarily [4] -41:10, 78:15, 103:14, 106:18 necessary [2] - 10:14, 116:16 need [15] - 25:11, 31:1, 32:4, 39:23, 45:16, 47:16, 62:5, 67:18, 68:5, 89:8, 108:9, 108:16, 114:16, 114:22, 115:14 needed [3] - 98:17, 105:10, 107:4 needs [4] - 8:13, 45:4, 114:1, 122:25 negotiate [2] - 92:15, 117:22 negotiated [5] - 71:25, 99:23, 99:24, 104:16, 116:13 negotiating [2] -100:19, 101:21 negotiation [1] - 102:7 negotiations [2] -102:9, 104:7 negotiators [1] -83:23 neighbor's [1] -111:11 **NELSON** [97] - 1:12, 3:1, 3:15, 8:11, 8:18, 8:24, 9:11, 9:18, 9:23, 10:4, 11:11, 11:20, 12:2, 12:7, 12:20, 12:22, 12:24, 13:3, 13:5, 15:9, 30:22, 31:7, 32:1, 32:18, 34:6, 34:18, 35:5, 37:8, 38:12, 38:25, 39:6, 39:12, 39:19, 39:22, 40:7, 40:14, 40:18, 40:21, 41:25, 44:1, 44:14, 45:10, 46:12, 46:14, 47:10, 48:6, 48:8, 48:13, 49:3, 49:9, 49:17, 49:19, 49:24, 50:7, 54:13, 55:21, 55:25, 66:13, 66:16, 66:23, 75:8, 75:16, 82:10, 82:16, 84:18, 87:1, 87:7, 87:19, 87:21, 88:9, 89:19, 90:7, 96:25, 97:19, 98:1, 98:7, 98:9, 101:18, 108:14, 110:22, 113:3, 113:9, 113:14,

113:20, 114:19, 115:8, 119:16, 120:6, 120:13, 121:13, 121:19, 121:25, 122:6, 122:8, 122:14, 123:7, 123:9 Nelson [5] - 12:22, 47:3, 48:8, 98:9, 123:9 Nelson's [1] - 47:7 Network [5] - 5:23, 8:23, 10:1, 38:15, 88:1 Network's [1] - 3:10 never [6] - 21:16, 21:19, 61:12, 103:22, 105:18 new [9] - 8:4, 23:17, 93.5 next [2] - 37:14 nice [1] - 52:19 night [1] - 70:3 **nilly** [1] - 66:2 noises [1] - 54:15 nominal [1] - 33:9 82.17 103:19, 103:20, 112:1

36:1, 36:22, 50:10, 81:3, 81:24, 91:6, nominated [2] - 56:5, non [5] - 69:21, 92:9, non-Indian [3] -103:19, 103:20, 112:1 non-Indians [1] - 92:9 non-Lakota [1] - 69:21 noncompliance [4] -28:18, 28:19, 29:9, 33:21 none [8] - 11:22, 12:16, 47:24, 90:25, 97:17, 98:3, 119:9, nonexclusive [2] -99:9, 99:10 nontribal [2] - 102:18, 114:14 North [5] - 62:9, 68:10, 77:7, 95:10, 121:1 **north** [2] - 64:4, 116:5 notable [1] - 106:5 Notary [2] - 124:7, 124:18 note [5] - 3:22, 39:4,

40:3, 91:21, 113:12

noted [2] - 40:19,

102:13

nothing [8] - 5:20, 30:5, 55:1, 59:3, 59:12, 90:14, 92:20, 118:22 notice [1] - 22:14 notion [3] - 58:3, 72:21, 94:4 number [3] - 13:18, 29:15, 112:11 numbers [2] - 65:12, 65:13

#### 0

Oahe [2] - 54:3, 92:12 **object** [1] - 46:10 objected [3] - 41:14, 46:3, 46:10 objecting [1] - 43:16 objection [3] - 113:13. 113:18, 113:19 objections [1] - 46:7 **objective** [1] - 108:8 obligated [1] - 113:18 **obligation** [1] - 115:19 obligations [1] - 109:3 obtain [2] - 101:15, 115:20 obtained [2] - 99:6, 99:7 obviously [4] - 19:11, 62:21, 110:1, 118:1 occupancy [1] - 68:3 occupation [1] - 92:7 occupied [1] - 78:6 October [1] - 114:4 **OF** [8] - 1:2, 1:4, 1:4, 1:5, 2:1, 124:1, 124:3 off-reservation [5] -56:21, 73:4, 83:8, 83:12, 84:6 offer [1] - 92:24 offered [9] - 10:17, 31:3, 42:11, 42:12, 42:17, 43:1, 43:15, 55:16, 89:25 offering [1] - 42:24 offerings [1] - 90:3 offers [1] - 41:13 office [2] - 66:8, 66:9 Office [1] - 70:19 officer [1] - 119:3 Oglala [39] - 98:18, 99:24, 100:1, 100:2, 100:6, 101:21, 102:10, 102:11, 102:23, 103:1, 103:4, 104:18,

104:22, 105:5, 105:10, 105:13, 106:3, 106:7, 106:15, 107:4, 112:18, 112:21, 113:11, 113:23, 113:25, 114:8, 115:16. 115:20. 115:21, 117:7, 117:9, 118:10, 118:15, 119:14, 120:18, 120:23, 121:11, 121:13 Oglalas [1] - 113:2 oil [2] - 104:9, 118:22 old [2] - 120:1, 120:2 Olson [1] - 70:18 on-line [1] - 49:24 once [1] - 99:3 one [38] - 3:13, 13:16, 14:20, 14:22, 19:1, 22:18, 22:19, 27:15, 28:21, 29:13, 31:15, 36:24, 42:7, 47:9, 47:13, 55:7, 56:18, 56:21. 60:1. 61:18. 62:3. 62:11. 66:23. 78:11, 79:13, 79:19, 81:16, 84:1, 85:24, 94:6, 96:6, 106:6, 108:1, 116:4, 117:17, 118:21, 119:18, 119:25 one's [1] - 85:7 one-third [1] - 116:4 ones [2] - 110:12, 110:13 Onida [1] - 124:13 open [5] - 24:17, 25:12, 26:2, 49:13, 121:20 operate [2] - 33:10, 113:25 operated [1] - 26:8 operates [1] - 20:25 operating [1] - 119:3 operation [7] - 19:25, 30:11, 62:13, 62:22, 82:24, 109:23, 110:19 operational [1] - 28:15 operative [1] - 41:9 operator [1] - 23:21 operators [1] - 112:4 opinion [4] - 25:21, 26:19, 77:15, 83:18 opinions [1] - 53:22 opponents [1] - 45:2 opportunity [10] -

17:18, 18:1, 32:5,

41:17, 42:1, 46:6, 12 58:21, 79:9, 81:10, 113:22 oppose [1] - 11:3 opposed [7] - 11:3, 12:17, 48:3, 98:4, 117:9, 117:17, 123:4 opposes [2] - 82:1, 86:24 **opposition** [2] - 87:16, 108:25 oral [2] - 47:20, 57:23 ORDER [1] - 1:5 order [13] - 3:3, 3:7, 4:4, 4:13, 4:14, 5:12, 10:14, 21:24, 35:18, 45:19, 62:3, 78:23, 98:18 orderly [1] - 28:4 orders [2] - 71:6, 78:20 ordinance [1] - 17:4 original [7] - 21:24, 23:18, 27:16, 68:3, 73:19, 79:4, 117:4 originates [1] - 79:23 OSRWS [1] - 105:7 **OST** [1] - 106:8 otherwise [2] - 86:13, 117:22 outlined [1] - 17:16 outset [1] - 75:18 outside [16] - 52:20, 54:9, 59:18, 62:16, 62:22, 63:3, 63:5, 67:17, 69:1, 71:1, 73:8, 73:22, 74:3, 74:23, 79:23, 79:25 outstanding [1] - 65:3 overall [1] - 18:12 overlap [4] - 61:17, 61:18, 66:1, 66:4 overreaching [1] -86:3 overstating [1] - 57:4 own [12] - 12:10, 15:20, 19:8, 53:10, 58:14, 75:25, 106:11, 106:13, 106:18, 111:8, 122:1, 122:9 owned [6] - 53:5, 58:11, 100:21, 100:22 owner [3] - 51:20, 113:24, 116:25 ownership [4] - 72:9, 72:10, 72:12, 101:5 Oyate [1] - 91:15

#### Ρ

**p.m** [1] - 123:13 page [10] - 20:7, 20:8, 26:7, 65:11, 65:13, 65:14, 65:15, 65:16, 68:6, 73:12 Paige [1] - 70:18 papers [2] - 50:19, 50:20 paragraph [1] - 105:3 Park [5] - 69:4, 69:5, 69:15, 69:19, 70:1 parking [1] - 69:9 Parks [2] - 69:20, 74.16 part [29] - 4:12, 9:7, 14:5, 14:7, 17:3, 18:6, 19:25, 21:15, 36:12, 67:25, 70:4, 77:14, 91:25, 102:20, 102:21, 104:14, 104:15, 105:13, 105:15, 105:19, 107:12, 108:3, 111:15, 111:22, 115:19, 120:7, 121:10, 121:24 participation [2] -112:14, 114:6 particular [7] - 17:24, 17:25, 25:11, 43:14, 43:22, 45:21, 80:23 particularity [2] -57:20, 59:9 particularly [3] -11:14, 32:24, 34:22 parties [11] - 10:2, 32:11, 37:22, 41:15, 50:11, 50:20, 52:5, 77:20, 81:9, 87:14, 87:15 partnership [1] -116:9 parts [2] - 68:10 party [5] - 6:18, 19:12, 25:19, 76:21, 77:22 pass [2] - 47:9, 59:20 passed [2] - 61:11, 117.9 passing [1] - 17:4 past [1] - 64:5 pasture [1] - 111:4 pausing [1] - 97:21 pay [1] - 25:11 payments [2] - 64:17, 64:18

peasant [1] - 51:12

people [14] - 28:16, 38:22, 58:9, 59:4, 61:13, 69:3, 69:15, 70:9. 70:11. 75:2. 83:23. 107:15. 108:12, 112:1 peoples [1] - 51:2 per [1] - 62:23 percent [3] - 20:16, 20:17, 80:2 perfectly [1] - 5:23 perhaps [5] - 36:22, 51:23, 57:3, 58:13, 119:19 Perkins [1] - 62:13 permanent [2] - 62:1, 71:11 permissible [2] - 5:23, 6.9 permission [15] -98:17, 101:15, 104:12, 104:21, 105:10, 105:25, 106:3, 107:4, 115:15, 115:20, 119:14, 121:2, 121:5, 121:12, 121:14 Permit [1] - 82:22 **PERMIT** [1] - 1:5 permit [45] - 3:3, 4:8, 4:15, 5:14, 8:8, 9:15, 10:24, 14:6, 14:23, 16:7, 17:9, 17:10, 17:11, 19:17, 20:10, 21:8, 21:25, 23:3, 23:5, 23:18, 28:7, 28:9, 28:17, 29:7, 29:10, 29:20, 30:13, 30:18, 33:2, 33:6, 35:24, 41:22, 44:23, 45:6, 49:11, 71:12, 75:4, 75:25, 81:1, 81:4, 81:12, 81:22, 93:14. 100:14 permits [4] - 24:9, 24:12, 28:18, 28:19 permitted [1] - 114:17 person [5] - 51:19, 69:21, 69:24, 89:4, 109:10 pertaining [1] - 3:19 Peter [1] - 9:19 **Petition** [3] - 4:23, 5:5, 11:9 **PETITION** [1] - 1:4 petition [4] - 3:2, 5:11, 10:18, 36:2

PHMSA [18] - 14:4,

14:5, 14:10, 14:16,

14:21, 18:10, 19:20, 22:1, 23:3, 27:11, 27:18, 30:16, 31:13, 31:18, 35:20, 35:24, 43:10, 43:12 PHMSA's [1] - 32:24 phone [4] - 8:14, 34:19, 54:14 **phonetic** [1] - 73:2 **phrase** [2] - 5:17, 25:12 physically [1] - 121:5 piece [1] - 116:6 Pierre [2] - 2:3, 102:16 Piersol [1] - 73:13 pigeonhole [1] - 37:17 Pille [3] - 112:22, 113:10, 113:22 **PILLE** [1] - 113:21 **pipe** [10] - 26:24, 103:24, 103:25, 104:1, 104:2, 119:9, 119:23, 120:5, 122:4 Pipeline [28] - 3:2, 13:21, 14:3, 14:12, 15:22, 15:23, 16:1, 16:6, 21:9, 50:24, 53:2, 91:18, 91:19, 91:22, 99:2, 99:19, 100:8, 100:13, 104:10, 110:4, 111:3, 114:16, 115:17, 117:10, 117:18, 118:12, 119:1, 122:20 **PIPELINE** [2] - 1:4, 1:6 pipeline [60] - 3:4, 8:2, 13:18, 16:13, 18:13, 19:7, 22:22, 24:14, 24:19, 25:1, 25:22. 25:24, 26:16, 27:22, 28:10, 28:14, 29:12, 29:18, 30:3, 31:18, 33:3, 33:7, 33:10, 34:11, 35:21, 36:25, 38:5, 38:21, 41:2, 42:16, 43:7, 66:5, 71:6, 76:8, 76:20, 78:9, 86:2, 91:24, 94:7, 98:13, 98:25, 101:1, 101:25, 103:21, 104:4, 104:5, 105:8, 106:20, 107:1, 107:17, 108:13, 109:2, 109:24, 110:13, 110:20, 111:4, 113:25, 118:23, 120:3, 121:22

pipelines [7] - 98:19, 98:23, 98:25, 99:8, 105:21, 118:13 place [13] - 26:25, 40:6, 44:16, 70:8, 81:11, 92:18, 97:13, 110:3, 110:7, 110:10, 111:15, 121:4 placed [1] - 109:9 placement [4] - 13:17, 42:18, 43:3, 43:5 places [2] - 36:24, 99:3 plain [3] - 92:13, 93:10, 95:22 **Plains** [3] - 67:6, 69:1, 120:25 plan [3] - 27:8, 30:15, 72:15 Plan [2] - 27:13, 27:18 planning [1] - 27:17 **plastic** [1] - 119:9 playing [1] - 12:10 plenty [1] - 78:7 plus [1] - 22:5 point [28] - 12:12, 13:25, 14:23, 32:21, 32:22, 33:16, 44:14, 47:13. 48:12. 48:24. 57:4. 57:9. 59:14. 59:17. 73:10. 74:14. 74:15. 75:18. 79:13. 79:16, 82:12, 82:18, 88:13, 91:22, 94:18, 95:9, 109:4, 122:12 pointed [1] - 33:24 pointing [2] - 56:7, 60:1 points [5] - 42:6, 57:1, 63:2, 93:17, 117:25 policy [1] - 117:19 politely [1] - 102:6 political [2] - 100:2, 102:12 pollution [2] - 24:15, 26:1 poor [1] - 112:6 population [4] - 22:20, 112:10, 116:4, 116:6 portion [2] - 45:18, 46:24 portions [3] - 41:1, 44:19, 44:24 portray [2] - 57:7, 57:8 portrays [1] - 68:1 pose [2] - 28:2, 38:21 position [10] - 5:8, 13:20, 32:9, 32:16, 38:16, 56:16, 87:4,

89:23, 115:2, 115:6 13 positions [2] - 47:19, 86:17 possessory [1] -60:23 **possibility** [1] - 109:5 possible [5] - 7:17, 25:23, 32:13, 58:22, 85:11 possibly [1] - 34:11 potable [1] - 34:14 potential [5] - 33:20, 53:17, 56:20, 81:11, 111:23 potentially [1] - 86:16 Power [1] - 81:19 power [6] - 63:12, 79:20, 80:2, 80:15, 80:21, 92:8 practical [1] - 116:25 practice [1] - 56:3 practiced [1] - 96:13 practices [1] - 70:5 pray [1] - 69:22 precedence [1] -81:13 precise [2] - 43:15, 62:8 precisely [2] - 94:18, 101:2 Preclude [7] - 3:11, 11:25, 50:2, 87:16, 97:3, 98:12, 122:19 preclude [3] - 3:19, 45:8, 48:18 precluded [1] - 8:8 predecessors [1] -53:9 preempted [10] -13:21, 15:1, 15:22, 17:5, 19:9, 20:20, 20:22, 23:19, 27:22, 31:20 preemption [7] -13:14, 16:23, 17:13, 19:5, 20:15, 41:8, 43:19 preempts [1] - 15:24 prefiled [3] - 13:15, 32:25, 56:18 prejudice [1] - 108:12 prejudiced [2] -107:12, 107:15 preparation [1] -27:17 prepared [5] - 27:9, 47:21, 67:24, 90:5, 120:21 present [9] - 15:15, 15:20, 17:19, 18:25,

25:18, 54:9, 59:13, 64:10, 91:23 present-day [1] -91:23 presentation [1] -97.7 presented [3] - 18:15, 44:15, 65:7 presenting [1] - 15:5 Preservation [4] -51:22, 53:15, 70:19, 70:20 preservation [2] -70:21, 72:9 preserved [1] - 54:8 preserving [1] - 15:20 president [1] - 119:3 presidential [1] -100:14 pressure [2] - 33:10, 33:11 presumption [3] -28:8, 28:13 pretty [5] - 20:8, 30:24, 40:11, 44:16, 122:22 prevent [2] - 102:4, 104.1 previous [1] - 77:2 previously [2] - 7:5, 91.25 primarily [1] - 50:22 principal [1] - 13:16 print [3] - 22:4, 67:23, 106:9 printer [1] - 106:9 private [8] - 53:9, 84:13, 100:19, 100:20, 100:21, 100:22, 107:20, 108:1 problems [2] - 49:8, 60:18 procedurally [1] -16:15 procedure [2] - 57:19, 59:8 Procedure [3] - 17:20, 59:21, 113:16 Procedures [1] -101:9 proceeding [15] - 4:5, 4:9, 4:25, 5:10, 6:18, 14:8, 17:7, 27:16, 37:16, 37:22, 55:9, 71:16, 88:7, 90:19, 123:13 proceedings [7] - 5:4, 5:25, 38:19, 79:12,

98:16, 124:9, 124:12

Proceedings [1] - 1:8 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2.1 process [14] - 18:12, 20:24, 38:21, 50:15, 62:7, 83:14, 84:10, 84:15, 93:6, 103:10, 107:2, 108:2, 108:4, 114:2 Professional [2] -124:6, 124:19 professor [1] - 96:15 program [1] - 56:11 prohibited [1] - 4:2 **prohibiting** [1] - 100:6 prohibition [1] - 13:23 prohibits [1] - 5:21 Project [2] - 103:3, 115:24 project [16] - 4:7, 28:1, 30:11, 35:15, 82:25, 91:21, 91:22, 92:14, 93:16, 110:6, 111:24, 111:25, 112:13, 112:15, 120:19, 121:15 promise [1] - 113:4 promising [1] - 83:24 **pronounce** [1] - 13:1 **pronounced** [1] - 67:5 pronunciation [1] -50:8 proof [5] - 6:11, 7:4, 8:1, 86:15, 94:7 proper [1] - 3:24 properly [11] - 13:1, 17:16, 17:19, 18:13, 25:23, 27:25, 36:18, 53:19, 106:23, 107:2, 110:4 properties [4] - 51:7, 70:24, 70:25, 84:3 property [27] - 51:13, 53:3, 53:5, 53:13, 76:15, 79:2, 83:9, 83:12, 83:17, 84:1, 84:7, 84:12, 84:13, 92:16, 92:17, 99:4, 99:5, 99:12, 102:25, 111:7, 111:11, 120:2, 120:3, 122:2, 122:23, 122:24 proposal [1] - 118:12 proposals [1] - 35:21 **propose** [1] - 81:23 proposed [21] - 4:6, 4:22, 5:7, 5:15, 5:17, 8:4, 9:6, 10:16, 11:15, 26:15, 33:3,

33:8, 35:15, 49:15,

119:22 propriety [2] - 42:13, 52:18 prosecute [2] - 29:14, 29:16 **prosper** [1] - 61:3 protect [3] - 35:14, 36:18, 94:14 protected [2] - 94:12, 95:22 protection [1] -103:25 protections [1] -84:11 **prove** [1] - 27:7 proved [1] - 68:3 provide [8] - 6:12, 16:3, 18:23, 23:23, 101:10, 115:3, 121:12, 121:14 provided [5] - 6:8, 22:8, 78:22, 106:6, 121:2 **providing** [1] - 39:5 province [1] - 43:10 provisions [3] - 14:3, 90:24. 105:5 Provost [2] - 56:8, 73:2 **psig** [1] - 33:11 Public [12] - 30:9, 55:8, 60:10, 80:25, 81:19, 97:14, 101:12, 101:14, 103:18, 122:13, 124:7, 124:18 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:11 public [9] - 52:22, 53:6, 53:7, 79:20, 80:15, 80:21, 92:2, 102:13, 102:15 publications [1] - 18:3 **PUC** [20] - 3:24, 3:25, 4:11, 4:15, 4:19, 5:25, 18:2, 27:10, 30:17, 54:24, 60:4, 60:15, 81:7, 81:11, 85:4, 85:7, 85:20, 86:6, 86:10 PUC's [3] - 7:9, 60:6, 81:9 pull [1] - 66:24 pulled [2] - 52:11, 52:12 pump [3] - 24:9, 26:6

purports [1] - 64:22

50:24, 53:2, 76:8,

91.24

proposing [1] -

81:10, 91:21, 91:22,

purpose [5] - 7:11, 53:18, 65:2, 95:6, 110:15 purposes [7] - 14:1, 21:24, 22:5, 38:1, 75:25, 116:25, 121:17 pursuant [2] - 6:14, 56:3 pursued [1] - 106:22 pursuing [1] - 46:20 purview [1] - 14:10 put [11] - 21:17, 24:21, 24:22, 24:25, 27:6, 31:18, 35:18, 54:14, 68:13, 104:19 puts [1] - 35:25 PVC [1] - 103:24 Q

qualifications [2] -17:23, 43:20 qualified [1] - 43:21 qualifies [1] - 6:19 qualify [2] - 18:5, 80:18 quality [2] - 56:11, 112:6 questions [17] - 11:10, 11:21, 44:2, 44:3, 45:7, 53:20, 54:21, 54:22, 86:8, 86:23, 96:25, 97:1, 119:17, 120:13, 120:15, 122:14, 122:15 quests [1] - 70:3 quib [1] - 68:5 quick [2] - 82:21, 102:14 quite [1] - 111:17 quote [1] - 33:14 quoted [2] - 33:16, 33:17 quoting [1] - 74:8

#### R

raised [5] - 4:24, 37:3, 43:8, 50:21, 93:17 raising [2] - 49:8, 108:22 ran [1] - 95:11 Randall [1] - 73:17 range [1] - 72:8 ranger [1] - 69:20 ranging [1] - 45:15 Rapid [5] - 74:6, 74:7,

88:22, 117:14, 14 118.11 **RAPPOLD** [12] - 9:12, 13:2. 13:4. 15:11. 31:2, 31:12, 44:13, 45:9. 48:10. 87:10. 87:20. 108:21 Rappold [19] - 9:13, 13:3, 15:10, 15:12, 30:22, 33:24, 35:8, 36:10, 38:8, 39:9, 42:2, 42:22, 44:11, 45:2, 87:9, 87:11, 88:2, 108:20, 108:23 rather [4] - 7:21, 8:3, 24:14, 43:22 reach [3] - 19:1, 25:6, 26:20 reached [5] - 8:1, 25:7, 30:8, 102:8, reaches [2] - 19:3, 114:15 reaching [1] - 91:3 read [7] - 12:3, 13:15, 28:12, 47:17, 47:21, 84:21, 120:7 readily [1] - 50:10 reading [1] - 61:19 reads [1] - 67:23 ready [1] - 49:25 real [1] - 102:14 realize [1] - 120:7 really [15] - 3:17, 35:25, 36:1, 37:2, 51:11, 59:14, 60:16, 63:20, 74:14, 85:8, 86:14, 90:2, 111:21, 112:16, 115:5 Realtime [2] - 124:6, 124:19 realty [4] - 66:9, 66:10, 67:14, 88:17 reason [13] - 5:6, 7:14, 18:22, 34:10, 52:1, 66:17, 68:21, 76:11, 80:6, 85:22, 86:23, 100:5, 116:23 reasonably [1] - 51:24 reasoned [1] - 81:7 reasoning [1] - 83:21 reasons [4] - 23:6, 34:17, 38:7, 102:8 rebut [1] - 42:25 rebuttal [4] - 11:12,

42:1, 90:8, 115:8

receive [3] - 23:14,

104:22, 108:13

recently [1] - 74:5

received [1] - 96:16

recertification [3] -36:16, 38:21, 111:24 recess [1] - 49:23 recited [1] - 68:19 Reclamation [16] -99:16, 99:20, 101:7, 104:17, 104:20, 105:20, 106:6, 107:3, 116:23, 116:24, 118:7, 118:9, 118:16, 120:24, 121:12 reclamation [2] -105:5, 116:20 reclamation's [1] -104:23 recognized [7] - 62:6, 72:19, 74:20, 77:4, 77:10, 78:5, 78:14 recognizing [1] -73:25 recommend [1] - 81:3 recommendations [6] - 19:19, 21:12, 22:1, 30:20, 31:13, 65:2 reconsideration [1] -4:17 record [19] - 16:10, 18:6, 30:5, 33:4, 34:9, 39:4, 40:3, 40:20, 70:16, 72:16, 87:13, 100:12, 100:14, 105:19, 105:24, 111:15, 113:12, 113:19, 116:16 recording [1] - 113:14 recruiter [1] - 88:23 reduced [3] - 61:6, 61:12, 114:6 reexamine [1] - 27:5 reference [4] - 23:8, 66:7, 77:15, 101:20 referenced [1] - 73:21 references [1] - 70:19 referendum [3] - 59:1, 59:2, 59:5 referring [1] - 73:15 refers [1] - 95:16 refile [1] - 36:21 reflects [1] - 24:18 refused [5] - 100:3, 100:5, 102:6, 112:11, 118:2 regarding [10] - 7:6, 15:15, 34:11, 75:20, 85:5, 97:24, 98:12, 109:23, 110:10, 122:19 regardless [1] - 29:10

region [1] - 28:5 regional [1] - 120:25 Registered [2] -124:5, 124:19 regular [2] - 80:9, 109:15 regulate [2] - 92:8, 101:13 regulated [1] - 94:12 regulation [4] - 32:24, 33:13, 84:5, 94:24 regulations [19] -5:20, 14:4, 16:2, 16:7. 16:12. 17:13. 19:14, 19:16, 21:9, 27:9, 27:14, 27:19, 29:11, 30:3, 35:20, 72:6, 82:24, 83:1, 103:11 regulator [1] - 14:10 regulatory [1] - 14:25 rehearing [1] - 4:16 relate [3] - 38:4, 48:1, 81:21 related [4] - 33:20, 49:3, 83:19, 86:21 relates [9] - 16:4, 29:17, 40:15, 41:18, 49:12, 73:4, 75:3, 87:17, 109:2 relating [3] - 41:21, 50:22. 63:20 relationship [2] - 89:7, 109:13 relatively [1] - 118:4 release [2] - 22:22, 71:21 releases [1] - 73:17 relevancy [2] - 38:1, relevant [17] - 16:21, 21:8, 25:8, 25:10, 26:18, 32:14, 41:22, 44:20, 44:25, 46:9, 71:17, 79:11, 86:16, 88:6, 110:15, 110:16, 114:13 relief [15] - 3:11, 3:19, 3:20, 4:1, 4:19, 5:2, 5:19, 6:5, 8:5, 8:7, 9:7, 11:17, 57:21, 59:10, 115:3 religious [2] - 69:17, 70:5 relinquished [1] -76:17 remainder [1] - 41:13 remains [4] - 72:9,

72:10, 72:11, 74:3

remedies [1] - 29:13

remedy [2] - 101:6, 101:10 remember [4] - 36:10, 119:2, 119:4, 120:4 remembers [1] -118:24 remotely [1] - 26:8 removal [1] - 73:14 removed [1] - 64:14 rendered [1] - 53:23 reparation [1] - 90:22 Reparations [2] -51:23. 53:15 reparations [1] - 95:20 repatriate [1] - 72:13 repatriation [1] -90:22 repeat [1] - 13:8 repeatedly [1] - 78:13 reply [4] - 5:1, 6:24, 51:21, 75:19 **Reply** [1] - 65:6 report [8] - 18:9, 21:22, 23:2, 25:21, 58:17, 67:25, 104:19, 106:5 reported [3] - 73:12, 74:5, 74:7 Reported [1] - 1:24 Reporter [4] - 124:6, 124:19, 124:19 reporter [4] - 65:11, 68:6, 74:11, 124:9 reporter's [1] - 54:16 represent [1] - 7:10 representative [4] -56:12, 113:24, 117:12, 118:15 representatives [2] -82:14, 117:13 represented [1] -56:14 representing [1] -75:12 republican [1] - 64:2 request [11] - 3:17, 4:6, 6:3, 6:5, 7:3, 8:7, 35:2, 59:10, 60:7, 100:15, 113:1 requested [5] - 5:2, 5:22, 8:5, 9:7, 57:21 requests [4] - 6:7, 38:10, 56:25, 82:1 require [6] - 14:2, 16:11, 16:25, 57:19, 78:15, 100:15 required [14] - 7:12, 14:14, 19:12, 25:17,

27:9, 30:16, 31:22,

41:6, 43:11, 101:15,

115:5, 115:16, 118:6, 119:14 requirement [8] -6:23, 6:24, 21:25, 22:11, 25:4, 26:25, 29:3. 80:24 requirements [15] -6:11, 17:9, 17:10, 20:1, 20:3, 22:24, 24:4, 27:14, 28:11, 29:17, 31:14, 33:12, 81:9, 114:12, 119:11 requires [11] - 17:2, 17:11, 19:18, 23:20, 24:6, 26:23, 27:8, 30:13, 30:15, 70:23, 109:6 requiring [1] - 41:5 reroute [4] - 45:20, 81:2, 81:23, 86:2 rerouting [6] - 41:1, 44:8, 45:18, 46:1, 48:1, 48:17 research [1] - 96:17 reservation [36] -53:3, 53:25, 56:11, 56:21, 59:13, 59:18, 62:4, 62:14, 62:16, 62:19, 62:20, 62:24, 63:1, 63:3, 63:6, 63:7, 63:10, 63:25, 64:9, 64:14, 72:14, 73:4, 73:8, 73:24, 74:4, 75:4, 76:18, 83:8, 83:12, 84:6, 88:15, 95:21, 102:17, 103:3, 103:6, 106:12 Reservation [8] -34:16, 54:6, 54:7, 56:16, 62:16, 62:23, 64:9, 64:17 reservations [15] -52:13, 52:21, 53:25, 55:5, 55:6, 58:12, 58:21, 59:13, 61:25, 64:16, 72:22, 91:23, 103:8, 106:13, 112:13 reserved [1] - 78:21 Reservoir [2] - 54:3, 92:12 residents [2] - 34:14, 112:3 resolution [5] - 17:5, 100:6, 100:23, 117:17, 118:20 resolutions [3] -117:8, 117:21, 118:3

resolve [1] - 55:10

resolved [4] - 27:20, 15 118:7, 122:11, 122:25 resource [1] - 60:24 resources [3] - 56:9, 61:2, 83:12 respect [16] - 7:2, 7:6, 13:12, 16:25, 42:12, 42:13, 42:16, 42:17, 43:2, 43:9, 59:3, 63:11, 63:14, 93:19, 117:20, 117:23 respected [3] - 68:12, 84:5, 112:16 respectfully [3] - 38:9, 39:25, 56:24 respects [4] - 37:20, 56:19, 60:22, 74:22 responded [1] - 67:15 responding [2] -57:17, 85:14 response [14] - 10:13, 17:17, 18:17, 20:7, 21:21, 22:8, 23:22, 27:8, 29:4, 30:15, 75:20, 108:18 responsibilities [2] -35:14, 109:16 responsibility [4] -14:11, 99:18, 101:8, 117:1 responsible [3] -56:10, 109:11, 109:25 responsive [1] - 18:7 rest [6] - 9:16, 20:19, 31:2, 44:9, 48:2, 75:24 restored [1] - 92:2 restricted [1] - 45:4 restrictive [3] - 41:6, 41:10, 41:12 result [3] - 33:1, 33:6, results [1] - 68:1 resume [1] - 18:3 returned [1] - 52:22 review [1] - 104:23 revoke [2] - 28:19, 29.6 rhetorically [1] - 90:10 ribbons [1] - 69:14 Richard [5] - 12:25, 18:8, 20:4, 20:16, 44:6 rights [145] - 6:20, 31:23, 50:3, 50:22, 51:10. 51:11. 51:17. 51:22, 51:24, 52:4,

52:14, 52:23, 54:4,

54:9, 54:19, 54:20, 54:22, 55:15, 55:18, 56:20, 56:21, 57:15, 57:16, 57:25, 58:3, 58:6, 59:3, 59:18, 59:23, 60:11, 60:12, 60:23, 60:24, 61:4, 61:6. 61:9. 61:10. 61:12, 61:13, 61:16, 61:21, 61:22, 61:24, 62:5, 62:6, 62:8, 62:12, 62:25, 63:2, 63:8, 63:12, 63:14, 63:21, 64:1, 65:3, 65:15, 65:17, 65:19, 65:20, 65:21, 65:23, 65:25, 67:10, 68:7, 68:24, 70:1, 71:5, 71:13, 71:18, 71:24, 72:8, 72:11, 72:18, 72:19, 73:5, 73:7, 74:18, 74:20, 75:23, 76:2, 76:15, 78:12, 78:14, 78:15, 78:17, 78:19, 78:24, 79:3, 79:4, 79:7, 79:8, 79:10, 80:25, 82:3, 82:4, 83:5, 83:9, 83:17, 84:1, 84:4, 84:7, 84:9, 84:12, 84:14, 85:5, 85:8, 85:20, 87:17, 88:20, 89:1, 89:8, 89:9, 89:17, 91:7, 91:9, 93:22, 93:23, 93:24, 94:2, 94:3, 94:4, 94:8, 94:11, 94:15, 94:19, 95:23, 96:3, 96:4, 96:9, 97:4, 109:2, 109:6, 109:19, 110:14, 111:7, 122:23 risk [9] - 13:17, 13:19, 25:2, 36:12, 36:23, 38:20, 42:12, 42:14, 42:15 Rislov [1] - 1:16 river [8] - 62:19, 62:21, 62:25, 64:2, 76:16, 76:19, 102:16 **River** [27] - 34:9, 34:13, 34:15, 62:15, 62:18, 63:5, 64:5, 64:11, 64:12, 71:23, 71:24, 76:11, 76:13, 77:6, 84:21, 85:3, 85:7, 86:24, 92:11, 94:6, 95:9, 95:12, 102:24, 102:25, 105:12, 107:24

road [1] - 100:21 Robert [3] - 112:22, 113:10, 113:22 robust [1] - 119:23 rock [2] - 56:24, 74:25 Rock [16] - 9:20, 38:9, 56:9, 56:15, 57:11, 62:6, 62:15, 62:23, 71:8, 71:10, 71:25, 72:24, 84:22, 85:13, 112:17, 112:25 role [4] - 14:16, 18:11, 27:24, 112:16 room [9] - 8:25, 21:3, 35:6, 47:22, 87:8, 108:19, 109:9, 110:23, 114:23 Room [1] - 2:3 Rosebud [20] - 9:13, 15:10, 15:13, 32:9, 32:16, 35:12, 38:8, 38:16, 41:17, 54:5, 54:7, 54:8, 58:23, 70:15, 87:11, 87:14, 88:14, 91:16, 105:12, 108:23 Rosebud's [2] - 34:10, 34:17 route [23] - 19:7, 36:15, 36:17, 43:9, 48:20, 48:23, 49:4, 49:7, 49:8, 49:14, 53:3, 71:7, 79:14, 80:24, 81:1, 81:3, 81:5, 81:9, 81:10, 81:13, 81:22, 81:23, 81:24 route-specific [1] -81:9 routed [4] - 24:19, 36:25, 43:8, 102:4 routing [3] - 13:17, 13:24, 18:13 RPR [1] - 1:24 RST [5] - 18:7, 18:8, 18:9, 18:17, 18:18 ruin [1] - 104:11 rule [3] - 46:3, 46:10, 59:8 ruled [2] - 77:3, 77:16 Rules [4] - 16:18, 17:20, 59:20, 113:16 rules [14] - 19:13, 19:15, 21:6, 27:22, 28:11, 28:20, 28:21, 57:19, 67:15, 67:18, 67:19, 74:22, 81:13, 110.19

ruling [4] - 5:21, 7:18,

48:18, 85:8

rulings [1] - 37:21 running [1] - 91:24 runs [1] - 62:18 rural [12] - 98:18, 101:21, 102:10, 102:23, 111:4, 112:5, 112:9, 116:10, 116:11, 116:14, 118:10, 120.23 Rural [19] - 9:3, 35:11, 48:14, 84:23, 99:25, 100:1, 102:11, 103:1, 103:4, 104:18, 104:22, 105:6, 105:11, 105:14, 106:3, 106:15, 107:4, 115:21, 121:11 Russia [1] - 63:18 rusting [1] - 104:1

# S

112:11 safely [1] - 43:7 safety [9] - 15:25, 16:12, 17:1, 18:13, 19:7, 27:22, 28:4, 29:18. 30:3 Safety [8] - 13:21, 94:23 14:3, 14:12, 15:22, 15:23, 16:1, 16:6, 21:9 **sake** [1] - 39:24 **satisfied** [3] - 25:9, 25:14, 100:24 **satisfy** [2] - 17:9, 28:11 satisfying [2] - 17:10, 17:11 save [1] - 53:13 saw [1] - 118:11 scenario [2] - 24:3, 25:16 **Schmidt** [1] - 31:13 **school** [1] - 116:2 scope [7] - 4:10, 5:2, 5:3, 13:14, 50:15, 50:17, 95:21 SDCL [3] - 13:24, 28:25, 81:14 seated [4] - 51:15, 91:25, 92:5, 94:22 second [7] - 9:7, 40:3, 57:9, 78:11, 96:14, 96:15. 121:19 secondly [2] - 42:22, 90:20

Secretary [1] - 109:10

see [11] - 8:12, 34:22, 37:2, 46:19, 58:8, 65:20, 68:9, 69:10, 75:14, 97:21, 104:21 seek [2] - 5:6, 94:14 seeking [3] - 16:3, 37:23, 42:8 seeks [2] - 32:23, 87:5 sees [1] - 72:4 Senator [2] - 112:12, 116:1 send [1] - 27:10 senior [1] - 99:13 sense [2] - 19:10, 45:20 sensitive [1] - 22:21 sent [1] - 100:10 **sentence** [3] - 33:16, 33:17, 75:24 serious [2] - 28:2, 36:4 seriously [1] - 26:15 serve [1] - 7:14 served [2] - 111:25, serves [3] - 103:7, 114:14, 116:4 service [3] - 102:5, 105:3, 105:7 session [2] - 54:6, set [2] - 36:18, 105:18 seven [1] - 55:4 several [1] - 112:7 severed [1] - 83:6 sexually [1] - 88:23 Shadehill [1] - 62:13 shale [1] - 34:12 shall [7] - 23:21, 54:15, 82:23, 89:11, 104:22, 105:4 shifting [1] - 34:23 short [1] - 49:23 **shorthand** [2] - 124:9 shortly [1] - 117:16 show [8] - 17:8, 17:12, 19:12, 19:14, 20:2, 24:2, 31:4, 57:12 showing [1] - 34:3 **shown** [2] - 5:11, 36:6 shows [1] - 106:7 SHPO [1] - 72:17 shrank [1] - 54:7 side [9] - 35:9, 76:11, 76:13, 76:16, 76:18, 76:19, 102:2, 120:4 sides [1] - 44:16 **signatory** [1] - 78:5 signed [1] - 94:21

significant [2] - 60:17,1 6 65:16 similar [4] - 19:1, 19:2, 26:22, 31:14 simple [4] - 52:25, 107:6, 122:22, 123:1 simply [13] - 3:18, 3:24, 12:8, 13:13, 34:10, 43:18, 58:4, 79:8, 80:11, 81:23, 86:20, 119:11, 120:11 single [2] - 55:7, 107:21 singled [1] - 77:12 **Sioux** [106] - 3:9, 6:13, 6:16, 8:21, 8:22, 9:13, 9:20, 15:13, 32:8, 32:9, 35:12, 38:8, 38:9, 38:16, 56:9, 56:24, 57:11, 58:23, 62:6, 63:23, 64:1, 64:5, 64:9, 64:17, 64:21, 65:4, 65:9, 67:7, 67:8, 67:20. 68:7. 68:8. 68:15, 68:25, 70:15, 71:8, 71:25, 72:24, 73:11, 73:13, 73:20, 74:23, 74:25, 75:22, 76:14, 76:20, 76:24, 77:5, 77:17, 77:19, 85:3, 86:17, 86:24, 87:11, 87:14, 88:14, 91:16, 95:4, 95:7, 95:12, 98:18, 99:24, 100:1, 100:2, 100:6, 101:21, 102:10, 102:11, 102:23, 103:1, 103:4, 104:18, 104:22, 105:5, 105:10, 105:12, 105:14, 106:3, 106:7, 106:15, 107:4, 108:23, 112:18, 112:21, 112:25, 113:11, 113:23, 113:25, 114:8, 115:16, 115:20, 115:21, 117:7, 117:9, 118:10, 118:15, 119:14, 120:18, 121:11, 121:13 Sisseton [1] - 91:15 Sisseton-Wahpeton [1] - 91:15 site [1] - 111:4

siting [3] - 16:12,

	T	T	1	1
49:4, 79:14	112:4, 114:15,	112:17, 112:25	statutes [5] - 5:20,	24:13 17
sitting [1] - 14:25	116:5, 116:6,	start [1] - 107:19	53:14, 53:16, 71:6,	subsequent [4] -
situated [1] - 77:6	116:12, 119:7,	started [2] - 95:9,	82:25	52:12, 64:8, 76:17,
situation [2] - 80:7,	124:7, 124:13	102:16	statutorily [1] - 7:12	79:6
111:16	south [4] - 64:3,	starting [1] - 104:24	statutory [5] - 4:18,	substantially [1] -
six [2] - 53:22, 55:4	73:16, 95:10, 116:6	<b>starts</b> [4] - 26:3,	10:24, 13:22, 13:23,	28:3
slight [1] - 68:21	<b>SOUTH</b> [2] - 1:2,	103:5, 117:3, 120:2	43:8	substantive [2] -
slightly [1] - 51:10	124:1	Stat [1] - 89:12	<b>stay</b> [1] - 70:3	53:20, 54:20
slip [1] - 36:23	<b>sovereign</b> [1] - 6:16	<b>STATE</b> [2] - 1:2, 124:1	stealing [1] - 93:20	successful [1] -
<b>slope</b> [1] - 36:23	<b>spacing</b> [1] - 22:23	<b>state</b> [20] - 9:5, 9:15,	steel [4] - 33:8, 33:9,	117:16
small [2] - 112:10,	speaking [1] - 31:5	15:24, 18:11, 45:13,	103:25, 104:2	successfully [1] -
112:11	speaks [2] - 93:22,	57:20, 72:16, 77:7,	step [2] - 58:22, 59:1	116:13
smaller [2] - 72:22,	101:22	79:21, 80:8, 80:10,	sticks [4] - 111:7,	suction [1] - 24:8
79:2	Special [5] - 14:5,	84:2, 84:9, 92:19,	111:9, 111:13,	sue [2] - 101:11
<b>SMITH</b> [2] - 49:16,	14:12, 14:17, 19:20,	94:25, 96:13,	111:14	sued [3] - 55:9, 55:10,
119:5	30:21	111:22, 116:19	sticky [1] - 49:21	95:5
Smith [1] - 1:15	<b>special</b> [5] - 23:3,	<b>State</b> [31] - 2:2, 6:24,	stifled [1] - 56:22	sufficiently [1] - 66:20
Society [1] - 70:22	33:2, 33:6, 35:24,	32:11, 52:2, 52:3,	still [17] - 15:16, 17:8,	suggest [2] - 4:20,
socio [1] - 28:2	88:16	53:10, 55:1, 58:20,	17:11, 25:9, 27:6,	81:3
socio-economic [1] -	<b>specific</b> [9] - 6:20,	58:24, 62:9, 62:24,	82:15, 88:17, 88:18,	suggesting [2] - 14:1,
28:2	43:1, 63:15, 80:5,	69:4, 69:5, 69:15,	89:2, 89:3, 89:9,	14:6
soils [1] - 34:12	80:11, 80:24, 81:9,	69:19, 70:1, 70:22,	89:17, 89:18, 105:9,	suggestion [4] - 7:19,
<b>Soldier</b> [1] - 56:13	81:13, 90:3	72:1, 79:23, 80:4,	106:2, 122:11	10:17, 41:13, 68:18
<b>sole</b> [1] - 106:25	specifically [16] -	84:16, 91:12, 94:9,	stone [1] - 82:4	SULLY [1] - 124:3
solved [1] - 103:22	3:19, 4:21, 6:12,	94:15, 100:11,	stopping [1] - 102:5	<b>summer</b> [1] - 96:15
<b>someone</b> [4] - 29:9,	14:19, 17:15, 19:17,	100:12, 103:9, 119:7, 121:4, 124:7	stops [2] - 107:19,	superfluous [1] -
29:20, 105:1	20:4, 21:22, 21:23, 32:22, 41:12, 41:18,	statement [12] - 19:20,	117:3	111:19
sometimes [4] -	41:22, 78:23, 81:22,	19:22, 21:13, 21:14,	storage [1] - 24:11	Supp [1] - 73:12
65:23, 65:24, 111:8,	82:5	30:21, 40:8, 82:21,	story [1] - 69:6 straightforward [1] -	supplement [1] - 118:14
111:9	specifications [2] -	112:20, 112:24,	3:18	supplemental [6] -
somewhere [3] -	104:24, 114:10	113:5, 114:20,	strange [1] - 111:5	19:21, 21:21, 22:8,
24:23, 36:15, 82:5 sorry [6] - 3:25, 21:14,	spelled [1] - 82:5	121:25	stray [1] - 47:14	44:11, 44:17, 117:25
69:21, 82:20, 88:4,	spend [1] - 15:4	statements [1] - 46:16	strays [1] - 45:7	Supplemental [1] -
95:14	spite [1] - 117:23	states [8] - 59:8, 78:1,	street [1] - 96:5	116:19
sort [2] - 22:23, 77:12	spoken [2] - 79:15,	79:24, 82:22, 83:16,	strength [1] - 33:8	<b>supply</b> [6] - 98:18,
sought [2] - 5:19,	118:6	89:7, 102:15, 102:23	stretch [1] - 79:5	99:25, 101:22,
11:18	spokesperson [1] -	States [27] - 51:6,	strongly [2] - 82:1,	102:10, 102:24,
sounds [1] - 47:8	82:18	51:18, 52:2, 52:6,	86:24	120:23
<b>source</b> [3] - 34:13,	<b>SS</b> [1] - 124:2	53:4, 55:7, 58:16,	student [1] - 96:14	Supply [13] - 100:1,
34:16, 106:25	stack [1] - 117:8	61:7, 63:18, 67:3,	studied [2] - 94:21,	102:11, 103:1,
sources [1] - 108:13	staff [13] - 27:15,	67:6, 68:4, 76:25,	103:17	104:18, 104:23,
South [60] - 2:2, 2:4,	40:22, 40:25, 41:13,	79:1, 88:21, 88:22,	study [2] - 119:8	105:6, 105:11,
4:15, 6:24, 16:18,	70:18, 89:20, 89:22,	91:17, 92:1, 92:6,	stuff [3] - 20:21,	105:14, 106:4,
24:19, 32:11, 35:14,	89:23, 89:25,	98:24, 99:6, 99:17,	58:10, 117:11	106:16, 107:5,
38:23, 52:10, 52:13,	114:24, 115:1,	101:8, 102:22,	<b>sub</b> [1] - 24:10	115:21, 121:11
52:21, 53:10, 53:11,	115:2, 115:3	111:13, 116:10, 122:10	subdivision [1] -	<b>support</b> [18] - 5:1, 6:7,
53:24, 55:5, 56:14,	STAFF [1] - 1:14	static [2] - 89:3, 89:5	100:2	8:21, 9:14, 9:21,
56:15, 56:22, 58:3,	stand [2] - 8:2, 81:20	stating [3] - 26:9,	subject [7] - 17:25,	10:2, 12:8, 13:9,
58:20, 58:24, 58:25,	standards [8] - 15:25,	78:8, 87:13	18:24, 19:8, 80:12,	32:8, 32:16, 32:22,
59:3, 59:4, 62:9,	16:12, 17:1, 18:14,	station [2] - 24:9,	89:25, 94:12, 94:24	34:17, 35:1, 38:16,
64:6, 64:10, 68:10,	100:10, 100:11,	24:10	subjects [5] - 15:21,	55:16, 88:3, 90:25,
69:20, 70:7, 70:22,	100:17, 105:20	stations [1] - 26:6	19:1, 19:2, 19:3,	108:25
72:1, 73:1, 73:9,	standing [1] - 56:24	status [2] - 58:7,	42:9	supporting [3] -
73:16, 77:7, 79:24,	<b>Standing</b> [17] - 9:20, 38:9, 56:9, 56:15,	88:16	<b>submit</b> [3] - 23:10,	34:10, 46:20, 57:6 supports [4] - 8:16,
79:25, 80:4, 81:17,	57:11, 62:6, 62:15,	statuses [1] - 6:21	36:3, 85:9	34:21, 87:4, 87:14
82:3, 84:14, 84:16,	62:23, 71:8, 71:10,	statute [5] - 15:2,	submitted [5] - 23:9,	supposed [2] - 65:14,
91:24, 92:10, 94:4,	71:25, 72:24, 74:25,	27:4, 72:6, 91:13,	27:9, 41:11, 102:21,	101:23
94:10, 99:10, 103:9, 111:6, 111:12,	84:22, 85:13,	98:24	115:4	Supreme [23] - 51:1,
111.0, 111.12,	,,		subsection [2] - 6:15,	

51:5, 53:22, 54:4, 55:4, 55:6, 64:20, 65:5, 68:17, 68:20, 68:21, 68:23, 70:13, 71:9, 81:18, 83:4, 83:18, 83:20, 83:21, 92:4, 92:11, 94:1, 94:20 surprise [2] - 122:1, 122:9 survive [2] - 54:23, 62:4 suspend [3] - 28:18, 29:6, 93:14 **Swan** [1] - 73:15 swiped [2] - 66:14, 67:14 symbolic [1] - 74:8 System [13] - 100:1, 102:11, 103:4, 104:18, 104:23, 105:6, 105:11, 105:14, 106:4, 106:16. 107:5. 115:21, 121:11 system [41] - 20:24, 22:16, 24:15, 27:23, 62:25, 94:15, 96:21, 98:18, 99:25, 100:7, 101:22, 102:10, 102:12, 102:13, 102:15, 102:20, 102:23, 102:24, 103:1, 103:5, 103:7, 103:12, 103:13, 103:23, 103:24, 103:25, 104:11, 105:8, 105:11, 109:9, 116:3, 116:10, 116:11, 116:12, 116:14, 120:18, 120:20, 120:23, 121:14, 122:24 system's [1] - 118:10 systems [1] - 95:2

#### Т

Table [4] - 7:8, 10:17, 23:7, 91:2 table [6] - 4:22, 5:16, 10:21, 60:17, 88:18, 90:2 tailored [1] - 5:3 takings [1] - 84:15 talks [2] - 24:5, 95:18 tank [3] - 24:11, 24:12, 107:20

tanks [1] - 108:1 tap [1] - 111:5 target [1] - 115:11 tastefully [1] - 65:8 TAYLOR [11] - 50:5, 50:12, 54:19, 90:9, 98:15, 113:12, 113:16, 115:9, 119:6, 119:25, 120.10 Taylor [11] - 50:4, 54:18, 97:10, 101:20, 104:15, 107:18, 107:23, 113:15, 115:8, 119:18, 120:14 Tee [3] - 51:5, 63:12, 63:15 Tee-Hit-Ton [3] - 51:5, 63:12, 63:15 telephone [2] - 32:3, 108:17 telephones [1] -108:15 telephonically [1] -1:13 terminated [5] - 53:1, 58:4, 58:7, 59:4, 74:19 terminates [1] - 79:24 termination [5] - 58:1, 58:17. 58:20. 58:22. 59:1 terminology [4] -57:5, 57:21, 59:6, 60:21 terms [8] - 6:18, 29:7, 29:10, 58:1, 59:11, 59:15, 66:2, 116:22 terrain [3] - 24:17, 25:12, 26:2 territory [17] - 57:10, 57:16, 67:1, 67:8, 67:17, 67:22, 70:2, 71:7, 77:24, 78:6, 78:9, 78:25, 83:6, 94:22, 95:7, 96:11, 96:12 testified [2] - 27:16 testifies [1] - 70:18 testify [2] - 31:14, 31:17 testimony [81] - 12:4, 13:15, 15:6, 15:19,

15:20, 16:4, 16:17,

16:19, 17:19, 18:18,

18:19, 18:23, 18:24,

18:25, 19:8, 20:4,

20:17, 21:1, 21:10,

23:9, 23:14, 23:18,

23:20, 24:5, 25:2, 25:4, 25:15, 26:3, 26:4, 31:3, 32:25, 33:19, 33:20, 33:25, 34:2, 34:3, 35:1, 36:12, 38:18, 39:5, 40:17, 41:1, 41:5, 41:11, 41:12, 41:14, 41:17, 41:20, 42:11, 42:13, 42:17, 42:24, 43:1, 43:15, 43:23, 44:7, 44:20, 44:24, 45:4, 45:7, 46:8, 47:25, 49:12, 55:16, 56:19, 60:3, 70:16, 71:10, 82:3, 85:9, 87:16, 88:6, 89:25, 90:3, 92:24, 98:12, 102:21, 109:1, 115:4, 122:19 Testimony [2] - 12:25, 44.6 testing [2] - 71:22, 94:7 **Teton** [2] - 77:18, 77:20 THE [6] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:6, 1:11 therefor [2] - 57:20, 59.9 therefore [5] - 25:7, 34:1, 84:13, 86:8, 92:7 they've [7] - 18:1, 18:15, 21:19, 23:9, 24:3, 31:3, 82:6 thickness [1] - 33:9 thinks [1] - 43:7 third [1] - 116:4 thirdly [2] - 13:18, 57:15 Thompson [1] -117:12 thorough [2] - 18:3, 26:16 threat [1] - 28:2 three [11] - 6:19, 6:20, 13:16, 22:8, 47:11, 57:1, 111:6, 111:12, 116:4, 116:8, 116:9 three-cornered [1] -116:8 throughout [2] -18:13, 114:14 thrown [3] - 46:2, 59:11, 66:2 tied [2] - 51:11, 69:12 ties [1] - 69:11 tile [1] - 100:21

tillquist[1] - 36:11

Tillquist [1] - 18:18 Tim [1] - 116:1 timely [1] - 4:16 tiny [1] - 69:11 **Title** [1] - 33:13 title [28] - 50:2, 50:25, 51:2, 51:3, 51:8, 52:23, 52:24, 52:25, 54:11, 54:20, 59:22, 64:22, 76:7, 77:4, 77:10, 78:5, 78:8, 78:14, 78:16, 78:18, 83:7, 83:23, 90:11, 96:10, 96:12, 97:4, 106:14, 106:15 titled [1] - 53:8 titles [1] - 55:18 **TO**[1] - 1:6 tobacco [2] - 69:11, 69:12 today [22] - 3:6, 14:1, 15:14, 18:6, 20:10, 28:13, 29:23, 39:5, 40:11, 46:5, 47:2, 47:9, 57:9, 63:10, 67:9, 67:11, 67:13, 89:15, 90:4, 105:19, 112:19, 123:12 together [2] - 68:13, 120:8 Ton [3] - 51:5, 63:12, 63:15 took [6] - 21:21, 23:18, 25:2, 78:3, 85:1, 124:9 top [2] - 66:24, 69:8 torn [1] - 72:21 total [1] - 50:23 totally [2] - 55:19, 97:23 touching [1] - 70:16 tough [1] - 54:16 toward [2] - 58:22, 59.1 track [1] - 13:11 Tracking [4] - 7:8, 10:17, 23:7, 91:2 tracking [2] - 5:16, 10:21 tract [4] - 52:9, 67:19, 68:4, 88:14 trade [1] - 51:14 trading [1] - 71:3 traditional [3] - 70:23, 70:25, 83:25 trail [2] - 69:9, 69:13 train [1] - 88:4 trample [1] - 14:10 trans [3] - 79:21, 80:8, 80:10

trans-state [3] - 79:21,18 80:8, 80:10 TRANSCANADA [1] -1:4 TransCanada [52] -3:2, 4:17, 5:9, 6:10, 8:4, 9:6, 10:7, 18:11, 23:21, 26:10, 26:15, 32:21, 32:23, 33:17, 33:25, 34:1, 35:3, 36:1, 36:5, 48:20, 49:15, 57:4, 60:8, 60:14, 60:22, 63:11, 64:7, 65:19, 72:16, 72:24, 73:22, 76:10, 77:12, 80:6, 81:15, 91:9, 91:17, 101:24, 102:6, 102:9, 104:22, 105:4, 105:7, 105:17, 105:24, 111:20, 114:7, 115:20, 116:20, 117:20, 117:21, 121:2 TransCanada's [8] -5:5, 35:12, 35:16, 37:5, 38:10, 38:17, 87:5, 109:1 transcend [1] - 63:9 transcends [1] - 63:1 transcribing [1] -54:17 Transcript [1] - 1:8 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1 transcription [1] -124:12 transmission [11] -79:19, 79:21, 79:22, 80:1, 80:8, 80:9, 80:10, 80:11, 80:14, 80:17, 80:19 treaties [8] - 52:5, 54:24, 61:11, 61:15, 61:16, 63:17, 83:19, 95:3 Treaty [19] - 52:8, 52:10, 61:23, 63:24, 64:7, 64:8, 65:22, 77:1, 77:4, 77:11, 77:14, 77:17, 77:22, 77:23, 78:2, 78:9, 88:25, 89:2, 89:12 treaty [43] - 52:12, 57:25, 60:12, 61:5, 61:6, 61:9, 61:10, 61:21, 61:22, 62:2, 62:4, 63:21, 64:12, 65:18, 65:20, 65:23,

65:25, 72:22, 76:15,

76:17, 76:21, 78:2,

78:3, 78:4, 78:13,
78:19, 78:22, 78:25,
83:11, 83:22, 84:2,
84:3, 88:20, 89:1,
89:5, 89:8, 89:13,
89:16, 94:21, 95:1,
95:19
trial [2] - 17:20, 25:13
tribal [21] - 51:7,
53:23, 56:3, 58:7,
59:3, 68:3, 75:12,
77:20, 82:14, 85:4,
87:15, 88:6, 93:24,
95:23, 96:9, 102:19,
109:6, 109:19,
110:14, 114:11,
114:14
<b>Tribal</b> [2] - 56:12,
56:14
tribally [1] - 58:11
<b>Tribe</b> [72] - 6:13, 6:16,
8:21, 8:22, 9:13,
9:20, 15:13, 32:8, 35:12, 38:0, 38:16
35:12, 38:9, 38:16, 53:5, 54:8, 55:9
53:5, 54:8, 55:9, 56:9, 56:24, 57:11,
57:12, 58:23, 62:3,
62:7, 62:24, 62:25,
63:3, 67:3, 67:16,
67:19, 68:3, 71:8,
71:25, 72:24, 73:11,
73:20, 74:25, 75:22,
76:14, 76:20, 76:24,
78:16, 78:24, 85:3,
86:17, 86:24, 87:11,
87:14, 88:15, 91:16,
92:8, 94:5, 95:7,
100:3, 100:6, 106:7,
108:24, 112:18,
112:21, 113:1,
113:11, 113:23,
113:24, 114:1,
114:8, 114:11,
115:16, 115:21,
117:7, 117:9, 118:15
tribe [2] - 84:2
<b>Tribe's</b> [12] - 3:10,
32:9, 62:8, 62:21,
63:2, 70:15, 83:5, 87:4, 94:3, 112:14,
87:4, 94:3, 112:14, 119:14, 121:10
Tribes [72] - 52:5,
53:1, 53:11, 55:10,
58:3, 58:6, 58:13,
58:15, 58:18, 59:17,
60:9, 60:10, 63:8,
63:9, 63:24, 65:24,
67:16, 70:24, 71:1,
71:2, 71:18, 72:10,
72:12, 72:20, 73:7,

74:1, 75:1, 78:5, 78:10, 78:18, 79:2, 83:11, 83:19, 86:1, 88:3, 88:18, 89:2, 89:7, 90:12, 91:7, 91:10, 92:5, 92:14, 92:16, 92:23, 93:1, 94:2. 96:2. 101:4. 101:6, 101:7, 101:16, 101:24, 102:1, 104:7, 105:12, 105:13, 106:10, 111:6, 111:12, 112:3, 116:4, 116:9, 117:2, 117:13, 117:17, 117:20, 117:23, 118:2, 118:17 Tribes' [2] - 50:23, 61:15 tributaries [3] - 63:5, 71:23, 94:6 tried [2] - 54:11, 54:12 trier [1] - 16:21 trigger [1] - 109:19 trouble [1] - 69:23 true [2] - 69:24. 124:11 trust [17] - 53:4, 98:23, 98:25, 99:18, 101:4, 101:8, 103:13, 103:14, 103:24, 106:10, 106:13, 106:18, 109:9, 109:13, 109:16, 117:1 trustee [1] - 117:1 try [5] - 56:25, 57:9, 57:17, 60:20, 92:22 trying [5] - 57:5, 74:15, 80:7, 87:18, 112:5 Tucker [1] - 101:9 turn [2] - 52:22, 88:15 two [19] - 13:17, 16:20, 18:22, 18:23, 22:3, 29:13, 29:15, 37:15, 38:3, 52:1, 53:13, 60:12, 99:3, 101:13, 107:23, 108:13, 115:16, 118:13 two-fold [1] - 52:1 **type** [3] - 25:22, 46:4, 80:11

typically [1] - 52:22

U **U.S** [22] - 50:25, 51:5, 53:22, 54:4, 55:4, 68:1, 68:2, 68:17, 70:13, 71:9, 83:3, 83:7, 83:22, 84:10, 84:11, 91:18, 92:3, 92:11, 93:25, 94:20, 95:19, 116:18 ultimately [3] - 15:6, 44:18, 65:5 unanimously [1] -83:4 unanticipated [2] -72:15, 90:24 unclear [2] - 59:25, 111:21 uncovered [1] - 72:11 under [22] - 3:21, 6:11, 7:1, 13:21, 15:22, 15:25, 17:19, 25:3, 36:17, 56:11, 63:4, 63:9, 67:24, 70:5, 71:18, 84:11, 88:14, 88:24, 88:25, 89:2, 89:12, 122:4 underlies [1] - 98:22 underlying [6] - 10:11, 11:5, 19:24, 21:18, 60:9, 72:6 underneath [7] -102:3, 103:21, 104:1, 120:1, 120:2, 120:3, 121:21 understood [4] -39:23, 45:9, 82:17, 109:8 undertaking [2] -109:5, 109:18 undertook [1] - 119:7 **unduly** [1] - 28:4 unfair [1] - 42:20 unfolded [1] - 61:5 unfortunately [1] -56:5 uniform [1] - 18:14 unilaterally [1] - 79:1 unique [2] - 77:13, 103:12 unit [2] - 6:14, 6:17 United [27] - 51:6, 51:18, 52:2, 52:6, 53:4, 55:7, 58:16,

61:7, 63:18, 67:3,

67:6, 68:4, 76:25,

79:1, 88:21, 88:22, 91:17, 92:1, 92:6,

98:24, 99:6, 99:17,

101:8, 102:22, 111:13, 116:10, 122:10 units [2] - 6:25, 7:7 **University** [1] - 119:7 unless [4] - 5:8, 11:10, 35:13, 71:2 unlike [1] - 72:24 unprotected [1] -92:17 unreasonable [1] -52:19 unsure [1] - 115:3 unusual [1] - 118:22 up [29] - 4:20, 20:12, 40:1, 40:4, 40:10, 44:14, 50:8, 64:16, 65:9, 66:19, 66:24, 67:21, 69:9, 71:9, 72:21, 79:14, 83:23, 86:23, 90:4, 94:23, 95:11, 95:12, 96:22, 112:12, 113:7, 120:16, 121:4, 121:9, 122:11 upcoming [1] - 86:18 Upper [2] - 67:6, 69:1 upstream [1] - 62:15 urge [3] - 10:2, 38:17, 88.5 urging [1] - 37:17 usu [1] - 87:17 usufructuary [33] -50:3, 50:5, 50:22, 51:10, 51:11, 51:12, 51:14, 51:17, 51:24, 51:25, 52:4, 52:24, 54:10, 54:19, 55:14, 55:18, 59:23, 78:12, 78:15, 78:19, 78:24, 79:3, 79:4, 83:8, 84:3, 84:7, 84:9, 84:12, 84:14, 85:5, 89:9, 89:17, 90:11 Usufructuary [1] -97:4 **UTILITIES** [2] - 1:1, 1:11 Utilities [7] - 30:9, 55:8, 60:10, 80:25, 97:14, 101:12, 101:14 utilities [2] - 112:21,

٧

utility [1] - 118:21

113:24

valid [2] - 89:3, 89:18

19 valve [8] - 22:11, 22:13, 22:22, 24:7, 25:23, 42:18, 43:2, 43.4 valves [6] - 13:18, 22:15, 22:16, 22:18, 24:6, 26:8 valving [4] - 25:25, 26:8, 26:11, 26:15 variance [1] - 81:8 variety [2] - 74:21, 111:16 various [1] - 102:8 vary [1] - 84:2 vast [2] - 53:8, 79:4 vehement [1] - 118:4 verify [1] - 108:7 version [1] - 65:10 versus [3] - 42:14, 58:24, 73:11 vested [1] - 83:8 veto [3] - 120:19, 120:22, 121:14 VICE [1] - 1:12 view [4] - 12:10, 37:15, 54:10, 55:12 viewed [2] - 5:18, 35:22 views [2] - 6:13, 6:25 violate [1] - 81:8 violates [2] - 81:13, 81:14 violating [1] - 80:23 violation [2] - 93:11, 93:13 virtue [3] - 19:25, 51:3, 78:19 vision [1] - 70:2 visit [1] - 70:9 visited [1] - 69:5 visual [2] - 21:24, 22:5 voice [3] - 75:2, 101:12, 114:1 voices [1] - 56:22 volume [2] - 23:24, 23:25 volumes [1] - 101:22 vote [6] - 12:17, 48:3, 59:1, 59:2, 59:5, 98:3 votes [8] - 12:21, 12:22, 48:7, 48:8, 98:8, 98:9, 123:8, 123:9 vs [3] - 76:24, 91:16, 92:10

### W

Wahpeton [1] - 91:15 waited [1] - 93:18 Walker [1] - 116:18 wall [3] - 33:9, 66:11, 67:13 walls [1] - 67:8 wants [3] - 15:14, 67:19, 94:5 Warning [1] - 93:19 **Washington** [1] - 66:9 wasting [1] - 45:20 water [76] - 34:14, 36:19, 56:9, 56:10, 56:17, 56:20, 56:21, 61:3, 61:23, 62:5, 62:6, 62:8, 62:12, 62:21, 62:25, 63:2, 63:4, 70:4, 71:20, 71:21, 71:24, 73:17, 93:22, 93:23, 93:24, 94:2, 94:3, 94:4, 94:5, 94:8, 94:11, 98:18, 99:25, 100:7, 100:20, 101:21, 102:2, 102:3, 102:4, 102:5, 102:10, 102:18, 102:19, 102:23, 102:24, 103:1, 103:8, 104:8, 104:11, 105:7, 105:21, 106:24, 106:25, 107:16, 107:22, 108:13, 112:5, 112:6, 114:13, 116:3, 116:10. 116:11. 116:12, 116:14, 117:14, 118:10, 118:23, 119:22, 120:18, 120:20, 120:23, 121:3, 121:13 Water [17] - 56:11, 94:9, 94:13, 100:1, 102:11, 103:3, 103:4, 104:18, 104:22, 105:6, 105:11, 105:14, 106:4, 106:16, 107:5, 115:21, 121:11 ways [1] - 24:1 **WEB** [2] - 119:5, 119:6 website [2] - 18:2, 31:4 week [2] - 66:9, 112:18

weigh [2] - 35:7, 114:22 weight [1] - 72:3 welcome [1] - 13:4 welfare [1] - 28:4 West [4] - 85:7, 102:24, 102:25, 107:24 west [4] - 64:2, 76:16, 76:19, 77:6 western [6] - 64:10, 64:14, 112:4, 114:15, 116:5, 116:6 Westerners [1] - 60:25 whichever [1] - 94:16 White [1] - 73:15 whoever's [1] - 54:14 whole [7] - 21:19, 36:11, 45:24, 47:2, 79:4, 88:4, 111:8 wholly [1] - 55:19 Wiconi [24] - 98:13, 98:19, 98:20, 98:22, 98:24, 99:2, 99:18, 103:2, 109:2, 109:9, 110:4, 111:3, 111:24, 112:2, 113:25, 114:9, 114:16, 115:17, 115:24, 118:14, 120:4, 121:3, 122:19 wide [2] - 45:15, 74:21 willing [1] - 36:6 willy [1] - 66:2 willy-nilly [1] - 66:2 Winters [2] - 93:24, 93:25 winters [1] - 94:1 Wisconsin [1] - 83:20 wisdom [1] - 46:19 wished [1] - 97:22 withdrawing [3] -33:1, 33:6, 35:24 withdrawn [1] - 71:22 witness [8] - 17:22, 17:24, 18:5, 19:3, 19:6, 36:11, 38:18, 43:22

witness's [1] - 24:4

witnesses [5] - 19:1,

25:7, 27:15, 31:4,

WITTLER [1] - 124:5

wondering [1] - 39:8

Wittler [2] - 1:24,

won [1] - 88:25

word [1] - 50:10

wording [1] - 83:11

words [1] - 61:21

56:18

124:18

workable [1] - 118:20 workaround [1] -102:2 workarounds [1] -118:13 worse [1] - 66:7 worst [7] - 22:10, 22:16, 23:22, 23:24, 24:3, 25:16, 36:24 worst-case [6] -22:10, 22:16, 23:22, 23:24, 24:3, 25:16 worth [1] - 60:1 wrap [1] - 39:25 wrestling [1] - 44:15 writing [2] - 61:12, 116:18 written [6] - 13:8, 13:11, 44:24, 47:17, 47:21, 71:5 wrote [3] - 10:13, 50:8, 73:13 Wyoming [3] - 67:21,

# X

68:10, 77:8

**X70M** [1] - 33:9 **XL** [6] - 1:6, 3:4, 22:16, 31:18, 33:7, 105:4

# Υ

Yankton [25] - 3:9, 5:22, 6:13, 6:16, 6:19, 8:22, 9:14, 32:8, 73:10, 73:20, 75:22, 76:14, 76:20, 77:13, 77:18, 77:21, 77:22, 79:18, 81:25, 84:23, 86:17, 91:16, 95:4, 95:7 Yankton's [1] - 75:20 year [5] - 69:25, 74:19, 96:14, 96:15, 116:1 years [16] - 8:3, 15:18, 18:5, 27:3, 34:24, 53:8, 64:25, 74:19, 90:12, 90:14, 90:15, 96:1, 96:5, 96:13, 96:18, 112:4 Yellowstone [1] - 64:3 yesterday [3] - 44:12, 44:17, 45:11 yourself [1] - 68:9

**Zephier** [3] - 8:19, 34:7, 84:19 **ZEPHIER** [3] - 8:20, 34:8, 84:20

**Ziebach** [1] - 34:15

zones [1] - 23:22

Ζ