BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE)	
APPLICATION OF DAKOTA)	HP14-002
ACCESS, LLC FOR AN ENERGY)	
FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT)	REPLY TO JOINT MOTION TO AMEND
THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE)	PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE
PROJECT)	

COMES NOW Dakota Access, LLC, (Dakota Access) by and through its attorneys of record, Brett Koenecke and Kara Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson LLP and respectfully replies to the joint Motion to Amend the Procedural Schedule. This reply is supported by the records, files, and pleadings served in this action.

Dakota Access does not object to procedural schedule adjustments so long as they remain fair to all parties and the Commission's requirement per SDCL 49-41B-24 remains attainable. Dakota Access thinks it is useful to further communicate the following points:

1. Dakota Access filed its application for a siting permit on December 15, 2014. That application, not discovery responses, is the foundation of the docket and the basis from which pre-filed testimony is drafted. That application includes over 60 pages of information to establish that: the proposed facility will comply with all applicable laws and rules; the facility will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment nor to the social and economic condition of inhabitants or expected inhabitants in the siting area; the facility will not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants; and the facility will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given the views of governing bodies of affected local units of government. See SDCL 49-41B-

- 22. In addition to the application itself, Dakota Access filed: (i) Exhibit A: over 200 pages of maps, (ii) Exhibit B: diagrams and drawings, (iii) Exhibit C: nearly 50 pages of supplemental information, (iv) Exhibit D: over 100 pages of project execution plans.
- 2. While the discovery process is necessary to further clarify, inquire or learn about the content of the siting application, the moving parties have had since December 15, 2014 to formulate their positions. It appears, based on the nature of the discovery requests to date, that interveners intend to focus on and develop testimony around information which may be outside the scope of SDCL 49-41B. Dakota Access objects to all requests that it accommodate the moving parties' intent to do so.
- 3. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe (RST) and the Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN) joined in the Motion to Amend the Procedural Schedule and claim the discovery schedule is prejudicial. However, to date, neither RST nor IEN served discovery on Dakota Access. It is hard to see their positions in light of this fact.
- 4. Mr. Boomsma, on behalf of his 24 clients also asks for an amendment to the procedural schedule. In their Motion, those parties state the need is due to "Dakota Access, LLC's discovery delays." However, only 1 of the 24 clients represented by Mr. Boomsma served discovery on Dakota Access. The other 23 individuals represented by Mr. Boomsma are not affected by the discovery process as they did not serve any discovery.
- 5. Including subparts, Mr. Boomsma sent 93 individual requests for information to Dakota Access on behalf of 1 of his client. Due to the need for additional research, Dakota Access was unable to timely answer 1 of the interrogatories sent by Mr. Boomsma. All others, aside from 1, were substantively answered on May 2, 2015. After necessary research was conducted, a reply was provided to the 1 missing interrogatory on May 11, 2015.

- 6. Discovery responses should have been served on Dakota Rural Action (DRA), Yankton Sioux Tribe (YST) and Mr. Boomsma (on behalf of Peggy Hoogestraat) by 5:00 pm on Friday, May 1, 2015. However, on Friday, May 1, 2015 it became apparent to Dakota Access that additional time was necessary to assure accurate responses were submitted. The above listed parties were advised of the concern. Thereafter, initial substantive responses were sent to the listed parties on Saturday, May 2, 2015 at 10:26 am, a little over 17 hours late. The 17 hour delay above does not reflect Dakota Access's inability to meet the procedural schedule established by the Commission. Rather, it reflects Dakota Access's desire to assure accurate discovery responses. Dakota Access does not concede that those extra hours caused any delay or hardship for other parties.
- 7. Dakota Access understands the discovery schedule set forth in the Procedural Schedule is merely intended to establish guidelines. The Procedural Schedule does not prohibit or limit the parties' right to serve additional discovery. Dakota Access expects to continue discovery, even if served after the guideline date for the "second round." Furthermore, Dakota Access perhaps perceives the usefulness of discovery after receipt of pre-filed testimony quite differently than the moving parties. Pre-filed testimony often generates additional questions. Dakota Access expects to engage in continued discovery if that situation arises. If the moving parties do not find discovery at that stage of the process useful, they are not obligated to participate in it. However, for the sake of an efficient and productive permit hearing, Dakota Access respectfully requests the Commission preserve the opportunity for parties to engage in discovery after the filing of pre-filed testimony.
- 8. Dakota Access takes issue with Movants' mischaracterization of the discovery process thus far in an apparent attempt to discredit Dakota Access. All allegations that Dakota

Access conducted itself with bad faith or inappropriately in any way, at any point during this proceeding, are simply inaccurate. Dakota Access expects various opinions to come to light in this siting docket. However, Dakota Access also expects to keep the process on point and in keeping with South Dakota law and process.

9. In conclusion, Dakota Access is prepared to meet the schedule as Ordered. Due to the twelve month Commission findings requirement in SDCL 49-41B-24 Dakota Access believes the pre-filed testimony and hearing schedule should remain as scheduled. Meaningful and productive briefing opportunity for all parties, post-hearing, is essential. Any adjustment to the testimony or hearing schedule may compromise that opportunity for the applicant, Commission Staff and interveners. With that said, Dakota Access will consider any proposal made by interveners.

Dated this <u>\(\frac{1}{2}\)</u> day of May, 2015.

MAY, ADAM, GERDES & THOMPSON LLP

BY:

BRETT KOENECKE KARA SEMMLER

Attorneys for Plaintiff
503 South Pierre Street

PO Box 160

Pierre, SD 57501-0160

(605) 224-8803

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Kara Semmler of May, Adam, Gerdes & Thompson hereby certifies that on or before the day of May, 2015, he electronically served through the PUC filing system or mailed by US First Class Mail, a copy of the Objection to Joint Motion to Amend the Procedural Schedule to the following:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen South Dakota Public Utilities Commission patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Ms. Kristen Edwards South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us

Mr. Brian Rounds South Dakota Public Utilities Commission <u>brian.rounds@state.sd.us</u>

Mr. Darren Kearney South Dakota Public Utilities Commission <u>darren.kearney@state.sd.us</u>

Mr. Tom Siguaw
Dakota Access, LLC
tom.siguaw@energytransfer.com

Mr. Keegan Pieper Dakota Access, LLC keegan.pieper@energytransfer.com

Mr. Stephen Veatch Dakota Access, LLC Stephen.veatch@energytransfer.com

Mr. Joey Mahmoud Dakota Access, LLC Joey.mahmoud@energytransfer.com

Mr. Jack Edwards
Dakota Access, LLC
Jack.edwards@energytransfer.com

Ms. Jennifer Guthmiller McPherson County Auditor mcphersonaud@valleytel.net

Mr. Keith Schurr Edmunds County Auditor Keith.schurr@state.sd.us

Ms. Kelly Toennies
Faulk County Auditor
Kelly.toennies@state.sd.us

Ms. Theresa Hodges Spink County Auditor spinkcoauditor@nrctv.com

Ms. Jill Hanson Beadle County Auditor auditor@beadlesd.org

Ms. Jennifer Albrecht Kingsbury County Auditor Jennifer.albrecht@state.sd.us

Ms. Susan Connor
Miner County Auditor
minerauditor@minercountysd.org

Ms. Roberta Janke
Lake County Auditor
lakeauditor@lakecountysd.com

Ms. Geralyn Sherman McCook County Auditor Geralyn.sherman@state.sd.us

Mr. Bob Litz Minnehaha County Auditor blitz@minnehahacounty.org

Ms. Sheila Hagemann Turner County Auditor turcoaud@iw.net Ms. Marlene Sweeter Lincoln County Auditor auditor@lincolncountysd.org

Ms. Lisa Schaefbauer Campbell County Auditor campbellcommission@yahoo.com

Ms. Karla Engle South Dakota Department of Transportation karla.engle@state.sd.us

Mr. Chris S. Giles
Lake County States Attorney
Chris.Giles@lakecountysd.com

Mr. Steve Harper WEB Water Development Association, Inc. sharper@webwater.org

Mr. Randy Kuehn rlkfarms@gmail.com

Mr. Michael F. Nadolski - Representing Lincoln County Board of Commissioners mnadolski@lincolncountysd.org

Mr. Bret Merkle - Representing Pente Farms, LLC; KKKP Property, LLLP; Pederson Ag, LLC; Calvin Schreiver; DLK&M, LLC; Jean Osthus; and Daniel & Marcia Hoiland bret@merklelaw.com

Ms. Cindy Heiberger
Minnehaha County
cjepsen@minnehahacounty.org

Mr. Kersten Kappmeyer Minnehaha County kkappmeyer@minnehahacounty.org

Mr. Glenn J. Boomsma - Representing: Peggy A. Hoogestraat, Kevin J. Schoffelman, Linda Goulet, Corlis Wiebers, Mavis Parry, Shirley Oltmanns, Janice E. Petterson, Marilyn Murray, Delores Andreessen Assid, Joy Hohn, and Orrin E. Geide glenn@breitlawpc.com

Mr. Larry A. Nelson - Representing: City of Hartford Frieberg, Nelson and Ask, L.L.P. lnelson@frieberglaw.com

Ms. Linda Glaeser Rocky Acres Land Investment, LLC lglaeser@seattlecca.org lmglaeser@wwdb.org

Mr. Dale E. Sorenson Dale E. Sorenson Life Estate a77man@msn.com

Ms. Kimberly Craven - Representing Dakota Rural Action and Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
kimecraven@gmail.com

Ms. Debra K., Mr. Duane H. & Mr. Dennis S. Sorenson stubbyfarmer@yahoo.com

Mr. Douglas Sorenson plowboy@svtv.com

Mr. William Haugen Haugen Investments LP wh401889@hotmail.com

Mr. Phillip Fett vonfett529@gmail.com

Mr. Bradley F. Williams bwilliams@bestlaw.com

Mr. Craig L. & Ms. Dotta-Jo A. Walker court_walker@hotmail.com

Ms. Diane Best City of Sioux Falls dbest@siouxfalls.org

Mr. Charles J. Johnson <u>c-bjohnson@svtv.com</u>

Mr. Paul A Nelsen paul@paulnelsenconstruction.com

Mr. Paul F. Seamans jacknife@goldenwest.net

Mr. John Wellnitz johnwellnitz@gmail.com

Mr. John Stratmeyer 46534 272nd St. Tea, SD 57064

Mr. Lorin L. Brass 46652 278th St. Lennox, SD 57039 brass@iw.net

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold - Representing: RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office and RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office Rappold Law Office Matt.rappold01@gmail.com

Ms. Thomasina Real Bird - Representing - Yankton Sioux Tribe Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP trealbird@ndnlaw.com

Ms. Margo D. Northrup - Representing: South Dakota Association of Rural Water Systems, Inc. Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup LLP m.northrup@riterlaw.com

KARA SEMMLER