

BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. HP14-002

**IN THE MATTER OF THE REVISED APPLICATION OF DAKOTA ACCESS, LLC FOR
AN ENERGY FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE DAKOTA ACCESS
PIPELINE**

**Rebuttal Testimony of Michael E. Timpson, Ph.D.
On Behalf of the Staff of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
August 14, 2015**

004282

1 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

2 A: Michael E. Timpson, Ph.D., Natural Resource Group, LLC (an ERM Group
3 Company), 1500 SW 1st Ave, Suite 885, Portland, OR, 97201.

4 **Q: Describe your educational background.**

5 A: I received a Bachelor's degree in 1982 from the University of Rhode Island in
6 Kingston, RI with a major in Natural Resources (soil science concentration). I
7 received a Master's degree in 1985 from North Dakota State University in Fargo,
8 ND, majoring in soil science, with a minor in geology. I received a Doctorate of
9 Philosophy in 1992 from the University of Tennessee-Knoxville in Knoxville
10 Tennessee, with a major in Plant and Soil Science and a minor in Environmental
11 Engineering. I conducted post-doctoral research at Oak Ridge National
12 Laboratory in 1993 and 1994, focusing on remediation of uranium-contaminated
13 soils.

14 **Q: By whom are you now employed?**

15 A: I have been employed by Natural Resource Group, LLC (an ERM Company)
16 since 2001. I currently hold the position of Principal Consultant in our Regulatory
17 Group and serve as the office manager of the Portland, Oregon office.

18 **Q: What work experience have you had that is relevant to your involvement on
19 this project?**

20 A: While pursuing my doctorate I was employed full time by the Department of Plant
21 and Soil Science, part of the agricultural experiment station system of the
22 University of Tennessee. As such, I conducted field work and operated a

1 laboratory that analyzed soils in support of the agricultural experiment station's
2 research program and also supported the United States Department of
3 Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service soil survey program. Prior
4 to joining Natural Resource Group, I worked for a smaller consulting firm
5 conducting soils and wetlands evaluations in support of natural gas pipeline
6 projects. Since joining Natural Resource Group I have conducted soils and
7 agricultural impact and mitigation assessments for more than 3,000 miles of
8 natural gas and petroleum pipelines across the United States, including three
9 recent natural gas pipelines in North Dakota. As a third-party contractor to the
10 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I've assisted in the preparation of soils
11 and agricultural impact assessments related to natural gas pipelines for 13
12 Environmental Impact Statements and Environmental Assessments under the
13 National Environmental Policy Act and/or applicable state programs.

14 **Q: What Professional Credentials do you hold?**

15 A: I am a Licensed Professional Soil Scientist in the State of Wisconsin (License
16 No. 174-112). My current license expires in July 2016.

17 **Q: What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

18 A: My rebuttal testimony is being provided to address specific concerns identified in
19 direct testimony provided by intervening landowners. That testimony is
20 specifically related to: the potential for trench excavation to bring dormant weed
21 seeds to the surface from deeper soil layers; the potential for soil compaction
22 related to construction to impact post-construction crop yields; and, the potential

1 for soil temperature changes that may occur over the pipeline due to pipeline
2 operations to impact post-construction crop yields.

3 **Q: What methodology did you employ?**

4 A: I reviewed the information provided in Sections 14.5 and 16.1 of Dakota Access'
5 Revised Application as well as the information provided in the Agricultural Impact
6 Mitigation Plan (AIMP, Exhibit D of Dakota Access' Revised Application). I also
7 reviewed existing publications and environmental review documents prepared for
8 federal and state permits for similar projects in the upper Midwest. In addition, I
9 applied my knowledge of soil characteristics and limitations as well as my
10 knowledge of the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey
11 Geographic Database (SSURGO) to determine if soils were properly classified by
12 their limitations and if the appropriate mitigation measures were proposed for
13 implementation to avoid or minimize potential construction impacts on agricultural
14 soils (as defined in the project AIMP).

15 **Q: In pre-filed direct testimony, intervening landowners raised concerns about**
16 **the possibility of impacts on crop yields due to heat generated during**
17 **operation of the pipeline. Based on your experience and research, do you**
18 **believe that heat-related impacts on crop yields could occur?**

19 A: Yes, heat-related effects on plant growth and crop yields have been identified as
20 a result of pipeline operations for natural gas and oil pipelines. Published reports
21 of impacts on plant growth and crop yields resulting from soil heating caused by
22 pipeline operations are limited, however, a recent assessment of pipeline
23 temperature effects on vegetation was conducted for the Alliance Pipeline, a

1 natural gas transmission pipeline that crosses portions of North Dakota,
2 Minnesota, Iowa and Illinois (TERA Environmental Consultants, 2004).
3 Measurements of soil temperature, plant available soil moisture, and spring
4 wheat and barley yields were recorded upstream and downstream of a
5 compressor station on the Alliance Pipeline in 2002, 2003, and 2004. Data were
6 collected from four sites downstream of the compressor station (at distances
7 ranging from 0.5 to 52 miles downstream) and compared with a site 0.5 mile
8 upstream of the compressor station. Data collection took place at points directly
9 over the trench, 6 feet way from the pipeline, and 43 feet away from the pipeline,
10 and at different soil depths. Soil temperature was highest directly over the
11 pipeline (as documented in previous studies, e.g., Naeth et al., 1993) and
12 decreased with increasing distance from the pipeline. No significant differences
13 were noted in plant available soil moisture or crop yield at any site with the
14 exception that mean plant available soil moisture was significantly greater over
15 the trench in 2002 than in adjacent areas. Data were collected under the drought
16 conditions that existed in 2002, while precipitation and plant available soil water
17 were normal to above normal in 2003 and 2004, respectively. The authors
18 anticipated that soil temperatures above the pipeline might lead to increased soil
19 drying, however, this effect was not documented. Increased soil temperature
20 above the pipeline did not significantly affect plant available soil moisture or crop
21 yield. Although the operational parameters of the Alliance natural gas pipeline
22 may vary from the proposed Dakota Access oil pipeline, similar temperature

1 effects on plant growth, soil moisture parameters, and crop yield may be
2 expected from operation of the Dakota Access pipeline project.

3 References:

4 Naeth, M.A., D.S. Chanasyk, W.B. McGill and A.W. Bailey. 1993. Soil
5 temperature regime in mixed prairie rangeland after pipeline construction and
6 operation. Can. Agriculture Engineering. 35(2): 89-95.

7 TERA Environmental Consultants. 2004. Effects of heat from a pipeline on crop
8 growth – interim results. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on
9 Environmental Concerns in Rights-of-Way Management, Saratoga Springs, NY.

10 **Q: If reduced crop yields are expected as a result of heat generated during**
11 **operation of the pipeline, are there any mitigation measures that can be**
12 **implemented? If so, please explain.**

13 A: Reduced crop yields may result from heat added to soils from pipeline
14 operations; however, the majority of studies published to date have
15 demonstrated a neutral to positive effect on crop yields as a result of the heat
16 effects from pipeline operation. Further, there are no mitigation measures that
17 can be implemented to change the heat effects on soils surrounding an operating
18 pipeline.

19 **Q: If there are ways to mitigate the impacts, what measure(s) do you**
20 **recommend the PUC should consider in order to mitigate the impacts of**
21 **crop yield loss due to heat generated during operation of the pipeline?**

22 A: Data regarding crop yields near buried pipelines indicate that most effects of heat
23 added to soils from pipeline operations have neutral to positive effects on crop

1 yields. As a result, no mitigation measures would be required to address heat
2 effects from pipeline operations.

3 **Q: In pre-filed direct testimony, intervening landowners raised concerns about**
4 **the possibility of impacts on crop yields due to the increased emergence of**
5 **noxious weeds resulting from trenching and other soil disturbance during**
6 **construction of the pipeline. Based on your experience and research, do**
7 **you believe that impacts from an increased occurrence of noxious weeds**
8 **could occur?**

9 A: Yes

10 **Q: If reduced crop yields or other impacts are expected as a result of the**
11 **spread of noxious weeds resulting from construction of the pipeline, are**
12 **there any mitigation measures that can be implemented? If so, please**
13 **explain.**

14 A: There are a variety of mitigation measures that can be implemented to minimize
15 the potential for spreading noxious and other weeds during pipeline construction.
16 Section 16.1 of Dakota Access' Revised Application describes the
17 preconstruction survey effort employed to document the presence of noxious
18 weeds along the proposed pipeline route in South Dakota. Section 16.1.1
19 describes the mitigation measures that may be employed to minimize the
20 potential for spreading noxious weeds along the pipeline route during
21 construction. The AIMP does not include a section describing the potential to
22 spread noxious or other weed species as a result of construction, and includes

1 no mention of mitigation measures that would be employed to avoid or minimize
2 the spread of weeds of any sort along the right-of-way.

3 **Q: If there are ways to mitigate the impacts, what measure(s) do you**
4 **recommend the PUC should consider in order to mitigate the impacts**
5 **resulting from the spread of noxious weeds resulting from pipeline**
6 **construction?**

7 A: Section 16.1.1 of the Revised Application states that Dakota Access would
8 consult with the South Dakota Department of Agriculture regarding appropriate
9 Best Management Practices (BMPs) to implement to minimize the spread of
10 noxious weeds during construction. The mitigation measures described in that
11 Section, if used in combination, would be sufficient to minimize the potential
12 spread of noxious weeds as a result of construction. However, the success of
13 the mitigation measures should be documented through post-construction weed
14 surveys for at least 2 years following the completion of construction.

15 Additional mitigation measures should be employed to minimize the potential for
16 propagation of other common agricultural weeds as a result of construction. In
17 areas of rotated cropland, typical weed control measures reduce the growth of
18 weeds, minimizing competition between agricultural crops and weed species for
19 nutrients and water. However, deeper portions of the topsoil in most agricultural
20 lands also act as a seed bank for long-lived weed seeds located below the depth
21 of most common pre-emergent herbicide treatments. Topsoil segregation,
22 performed to preserve topsoil productivity and eliminate the potential for rutting
23 due to construction traffic resulting in mixing of topsoil and subsoil, will result in a

1 mixing of the soil to the depth of the topsoil segregated from the construction
2 workspace. For example, in areas with 12-inches or more of topsoil, Dakota
3 Access proposes to segregate 12-inches of topsoil from the ditch and spoil
4 storage areas of the construction right-of-way. Moving this volume of topsoil
5 across the construction workspace will mix the soil. This mixing action brings
6 dormant weed seeds to the surface of the stored topsoil piles and can result in
7 significant growth of weeds. To minimize the potential for this new weed growth
8 to result in new weed infestations following construction and restoration of the
9 right-of-way, monitoring and controlling the growth of weeds on topsoil storage
10 piles should be employed. To implement this additional weed control mitigation,
11 the environmental inspector or agricultural inspector should be capable of
12 identifying multiple species of weeds at a number of life stages, and be able to
13 recommend and implement weed control measures early enough in the life cycle
14 of the weed species in question to minimize or prevent the plants from setting
15 seeds.

16 **In pre-filed direct testimony, intervening landowners raised concerns about**
17 **the possibility of long-term impacts on crop yields due to the compaction**
18 **of soil occurring during construction of the pipeline. Based on your**
19 **experience and research, do you believe that soil compaction impacts on**
20 **crop yields could occur?**

21 A: Yes.

1 **Q: If reduced crop yields are expected as a result of soil compaction during**
2 **construction of the pipeline, are there any mitigation measures that can be**
3 **implemented?**

4 A: There are mitigation measures that can be implemented to minimize the potential
5 for compaction of soils to impact post-construction crop yields.

6 **Q: If there are ways to mitigate the impacts of soil compaction, what**
7 **measure(s) do you recommend the PUC should consider in order to**
8 **mitigate the impacts of crop yield loss due to soil compaction during**
9 **construction of the pipeline?**

10 A: Section h of the AIMP describes the mitigation measures that would be
11 implemented to alleviate compaction of soils resulting from construction traffic.
12 Soil compaction is typically greatest on the “working side” or “travel lane” portion
13 of the construction right-of-way, and largely results from the use of rubber-tired
14 trucks used for hauling pipe segments and transporting other heavy items along
15 the right-of-way. Little if any compaction typically occurs on the spoil storage
16 side of the right-of-way, and virtually no compaction occurs over the trench line.

17 The deep tillage methods described in Section h of the AIMP will likely be
18 adequate to alleviate soil compaction that will result from construction. However,
19 the approach for implementing the deep tillage methods and a means to
20 determine if the proposed 3 passes of the tillage equipment have been sufficient
21 to remediate the compacted soils is insufficient. The industry standard for
22 judging whether decompaction measures are adequate is a comparison of soil
23 density, as measured with a tool called a penetrometer, on the right-of-way with

1 undisturbed soils in adjacent off-right-of-way areas of the same field. Dakota
2 Access' AIMP contains no provisions for making these comparisons, it simply
3 assumes that 3 passes of the deep tillage equipment will be sufficient to alleviate
4 the level of compaction induced by construction traffic. Natural Resource Group
5 recommends that the PUC include requirements for compaction testing of areas
6 on and off the construction right-of-way, using a penetrometer or other equivalent
7 measuring device, to provide an appropriate means of determining whether deep
8 tillage operations have reduced compaction to levels similar to adjacent sections
9 of cropland undisturbed by construction activities.

10 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 **A:** Yes.



Michael E. Timpson, Ph.D., L.P.S.S.
e-mail: mike.timpson@NRG-LLC.com

Mike Timpson is a Senior Consultant at Natural Resource Group, LLC (NRG) and the Office Manager in NRG's Portland office. Mike has been working in the industry since 1997 and has expertise in soil, geological, and wetland resources for natural gas pipeline and liquefied natural gas (LNG) projects under the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). He manages projects and coordinates the efforts of natural resource subconsultants. Mike has experience preparing Environmental Report Applications for several FERC 7(c) pipeline projects, as well as preparation of federal, state, and local permits necessary for the construction and operation of natural gas and petroleum pipelines. He also has extensive experience preparing sections for third-party Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) and Environmental Assessments (EAs) for a number of lead federal agencies.

Selected Project Experience

- WBI Energy Transmission – Wind Ridge Pipeline Project, April 2014 –present, 96-miles of 16-inch-diameter pipeline, two meter stations, and associated facilities in North Dakota: Project Manager responsible for overseeing the preparation of the FERC 7(c) environmental report application, including authoring Resource Report 10 (Alternatives), preparation of an applicant-prepared draft Environmental Assessment, biological and cultural resource surveys, federal and state permitting, and public affairs support.
- Texas Gas Transmission, LLC – Texas Gas Abandonment Project, February 2013 to present, 568 miles of 26-inch-diameter pipeline and associated facilities in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana: Project Manager responsible for overseeing the preparation of the FERC section 7(b) environmental report application, including authoring Resource Report 1 (Project Description), and providing quality assurance for the rest of the environmental application.
- Northwest Pipeline, GP – Kalama Lateral Pipeline Project, November, 2011 – 2012, 3.1 miles of 16-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline, a new meter station, and pig launcher/receiver facilities in Cowlitz County, Washington: Project Manager responsible for overseeing the preparation of the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application, including authoring Resource Reports 1 (Project Description) and 10 (Alternatives), and assisting with Clean Water Act permitting.
- Williams Gas Pipeline, Project Manager – Pipeline Feasibility Study and Cost Estimate, October – December 2011, Environmental Permitting and Cost Estimate for 68- and 98-mile-long, 24-inch-diameter pipeline routes and associated aboveground facilities in southeastern Virginia: The cost estimates included use of the FERC pre-filing process, federal and state permitting, protected species consultations and biological surveys, cultural resource consultations and surveys, preparation of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents, construction inspection and compliance monitoring, and environmental and cultural resource mitigation.
- Portland General Electric Company, Cascade Crossing Transmission Project, October, 2010 – June 2013, 215 miles of new 500 kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line, upgrade of an existing 230 kV line, and related facilities in Oregon: Deputy Project Manager for the preparation of a third-party EIS for the U.S. Forest Service, preparing the project description and Alternatives section, the Traffic and Transportation section, and portions of the Vegetation and Water Resources sections of the EIS, and providing QA/QC oversight for the document.
- Alliance Pipeline, LP, Tioga Lateral Pipeline Project, 2011 – 2012, about 80 miles of natural gas pipeline and a new compressor station in North Dakota: Project team



member responsible for preparation of Resource Reports 2 (Water Use and Quality) and 6 (Geological Resources), section of the applicant-prepared EA for Water Resources and Geology; for the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application. Managed the subconsultant conducting wetland and waterbody surveys, coordinated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on jurisdictional determinations and prepared the pre-construction notification for Section 404, Nationwide Permit 12 application.

- Spectra Energy Corporation, New Jersey – New York Expansion Project, 2011 – 2012, 20 miles of multi-diameter natural gas pipeline and related aboveground facilities in New Jersey and New York: Project team member responsible for preparing the Wildlife and Aquatic Resources section; assisted with non-pipeline Alternatives section for a FERC third-party EIS.
- Liberty Natural Gas, Liberty Natural Gas Deepwater Port, September 2010 – February 2011, an offshore natural gas receiving terminal, 44 miles of offshore 36-inch-diameter pipeline in the Atlantic Ocean and Raritan Bay, and 9 miles of onshore 36-inch-diameter pipeline in New Jersey: Project team member responsible for preparing the offshore sediments section of a third-party EIS for the U.S. Coast Guard Deepwater Ports Standards Division; U.S. Maritime Administration; and cooperating agencies, including the FERC.
- Sierra Pacific Power Company, Electric Transmission Line Routing and Feasibility Study, 2009, 25 to 50 miles of 345 kV transmission lines (two) in Nevada: Project Manager responsible for preparing a report to identify and rank potential route alternatives.
- ConocoPhillips/BP, Denali – The Alaska Gas Pipeline Project, 2008, 1,700 miles of 48-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline originating on the North Slope of Alaska and terminating near Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Project team member responsible for study planning for soils and geological resources.
- Guardian Pipeline, LLC, Guardian Expansion and Extension Project, 2006 – Present, 119 miles of 30-, 20-, and 16-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and two new compressor stations in Illinois and Wisconsin: Project Manager responsible for overseeing the preparation of the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application, including authoring Resource Report 1 (Project Description), and federal, state, and local permitting. Also managing construction and monitoring of a compensatory wetland mitigation site in eastern Wisconsin, and post-construction monitoring of wetlands and agricultural impacts along the pipeline.
- Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Leidy to Long Island Expansion Project 2005, 51 miles of natural gas pipeline in Pennsylvania and New Jersey: Project Manager responsible for overseeing the preparation of the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application and applicant-prepared EA, including preparing Resource Report 1 (Project Description) and assisting with Resource Report 10 (Alternatives).
- Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Central New Jersey Expansion Project, 2004, 3.9 miles of natural gas pipeline in New Jersey: Project team member responsible for preparing FERC Resource Reports 6 (Geology) and 7 (Soils), conducting wetland delineations, and assisting with preparing wetland permit applications.
- Questar Pipeline Company, Southern System Expansion Project, 2003 – 2004, about 20 miles of natural gas pipeline in Utah: Project team member responsible for supervising the preparation of Resource Reports 6 and 7 (Geology and Soils) for the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application.
- EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc., Entrega Gas Pipeline Project, 2003 – 2004, 327 miles of 42- and 36-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline in Colorado and Wyoming: Project team member responsible for preparing Resource Report 7 (Soils) for the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application.



- Guardian Pipeline, LLC, Guardian Pipeline Project, 1999 – 2002, 149 miles of 36-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline in Illinois and Wisconsin: Project team member responsible for conducting and supervising wetland delineations and topsoil depth surveys, performing data quality control and electronic data transfer to project engineering firm, and managing surveys for endangered and threatened species.
- Pearl Crossing LNG Terminal LLC and Pearl Crossing Pipeline LLC (ExxonMobil), Pearl Crossing LNG Project, 2004 – 2005, 170 miles (two 53-mile-long offshore pipelines and one 64-mile-long onshore pipeline) of 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and an offshore LNG import terminal in the Gulf of Mexico and Louisiana: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils and Sediments sections of a FERC and U.S. Coast Guard third-party EIS.
- Creole Trail LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project, 2005 – 2006, an LNG terminal and 123.6 miles of send out pipeline in Louisiana: Prepared the sediments section for the LNG terminal and assisted with the Soils and Wetlands sections.
- ExxonMobil, Vista Del Sol LNG Terminal Project, 2004 – 2005, LNG import terminal and 27-mile pipeline near Corpus Christi, Texas: Project team member responsible for preparing the Sediments and Soils sections of a FERC third-party EIS.
- Gulf LNG Energy, LLC and Gulf LNG Pipeline, LLC, Gulf LNG Clean Energy Project, 2005 – 2006, 5 miles of 36-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and an LNG import terminal in Mississippi: Project team member responsible for preparing the Dredging and Sediment Analysis section of the EIS; also provided oversight on the Soils section.
- Bradwood Landing, LLC and NorthernStar Energy, LLC, Bradwood Landing LNG Project, 2005 – 2006, 36 miles of 30- and 36-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and an LNG import terminal in Oregon, Washington: Project team member responsible for preparing the Dredging and Sediment Analysis section of the draft EIS.
- KeySpan LNG, L.P., KeySpan LNG Facility Upgrade Project, 2004 – 2005, an LNG facility expansion in Rhode Island: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils, Sediments, and Alternatives sections for a FERC third-party EIS.
- Crown Landing, LLC, Crown Landing LNG Terminal, 2005 – 2006, an LNG storage facility and 11 miles of natural gas pipeline in New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils and Sediments sections of a FERC third-party EIS.
- Weaver's Cove Energy, LLC, Weaver's Cove LNG Project, 2004 – 2005, an LNG terminal facility and 6 miles of natural gas pipeline in Massachusetts: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils and Sediments sections of a FERC third-party EIS.
- Cheyenne Plains Gas Pipeline Company, LLC, Cheyenne Plains Pipeline Project, 2003 – 2004, 387 miles of 36-, 30-, 20-, and 8-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline, one new compressor station, and modifications to one existing compressor station in Colorado and Kansas: Project team member responsible for preparing the Groundwater, Soils, and Geology sections of a FERC third-party EIS.
- Hackberry LNG Terminal, LLC, Hackberry LNG Terminal Project, 2002 – 2003, an LNG plant in Louisiana: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils section of a FERC third-party EIS.
- Williams, Chacahoula Gas Storage Project, 2001 – 2002, natural gas cavern storage and pipeline in Louisiana: Project team member responsible for preparing Resource Report 7 (Soils) for the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application and the Soils section of the applicant-prepared EA.
- Kern River Gas Transmission Company, Kern River 2003 Expansion Project, 2002, 717 miles of natural gas pipeline and three new compressor stations and modifications to six existing compressor stations in Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, and California: Project



team member responsible for conducting third-party compliance monitoring for the FERC, and overseeing pre-construction plant salvage operations on Spreads 8 and 9 in Nevada and eastern California.

- Alaska Gas Pipeline Producers Team, Alaska Gas Pipeline Project, 2001 – 2002, 1,628 miles of natural gas pipeline in Alaska, North Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois: Project team member responsible for preparing Resource Report 7 (Soils) for the FERC section 7(c) Environmental Report Application.
- NRG Energy, Inc. Arthur Kill Pipeline Project, 2002 – 2004, 2.3 miles of natural gas pipeline in New York: Project team member responsible for preparing the Soils and Geology sections of New York State Public Service Commission Article VII application.
- Georgia Strait Crossing Pipeline LP, Georgia Strait Crossing Pipeline Project, 2001 – 2002, 47 miles of 20- and 16-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline and one compressor station in Washington State and the Strait of Georgia: Project team member responsible for preparing Geology, Soils and portions of the Water Resources sections for a FERC third-party EIS.
- Kinder Morgan Inc., Illinois Power Lateral Project, 2001, 49 mile-long natural gas pipeline in south-central Illinois, managed wetland delineations and threatened and endangered species surveys.

Education and Training

- Ph.D., Plant and Soil Science, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1992
- M.S., Soil Science, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota, 1985
- B.S., Natural Resources, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island, 1982
- Licensed Professional Soil Scientist, Wisconsin #174-112
- FERC, Environmental Report Preparation Seminar, 2014
- FERC, Environmental Compliance Seminar, 2014

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
DAKOTA ACCESS, LLC FOR AN ENERGY)	
FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT THE)	HP14-002
DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE)	
)	
)	
)	

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony of Michael E. Timpson, Ph.D., Attachment 1 and Certificate of Service were served electronically to the Parties listed below, on the 14th day of August, 2015, addressed to:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us

Mr. Brett Koenecke
May, Adam, Gerdes and Thompson, LLP
PO Box 160
Pierre, SD 57501
Brett@mayadam.net

Ms. Kristen Edwards
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us

Ms. Kara Semmler
May, Adam, Gerdes and Thompson, LLP
PO Box 160
Pierre, SD 57501
kcs@magt.com

Mr. Brian Rounds
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
brian.rounds@state.sd.us

Mr. Tom Siguaw
Senior Project Director - Engineering
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
tom.siguaw@energytransfer.com

Mr. Darren Kearney
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
darren.kearney@state.sd.us

Mr. Keegan Pieper
Associate General Counsel
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
keegan.pieper@energytransfer.com

Mr. Stephen Veatch
Senior Director - Certificates
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
Stephen.veatch@energytransfer.com

Mr. Joey Mahmoud
Senior Vice President - Engineering
Dakota Access, LLC
1300 Main Street
Houston, TX 77002
Joey.mahmoud@energytransfer.com

Mr. Jack Edwards
Project Manager
Dakota Access, LLC
4401 S. Technology Dr.
South Suite
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
Jack.edwards@energytransfer.com

Ms. Jennifer Guthmiller
McPherson County Auditor
PO Box 390
Leola, SD 57456
mcpersonaud@valleytel.net

Mr. Keith Schurr
Edmunds County Auditor
PO Box 97
Ipswich, SD 57451
Keith.schurr@state.sd.us

Ms. Kelly Toennies
Faulk County Auditor
PO Box 309
Faulkton, SD 57438
Kelly.toennies@state.sd.us

Ms. Theresa Hodges
Spink County Auditor
210 E. Seventh Ave.
Redfield, SD 57469
spinkcoauditor@nrctv.com

Ms. Jill Hanson
Beadle County Auditor
Suite #201
450 Third St. SW
Huron, SD 57350
auditor@beadlesd.org

Ms. Jennifer Albrecht
Kingsbury County Auditor
PO Box 196
DeSmet, SD 57231
Jennifer.albrecht@state.sd.us

Ms. Susan Connor
Miner County Auditor
PO Box 86
Howard, SD 57349
minerauditor@minercountysd.org

Ms. Roberta Janke
Lake County Auditor
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042
lakeauditor@lakecountysd.com

Ms. Geralyn Sherman
McCook County Auditor
PO Box 190
Salem, SD 57058
Geralyn.sherman@state.sd.us

Mr. Bob Litz
Minnehaha County Auditor
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
blitz@minnehahacounty.org

Ms. Sheila Hagemann
Turner County Auditor
PO Box 370
Parker, SD 57053
turcoaud@iw.net

Ms. Marlene Sweeter
Lincoln County Auditor
104 N. Main St.
Canton, SD 57013
auditor@lincolncountysd.org

Ms. Lisa Schaeftbauer
Campbell County Auditor
PO Box 37
Mound City, SD 57646
campbellcommission@yahoo.com

Ms. Karla Engle
Special Assistant Attorney General
South Dakota Department of
Transportation
700 E. Broadway Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501-2586
karla.engle@state.sd.us

Mr. Scott Pedersen
Chairman
Lake County
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042
lakegovt@lakecountysd.com

Mr. Chris S. Giles
Attorney
Lake County States Attorney
200 E. Center St.
Madison, SD 57042
Chris.Giles@lakecountysd.com

Mr. Steve Harper
General Manager
WEB Water Development Association,
Inc.
PO Box 51
Aberdeen, SD 57402
sharper@webwater.org

Mr. Randy Kuehn
17940 389th Ave.
Redfield, SD 57469
rlkfarms@gmail.com

Mr. Jim Schmidt
Chairman
Lincoln County Board of Commissioners
104 N. Main, Ste. 110
Canton, SD 57013-1703
Auditor@lincolncountysd.org

Mr. Michael F. Nadolski
Attorney
Lincoln County
Ste. 200
104 N. Main
Canton, SD 57077
mnadolski@lincolncountysd.org

Mr. Bret Merkle
Merkle Law Firm
PO Box 90708
Sioux Falls, SD 57109-0708
bret@merklelaw.com

Ms. Cindy Heiberger
Commission Chairman
Minnehaha County
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
[cjepsen@minnehahacounty.org](mailto:cjepson@minnehahacounty.org)

Mr. Kersten Kappmeyer
Attorney
Minnehaha County
415 N. Dakota Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57104
kkappmeyer@minnehahacounty.org

Mr. Glenn J. Boomsma
Attorney
Breit Law Office, P.C.
606 E. Tan Tara Circle
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
glenn@breitlawpc.com

Ms. Peggy A. Hoogestraat
27575 462nd Ave.
Chancellor, SD 57015
gardengalpeggy@gmail.com

Ms. Joy A. Hohn
46178 263rd St.
Hartford, SD 57033
rinchohn@gmail.com

Ms. Marilyn J. Murray
1416 S. Larkspur Trl.
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
murrayma1@sio.midco.net

Mr. Larry A. Nelson
Frieberg, Nelson and Ask, L.L.P.
PO Box 38
Canton, SD 57013
lnelson@frieberglaw.com

Ms. Teresa Sidel
City Administrator
City of Hartford
125 N. Main Ave.
Hartford, SD 57033
cityhall@hartfordsd.us

Ms. Linda Glaeser
Manager
Rocky Acres Land Investment, LLC
27324 91st Ave. E.
Graham, WA 98338
lglaeser@seattlecca.org
lmglaeser@wwdb.org

Ms. Linda Goulet
27332 Atkins Pl.
Tea, SD 57064
45Lgoulet@gmail.com

Mr. Dale E. Sorenson
Dale E. Sorenson Life Estate
45064 241st St.
Madison, SD 57042
a77man@msn.com

Ms. Kimberly Craven
3560 Catalpa Way
Boulder, CO 80304
kimecraven@gmail.com

Ms. Sabrina King
Community Organizer
Dakota Rural Action
518 Sixth Street, #6
Rapid City, SD 57701
sabrina@dakotarural.org

Mr. Frank James
Staff Director
Dakota Rural Action
PO Box 549
Brookings, SD 57006
fejames@dakotarural.org

Ms. Debra K.,
Mr. Duane H.
& Mr. Dennis S. Sorenson
24095 451st Ave.
Madison, SD 57042
stubbyfarmer@yahoo.com

Mr. Douglas Sorenson
24095 451st Ave.
Madison, SD 57042
plowboy@svtv.com

Mr. William Haugen

Haugen Investments LP
PO Box 545
Hartford, SD 57033
wh401889@hotmail.com

Mr. Phillip Fett
PO Box 572
Lennox, SD 57039
vonfett529@gmail.com

Ms. Shirley M. Oltmanns
26576 466th Ave.
Sioux Falls, SD 57106
ssoltm@gmail.com

Mr. Bradley F. Williams
1044 Overlook Rd.
Mendota Heights, MN 55118
bwilliams@bestlaw.com

Mr. Craig L. & Ms. Dotta-Jo A. Walker
733 NE 15th St.
Madison, SD 57042
court_walker@hotmail.com

Mr. Kevin J. Schoffelman
712 W. Fourth Ave.
Lennox, SD 57039
klschoff@outlook.com

Ms. Diane Best
Attorney
City of Sioux Falls
224 W. Ninth St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-7402
dbest@siouxfalls.org

Mr. Charles J. Johnson
45169 243rd St.
Madison, SD 57042
c-bjohnson@svtv.com

Ms. Janice E. Petterson
6401 S. Lyncrest Ave., Apt. 307
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
grmjnjp@sio.midco.net

004301

Ms. Corliss F. Wiebers
607 S. Elm St.
PO Box 256
Lennox, SD 57039
wiebersco@gmail.com

Mr. Paul A Nelsen
46248 W. Shore Pl.
Hartford, SD 57033
paul@paulnelsonconstruction.com

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
27893 244th St.
Draper, SD 57531
jackknife@goldenwest.net

Mr. John Wellnitz
305 A St.
Osceola, SD 57353
johnwellnitz@gmail.com

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

Mr. Tom Goldtooth
Executive Director
Indigenous Environmental Network
ien@igc.org

Mr. Dallas Goldtooth
Community Organizer
Indigenous Environmental Network
goldtoothdallas@gmail.com

Mr. Matthew L. Rappold
Rappold Law Office
816 Sixth St.
PO Box 873
Rapid City, SD 57709
Matt.rappold01@gmail.com

Ms. Paula Antoine
RST-Sicangu Oyate Land Office
PO Box 658
Rosebud, SD 57570
wopila@gwtc.net

Mr. Royal Yellow Hawk
RST- Sicangu Lakota Treaty Office
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
yellowhawkroyal@yahoo.com

Ms. Thomasina Real Bird
Attorney
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
1900 Plaza Dr.
Louisville, CO 80027
trealbird@ndnlaw.com

Ms. Mavis A. Parry
3 Mission Mtn. Rd.
Clancy, MT 59634
mavisparry@hotmail.com

Ms. Margo D. Northrup
Attorney
Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Northrup LLP
PO Box 280
Pierre, SD 57501-0280
m.northrup@riterlaw.com

And on August 14th, 2015, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was mailed via U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, to the following:

Delores Andreessen Assid
c/o Laurie Kunzelman
3604 E. Woodsedge St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57108

Mr. Orrin E. Geide
46134 263rd St.
Hartford, SD 57033

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

/s/Kristen N. Edwards_____.

Kristen N. Edwards
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 East Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501