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

#### 

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION:BY TRANSCANADA KEYSTONEPIPELINE, LP FOR A PERMIT UNDER:THE SOUTH DAKOTA ENERGY:CONVERSION AND TRANSMISSION:FACILITIES ACT TO CONSTRUCT THEDKEYSTONE XL PROJECT:

HP 14-001

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

#### 

Under SDCL § 49-41B-27, Petitioner TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP, moves that the Commission enter an order limiting the scope of discovery to issues related to whether "the project continues to meet the conditions on which the permit was granted." SDCL § 49-41B-27.

On March 12, 2009, Keystone filed an application for a permit to operate and construct the Keystone XL Pipeline ("the Project"). After a hearing, the Commission entered a Final Decision and Order, and later an Amended Final Decision and Order dated June 29, 2010, to which 50 conditions are attached. The Amended Final Decision and Order marked the conclusion of a contested case under SDCL § 1-26-1(2). The

Amended Final Decision and Order was appealable under SDCL §§ 49-41B-30 and 49-1-19. The Amended Final Decision and Order was not appealed.

## 1. A certification proceeding is not a reconsideration of the permit.

An unappealed order is final and entitled to preclusive effect. Jundt v. Fuller, 2007 S.D. 62, ¶ 12, 736 N.W.2d 508, 513. The Commission's administrative rules do not provide for reconsideration of a final order, and the South Dakota Supreme Court has held that an agency may not reconsider a final decision in a contested case. "Nothing in South Dakota's Administrative Procedures Act authorizes an administrative agency to reconsider a decision in a contested case." Id. ¶7,736 N.W.2d at 512. While the Commission has the inherent authority to correct a decision that appears to be erroneous, that authority ends when the appeal time has run. "Once an agency's adjudication has become final it is no longer subject to reconsideration." Id. Thus, a proceeding under SDCL § 49-49B-27 is not a substitute for an appeal, and it is not an opportunity for the Intervenors to ask the Commission to reopen the permit, including the 50 conditions, or to reconsider its decision granting Keystone a permit to construct and operate the Project. Every Intervenor in this docket could have applied for party status in HP09-001. This docket is not an opportunity for those who did not previously intervene - or those that did - to relitigate the issues in HP 09-001.

2

#### 2. The certification statute is narrowly drawn.

The certification statute requires that Keystone certify that the Project "continues to meet the conditions on which the permit was issued." SDCL § 49-41B-27. Significantly, the statute does not provide that after four years the permit expires. It is inaccurate for some Intervenors to refer to "reissuance of the permit," or to question whether the permit should be "regranted." There is no statutory basis to suggest that the permit is invalid or has expired. To the contrary, a permit may be revoked or suspended by the Commission only for certain enumerated conditions, including misstatements of material fact in the application, failure to comply with the terms or conditions of the permit, or violation of any material provision of Chapter 49-41B. SDCL § 49-41B-33. Nor has the Commission adopted an administrative rule providing that a permit expires after four years if construction has not started. Rather, the statute requires only that Keystone certify that the Project continues to meet the conditions on which the permit was issued if construction commences more than four years after the permit was issued. SDCL § 49-41B-27.

Because the permit has not expired and the Amended Final Decision and Order was not appealed and is entitled to preclusive effect, the scope of this proceeding is necessarily narrower than whether the permit should have been granted in the first place. Keystone previously met its burden of proof under SDCL § 49-41B-22. The certification

3

statute does not authorize a proceeding under which Keystone must again prove that the Project satisfies the criteria in SDCL § 49-41B-22.

## **3.** The certification statute defines the scope of discovery.

The scope of discovery must be limited to the issues identified in the statute, namely whether "such facility continues to meet the conditions upon which the permit was issued." SDCL § 49-41B-27. The statute is not broad enough to allow the Intervenors to relitigate issuance of the permit and does not authorize Intervenors to inject new issues into the PUC's review of the Certification that were not fundamental to the PUC's decision in the original permit proceeding. Thus, the following issues that have been raised by various Intervenors in applications for party status are beyond the scope of this proceeding: the effects of the Project on the soils of the Sandhills; the effects of the Project on the Ogallala Aquifer and other streams, river, and waterbodies; whether the Project is in the national interest; whether the Department of State conducted sufficient consultation with interested Tribes under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; whether Keystone is entitled to exercise the right of eminent domain; and whether development of the oil sands in Canada harms the environment and contributes to levels of CO2 in the atmosphere. As stated in Keystone's certification, Keystone can and will comply with the 50 conditions attached to the Final Decision and Order during construction, operation, and maintenance of the Project. The scope of

4

# discovery must be limited to a challenge to Keystone's certification. The scope of

discovery cannot be whether the Permit should have been granted in the first place.

Thus, Keystone request that the Commission enter an order that:

All discovery must be limited to: (1) whether the proposed Keystone XL Pipeline continues to meet the 50 Amended Permit Conditions stated in Exhibit A to the Amended Final Permit and Order dated June 29, 2010; or (2) the changes to the Findings of Fact in the Amended Final Permit and Order identified in Keystone's Tracking Table of Changes attached as Exhibit C to Keystone's Petition for Order Accepting Certification Under SDCL § 49-41B-27. Each discovery request must identify by number the Amended Permit Condition or the Finding to which it is addressed.

### Conclusion

As has already been mentioned in the proceedings, the issues presented in this docket are narrow. Entering an order limiting the scope of discovery will assist all parties in conducting discovery and will avoid unnecessary motion practice before the Commission related to the relevance of requested discovery. A clear definition of the scope of discovery will also facilitate a timely decision in this docket, which should take significantly less time than was allowed for the Commission's consideration of the permit under SDCL § 49-41B-24. Keystone respectfully requests that the Commission enter an appropriate order.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2014.

# WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

William Taylor By

William Táylor James E. Moore PO Box 5027 300 South Phillips Avenue, Suite 300 Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027 Phone (605) 336-3890 Fax (605) 339-3357 Email james.moore@woodsfuller.com bill.taylor@woodsfuller.com Attorneys for Applicant TransCanada



# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2014, I sent by United States

first-class mail, postage prepaid, or e-mail transmission, a true and correct copy of

Keystone's Motion to Define the Scope of Discovery Under SDCL § 49-41B-27, to the

following:

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

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

Tony Rogers, Director Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility Commission 153 South Main Street Mission, SD 57555 tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Jane Kleeb 1010 North Denver Avenue Hastings, NE 68901 jane@boldnebraska.org Kristen Edwards Staff Attorney South Dakota Public Utilities Commission 500 E. Capitol Avenue Pierre, SD 57501 <u>kristen.edwards@state.sd.us</u>

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

Cindy Myers, R.N. PO Box 104 Stuart, NE 68780 <u>csmyers77@hotmail.com</u>

Byron T. Steskal Diana L. Steskal 707 E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Stuart, NE 68780 prairierose@nntc.net

Terry Frisch Cheryl Frisch 47591 875<sup>th</sup> Road Atkinson, NE 68713 tcfrisch@q.com

Lewis GrassRope PO Box 61 Lower Brule, SD 57548 wisestar8@msn.com

Robert G. Allpress 46165 Badger Road Naper, NE 68755 bobandnan2008@hotmail.com

Amy Schaffer PO Box 114 Louisville, NE 68037

Benjamin D. Gotschall 6505 W. Davey Road Raymond, NE 68428 ben@boldnebraska.org

Elizabeth Lone Eagle 593 Bridger/PO Box 160 Howes, SD 57748 <u>bethcbest@gmail.com</u>

John H. Harter 28125 307<sup>th</sup> Avenue Winner, SD 57580 johnharter11@yahoo.com Arthur R. Tanderup 52343 857<sup>th</sup> Road Neligh, NE 68756 <u>atanderu@gmail.com</u>

Carolyn P. Smith 305 N. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Plainview, NE 68769 peachie-1234@yahoo.com

Jeff Jensen 14376 Laflin Road Newell, SD 57760 jensen@sdplains.com

Louis T. (Tom) Genung 902 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Street Hastings, NE 68901 tg64152@windstream.net

Nancy Hildring 6300 West Elm Black Hawk, SD 57718 nhilshat@rapidnet.com

Paul F. Seamans 27893 249<sup>th</sup> Street Draper, SD 57531 jacknife@goldenwest.net

Viola Waln PO Box 937 Rosebud, SD 57570 walnranch@goldenwest.net



Peter Capossela Peter Capossela, P.C. PO Box 10643 Eugene, OR 97440 pcapossela@nu-world.com

South Dakota Wildlife Federation PO Box 7075 Pierre, SD 57501 <u>sdwf@mncomm.com</u>

Jerry P. Jones 22584 US Hwy 14 Midland, SD 57552

Debbie J. Trapp 24952 US Hwy 14 Midland, SD 57552 <u>mtdt@goldenwest.net</u>

Douglas Hayes Sierra Club 1650 38<sup>th</sup> St., Suite 102W Boulder, CO 80301 doug.hayes@sierraclub.org

Duncan Meisel 20 Jay St., #1010 Brooklyn, NY 11201 <u>duncan@350.org</u> Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio 9748 Arden Road Trumansburg, NY 14886 wrexie.bardaglio@gmail.com

Kevin C. Keckler Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe PO Box 590 Eagle Butte, SD 57625 kevinckeckler@yahoo.com

Cody Jones 21648 US Hwy 14/63 Midland, SD 57552

Gena M. Parkhurst 2825 Minnewsta Place Rapid City, SD 57702 <u>GMP66@hotmail.com</u>

Joye Braun PO Box 484 Eagle Butte, SD 57625 jmbraun57625@gmail.com

The Yankton Sioux Tribe Robert Flying Hawk, Chairman PO Box 1153 Wagner, SD 57380 <u>robertflyinghawk@gmail.com</u> Thomasina Real Bird Attorney for Yankton Sioux Tribe <u>trealbird@ndnlaw.com</u>

Bruce Ellison Attorney for Dakota Rural Action 518 6<sup>th</sup> Street #6 Rapid City, SD 57701 belli4law@aol.com

RoxAnn Boettcher 86061 Edgewater Avenue Bassett, NE 68714 boettcherann@abbnebraska.com

Bonny Kilmurry 47798 888 Road Atkinson, NE 68713

Intertribal Council on Utility Policy PO Box 25 Rosebud, SD 57570 bobgough@intertribalCOUP.org

Dallas Goldtooth 38731 Res Hwy 1 Morton, MN 56270 goldtoothdallas@gmail.com Chastity Jewett 1321 Woodridge Drive Rapid City, SD 57701 chasjewett@gmail.com

Bruce Boettcher 86061 Edgewater Avenue Bassett, NE 68714 boettcherann@abbnebraska.com

Ronald Fees 17401 Fox Ridge Road Opal, SD 57758

Tom BK Goldtooth PO Box 485 Bemidji, MN 56619 <u>ien@igc.org</u>

Gary F. Dorr 27853 292<sup>nd</sup> Winner, SD 57580 <u>gfdorr@gmail.com</u>

MANN

One of the attorneys for TransCanada