

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

**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**

*
* **STAFF’S BRIEF IN RESPONSE**
* **TO MOTION TO PRECLUDE**
* **IMPROPER RELIEF OR, IN**
* **THE ALTERNATIVE, TO**
* **AMEND FINDINGS OF FACT**
*
* **HP14-001**
*
*

COMES NOW, Staff (“Staff”) of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) and hereby files this brief in response to the Motion to Preclude Improper Relief or, In the Alternative, to Amend Findings of Fact filed by Yankton Sioux Tribe and Indigenous Environmental Network (“Movants”). Staff will address the alternative requests for relief separately.

I. Request to Preclude Improper Relief

In its first request, Movants seek an order that the Commission refrain from altering the Findings of Fact in the Amended Final Decision and Order (“Permit”) issued by the Commission in HP09-001. While Staff does agree that it is improper for the Commission to amend the Findings of Fact, as discussed below, it is also improper for the Commission to issue an order precluding itself from issuing future orders of a certain nature. There is no law or precedent permitting a judicial body to preclude itself. The proper time and place for this request would appear to be in closing argument or post-hearing briefs, when parties have the opportunity to discuss the law as it applies to the facts of this proceeding. However, the relief sought by this request is simply not available in the manner with which it is sought.

A. The Tracking Table of Changes is not tantamount to a request for the Commission to amend its decision.

Keystone has not requested the Commission amend the Findings of Fact. It appears that Keystone has simply provided the Tracking Table of Changes to demonstrate that the project is essentially the same and that the project updates prove that Keystone can continue to meet the conditions upon which the permit was issued.

Movants make contradictory statements on page five of their Motion when they argue that

Because these “updates” which represent key elements of the decision to issue the permit were not taken into consideration in that decision, the Commission did not have the requisite information to reach a decision at the time the Final Decision was entered thus the permit should not have been issued.

By making these statements, Movants argue changes have occurred, but then take the Commission to task for making a decision without having that information at the time the permit was issued. Either these were changes, meaning by their very nature the information was not conceivable at the time, or they are not changes and the Commission could have had and considered the information.

Moreover, simply making updates to the project does not, per se, equate to an amendment of the permit. Some updates are actually expected of the company. For example, Condition 31 references compliance with the Special Permit “if issued.” The Special Permit was not issued. Therefore, Keystone included in its Tracking Table of Changes specifications that would bring the project into compliance with federal regulation absent the Special Permit. “It is presumed that the Legislature [does] not intend for an absurd or unreasonable result.” *Krukow v. S.D. Bd. Of Pardons*, 2006 SD 46, ¶ 12, 716 N.W.2d 121, 124. It would be wholly unreasonable to

interpret SDCL § 49-41B-27 to require that a project make no changes, even if doing so would require them to operate contrary to federal law. When the Commission issued the permit, it required Keystone to construct and operate the pipeline in accordance with the PHMSA Special Permit, if issued. The Commission could not have been charged with knowing that the Special Permit would not have been issued, and, therefore, cannot be taken to task if it allows the project to be constructed and operate in compliance with federal regulations. Forcing the Commission to either predict the future as to federal regulations and make findings accordingly or deny certification of any project that attempts to make changes to remain in compliance with federal regulations would lead to an absurd result.

B. The Commission has already ruled on this issue.

The Commission has addressed this issue twice already. The Commission included review of Appendix C in the Order to Limit the Scope. In the Commission's discussion on December 9, 2014, Commissioner Nelson stated that "[w]hen the word 'conditions' is used, it is used in relation to those things that we, the Commission, attached to the permit when it was originally granted, not the circumstances under which the permit was originally granted." December 9 Transcript 15:3-7.

Furthermore, on January 6, 2015, the Commission heard oral arguments on Yankton Sioux Tribe's ("Yankton") Motion to Dismiss. On December 2, 2014, Yankton filed a Motion to Dismiss, arguing that Keystone failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. In its Motion, Yankton argued that "the permit issued in 2010 is inextricably tied to those findings of fact and conclusions of law as the basis for the Commission's decision to issue the permit."

Motion at ¶2. Yankton went on to state that the submission of the Tracking Table of Changes was a “veiled attempt to amend the Final decision...”

When the Commission took up this issue, ultimately denying the Motion to Dismiss, Commissioner Hanson stated that “[t]here would be no reason for a certification process if one change or a few changes or even many changes disqualified an Applicant. It just is totally contrary to what the entire purpose of the Docket is.” Motion Transcript 28:5.

Commissioner Nelson agreed, stating

I did look at the tracking table and the changes that are outline there to find [if there was] some material change to the South Dakota portion that really stuck out[,] and in my cursory review I didn't find that. ...I think we need to go through this process to find out what's there and have any of those changes impacted the conditions that we laid out a number of years ago.

Motion Transcript 29:9. The Commission then issued an Order finding that the [Petition for Certification] does not on its face demonstrate that the Project no longer meets the permit conditions.

II. Request to Amend Findings of Fact

Staff agrees with Movants that the Commission lacks the authority to amend Findings of Fact in the Permit. Any application for rehearing or reconsideration would need to be made in Docket HP09-001, not Docket HP14-001, by a party to Docket HP09-001, within thirty days of the issuance of the permit, pursuant to ARSD 20:10:01:30.01. Therefore, the alternative relief sought by Movants is not available in this docket and should be denied.

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, Staff recommends the Commission deny the Motion to Preclude Improper Relief or, In the Alternative, to Amend Findings of Fact.

Dated this 2nd day of June, 2015.



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

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

**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)**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

HP14-001**

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of Staff's Brief in Response to Motion to Preclude Improper Relief or, In the Alternative, to Amend Findings of Facts, and Certificate of Service were served electronically to the Parties listed below, on the 2nd day of June, 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

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

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

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

Mr. James P. White
Attorney
TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP
Ste. 225
1250 Eye St., NW
Washington, DC 20005
jim_p_white@transcanada.com

Mr. James E. Moore
Attorney
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
james.moore@woodsfuller.com

Mr. William G. Taylor
Attorney
Woods, Fuller, Shultz and Smith P.C.
PO Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117
bill.taylor@woodsfuller.com

Mr. Paul F. Seamans
27893 249th St.
Draper, SD 57531
jackknife@goldenwest.net

Mr. John H. Harter
28125 307th Ave.
Winner, SD 57580
johnharter11@yahoo.com

Ms. Elizabeth Lone Eagle
PO Box 160
Howes, SD 57748
bethcbest@gmail.com

Mr. Tony Rogers
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility
Commission
153 S. Main St.
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

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

006976

Ms. Jane Kleeb
Bold Nebraska
1010 N. Denver Ave.
Hastings, NE 68901
jane@boldnebraska.org

Mr. Benjamin D. Gotschall
Bold Nebraska
6505 W. Davey Rd.
Raymond, NE 68428
ben@boldnebraska.org

Mr. Byron T. & Ms. Diana L. Steskal
707 E. 2nd St.
Stuart NE 68780
prairierose@nntc.net

Ms. Cindy Myers, R.N.
PO Box 104
Stuart, NE 68780
csmyers77@hotmail.com

Mr. Arthur R. Tanderup
52343 857th Rd.
Neligh, NE 68756
atanderu@gmail.com

Mr. Lewis GrassRope
PO Box 61
Lower Brule, SD 57548
wisestar8@msn.com
(605) 208-0606 - voice

Ms. Carolyn P. Smith
305 N. 3rd St.
Plainview, NE 68769
peachie_1234@yahoo.com

Mr. Robert G. Allpress
46165 Badger Rd.
Naper, NE 68755
bobandnan2008@hotmail.com
(402) 832-5298 - voice

Mr. Louis T. Genung
902 E. 7th St.
Hastings, NE 68901
tg64152@windstream.net

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

Ms. Nancy Hilding
6300 W. Elm
Black Hawk, SD 57718
nhilshat@rapidnet.com

Mr. Gary F. Dorr
27853 292nd
Winner, SD 57580
gfdorr@gmail.com

Mr. Bruce & Ms. RoxAnn Boettcher
Boettcher Organics
86061 Edgewater Ave.
Bassett, NE 68714
boettcherann@abbnebraska.com

Ms. Wrexie Lainson Bardaglio
9748 Arden Rd.
Trumansburg, NY 14886
wrexie.bardaglio@gmail.com
(607) 229-8819 - voice

Mr. Cyril Scott
President
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
cscott@gwtc.net
ejantoine@hotmail.com

Mr. Eric Antoine
Attorney
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 430
Rosebud, SD 57570
ejantoine@hotmail.com

Ms. Paula Antoine
Sicangu Oyate Land Office Coordinator
Rosebud Sioux Tribe
PO Box 658
Rosebud, SD 57570
wopila@gwtc.net
paula.antoine@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Mr. Harold C. Frazier
Chairman
Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe
PO Box 590
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
haroldcfrazier@yahoo.com

Ms. Amy Schaffer
PO Box 114
Louisville, NE 68037
amyannschafter@gmail.com

Ms. Debbie J. Trapp
24952 US HWY 14
Midland, SD 57552
mtdt@goldenwest.net

Ms. Gena M. Parkhurst
2825 Minnewasta Place
Rapid City, SD 57702
gmp66@hotmail.com

Ms. Joye Braun
PO Box 484
Eagle Butte, SD 57625
imbrown57625@gmail.com

Mr. Robert Flying Hawk
Chairman
Yankton Sioux Tribe
PO Box 1153
Wagner, SD 57380
Robertflyinghawk@gmail.com

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

Ms. Chastity Jewett
1321 Woodridge Dr.
Rapid City, SD 57701
chasjewett@gmail.com

Mr. Duncan Meisel
350.org
20 Jay St. #1010
Brooklyn, NY 11201
duncan@350.org

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

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

Mr. Bruce Ellison
Attorney
Dakota Rural Action
518 Sixth St. #6
Rapid City, SD 57701
belli4law@aol.com

Mr. Tom BK Goldtooth
Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
PO Box 485
Bemidji, MN 56619
ien@igc.org

Mr. Dallas Goldtooth
38371 Res. HWY 1
Morton, MN 56270
goldtoothdallas@gmail.com

Ms. Bonny Kilmurry
47798 888 Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
bjkilmurry@gmail.com

Mr. Robert P. Gough
Secretary
Intertribal Council on Utility Policy
PO Box 25
Rosebud, SD 57570
bobgough@intertribalCOUP.org

Mr. Terry & Cheryl Frisch
47591 875th Rd.
Atkinson, NE 68713
tcfrisch@g.com

Ms. Tracey Zephier
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
Ste. 104
910 5th St.
Rapid City, SD 57701
tzephier@ndnlaw.com

Mr. Travis Clark
Fredericks Peebles & Morgan LLP
Ste. 104
910 5th St.
Rapid City, SD 57701
tclark@ndnlaw.com

Mr. Robin S. Martinez
Martinez Madrigal & Machicao, LLC
616 W. 26th St.
Kansas City, MO 64108
robin.martinez@martinezlaw.net

Ms. Mary Turgeon Wynne, Esq.
Rosebud Sioux Tribe - Tribal Utility
Commission
153 S. Main St
Mission, SD 57555
tuc@rosebudsiouxtribe-nsn.gov

Ms. April D. McCart
Certified Paralegal
Martinez Madrigal & Machicao, LLC
616 W. 26th St.
Kansas City, MO 64108
april.mccart@martinezlaw.net

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

Mr. Paul C. Blackburn - Representing: Bold
Nebraska
Attorney
4145 20th Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55407
paul@paulblackburn.net

Ms. Kimberly E. Craven - Representing:
Indigenous Environmental Network (IEN)
Attorney
3560 Catalpa Way
Boulder, CO 80304
kimecraven@gmail.com

And on June 2, 2015, a true and accurate copy of the foregoing was mailed via U.S. Mail, first class postage prepaid, to the following:

Mr. Cody Jones
21648 US HWY 14/63
Midland, SD 57552

Mr. Jerry Jones
22584 US HWY 14
Midland SD 57552

Ms. Elizabeth Lone Eagle
PO Box 160
Howes, SD 57748

Mr. Ronald Fees
17401 Fox Ridge Rd.
Opal, SD 57758



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

006979