BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

 $0 \hbox{-} 0 \hbox{-}$

IN THE MATTER OF THE :

APPLICATION BY TRANSCANADA HP 14-001

KEYSTONE PIPELINE, LP FOR A

PERMIT UNDER THE SOUTH DAKOTA

ENERGY CONVERSION AND : APPLICANT'S PROPOSED TRANSMISSION FACILITIES ACT TO PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

CONSTRUCT THE KEYSTONE XL

PROJECT

:

:

 $0 \hbox{-} 0 \hbox{-}$

In compliance with the Commission's order dated November 14, 2014, Applicant TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP ("Keystone"), submits the following suggested procedural schedule for this docket:

| December 15, 2014 | deadline for filing written discovery requests |
|-------------------|--|
| 2000med 10, 201. | acadime for mining withten discovery requests |

January 16, 2015 responses to written discovery due

February 19, 2015 applicant, staff, and intervenor prefiled

testimony due

March 12, 2015 applicant, staff, and intervenor rebuttal

testimony due

March 24-27, 2015 evidentiary hearing

Keystone respectfully submits that this proposed schedule is reasonable. First, Keystone's certification was filed on September 15, 2014. The proposed hearing would

01776485.1

be six months after the petition was filed, and a decision could follow soon thereafter. By comparison, Keystone's permit application in Docket HP09-001 was filed on March 12, 2009. The 2009 process started with a series of statutorily-required public meetings, organized and hosted by the Commission, in Winner, Phillip, and Buffalo. All discovery and pre-hearing activity was concluded, and the evidentiary hearing on the application was held beginning on November 2, 2009, less thane eight months after the application was filed.

By statute, the underlying permit application had to be decided within one year after filing. SDCL § 49-41B-24. It would make no sense for proceedings in this certification docket, in which the issues are much narrower than the scope of the initial permit application, to take longer than in the underlying docket. Because of national politics, some of the Intervenors may think strategically that they would benefit from a protracted proceeding, but the schedule should be based on the scope of the issues and should account for Keystone's interest in an orderly and expeditious process.

Second, the issues are narrow, as explained in Keystone's motion to define the scope of discovery. South Dakota law clearly states that the Commission may not reconsider a final decision in a contested case under the guise of certification under SDCL § 49-41B-27. The statute requiring that Keystone certify that the project continues to meet the conditions on which the permit was granted is not a window for the

01776485.1

Case Number: HP 14-001

Name of Document: Applicant's Proposed Procedural Schedule

Intervenors to ask the Commission to relitigate the issues in the initial permit proceedings, HP09-001. In its petition for certification, Keystone has identified matters that affect any of the Commission's findings of fact in the underlying docket. Discovery related to those issues will be necessarily narrower than was discovery in the underlying docket, so there is no reason why discovery cannot be completed with the schedule Keystone proposes.

In conclusion, the Commission's procedural schedule should reflect the limited nature of the proceeding, account for the interests of all parties, and provide for resolution in less time than it took to reach a decision on the initial permit application. Keystone respectfully requests that the Commission adopt its proposed schedule.

Dated this 1st day of December, 2014.

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.

By /s/ James E. Moore

William Taylor

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

- 3 -01776485.1