#### **BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. FOR ROUTE APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE MAJOR OIL PIPELINE SITING ACT. Application No. OP-0003

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S OBJECTION TO, AND MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE, EVIDENCE OFFERED BY THE PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA AND THE YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska ("Tribe") hereby responds to Applicant's Objection to, and Motion in Limine to Exclude, Evidence Offered by the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska and the Yankton Sioux Tribe.

## I. SHANNON WRIGHT'S TESTIMONY MENTIONING LEAKS IS NOT WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE LIMITATION OF MOPSA.

Applicant's first objection is to Questions 107, 108, 119, 120, and 129. The basis of Applicant's objection is that, it asserts, each of those questions involves consideration of potential spills or leaks from Applicant's proposed pipeline. While Section 57-1407 limits the Commission's consideration of spills or leaks, Applicant reads that section and the Commission's orders much too broadly. Section 57-1407 states the Commission "shall not evaluate safety considerations, including the risk or impact of spills or leaks." Neb. Reb. Stat. 57-1407(4). The Commission's Order on Formal Intervention Petitions and Order Granting in Part, Denying in Part, Motions to Compel cited by Applicant each mimic this language precisely. Order on Formal Intervention Petitions at 1 (March 31, 2017); Order Granting in Part, Denying in Part, Motions to Compel at 4 (June 14, 2017). Applicant urges the Commission to read the statute and orders of the Commission as prohibiting the Commission from considering spills or leaks in any manner or fashion. But, that is simply not the language of the statute.

## A. <u>Section 57-1407 Does Not Prohibit Any Evidence or Discussion of Leaks or</u> Spills, Only Leaks or Spills in Reference to Safety Considerations.

From the outset, the language of a statute is to be given its plain and ordinary meaning. *Lincoln Lumber Co. v. Lancaster*, 260 Neb. 585, 618 N.W.2d 676, 680 (2000). Only if a statute is ambiguous does a court turn to other rules of construction to determine its meaning. While Section 15-1407 references "spills or leaks," it is not a blanket prohibition. The reference to "spills or leaks" is only in the context of and as an example of "safety considerations." Thus, in order to be excluded from the Commission's evaluation, a matter related to spills or leaks must be a "safety consideration." That is clear from the very language of the statute which makes "the risk or impact of spills or leaks" solely an included item of "safety considerations." In other words, "spills or leaks" is an example of "safety considerations" and not its own separate matter.

Applicant's proposed reading of prohibiting any mention of spills or leaks tweaks the plain language of the statute and actually negates the word "including" and the fact that "spills or leaks" is part of an example clause. "It is an elementary rule of construction that effect must be given, if possible, to every word, clause, and sentence of a statute." *Ulbrick v. Nebraska City, Otoe County*, 180 Neb. 229, 230, 141 N.W.2d 849, 851 (1966). Applicant would violate the most basic rules of statutory construction by removing words from the statute and rewriting it to say the Commission "shall not evaluate [] the risk or impact of spills or leaks." But, that is not what the statute says. If the Nebraska legislature wanted to prevent the Commission from considering anything regarding spills or leaks, it would have said so; it would have written the statute the way Applicant urges, to say, "shall not evaluate the risk or impact of spills or leaks." But, it did not do so – it referenced spills or leaks only in the context of "safety considerations." The basis for removing evaluation of safety considerations is provided in the legislature's findings and purpose under MOPSA. The legislature noted that the state has full authority to determine the location and siting of major oil pipelines so long as the state "does not regulate in the area of safety as to the design, installation, inspection, emergency plans and procedures, testing, construction, extension, operation, replacement, and maintenance of major oil pipelines...." NEB. REV. STAT. § 57-1403(1). The basis for this exclusion is the legislature's reading of federal law preempting the state's authority with respect to oil pipeline safety.

Similarly, the legislature stated that the purpose of MOPSA shall not be "construed to regulate any safety issue with respect to any aspect of any interstate oil pipeline," but shall handle all issues "apart from safety considerations." *Id.* § 57-1402(2). The legislature intended that MOPSA reach all issues beyond safety considerations by providing that MOPSA and the considerations of the Commission shall cover "the remaining sovereign powers and purposes of Nebraska which are not included in the category of safety regulation." *Id.* In other words, to the extent Section 57-1407 requires any construction with reference to legislative intent, the phrase "safety considerations, including the risk or impact of spills or leaks" must be construed narrowly to ensure that "the remaining sovereign powers and purposes of Nebraska" are retained. Therefore, Section 57-1407 cannot be read as a complete prohibition on the mentioning or consideration of leaks or spills, but only leaks or spills in terms of "the evaluation of safety considerations."

The broad reading proposed by Applicant is also contrary to the considerations the legislature mandated the Commission consider. Section 57-1407 requires the Commission to evaluate "methods to minimize or mitigate the potential impacts of the major oil pipeline" on natural resources and "social impacts of the major oil pipeline." *Id.* § 57-1407(4)(c), (d). Notably, these sections do not instruct the Commission to only look at the impacts of "the siting or location" of the

pipeline; they include social impacts and impacts on natural resources related to the pipeline overall. Read together and giving effect to each word, clause, and sentence in the context of the legislature's declared findings and purpose, it is clear that MOPSA requires the Commission to evaluate *all* social impacts and impacts on natural resources, excluding only "safety considerations." Therefore, to the extent discussion of the impacts of a leak or spill do not involve "safety considerations" and deal with impacts of the pipeline, the Commission is not only empowered to consider the matter, but mandatorily required to consider the matter.

## B. <u>Mr. Wright's Testimony Does Not Involve Safety Considerations and Is Entirely</u> Within the Scope of Matters the Commission Is Required to Consider.

Mr. Wright's testimony in Questions 107, 108, 119, 120, and 129 is not an evaluation of or evidence related to safety considerations. While the testimony in those questions mentions a leak or a cleanup or contamination, it is solely with respect to the *impact* on the Tribe's cultural resources. Mr. Wright's testimony in Questions 107, 109, 119, 120, and 129 discusses nothing about safety considerations. He did not discuss the design, the installation, the inspection, or the maintenance of the pipeline. He did not testify about emergency plans or testing, construction, operation, or replacement of the pipeline. He solely discussed the *impacts* of the pipeline on the Tribe's cultural resources.

As the Commission noted in its Order on Formal Interventions, the Commission is required "to consider evidence of the social impacts of the project" and that "encompasses many concepts and issues, including cultural, anthropological, and historical concepts." Order on Formal Intervention Petitions at 6. Mr. Wright's testimony in Questions 107, 109, 119, 120, and 129 is precisely "evidence of the social impacts of the project" and one of the "many concepts and issues" encompassed by that consideration in relation to "cultural, anthropological, and historical concepts"

of the Tribe. Merely mentioning leaks does not make testimony an evaluation of safety considerations, despite Applicant's suggestion otherwise. Mr. Wright nowhere evaluates the safety of the pipeline with respect to leaks or spills; he only discusses the impact of the pipeline on the Tribe's cultural resources, which is precisely what the Commission is required to evaluate and consider.

## C. <u>Even If Mr. Wright's Mentioning of Leaks Could Be Excluded, Applicant Seeks</u> to Exclude Testimony That Does Not Even Mention or Involve Leaks or Spills.

Even if Applicant is correct that any mention of the words "leak" or "spill" is "forbidden testimony," the questions Applicant objects to are not limited to leaks and spills. Neither Question 107 nor Mr. Wright's answer to that question in any manner mention spills or leaks or even safety. The Question states, "In your opinion, would the presence of the Keystone XL Pipeline along either the Preferred Route or the Mainline Alternative Route, once completed, pose any ongoing problems with regard to cultural or historic resources?" and Mr. Wright simply states, "Yes." There is no mention whatsoever of spills, leaks, or safety. Yet, Applicant seeks to exclude the question and answer. Similarly, Question 108 asks Mr. Wright to specifically explain how the presence of the pipeline would pose ongoing problems for the Tribe's cultural resources. The question makes no mention of leaks or spills. While Mr. Wright expresses that a leak could destroy cultural resources and sites, he also references destruction from repairs of the pipeline, which may not necessarily involve leaks. Mr. Wright also points out, "There also could be a question about whether the Tribe and its members will be allowed to access the sites." Applicant seeks to exclude even that statement, though it makes no mention or even a suggestion of spills, leaks, or safety – it only mentions the possibility that Applicant's pipeline would prevent the Tribe and its members from accessing its cultural sites and resources. Applicant's motion is far beyond even the scope of its objection,

suggesting a motive beyond its stated purpose of excluding the mention of leaks or spills. Even if use of the words "leak" and "spill" are prohibited, it provides no basis for Mr. Wright's testimony which does not mention leaks or spills to be excluded.

## II. APPLICANT HAS NO PROPER BASIS TO EXCLUDE MR. WRIGHT'S OPINION TESTIMONY, EVEN IF THAT TESTIMONY IS AN OPINION ON AN ULTIMATE ISSUE FOR THE COMMISSION.

#### A. The Rules of Evidence Expressly Permit a Witness to Provide an Opinion.

Applicant objects to Questions 45 and 46 in Mr. Wright's testimony, which deal with Mr. Wright's opinion on whether not including Traditional Cultural Property ("TCP") surveys on federal and state lands complies with the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA") and his opinion as to whether failing to comply with the NHPA would constitute complying with all applicable laws. Such opinions are specifically allowed under Rule of Evidence 701. NEB. REV. STAT. § 27-701. Rule 701 is modeled on Federal Rule of Evidence 701, which states in its comments, "Such opinion testimony is admitted not because of experience, training or specialized knowledge within the realm of an expert, but because of the particularized knowledge that the witness has by virtue of his or her position..." FED. R. EVID. 701, cmt.

As Mr. Wright's testimony states, his very job involves the implementation of and compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA. His testimony also states that he is familiar with the NHPA and describes the legal requirements of the NHPA, including the requirement of TCP surveys. Thus, there is a precise foundation for him to opine on the requirements of the NHPA and he does have a basis for providing his opinion on what constitutes that compliance.

Applicant also objects to Mr. Wright's opinion, expressed in Questions 148 and 149, on whether the construction of the pipeline would be in the public interest with respect to cultural and social issues. As the Applicant is fond of reminding the Commission, the Tribe has been limited to

discussing social and cultural issues. Mr. Wright is the Tribe's Tribal Historic Preservation Officer and, as he testified, is charged specifically with handling consultations regarding the Tribe's cultural resources, protecting and preventing damage to the Tribe's cultural resources, monitoring construction with respect to the Tribe's cultural resources, handling of unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources, and mitigation of damage to the Tribe's cultural resources. Both Question 148 and Question 149 expressly ask for Mr. Wright's opinion and his testimony demonstrates the foundation for his opinion based on his very job. As discussed, Rule of Evidence 701 expressly permits Mr. Wright to provide opinions in his testimony.

The Commissioners can weigh and determine the credibility of Mr. Wright's opinion testimony; the mere fact that Mr. Wright provided an opinion on compliance with laws and issues he works with on a daily basis does not make that opinion inadmissible. *See State v. Myers*, 205 Neb. 867, 290 N.W.2d 660 (1980) (holding that a witness with personal knowledge of a defendant may be allowed to testify as to the mental condition of the defendant who is pleading insanity and the jury may weigh the credibility of the opinion). The Rules of Evidence precisely allow for opinion testimony and Applicant's objection is baseless and groundless, unless Applicant proposes excluding all opinions from every witness' testimony, including its own.

## B. <u>The Rules of Evidence Explicitly Permit a Witness to Testify on an Ultimate</u> <u>Issue to Be Decided by the Commission</u>.

Applicant includes as a basis for its objection to Questions 45, 36, 148, and 149 of Mr. Wright's testimony that those questions involve testimony on ultimate issues to be determined by the Commission. But, this is not a proper basis to object to evidence or testimony. Rule of Evidence 704 plainly states, "Testimony in the form of an opinion or inference otherwise admissible is not objectionable because it embraces an ultimate issue to be decided by the trier of fact." NEB. REV. STAT. § 27-704. In other words, the Rules of Evidence explicitly say that Applicant *cannot* object to testimony because it is opines on an ultimate issue to be decided by the Commission.

The question is not whether Mr. Wright's opinion on what constitutes compliance with the NHPA or whether any of the proposed routes' impact on cultural resources is in the public interest involves an ultimate issue for the Commission, but whether the opinion will assist the Commission to understand the evidence or determine issues before it. *State v. Reynolds*, 235 Neb. 662, 683, 457 N.W.2d 405, 419 (1990). Amongst the issues the Commission must consider is whether the Applicant has demonstrated compliance with applicable laws, NEB. REV. STAT. § 57-1407(4)(a). The Commission is also required to consider natural resources and social impacts, as recognized by the Commission in granting the Tribe's Petition of Formal Intervention and recognizing that cultural resources falls within the scope of the Commission's considerations. *Id.* § 57-1407(4)(b), (d). Each of those matters are factors the Commission must consider in order to determine whether the proposed routes are in the public interest. *Id.* § 57-1407(4).

Mr. Wright discusses the legal requirements of the NHPA, including its TCP survey requirements, and then opines on whether certain actions would constitute compliance with that law. The opinions are directly helpful to understanding his testimony with respect to the legal requirements related to cultural resources and the issue of Applicant's requirements to comply with the law. Mr. Wright's discussion about what involves compliance with laws he works with everyday is certainly relevant and may assist the Commission in determining Applicant's compliance with laws. Simultaneously, his background and experience in handling cultural resources of the Tribe – including with respect to construction and disturbance of those resources as well as mitigation – in terms of whether the impact on those cultural resources is in the public interest is also relevant and his opinion regarding the impact of the social and cultural issues in terms of the public interest may

also assist the Commission. Consequently, Mr. Wright's opinion testimony on compliance with the NHPA and whether the impact of the pipeline on the Tribe's cultural resources makes any of the proposed routes in the public interest is admissible.

In reality, Applicant's assertion that somehow the Commission cannot hear opinions on ultimate issues in this matter is patronizing and insulting to the Commissioners. The Commissioners are fully capable of weighing the testimony of each witness – whether opinion or fact and whether it involves an ultimate issue or not – and coming to their own conclusions. Applicant seems to believe that if the Commissioners hear any testimony on an ultimate issue, the Commissioners will somehow be incapable of utilizing their own intellect or exercising their own thoughts. But, the Commissioners are fully capable of performing their legal obligations and weighing the opinions of witnesses appropriately. The Rules of Evidence specifically permit witnesses to testify as to ultimate issues to be decided by the Commission and Applicant's objection is baseless and groundless.

#### **III. CONCLUSION**

The Tribe requests that the Commission deny Applicant's Objection To, and Motion in Limine to Exclude, Evidence Offered by the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska and the Yankton Sioux Tribe. However, in the event the Commission excludes Mr. Wright's mentioning of leaks, the Tribe requests that the Commission retain Mr. Wright's testimony in Questions <u>107</u> and 108 which does

not make an reference to leaks or spills.

Dated: July 27, 2017

Brad S. Jołky #25720 BRAD S. JOLLY & ASSOCIATES 15355 Gadsden Drive Brighton, CO 80603 Telephone: (720) 685-7105 Facsimile: (206) 339-7209 Email: bsj@bsjlawfirm.com ATTORNEY FOR PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA

#### **BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

)

)

)

)

)

)

) )

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. FOR ROUTE APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE MAJOR OIL PIPELINE SITING ACT.

Application No. OP-0003

## RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska ("Tribe") hereby responds to Applicant's Motion in Limine seeking to exclude intervenors from referring to or mentioning during argument or from eliciting any testimony or evidence regarding certain topics.

1. Any exhibit not produced during the course of discovery and identified on the parties' exhibit lists filed in accordance with the Case Management Plan ("CMP"). Applicant seeks to exclude any exhibit not produced by an intervenor on or prior to the June 7 deadline for intervenors to submit testimony, exhibits, workpapers, and witness lists. However, there are a few errors in Applicant's reasoning.

First, Applicant had not completed serving all of its discovery by the June 7 deadline. For example, the Tribe received two disks of documents from Applicant after the June 7 deadline, one on June 8 and one on June 9. (Exhibits A, B). Consequently, the Tribe did not even receive all potential exhibits from the Applicant until *after* the June 7 deadline. The disk received on June 8 contained 165 separate documents and the disk received on June 9 contained 645 separate documents. (Exhibits C, D). This is not an insignificant amount of documents, each potentially an exhibit the Tribe could use. To deny the Tribe the ability to utilize any of that discovery in the hearing when Applicant did not produce that discovery in time for the Tribe and its witness to review that discovery by the June 7 deadline would be extraordinarily prejudicial to the Tribe and likely

violate its due process rights by improperly limiting its opportunity to be heard. It also would encourage applicants to withhold discovery until after intervenors file their testimony and exhibits in order to prevent the use of information revealed in discovery the intervenors could use.

Second, while the intervenors were required to file testimony and exhibits by June 7, Applicant was not required to file any testimony or exhibits regarding the intervenors' issues until July 17. The intervenors have the right to cross-examine Applicant's witnesses, which obviously includes the right to utilize exhibits for that cross-examination. Yet, the intervenors did not know the content of Applicant's rebuttal evidence or even the identity of Applicant's rebuttal witnesses until long after the June 7 deadline. The same is true of other intervenors, particularly those Applicant acknowledges are aligned with it – the other intervenors did not have any of their testimony or exhibits until the June 7 deadline.

In the case of the Tribe, which the Commission has limited to social and cultural issues, Applicant did not even file any testimony regarding social or cultural issues with its Application. Thus, the Tribe had no ability to know what exhibits or testimony it would need to respond to Applicant with respect to social or cultural issues until July 17. The Applicant bears the burden of proof in these proceedings, but did not actually present any initial evidence on the very issues it so diligently works to keep the Tribe limited to. To prohibit the intervenors from bringing forth any exhibits or testimony in response to Applicant's rebuttal testimony – which is actually its first presentation with respect to the majority of issues the Commission is required to consider under MOPSA – would be a gross violation of the intervenors' due process right to be heard.

The intervenors must be provided the proper opportunity to respond to the Applicant's showing under MOPSA. It is Applicant that bears the burden of proof in these proceedings, yet it never bothered to present any testimony or evidence to meet that burden of proof until *after* the

deadline for intervenors to file their initial testimony and exhibits. The intervenors – at least those opposing the proposed routes – have the right to respond to Applicant's case in chief. But, they have not yet been given the opportunity to fully do so. Their only true opportunity to do so will be cross-examination and redirect testimony of witnesses at the hearing, including presentation of exhibits. Applicant cannot be allowed to prevent any actual response to its case by having the Commission limit evidence to that provided long before the party with the burden of proof even presented the majority of its evidence.

Applicant also apparently fails to recognize that while the Commission set a first deadline of June 7 for intervenors to file exhibits, the CMP also provides a second deadline of July 31 to file a Consolidated Hearing Exhibit List. Order Entering Case Mgt. Plan, Scheduling Telephonic Planning Conf., and Not. of Hearing at 8 (April 5, 2017). Presumably, that second deadline for exhibits includes exhibits parties may wish to introduce in response to Applicant's exhibits and testimony filed on July 17 as well as testimony and exhibits filed by other intervenors. The Commission should not limit the intervenors to exhibits and testimony filed before the intervenors were even given a chance to see the Applicant's testimony and exhibits – it would be akin to requiring a defendant to present his or her case before the plaintiff or prosecutor presented any evidence and then telling the defendant he or she could not respond to the plaintiff or prosecutor.

It is notable that Applicant is not seeking to bind itself to this limitation, only requesting that the Commission limit the intervenors ability to produce any evidence or testimony in response to the Applicant. If the intervenors cannot introduce any additional exhibits in response to Applicant's rebuttal testimony, then it is clear the Applicant must also be prohibited from introducing any additional exhibits as well. Item 1 of Applicant's Motion in Limine must be denied.

2. Any testimony of any witness on direct examination which was not contained in that witness' admissible pre-filed testimony. Again, the Applicant is attempting to limit the intervenors to evidence and testimony they were required to produce before ever seeing Applicant's case in chief. As discussed, Applicant did not produce any testimony, exhibits or other evidence regarding social and cultural issues prior to June 7 – the Application only includes one brief discussion of handling cultural resources in a general manner with no reference to specific resources and the filed testimony in no way relates to social or cultural issues. If the intervenors are not permitted to elicit any direct testimony in response to Applicant's evidence and testimony, it would merely encourage applicants before the Commission to hide all of their evidence and testimony related to their cases in chief until after the deadline for intervenors to file their evidence has passed. It would result in the most unjust and backwards process possible, requiring respondents to present their case before the party with the burden of proof even presents a single piece of evidence. The Applicant cannot limit its initial presentation of evidence, force the intervenors to "guess" what its remaining evidence will be, and then cut off the intervenors from responding to that remaining evidence after it is presented. Item 2 of Applicant's Motion in Limine must be denied.

3. Any testimony by any person who has not submitted admissible pre-filed testimony in accordance with the CMP in this matter. The Tribe expresses no opinion on this requested limitation, though Applicant's Motion is written in a manner which would only apply this exclusion to intervenors. If this part of Applicant's Motion is to be granted, it must apply with equal force to the Applicant itself.

4. Any cross examination of any witness or argument on topics relating to pipeline safety including but not limited to the risk or impact of pipeline leaks and spills, terrorist attacks, depth of cover, the chemical characteristics of crude oil, and spills or leaks from the

4

**Keystone Mainline.** The Tribe does not object to limiting evidence on safety considerations, including the risk or impact of spills or leaks, to the extent required by Section 57-1407(4) of MOPSA. However, that limitation should be strictly limited to safety considerations and not any and all mention of spills or leaks or other matters, such as potential attacks on the pipeline. Applicant has attempted to expand the limitation in Section 57-1407(4) far beyond safety considerations to encompass any mention of spills or leaks. But, as discussed in the Tribe's Response to Applicant's Objection to, and Motion in Limine to Exclude, Evidence Offered by the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska and the Yankton Sioux Tribe and incorporated herein by reference, the statute is not as broad as Applicant proposes. So long as cross-examination and argument does not regard safety considerations, there is no limitation on discussing spills and leaks, particularly if that discussion is in terms of impacts on natural resources or social impacts, as the Commission is required to consider.

5. Any cross examination of any witness or argument on topics relating to the identity or nationality of the individuals or entities which own Keystone. The Tribe expresses no opinion on this requested limitation, but joins in any other parties' resistance to this requested limitation.

6. Any cross examination of any witness or argument on topics relating to Keystone XL's necessity or commercial viability, including but not limited to Keystone's customers or their respective contract terms, the finite nature of the Canadian oil sands, or the energy needs of Nebraska. The Tribe expresses no opinion on this requested limitation, but joins in any other parties' resistance to this requested limitation.

7. Any cross examination of any witness or argument on topics relating to easement terms (including appraised values of property, compensation via lease or one- time payments), prior or future easement negotiations, the alleged treatment of land owners by land agents, or

5

eminent domain (in the past or future). The Tribe expresses no opinion on this requested limitation, but joins in any other parties' resistance to this requested limitation.

8. Any cross examination of any witness or argument on topics relating to any person associated with Keystone that participated in the legislative process when the Siting Act was developed. The Tribe expresses no opinion on this requested limitation, but joins in any other parties' resistance to this requested limitation.

9. Any use of exhibits marked "confidential" without prior approval of and notice to the Hearing Officer so that the Hearing Room may be cleared in advance of confidential business information being publicly disclosed. The Tribe agrees with this limitation to the extent it refers to matters covered by the May 30, 2017 Agreed Protective Order between Applicant and the Tribe, which only applies to (1) surveys and results of surveys of cultural resources, including Traditional Cultural Property ("TCP") surveys; (2) the identity, including location, of all cultural resources found or discovered along any of the proposed routes; (3) maps or other documents that identify any cultural resources found or discovered along or near each of the proposed routes; and (4) trade secrets or other confidential research, development, or commercial information. Applicant should not be permitted to expand the realm of what is "confidential" beyond those items listed in the Agreed Protective Order. If Applicant desired to protect other "confidential" business information not within the scope of the Agreed Protective Order, it should have sought a protective order for that business information in advance rather than seeking an order in limine for such information.

The Tribe requests that the Commission deny Applicant's Motion in Limine with respect to Items 1 and 2 of Applicant's Motion in Limine and limit any order granted with respect to Items 3, 4, and 9 and discussed herein. Dated: July 27, 2017

Brad S. Jolly, #23720 BRAD 5. JOLLY & ASSOCIATES 15355 Gadsden Drive Brighton, CO 80603 Telephone: (720) 685-7105 Facsimile: (206) 339-7209 Email: bsj@bsjlawfirm.com ATTORNEY FOR PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA McGrath North

ATTORNEYS

April N.Hook P: 402.633.6813 | F: 402.952.6813 ahook@mcgrathnorth.com

Recid 6/8/17

June 5, 2017

Brad S. Jolly, Esq. Brad S. Jolly & Associates 15355 Gadsden Drive Brighton, CO 80603

> In the Matter of the Application of TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP, Re: Application No. OP-0003

Dear Mr. Jolly:

Enclosed please find a disk containing supplemental documents being produced by Applicant TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. in response to the discovery requests served by The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska in the above-referenced matter.

Very truly yours,

April N. Hook

ANH:ml Enc.



April N.Hook P: 402.633.6813 | F: 402.952.6813 ahook@mcgrathnorth.com

Recid 6/9/17

June 7, 2017

Brad S. Jolly, Esq. Brad S. Jolly & Associates 15355 Gadsden Drive Brighton, CO 80603

McGrath North

ATTORNEYS

## Re: In the Matter of the Application of TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, LP, Application No. OP-0003

Dear Mr. Jolly:

Enclosed please find a disk containing supplemental documents being produced by Applicant TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. in response to the discovery requests served by The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska in the above-referenced matter. Please note these documents have been designated as Confidential and are being produced subject to the parties' agreed upon Protective Order.

Sincerely,

pril N. Hook

ANH:sh Enc.

cc: James G. Powers, Esq. Patrick D. Pepper, Esq.



Screen Shot of File List from Disc Titled "Keystone Supplemental Response to Ponca Tribe Discovery June 5, 2017" (Rec'd June 8, 2017)

Response		
View Go Bookmarks Help	5 Hép	
■ ↔	🖉 📃 (media/bs/Response	:: ::: ∎ ::: ♂ 다:
38368.pdfEK	38368.pdf 📃 EKXL 009290.pdf 📑 EKXL 009775.pdf 📑 EKXL 010964.pdf 📷 EKXL 01101.pdf 🦉 EKXL 011745.pdf	

0

EKXL011745.pdf	EKXL015299.pdf	EKXL015305.pdf	EKXL015412.pdf	EKXL015433.pdf	EKXL015457.pdf	EKXL019215.pdf	EKXL019233.pdf	EKXL019236.pdf																					
EKXL011001.pdf	EKXL011092.pdf	EKXL011094.pdf	EKXL011096.pdf	EKXL011103.pdf	EKXL011104.pdf	EKXL011105.pdf	EKXL011109.pdf	EKXL011110.pdf	EKXL011112.pdf	EKXL011113.pdf	EKXL011114.pdf	EKXL011115.pdf	EKXL011117.pdf	EKXL011181.pdf	EKXL011196.pdf	EKXL011198.pdf	EKXL011199.pdf	EKXL011200.pdf	EKXL011203.pdf	EKXL011204.pdf	EKXL011205.pdf	EKXL011208.pdf	EKXL011210.pdf	EKXL011217.pdf	EKXL011219.pdf	EKXL011221.pdf	EKXL011226.pdf	EKXL011739.pdf	EKXL011744.pdf
EKXL010864.pdf EKXL010866.pdf	EKKL010867.pdf	EKXL010885.pdf	EKXL010886.pdf	EKXL010889.pdf	EKXL010891.pdf	EKXL010893.pdf	EKXL010895.pdf	EKXL010896.pdf	EKXL010899.pdf	EKXL010901.pdf	EKXL010909.pdf	EKXL010911.pdf	EKXL010915.pdf	EKXL010917.pdf	EKXL010958.pdf	EKXL010960.pdf	EKXL010963.pdf	EKXL010967.pdf	EKXL010968.pdf	EKXL010977.pdf	EKXL010981.pdf	EKXL010984.pdf	EKXL010985.pdf	EKXL010986.pdf	EKXL010991.pdf	EKXL010992.pdf	EKXL010998.pdf	EKXL010999.pdf	EKXL011000.pdf
EKXL009775.pdf	EKXL009780.pdf	EKXL009781.pdf	EKXL009782.pdf	EKXL009785.pdf	EKXL009786.pdf	EKXL009828.pdf	EKXL009829.pdf	EKXL009830.pdf	EKXL010077.pdf	EKXL010086.pdf	EKXL010381.pdf	EKXL010412.pdf	EKXL010419.pdf	EKXL010429.pdf	EKXL010433.pdf	EKXL010435.pdf	EKXL010438.pdf	EKXL010448.pdf	EKXL010623.pdf	EKXL010624.pdf	EKXL010626.pdf	EKXL010627.pdf	E EKKL010630.pdf	EKXL010636.pdf	EKXL010637.pdf	EKXL010681.pdf	EKXL010729.pdf	EKXL010783.pdf	EKXL010825.pdf
EKXL009290.pdf	EKXL009331.pdf	EKXL009344.pdf	EKXL009345.pdf	EKXL009346.pdf	EKXL009348.pdf	EKXL009371.pdf	EKXL009373.pdf	EKXL009475.pdf	EKXL009484.pdf	EKXL009586.pdf	EKXL009595.pdf	EKXL009602.pdf	EKXL009603.pdf	EKXL009605.pdf	EKXL009606.pdf	EKXL009644.pdf	EKXL009645.pdf	EKXL009647.pdf	EKXL009648.pdf	EKXL009650.pdf	EKXL009651.pdf	EKXL009652.pdf	EKXL009653.pdf	EKXL009656.pdf	EKXL009657.pdf	EKXL009659.pdf	EKXL009660.pdf	EKXL009663.pdf	EKXL009664.pdf
EKXL008368.pdf EKXL008371.pdf	EKXL008375.pdf	EKXL008376.pdf	EKXL008425.pdf	EKXL008427.pdf	EKXL008431.pdf	EKXL008436.pdf	EKXL008439.pdf	EKXL008443.pdf	EKXL008450.pdf	EKXL008451.pdf	EKXL008464.pdf	EKXL008465.pdf	EKXL008516.pdf	EKXL008524.pdf	EKXL008526.pdf	EKXL008528.pdf	EKXL008529.pdf	EKXL008542.pdf	EKXL008545.pdf	EKXL008549.pdf	EKXL008550.pdf	EKXL008553.pdf	EKXL008554.pdf	EKXL008557.pdf	EKXL008558.pdf	EKXL008561.pdf	EKXL008562.pdf	EKXL009284.pdf	EKXL009288.pdf

EXHIBIT O

0

165 items

ot of File List from Disc Titled "Keystone Supplemental Response to Ponca Tribe Discovery June 7, 2017"	(Rec'd from Applicant June 9, 2017)
Screen Shot of File ]	

⊗ 回 🔵 Response

File Edit View Go B	Bookmarks Help													
¢ + *	Umedia/bsj/R	sj/Response											<u>ات</u> م	
EKXL021402.pdfE	EKXL026622.pdf	EKXL029715.pdf	SKXL034684.pdf	EKXL035136.pdf	EKXL036936.pdf	EKXL037297.pdf	EKXL047200.pdf	EKXL047865.pdf	EKXL052187.pdf	EKXL054087.pdf	EKXL058484.pdf	JEKXL058806.pdf	EKXL062944.pdf	EKXL064959.pdf
EKXL021403.pdf	EKXL026623.pdf	EKXL029717.pdf	EKXL034685.pdf	EKXL035271.pdf	EKXL036947.pdf	EKXL037298.pdf	EKXL047201.pdf	EKXL047868.pdf	EKXL052216.pdf	EKXL054094.pdf	EKXL058486.pdf	EKXL058827.pdf	EKXL062945.pdf	EKXL064968.pdf
-	EKXL026625.pdf	EKXL029731.pdf	EKXL034752.pdf	EKXL035274.pdf	EKXL036951.pdf	EKXL037321.pdf	EKXL047226.pdf	EKXL047927.pdf	EKXL052217.pdf		EKXL058489.pdf	LEKXL058897.pdf	EKXL062954.pdf	EKXL064970.pdf
-	EKXL026626.pdf	EKXL029732.pdf	EKXL034753.pdf	EKXL035283.pdf	EKXL036955.pdf	EKXL037322.pdf	EKXL047227.pdf	EKXL051461.pdf	EKXL052227.pdf	EKXL055193.pdf	EKXL058491.pdf	EKXL058898.pdf	EKXL062955.pdf	EKXL064971.pdf
- 1 -	EKXL026643.pdf	EKXL029733.pdf	EKXL034754.pdf	EKXL035296.pdf	EKXL036965.pdf		EKXL047234.pdf	EKXL051465.pdf	EKXL052231.pdf	EKXL055195.pdf	EKXL058493.pdf	EKXL059504.pdf	EKXL062956.pdf	EKXL064972.pdf
EKXL022022.pdf	EKXLU26650.pdf	EKXL029/56.pdf	LEKXL034/5/.pdf	EKXL035308.pdf	LEKXLU369/1.pdf	EKXLU3/5/3.pdf EKXL037507 odf	EKXL04/261.pdf	LEKXLUS1602.pdf	LEKXL052240.pdf	EKXLU55330.pdf	EKXL058497.pdf	LEKXL059/18.pdf	EKXL062958.pdf	LEKXL0649/4.pdf
	EKXI 036661 ndf	EKVI 030701 ndf			I EKYI 036082 ndf		I EKYLOG7093 pdf	LEKYLOST600 ndf	LEKVI 053343 ndf	LEKYLDES242 pdf	LEAVI DEBET 7 ndf	LEKYI 062430 ndf		
7 8	בעאו הספבידה המיד				TERVI 02002 Ddf				EKVL052245.pdf	EKVIDEADA pdf	Ervincestandf	EKVI AGAGA DAF		
	EKXL026959.pdf	EKXL029798.pdf	EKXL034805.pdf	EKXL035315.pdf	EKXL036985.pdf	EKXL037743.pdf	EKXL047311.pdf	LEKXL051611.pdf	EKXL053642.pdf	EKXL055443.pdf	EKXL058520.pdf	EKXL062666.pdf	EKXL062962.pdf	EKXL065293.pdf
	EKXL027028.pdf	EKXL029811.pdf	EKXL034806.pdf	TEKXL035317.pdf	EKXL036989.pdf	EKXL043529.pdf	EKXL047394.pdf	EKXL051614.pdf	EKXL053643.pdf	EKXL055445.pdf	EKXL058530.pdf	EKXL062667.pdf	EKXL062963.pdf	EKXL065310.pdf
	EKXL027123.pdf	EKXL029830.pdf	EKXL034809.pdf	EKXL035318.pdf	EKXL036994.pdf	EKXL043533.pdf	EKXL047395.pdf	EKXL051638.pdf	EKXL053646.pdf	EKXL055449.pdf	EKXL058567.pdf	EKXL062669.pdf	EKXL062974.pdf	EKXL065509.pdf
EKXL023442.pdf T	EKXL027124.pdf	EKXL030063.pdf	EKXL034810.pdf	EKXL035322.pdf	EKXL036997.pdf	EKXL044191.pdf	EKXL047438.pdf	EKXL051685.pdf	EKXL053647.pdf	EKXL055450.pdf	EKXL058570.pdf	EKXL062670.pdf	EKXL062980.pdf	EKXL065535.pdf
LEKXL023443.pdf	EKXL027125.pdf	LEKXL030069.pdf	EKXL034817.pdf	EKXL035323.pdf	EKXL036998.pdf	EKXL044192.pdf	EKXL047439.pdf	EKXL051686.pdf	EKXL053648.pdf	EKXL055457.pdf	EKXL058627.pdf	EKXL062671.pdf	EKXL062981.pdf	EKXL065795.pdf
EKXL023444.pdf	EKXL027126.pdf	EKXL030070.pdf	EKXL034818.pdf	EKXL035324.pdf	EKXL037082.pdf	EKXL044862.pdf	EKXL047449.pdf	EKXL051687.pdf	EKXL053650.pdf	EKXL055463.pdf	EKXL058632.pdf	JEKXL062672.pdf	EKXL062998.pdf	EKXL065848.pdf
EKXL023460.pdf	EKXL027173.pdf	EKXL030112.pdf	EKXL034827.pdf	EKXL035325.pdf	EKXL037083.pdf	EKXL046503.pdf	EKXL047450.pdf	EKXL051738.pdf	EKXL053651.pdf	EKXL055464.pdf	EKXL058633.pdf	EKXL062675.pdf	EKXL063003.pdf	
EKXL023461.pdf	EKXL027174.pdf	EKXL030234.pdf	EKXL034843.pdf	EKXL035326.pdf	EKXL037091.pdf	EKXL046504.pdf	EKXL047459.pdf	EKXL051741.pdf	EKXL053656.pdf	EKXL055724.pdf	EKXL058662.pdf	EKXL062679.pdf	EKXL063005.pdf	
	EKXL027176.pdf	EKXL031687.pdf	EKXL034844.pdf	EKXL035329.pdf	EKXL037094.pdf	EKXL046505.pdf	EKXL047601.pdf	EKXL051742.pdf	EKXL053670.pdf	EKXL055725.pdf	EKXL058667.pdf	EKXL062682.pdf	EKXL063006.pdf	
EKXL023469.pdf	EKXL027177.pdf	EKXL031729.pdf	EKXL034845.pdf	TEKXL035330.pdf	EKXL037096.pdf	EKXL047045.pdf	LEKXL047607.pdf	EKXL051744.pdf	EKXL053677.pdf	EKXL057865.pdf	EKXL058669.pdf	EKXL062687.pdf	EKXL063008.pdf	
EKXL023471.pdf	EKXL027182.pdf	EKXL031922.pdf	EKXL034846.pdf	EKXL035384.pdf	EKXL037106.pdf	LEKXL047046.pdf	EKXL047608.pdf	EKXL051745.pdf	EKXL053679.pdf	EKXL057867.pdf	EKXL058672.pdf	EKXL062693.pdf	EKXL063012.pdf	
EKXL023472.pdf	EKXL027185.pdf	EKXL032053.pdf	EKXL034853.pdf	EKXL035386.pdf	EKXL037107.pdf	EKXL047047.pdf	EKXL047610.pdf	EKXL051748.pdf	EKXL053680.pdf	JEKXL057868.pdf	JEKXL058675.pdf	LEKXL062698.pdf	EKXL063110.pdf	
EKXL023505.pdf	EKXL027186.pdf	EKXL032104.pdf	EKXL034857.pdf	EKXL035421.pdf	EKXL037118.pdf	EKXL047055.pdf	EKXL047626.pdf	EKXL051751.pdf	EKXL053681.pdf	EKXL057877.pdf	EKXL058676.pdf	EKXL062699.pdf	EKXL063136.pdf	
EKXL023536.pdf	EKXL027189.pdf	EKXL032181.pdf	EKXL034860.pdf	EKXL035437.pdf	EKXL037119.pdf	JEKXL047056.pdf	EKXL047628.pdf	EKXL051755.pdf	EKXL053682.pdf	LEKXL057914.pdf	EKXL058680.pdf	EKXL062717.pdf	EKXL063138.pdf	
EKXL023694.pdf	EKXL027193.pdf	_ EKXL032283.pdf	EKXL034907.pdf	EKXL035446.pdf	EKXL037121.pdf	EKXL047078.pdf	EKXL047629.pdf	EKXL051802.pdf	EKXL053686.pdf	EKXL057915.pdf	EKXL058684.pdf	JEKXL062733.pdf	EKXL063566.pdf	
EKXL023706.pdf	EKXL027201.pdf	EKXL032284.pdf	EKXL034908.pdf	EKXL035484.pdf	EKXL037122.pdf	EKXL047079.pdf	EKXL047675.pdf	EKXL051807.pdf	EKXL053688.pdf	] EKXL057950.pdf	LEKXL058686.pdf	EKXL062749.pdf	EKXL063567.pdf	
EKXL024057.pdf	EKXL027308.pdf	EKXL032313.pdf	EKXL034909.pdf	EKXL035485.pdf	- EKXL037132.pdf	EKXL047102.pdf	EKXL047677.pdf	EKXL051825.pdf	EKXL053697.pdf	EKXL057951.pdf	EKXL058687.pdf	JEKXL062772.pdf	EKXL063612.pdf	
EKXL024058.pdf	EKXL027317.pdf	EKXL032352.pdf	LEKXL034952.pdf	EKXL035624.pdf	EKXL037134.pdf	EKXL047104.pdf	EKXL047679.pdf	EKXL051844.pdf	EKXL053706.pdf	EKXL057952.pdf	EKXL058691.pdf	EKXL062791.pdf	EKXL063617.pdf	
EKXL024086.pdf	EKXL027318.pdf	EKXL032359.pdf	EKXL034953.pdf	LEKXL035680.pdf	EKXL037137.pdf	EKXL047128.pdf	EKXL047682.pdf	EKXL051845.pdf	EKXL053707.pdf	EKXL057953.pdf	EKXL058696.pdf	EKXL062833.pdf	LEKXL063621.pdf	
EKXL024090.pdf	EKXL027319.pdf	EKXL032360.pdf	EKXL034985.pdf	EKXL035681.pdf	EKXL037138.pdf	EKXL047136.pdf	EKXL047701.pdf	EKXL051871.pdf	EKXL053708.pdf	EKXL057974.pdf	EKXL058700.pdf	EKXL062861.pdf	EKXL063622.pdf	
T	EKXL027325.pdf	EKXL032385.pdf	EKXL035004.pdf	EKXL035682.pdf	EKXL037139.pdf	EKXL047137.pdf	EKXL047716.pdf	EKXL051872.pdf	EKXL053742.pdf	JEKXL057989.pdf	JEKXL058702.pdf	EKXL062862.pdf	LEKXL063629.pdf	
1	EKXL027431.pdf	EKXL032387.pdf	EKXL035006.pdf	EKXL035693.pdf	EKXL037146.pdf	EKXL047152.pdf	EKXL047719.pdf	EKXL051874.pdf	EKXL053743.pdf	EKXL058030.pdf	EKXL058708.pdf	-] EKXL062872.pdf	EKXL064927.pdf	
	EKXL027736.pdf	EKXL032390.pdf	EKXL035013.pdf	EKXL035715.pdf	EKXL037148.pdf	EKXL047153.pdf	EKXL047732.pdf	EKXL051883.pdf	LEKXL053745.pdf	EKXL058031.pdf	2	EKXL062874.pdf	EKXL064929.pdf	
1	EKXL027749.pdf	LEKXL032391.pdf	EKXL035015.pdf	EKXL035738.pdf	EKXL037150.pdf	EKXL047154.pdf	EKXL047740.pdf	EKXL051884.pdf	LEKXL053746.pdf	EKXL058095.pdf	EKXL058710.pdf	LEKXL062876.pdf	EKXL064930.pdf	
-	EKXL027772.pdf	EKXL032426.pdf	EKXL035016.pdf	EKXL035908.pdf	EKXL037152.pdf	EKXL047155.pdf	EKXL047764.pdf	EKXL051888.pdf	EKXL053747.pdf	EKXL058123.pdf	EKXL058713.pdf	EKXL062879.pdf	EKXL064931.pdf	
EKXL024395.pdf	EKXL027794.pdf	EKXL032429.pdf	EKXL035017.pdf	EKXL035912.pdf	EKXL037154.pdf	EKXL047156.pdf	JEKXL047776.pdf	EKXL051917.pdf	EKXL053748.pdf	EKXL058124.pdf	-	EKXL062880.pdf	EKXL064932.pdf	
EKXL024472.pdf	EKXL028560.pdf	EKXL032432.pdf	EKXL035019.pdf	EKXL036575.pdf	EKXL037155.pdf	EKXL047158.pdf	EKXL047777.pdf	EKXL051921.pdf	EKXL053751.pdf	EKXL058126.pdf		EloxL062881.pdf	EKXL064935.pdf	
EKXL024514.pdf	EKXL028574.pdf	EKXL032985.pdf	EKXL035021.pdf	EKXL036576.pdf	EKXL037174.pdf	EKXL047159.pdf	EKXL047779.pdf	EKXL051924.pdf	EKXL053752.pdf	EKXL058128.pdf	EKXL058721.pdf	EKXL062883.pdf	EKXL064936.pdf	
EKXL024556.pdf	EKXL028576.pdf	EKXL033400.pdf	EKXL035031.pdf	EKXL036842.pdf	EKXL037183.pdf	EKXL047179.pdf	EKXL047780.pdf	EKXL051936.pdf	EKXL053764.pdf	EKXL058343.pdf	EKXL058723.pdf	EKXL062884.pdf	EKXL064939.pdf	
EKXL024646.pdf	EKXL028577.pdf	EkxL033401.pdf	EKXL035043.pdf	EKXL036873.pdf	EKXL037203.pdf	EKXL047181.pdf	EKXL047791.pdf	EKXL051941.pdf	EKXL053879.pdf	EKXL058348.pdf	EKXL058726.pdf	EKXL062886.pdf	EKXL064948.pdf	
EKXL026099.pdf	EKXL028743.pdf	EKXL033424.pdf	EKXL035044.pdf	EKXL036895.pdf	EKXL037210.pdf	EKXL047185.pdf	EKXL047793.pdf	EKXL051942.pdf	LEKXL053882.pdf	EKXL058387.pdf	JEKXL058729.pdf	EKXL062887.pdf	EKXL064949.pdf	
EKXL026150.pdf	EKXL028744.pdf	EKXL033426.pdf	EKXL035052.pdf	EKXL036896.pdf	EKXL037212.pdf	EKXL047187.pdf	EKXL047794.pdf	EKXL052028.pdf	EKXL053975.pdf	EKXL058390.pdf	EKXL058744.pdf	EKXL062889.pdf	EKXL064952.pdf	
JEKXL026281.pdf JE	EKXL028955.pdf	EKXL033435.pdf	EKXL035054.pdf	EKXL036908.pdf	EKXL037231.pdf	EKXL047188.pdf	EKXL047808.pdf	EKXL052074.pdf	EKXL054023.pdf	EKXL058391.pdf	JEKXL058760.pdf	EKXL062890.pdf	EKXL064953.pdf	
EKXL026474.pdf	EKXL028956.pdf	EKXL033995.pdf	EKXL035065.pdf	EKXL036913.pdf	LEKXL037232.pdf	EKXL047189.pdf	EKXL047820.pdf	EKXL052076.pdf	EKXL054026.pdf	EKXL058415.pdf	EKXL058768.pdf	JEKXL062894.pdf	EKXL064954.pdf	
EKXL026599.pdf	EKXL029684.pdf	EKXL034353.pdf	EKXL035111.pdf	EKXL036934.pdf	EKXL037288.pdf	EKXL047190.pdf	EKXL047825.pdf	EKXL052078.pdf	EKXL054032.pdf	EKXL058466.pdf	EKXL058794.pdf	EKXL062925.pdf	EKXL064955.pdf	
EKXL026610.pdf	EKXL029699.pdf	EKXL034383.pdf	EKXL035123.pdf	EKXL036935.pdf	EKXL037295.pdf	EKXL047199.pdf	EKXL047864.pdf	EKXL052080.pdf	EKXL054086.pdf	EKXL058467.pdf	EKXL058795.pdf	EKXL062941.pdf	EKXL064957.pdf	
a)						ŧ.	645 items						EXHIBIT	

EXHIBI 

### **BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

)

)

)

)

)

)

) )

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. FOR ROUTE APPROVAL OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE MAJOR OIL PIPELINE SITING ACT.

Application No. OP-0003

## RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE

The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska ("Tribe") hereby responds to Applicant's Motion in Limine

seeking to prohibit cross-examination of witnesses by parties with aligned interests.

## I. APPLICANT'S REQUEST TO LIMIT INTERVENORS TO CROSS-EXAMINATION WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THEIR ALLOWED PARTICIPATION.

The Tribe does not express an opinion on Applicant's request to limit intervenors to crossexamination within the scope of their allowed participation as set forth in the Commission's Order on Formal Intervention Petitions, subject to the Tribe's continuing objection to the Commission excluding the Tribe from participating with respect to its governmental and other interests stated in its Petition of Formal Intervention. However, the Tribe joins in any other parties' resistance to this requested limitation and would note that Landowner Intervenors have no limit on the scope of their participation.

# II. APPLICANT'S REQUEST TO PROHIBIT INTERVENORS' FROM ELICITING TESTIMONY VIA CROSS-EXAMINATION.

The Tribe strenuously opposes Applicant's further attempt to avoid any response to its case in chief, which was not revealed until long after the intervenors were required to file their testimony and exhibits. Applicant urges the Commission to prevent the intervenors "from eliciting evidence via 'cross-examination,' which should have been submitted in the pre-filed direct testimony." Applicant apparently bases this request on the fact the Commission set a deadline of June 7 for intervenors to file their testimony and exhibits and avoiding "unfair surprise" to Applicant.

There is serious flaw in Applicant's reasoning. As discussed in the Tribe's Response to Applicant's Motion in Limine seeking to exclude intervenors from referring to or mentioning certain topics filed contemporaneously with this Response and incorporated herein by reference, Applicant had not completed serving all of its discovery by the June 7 deadline. The Tribe received two disks of documents from Applicant after the June 7 deadline, one on June 8 and one on June 9. (Response to Applicant's Motion in Limine, Exhibits A, B). Consequently, the Tribe did not even receive all discovery from the Applicant until *after* the June 7 deadline. The disk received on June 8 contained 165 separate documents and the disk received on June 9 contained 645 separate documents. (Response to Applicant's Motion in Limine, Exhibits C, D). This is not an insignificant amount of documents, each containing information the Tribe could potentially use. But, Applicant is attempting to prevent the Tribe from utilizing information it did not even receive from Applicant until *after* the deadline is a denial would be extraordinarily prejudicial to the Tribe and likely violate its due process rights by improperly limiting its opportunity to be heard.

In addition, while the intervenors were required to file testimony and exhibits by June 7, Applicant was not required to file any testimony or exhibits regarding the intervenors issues until July 17. At the same time, Applicant acknowledges that some intervenors are aligned with it and in favor of the proposed routes, while others are opposed to Applicant and the proposed routes. Those intervenors who are aligned with Applicant also filed their testimony and exhibits on June 7. The intervenors have the right to cross-examine Applicant's witnesses as well as those of other intervenors. Yet, the intervenors did not know the content of Applicant's rebuttal evidence or even the identity of Applicant's rebuttal witnesses until long after the June 7 deadline. Nor did the intervenors opposed to the proposed routes know the content of testimony or identity of witnesses of those intervenors aligned with Applicant until the June 7 deadline.

In the case of the Tribe, which the Commission has limited to social and cultural issues, Applicant did not file any testimony or provide any evidence regarding social or cultural issues with its Application. Thus, the Tribe had no ability to know what exhibits or testimony it would need to respond to Applicant with respect to social or cultural issues until July 17. Though it seems to forget it, the Applicant bears the burden of proof in these proceedings. But, it did not actually present any initial evidence on the very issues it so diligently works to keep the Tribe limited to. Thus, the Tribe had to not only elicit its own evidence and testimony, but attempt to essentially "guess" what Applicant's evidence and testimony on social and cultural issues would be. Now, Applicant purports to severely limit the Tribe from actually responding to Applicant's presentation of evidence on social and cultural issues. Applicant feigns concern over "unfair surprise," but it is actually arguing that the Commission allow it to engage in "unfair surprise" by making its case in chief after the intervenors filed their testimony and then prohibiting the intervenors from responding to that case in chief. To prohibit the intervenors from bringing forth any testimony that the intervenors failed to "guess" Applicant would later present would be a gross violation of the intervenors' due process right to be heard.

The intervenors must be provided the proper opportunity to respond to the Applicant's showing under MOPSA. It is Applicant that bears the burden of proof in these proceedings, yet it never bothered to present any testimony or evidence to meet that burden of proof until *after* the deadline for intervenors to file their initial testimony and exhibits. The intervenors – at least those opposing the proposed routes – have the right to properly and fully respond to Applicant's case in chief as well as the intervenors aligned with Applicant. But, they have not yet been given the

opportunity to do so. Their only true opportunity to do so will be cross-examination and redirect testimony of witnesses at the hearing. Applicant cannot be allowed to prevent any actual response to its case by having the Commission limit evidence to that provided long before Applicant even presented its case in chief and attempted to meet its burden of proof.

The Commission should not limit the testimony intervenors can elicit in cross-examination or redirect of their own witnesses to what the Applicant deems "should" have been filed in the intervenors direct testimony even when the intervenors did not know the content of Applicant's evidence as the party with the burden of proof. Such a limitation would be akin to requiring a defendant to present his or her case before the plaintiff or prosecutor presented any evidence and then telling the defendant he or she could not respond to the plaintiff or prosecutor beyond what the defendant presented prior to the plaintiff's or prosecutor's case in chief.

If the intervenors are not permitted to elicit any testimony in response to Applicant's evidence and testimony, it would merely encourage applicants before the Commission to hide all of their evidence and testimony related to their cases in chief until after the deadline for intervenors to file their evidence has passed. It would result in the most unjust and backwards process possible, requiring respondents to present their case before the party with the burden of proof even presents a single piece of evidence. The Applicant cannot limit its initial presentation of evidence, force the intervenors to "guess" what its evidence will be, and then cut off the intervenors from responding to that remaining evidence after it is presented.

#### III. CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, the Tribe requests that the Commission deny Applicant's Motion in Limine with respect to seeking to prohibit cross-examination of witnesses by parties with aligned interests.

Dated: July 27, 2017

Brad S. Jolly, #23720 BRAD'S. JOLLY & ASSOCIATES 15355 Gadsden Drive Brighton, CO 80603 Telephone: (720) 685-7105 Facsimile: (206) 339-7209 Email: bsj@bsjlawfirm.com ATTORNEY FOR PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A COPY of the foregoing **RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S OBJECTION TO, AND MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE, EVIDENCE OFFERED BY THE PONCA TRIBE OF NEBRASKA AND THE YANKTON SIOUX TRIBE, RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE** along with **EXHIBITS A-D**, and **RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S MOTION IN LIMINE** were served by electronic mail this 27th day of July, 2017 to the following:

James G. Powers McGrath, North, et al. First National Tower, Ste. 3700 1601 Dodge Street Omaha, NE 68102 jpowers@mcgrathnorth.com

Patrick D. Pepper McGrath, North, et al. First National Tower, Ste. 3700 1601 Dodge Street Omaha, NE 68102 ppepper@mcgrathnorth.com

Jennifer S. Baker Jayne Antony Fredericks Peebles and Morgan, LLP 1900 Plaza Drive Louisville, CO 80027 jbaker@ndnlaw.com

Wrexie Bardaglio 9748 Arden Road Trumansburg, NY 14886 wrexie.bardaglio@gmail.com

Leverne A. Barrett 1909 Co. Rd. E Ceresco, NE 68017

Mia Bergman O'Donoghue & O'Donoghue LLP 86424 514 Ave. Orchard, NE 68764 mbergman85@hotmail.com Elizabeth (Liz) Mensinger 6509 Wirt St. Omaha, NE 68104 lizmensinger@gmail.com

Cindy Myers P.O. Box 104 Stuart, NE 68780 csmyers77@hotmail.com

Crystal Miller 7794 Greenleaf Drive LaVista, NE 68128 neccmiller@juno.com

Janece Mollhoff 2354 Euclid Street Ashland, NE 68003 wjmollhoff@windstream.net

Greg Nelson 3700 Sumner St. Lincoln, NE 68506 gnelson@inetnebr.com

Julie Nichols 1995 Park Ave. Lincoln, NE 68502

Jana Osborn 1112 Meadowlark Alliance, NE 69301 janajearyb@gmail.com

James Douglas Osborn 43110 879th Rd. Ainsworth, NE 69210 Ellen O. Boardman O'Donoghue & O'Donoghue LLP 4748 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20016 eboardman@odonoghuelaw.com

Anna Friedlander O'Connor Law Firm 4748 Wisconsin Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20016 afriedlander@odonoghuelaw.com

Robert O'Connor, Jr P.O. Box 45116 Omaha, NE 68145 reolaw@aol.com

Dara Illowsky 1650 38th Street, Suite 102w Boulder, CO 80301 dara.illowsky@sierraclub.org

Kimberly E Craven 33 King Canyon Road Chadron, NE 69337 Kimecraven@gmail.com

Cathie (Kathryn) Genung 902 East 7th St. Hastings, NE 68901 tg64152@windstream.net

Louis (Tom) Genung 902 East 7th St. Hastings, NE 68901 tg64152@windstream.net

Andy Grier 916 S. 181st St. Elkhorn, NE 68022 griea01@cox.net

Christy J. Hargesheimer 620 S 30th St. Lincoln, NE 68510 chrispaz@neb.rr.com Christine Polson 4923 Valley St Omaha, NE 68106 snpolson@cox.net

Dave Polson 4923 Valley Street Omaha, NE 68106 honk@cox.net

Joseph Pomponio 551B Sand Creek Rd. Albany, NY 12205 lukaz@msn.com

Collin A. Rees 4721 Heather Lane Kearney, NE 68845 collin@priceofoil.org

Donna Roller 2000 Twin Ridge Rd. Lincoln, NE 68506 rollerski@gmail.com

Cecilia Rossiter 949 N 30th St. Lincoln, NE 68503 punion@gmail.com

Corey Runmann 2718 S. 12th St. Lincoln, NE 68502 rumannc@gmail.com

Lois Schreur 2544 N. 61st Street P.O. Box 4376 Omaha, NE 68104 leschreur@centurylink.net

Tristan Scorpio 208 S Burlington Ave., Ste. 103 Box 325 Hasting, NE 68901 Richard S. Hargesheimer Blake & Uhlig, PA 620 South 30th St. Lincoln, NE 68510 rshargy@gmail.com

Robert J. Henry Blake & Uhlig, PA 753 State Avenue, Ste. 475 Kansas City, KS 66101 rjh@blake-uhlig.com

Michael J. Stapp Blake & Uhlig, PA 753 State Avenue, Ste. 475 Kansas City, KS 66101 mjs@blake-uhlig.com

Michael E. Amash 753 State Avenue, Ste. 475 Kansas City, KS 66101 mea@blake-uhlig.com

Becky Hohnstein P.O. Box 272 Minatare, NE 69356 jimhohnstein@gmail.com

Marvin E. Hughes 714 W 5th St, Ste. 120 Hastings, NE 68901 bhughes@gtmc.net

John Jarecki 6112 Bedford Ave. Omaha, NE 68104 johnjarecki110@gmail.com

Karen Jarecki 6112 Bedford Ave. Omaha, NE 68104 tenbuckstwo@yahoo.com Julie Shaffer 5405 Northern Hills Dr. Omaha, NE 68152

Sandra Slaymaker 102 E 3rd St. #2 Atkinson, NE 68713 sandyslaymaker@gmail.com

Susan Soriente 1110 Rockhurst Drive Lincoln, NE 68510 ssoriente@gmail.com

Lorne Stockman Oil Change International 714 G St., SE, Suite 202 Washington, DC 20003 lorne@priceofoil.org

Susan Straka-Heyden 46581 875th Rd. Stuart, NE 68780 suzie\_sl@hotmail.com

Kimberly L. Stuhr 19303 Buffalo Rd. Springfield, NE 68059 kimberlystuhr13@yahoo.com

Jacques Tallichet 2821 S. 79th St. Lincoln, NE 68506 jacques.tallichet@gmail.com

Paul Theobald 85718 544th Avenue Foster, NE 68765 ptheobald36@gmail.com

Jonathan H. Thomas 960 S Cotner Blvd. Lincoln, NE 68510 thewild things@yahoo.com Brian F. Jorde Domina Law Group PC LLO 2425 S 144th Street Omaha, NE 68144-3267 bjorde@dominalaw.com

Dave Domina Domina Law Group PC LLO 2425 S 144th Street Omaha, NE 68144-3267 ddomina@dominalaw.com

Taylor R. M Keen 5022 Hamilton St. Omaha, NE 68132-1448 taylorkeen7@gmail.com

Judy King 1261 Fall Creek Rd. Lincoln, NE 68510 kingjud@gmail.com

Michelle C. LaMere P.O. Box 514 Winnebago, NE 68071

Pamela Luger 8732 Granville Pkwy. LaVista, NE 68128 pam1181@yahoo.com

Kendall Maxey 350.org 20 Jay Street Brooklyn, NY 11201 kendall@350.org

Sarah Zuekerman 1729 K St. #7 Lincoln, NE 68508 sarahj1182@gmail.com@gmail.com Elizabeth L. Troshynski 87769 484th Ave. Atkinson, NE 68713 btroshyn@hotmail.com

Christine Troshynski 101 S. 1st St. Emmet, NE 68734 ctroshynski@gmail.com

Julie Walker 2570 West Luther St. Martell, NE 68404 jw9095@yahoo.com

Susan C. Watson 2035 N 28th St., Apt. 213 Lincoln, NE 68503 scwatson1965@gmail.com

Susan J. Weber 2425 Folkways Blvd., Apt. 329 Lincoln, NE 68521 susanjweber4@yahoo.com

Douglas Whitmore 8856 N 83rd Ave. Omaha, NE 68122 douglas@whitmore4congress.com

Kenneth C. Winston 1327 H St., Ste. 300 Lincoln, NE 68508 kwinston@inebraska.com

Sandy Zdan 4817 Douglas Omaha, NE 68132 sandywz@cox.net