BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois for Other Relief or, in the Alternative, a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Authorizing it to Construct, Install, Own, Operate, Maintain and Otherwise Control and Manage a 345,000-volt Electric Transmission Line from Palmyra, Missouri, to the Iowa Border and Associated Substation near Kirksville, Missouri.	)))))))	**File No. EA-2015-0146**

NEIGHBORS UNITED'S MOTION TO COMPEL MIDCONTINENT INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR, INC.'S RESPONSE TO DATA REQUESTS

COMES NOW Neighbors United Against Ameren's Power Line (Neighbors United), by and through the undersigned counsel, and for its Motion to compel response to certain data requests states:

1. On December 18, 2015, Neighbors United served a Second Set of Data Requests to the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) containing seventeen data requests.

2. While MISO objected to eight of the data requests, this Motion is only asking the Commission to Order MISO to respond to data requests 2-8, 2-9, and 2-10.

3. The undersigned attempted to confer by telephone with counsel for MISO on January 7, 2016, regarding these disputes. The undersigned conveyed by telephone to counsel Joshua Harden the specific data requests that Neighbors United wished MISO to reconsider, but was not able to schedule a conference with Mr. Smalls, MISO's internal counsel, as of the time of this filing.

4. As per the Commission's August 5, 2015 Order Setting Procedural Schedule in paragraph 13 states "The Commission may rule on discovery motions filed

after Surrebuttal Testimony is filed without holding the conference required by 4 CSR 240-2.090(8)(B)."

5. This Motion is not intended to harass any party or delay this proceeding, but to receive complete and accurate discovery responses from MISO. The undersigned is available for argument on this Motion should the Commission desire such.

6. Neighbors United requests the Commission order data request responses be provided no later than January 18, 2016, as to allow all parties reasonable time to prepare for the evidentiary hearing scheduled to begin on January 25, 2016.

7. DR 2-8 requested the following information: *"MO PSC witness Stahlman states in his rebuttal testimony (p. 4, lines 7-9): "Staff's review of the MTEP14 MVP Triennial Review was unable to locate the cost-benefit ratio of specific projects; it appears that the study was performed on the entire portfolio." (a) Does MISO agree that the cost-benefit ratios presented in the MTEP11 MVP study and the MTEP14 MVP Triennial Review, including those for Missouri, are based on the entire MVP portfolio and do not represent the cost-benefit ratio of specific projects like the Mark Twain line? Please explain. If no, please state so.*" MISO objected to this request on December 28, 2015, stating: *"Objection: See General Objection. Pursuant to the December 9 Order, "additional discovery [is] "limited to discovery directed towards new information contained in surrebuttal testimony only." Neighbors has failed to link the data request to anything contained in the surrebuttal testimony. At this time in the proceeding, this data request is beyond the scope of discovery."*

8. In regard to DR 2-8, the data request relates to Mr. Smith's surrebuttal testimony at page 13, lines 6-9, where he states "A revised plan would not provide the

same positive economic opportunities for customers in Missouri and elsewhere that are provided by the plan that includes the Mark Twain facilities." Neighbors United is attempting to determine from this witness MISO's position on whether MISO conducted independent cost benefit studies for the specific Missouri Mark Twain Transmission Project (MTTP), which is the specific project the Commission is being asked to approve, not the entire MVP portfolio. Since the Commission is being asked to specifically approve the MTTP, it should have available to it evidence of whether the specific project's economic benefits outweigh the costs, and consider that evidence in its decision-making. MISO did not object to this DR on any other grounds other than its belief that this is not new information that qualifies for discovery requests. However, the argument is disingenuous as Mr. Smith only filed surrebuttal in this case and there was no other opportunity to specifically question Mr. Smith on testimony he has provided in this case other than when Neighbors United did. Neighbors United requests the Commission order MISO to provide a full and complete answer to this data request.

9. DR 2-9 requested the following information: *"Please explain whether MISO agrees that no cost-benefit ratio analysis was done by MISO as part of the MVP process that evaluates the cost-benefit ratio of the MVP portfolio with and without the Mark Twain line? If MISO disagrees, please state so."* As with DR 2-8, MISO objected to this request on December 28, 2015, stating: *"Objection: See General Objection. Pursuant to the December 9 Order, "additional discovery [is] "limited to discovery directed towards new information contained in surrebuttal testimony only." Neighbors has failed to link the data request to anything contained in the surrebuttal testimony. At this time in the proceeding, this data request is beyond the scope of discovery."*

10. As with DR 2-8, MISO's only objection to DR 2-9 was its argument that this DR was not new information that qualifies for discovery requests. Again, this DR relates to Mr. Smith's surrebuttal testimony at page 13, lines 6-9, where he states "A revised plan would not provide the same positive economic opportunities for customers in Missouri and elsewhere that are provided by the plan that includes the Mark Twain facilities." Neighbors United is attempting to question the witness on his statement that appears for the first time in his surrebuttal testimony to determine whether this witness believes MISO conducted independent cost benefit studies for the specific MTTP. Neighbors United requests the Commission order MISO to provide a full and complete answer to this data request.

11. DR 2-10 requested the following information: *"Please explain: (a) what Missouri projects are included in the Missouri benefit to cost ratios of 2.0 to 2.9 in the MTEP 2011 and 2.3 to 3.3 in the Triennial Review; and (b) how both Missouri cost ratios were calculated and include any supporting documentation."* As with DR 2-8 and 2-9, MISO objected on the same grounds. Neighbors United makes the same arguments for this DR as it did supra for DR 2-8 and 2-9 and will not repeat them here for brevity. Neighbors United requests the Commission order MISO to provide a full and complete answer to this data request.

WHEREFORE, Neighbors United files the Motion to Compel with the Commission and respectfully requests the Commission order MISO to respond to the data requests as explained herein and any further relief the Commission deems reasonable and proper in this instance.

Respectfully submitted,

HERNANDEZ LAW FIRM, LLC

By: **/s/ Jennifer Hernandez**
Jennifer Hernandez, MO Bar No. 59814
1802 Sun Valley Drive
Jefferson City, Missouri 65109
Phone: 573-616-1486
Fax: 573-342-4962
E-Mail: jennifer@hernandezlegal.com

ATTORNEY FOR NEIGHBORS UNITED AGAINST AMEREN'S POWER LINE

Certificate of Service

I certify that a true copy of the above and foregoing was served to all counsel of record by electronic mail this 7th day of January 2016.

/s/ Jennifer Hernandez
Jennifer Hernandez