BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing it to Construct, Own, Operate, Control, Manage and Maintain a High Voltage, Direct Current Transmission Line and an Associated Converter Station Providing an Interconnection on the Maywood -Montgomery 345kV Transmission Line

File No. EA-2016-0358

)

)

)

)

)

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL REGARDING JOINT PROSECUTION AND DEFENSE AGREEMENT

Issue Date: February 17, 2017 Effective Date: February 17, 2017

On August 30, 2016, Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC ("Grain Belt Express") filed an application with the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity to construct, own, operate, control, manage and maintain a high voltage, direct current transmission line and associated facilities within Buchanan, Clinton, Caldwell, Carroll, Chariton, Randolph, Monroe and Ralls Counties, Missouri, as well as an associated converter station in Ralls County. In its *Order Setting Procedural Schedule and Other Procedural Requirements* issued on October 19, 2016, the Commission ordered that any pending written discovery motion may be ruled upon by the presiding regulatory law judge either on the record or in a written order.

On January 30, 2017, the Missouri Landowners Alliance ("MLA") filed a motion seeking to compel Grain Belt Express and the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission ("MJMEUC", and collectively, the "Respondents") to respond to certain data requests submitted to them by MLA relating to the Transmission Service Agreement between those two parties. While Respondents provided some information in response to

MLA's data requests, including a copy of the Transmission Service Agreement, other data requests were denied on the basis of attorney-client privilege and attorney work product. Specifically, Respondents assert the common interest doctrine, as memorialized in a Joint Prosecution and Defense Agreement ("Agreement") executed by those two parties on June 1, 2016, as the reason for refusing to respond to MLA's data requests.

MLA requests that the Commission compel Respondents to fully answer its data requests for the following reasons:

- MLA alleges that Respondents have improperly asserted attorneyclient privilege through the common interest doctrine as a shield to prevent inquiries regarding the Transmission Service Agreement and "throw a protective blanket over" Respondents' communications;
- The common interest doctrine does not apply in this case because Respondents' common interest is merely commercial, rather than a common legal interest;
- 3. Even if the Agreement does properly assert privilege through a common interest, Respondents' communications prior to the date the Agreement was executed are not protected by any such privilege and are discoverable by MLA; and
- If MLA is denied access to the information it is seeking, MLA would be deprived of its right to due process of law under the United States and Missouri Constitutions.

"The attorney-client privilege prohibits the discovery of confidential communications, oral or written, between an attorney and his client with reference to litigation pending or

2

contemplated.^{*1} A client waives the attorney-client privilege when he or she voluntarily shares the communication with a third party, but there is no waiver where the third party shares a common interest in the outcome of the litigation and where the communication was made in confidence.² "The common interest doctrine extends the attorney-client privilege to two separate clients, who are represented by separate attorneys, who share an identical legal interest, and who agree to exchange information regarding the matter."³ The common interest may be "either legal, factual, or strategic in character"⁴, but "must be an identical interest and a legal interest, as opposed to a merely commercial interest".⁵

Based on the terms of the Agreement and the information provided by MLA and Respondents, Respondents have established that attorney-client privilege or attorney work product apply to their communications; that they share a common interest in Grain Belt Express obtaining a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Commission; that Respondents have shared communications in confidence regarding that interest; and that Respondents have not waived the privilege, as they have both objected to MLA's data requests.

While MLA characterizes the Agreement and assertion of attorney-client privilege by Respondents as an improper attempt to avoid discovery, there is no evidence of bad faith on the part of Respondents. Respondents have only invoked a privilege that is provided by

¹ Ayers Oil Co. v. Am. Bus. Brokers, Inc., No. 2:09 CV 02 DDN, 2009 WL 4725297, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 2, 2009). See also, Section 491.060(4), RSMo 2000.

² Lipton Realty, Inc. v. St. Louis Housing Authority, 705 S.W.2d 565, 570 (Mo. App. 1986).

³ Ayers Oil Co. at p. 2.; John Morrell & Co. v. Local Union 304A of United Food & Commercial Workers, AFL-CIO, 913 F.2d 544, 556 (8th Cir. 1990).

⁴ In re Grand Jury Subpoena Duces Tecum, 112 F.3d 910, 922 (8th Cir. 1997).

⁵ Ayers Oil Co., at p. 2.

law.⁶ Since Respondents are both parties to this proceeding, the common interest between Respondents is a legal interest, not merely commercial⁷, so the common interest doctrine does apply in this case.

MLA argues that Respondents' communications prior to the date the Agreement was executed are not protected by any such privilege and are discoverable by MLA. While a written agreement, such as the Agreement executed by Respondents, is the most effective method of establishing the existence of a common interest agreement, an oral agreement may also establish such a common interest.⁸ Representations by Grain Belt Express indicate that Grain Belt Express and MJMEUC have been exchanging information covered by attorney-client privilege and attorney work product long before the Agreement was executed. This information related to working drafts of the Agreement and the Transmission Service Agreement and coordination of legal strategy in preparation for another attempt at obtaining approval for the transmission line project from the Commission. The terms of the Agreement support this position, stating that it is Respondents' intent that "past and future communications" among Respondents and their counsel remain confidential and protected from disclosure to any third party. The Commission concludes that Respondents' common interest pre-dates the Agreement, so any privileged communications prior to the Agreement may not be disclosed to MLA.

⁶ Courts have stated that the rationale for the common interest privilege is to encourage persons who share a common interest in litigation to communicate with their respective attorneys and with each other to effectively prosecute or defend their claims. *In re Grand Jury Subpoenas, 89-3 & 89-4, John Doe 89-129,* 902 F.2d 244, 249 (4th Cir. 1990); Jeffery McPherson & Brian E. Kaveney, *The Common Interest Rule: May Parties Whose Interests Are Aligned Protect Their Coordinated Legal Strategy from Adversaries?*, 66 J. Mo. B. 20 (2010). ⁷ Persons with merely commercial interests are usually not parties to the litigation. See, *Ayers Oil Co. v. Am. Bus. Brokers, Inc.*, No. 2:09 CV 02 DDN, 2009 WL 4725297, at *2 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 2, 2009).

⁸ Intex Recreation Corp. v. Team Worldwide Corp., 471 F. Supp. 2d 11, 16 (D.D.C. 2007); See also, Lipton Realty, Inc, 705 S.W.2d at 570, where the common interest did not involve a written agreement.

MLA argues that if it cannot obtain access to the information it is seeking, it will be denied due process of law. However, once the privilege is established, the privilege is absolute. "[E]ven if an adversary can show a need for the material and hardship in acquiring it, discovery of the privileged communication is not authorized".⁹ Allowing discovery of matters which are privileged or work product would constitute an abuse of discretion by the Commission.¹⁰ Therefore, based on all of the reasons stated above, the Commission will deny MLA's motion to compel against Grain Belt Express and MJMEUC.

THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:

1. The Missouri Landowners Alliance's motion to compel against Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC and the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission filed on January 30, 2017, is denied.

2. This order shall be effective when issued.

BY THE COMMISSION



Corris L Woodryk

Morris L. Woodruff Secretary

Michael Bushmann, Senior Regulatory Law Judge by delegation of authority pursuant to Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri, on this 17th day of February, 2017.

⁹ State ex rel. Tillman v. Copeland, 271 S.W.3d 42, 45 (Mo. App. 2008).

¹⁰ *St. Louis Little Rock Hosp., Inc. v. Gaertner*, 682 S.W.2d 146, 148 (Mo. App. 1984).

STATE OF MISSOURI

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

I have compared the preceding copy with the original on file in this office and I do hereby certify the same to be a true copy therefrom and the whole thereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal of the Public Service Commission, at Jefferson City, Missouri, this 17th day of February 2017.



Morris L. Woodruff Secretary

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

February 17, 2017

File/Case No. EA-2016-0358

Missouri Public Service	Office of the Public Counsel	Charles Henke
Commission	Hampton Williams	Paul A Agathen
Staff Counsel Department	200 Madison Street, Suite 650	485 Oak Field Ct.
200 Madison Street, Suite 800	P.O. Box 2230	Washington, MO 63090
P.O. Box 360	Jefferson City, MO 65102	paa0408@aol.com
Jefferson City, MO 65102	opcservice@ded.mo.gov	•
staffcounselservice@psc.mo.gov		

Consumers Council of	Gr
Missouri	LL
John B Coffman	Lis
871 Tuxedo Blvd.	25
St. Louis, MO 63119-2044	Po
john@johncoffman.net	lgil

Grain Belt Express Clean Line,
LLCGrain Belt Express Clean Line, LLCLisa A GilbreathJoshua Harden254 Commercial StreetKansas City, MO 64111Portland, ME 64111-0410joshua.harden@dentons.comIgilbreath@pierceatwood.comJoshua Harden

IBEW Local Union 2

St. Louis, MO 63105

7730 Carondelet Ave., Suite 200

eperez@hammondshinners.com

Emilv Perez

Grain Belt Express Clean Line, IBEW Local Union 2 LLC Sherrie Hall

LLC Karl Zobrist 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111 karl.zobrist@dentons.com

IBEW Local Union No. 53

St. Louis, MO 63105

7730 Carondelet Ave., Ste. 200

sahall@hammondshinners.com

Sherrie Hall

sahall@hammondshinners.com IBEW Local Union No. 53 Emily Perez

St. Louis, MO 63105

7730 Carondelet Ave., Ste. 200

IBEW Local Union No. 53Infinity Wind PowerEmily PerezTerri Pemberton7730 Carondelet Ave., Suite 2003321 SW 6th AveSt. Louis, MO 63105Topeka, KS 66606eperez@hammondshinners.comterri@caferlaw.com

Matthew and Christina Reichert Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

Missouri Farm Bureau Brent E Haden 827 E Broadway Columbia, MO 65201 brent@hadenlaw.com Missouri AFL-CIO James Faul 4399 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, MO 63108 jfaul@hghllc.net

Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers (MIEC) Diana M Vuylsteke 211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600 St. Louis, MO 63102 dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com Missouri Department of Economic Development Alexander Antal 10 Clinton Dr., Unit A Columbia, MO 65203-6520 Alexander.Antal@ded.mo.gov

Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission Douglas Healy 3010 E. Battlefield, Suite A Springfield, MO 65804 doug@healylawoffices.com Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission Penny Speake 3010 E. Battlefield, Suite A Springfield, MO 65804 penny@healylawoffices.com

Missouri Public Service

Commission Nathan Williams 200 Madison Street, Suite 800 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 nathan.williams@psc.mo.gov

R. Kenneth Hutchinson

Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

Robyn Henke

Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

Roseanne Meyer

Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

The Wind Coalition

Sean Brady PO Box 4072 Wheaton, IL 60189-4072 sbrady@windonthewires.org Missouri Joint Municipal **Electric Utility Commission** Peggy A Whipple 514 E. High Street, Suite A Jefferson City, MO 65101 peggy@healylawoffices.com

Missouri Landowners Alliance Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

Missouri Retailers Association Natural Resources Defense

Diana M Vuylsteke 211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600 St. Louis, MO 63102 dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com

Council

Henry B Robertson 319 N. Fourth St., Suite 800 St. Louis, MO 63102 hrobertson@greatriverslaw.org

Randall Meyer Paul A Agathen 485 Oak Field Ct. Washington, MO 63090 paa0408@aol.com

Rockies Express Pipeline

Colly J Durley 111 S. Ninth St., Suite 200 P.O. Box 918 Columbia, MO 65205-0918 Durley@smithlewis.com

Show Me Concerned

Landowners David C Linton 314 Romaine Spring View Fenton, MO 63026 Jdlinton@reagan.com

The Wind Coalition

Deirdre K Hirner 2603 Huntleigh Place Jefferson City, MO 65109 dhirner@awea.org

Renew Missouri

Andrew J Linhares 1200 Rogers Street, Suite B Columbia, MO 65201-4744 Andrew@renewmo.org

Rockies Express Pipeline

Sarah E Gibonev 111 South Ninth Street, Suite 200 P.O. Box 918 Columbia, MO 65205-0918 giboney@smithlewis.com

Sierra Club

Henry B Robertson 319 N. Fourth St., Suite 800 St. Louis, MO 63102 hrobertson@greatriverslaw.org

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

David Woodsmall 807 Winston Court Jefferson City, MO 65101 david.woodsmall@woodsmalllaw.com Wind on the Wires Sean Brady PO Box 4072 Wheaton, IL 60189-4072 sbrady@windonthewires.org Wind on the Wires Deirdre K Hirner 2603 Huntleigh Place Jefferson City, MO 65109 dhirner@awea.org

Enclosed find a certified copy of an Order or Notice issued in the above-referenced matter(s).

Sincerely,

Morris L. Woodruff

Secretary

Recipients listed above with a valid e-mail address will receive electronic service. Recipients without a valid e-mail address will receive paper service.