

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing
March 23, 2017
Missouri Public Service Commission
At Jefferson City
VOLUME 16

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) File No.
Maintain a High Voltage, Direct) EA-2016-0358
Current Transmission Line and an)
Associated Converter Station)
Providing an Interconnection on)
the Maywood-Montgomery 345kV)
Transmission Line)

MICHAEL BUSHMANN, PRESIDING
SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

DANIEL Y. HALL, Chairman
WILLIAM P. KENNEY,
STEPHEN M. STOLL
SCOTT T. RUPP
MAIDA J. COLEMAN,
COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
TARA SCHWAKE, RPR, CRR, CSR

1 APPEARANCES

2 For Grain Belt Express Clean Line, LLC:

3 MR. JOSHUA K.T. HARDEN

4 MR. KARL ZOBRIST

5 MR. CARY KOTTLER

6 MS. MICHELE HALL

7 joshua.harden@dentons.com

8 karl.zobrist@dentons.com

9

10 For Show Me Concerned Landowners:

11 MR. DAVID C. LINTON

12 jdlinton@reagan.com

13

14 For Staff of Missouri Public Service Commission:

15 MR. KEVIN THOMPSON

16 MR. NATHAN WILLIAMS

17 MS. JAMIE MYERS

18 MR. MARK JOHNSON

19 kevin.thompson@psc.mo.gov

20

21 For Missouri Landowners Alliance:

22 MR. PAUL AGATHEN

23 paad408@aol.com

24

25

1 For The Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility
2 Commission:

3 MR. DOUGLAS L. HEALY
4 MS. PEGGY A. WHIPPLE
5 doug@healylawoffice.com
6 peggy.whipple@psc.mo.gov

7

8 For Missouri Farm Bureau:

9 MR. CONNIE S. HADEN
10 connie@showmelaw.com

11

12 For Missouri Department of Economic Development:

13 MR. BRIAN BEAR
14 brian.bear@ded.mo.gov

15

16 For Rockies Express Pipeline:

17 MS. SARAH E. GIBONEY
18 sgiboney@smithlewis.com

19

20 For Infinity Wind Power:

21 MS. TERRI PEMBERTON
22 terri@caferlaw.com

23

24

25

1 For Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers (MIEC):

2 MR. LEWIS MILLS

3 lewis.mills@bryancave.com

4

5 For Wind on the Wires and The Wind Coalition:

6 MR. SEAN R. BRADY

7 sbrady@windonthewires.org

8

9 For Sierra Club and NRDC:

10 MR. HENRY ROBERTSON

11 hrbtn@aol.com

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go on the
3 record. Good morning. Today is March 23, 2017, it
4 is the fourth day in the evidentiary hearing for
5 file number EA-2016-0358.

6 At this point we're ready to take the
7 next witness, which would be the first witness for
8 MJMEUC.

9 MR. HEALY: We would call Duncan
10 Kincheloe to the stand.

11 DUNCAN KINCHELOE,
12 having been called as a witness, was sworn
13 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
14 as follows:

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

17 Q Good morning.

18 A Good morning.

19 Q Can you state your name for the
20 Court, please?

21 A Duncan E. Kincheloe, III.

22 Q And who is your employer, Mr.
23 Kincheloe?

24 A My attorney?

25 Q Your employer.

1 A My employer. Missouri Joint
2 Municipal Electric Utility Commission.

3 Q **What's your position there?**

4 A Chief Executive Officer, President,
5 CEO.

6 Q **And you caused rebuttal testimony to
7 be filed in this case, that's been marked Exhibit
8 475; is that correct?**

9 A That's correct.

10 Q **And if I asked you questions
11 contained in that exhibit and that testimony, would
12 your answers be the same today as they were when
13 they filed that testimony?**

14 A Yes, there are some things that could
15 be updated, but as of the time it was submitted,
16 yes.

17 (Wherein, Exhibit 475 was
18 introduced.)

19 MR. HEALY: Okay, I'd move for the
20 introduction of 475.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Exhibit 475 has been
22 offered. Is there any objection? Hearing none,
23 that is received into the record.

24 MR. HEALY: I would tender the
25 witness for cross.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
2 by Grain Belt.

3 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Robertson, are
5 you representing Sierra Club today?

6 MR. ROBERTSON: Sierra Club and NRDC.
7 No questions.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

9 MR. BRADY: No questions.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

11 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions, Judge.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

13 MR. MILLS: No questions.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. You
16 clearly invited one.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

19 Q What would you update in your
20 testimony?

21 A Well, as to the question regarding
22 indications of municipal interest in renewable
23 power, that was posed in the testimony, the
24 additional indications that I would point to are we
25 have more recently concluded contracts with the --

1 in addition to the MoBap commitment, we've
2 concluded contracts to supply Kirkwood Municipal
3 Utility and I think Mark Petty, Director of
4 Utilities, is here today, for 25 megawatts of power
5 associated with this project, and on Tuesday night
6 the Hannibal City Council authorized and later
7 signed a contract with us for 15 megawatts of
8 power.

9 So that brings that status of
10 completed contracts and commitments to 100
11 megawatts in addition to the 35 megawatts that we
12 have indications that Columbia Water & Light wants
13 to enter into and the megawatt from Centralia. And
14 so those are the current updates as to municipal
15 interests.

16 Q Now, what MJMEUC is obtaining from
17 Grain Belt is transmission only; correct?

18 A From Grain Belt, yes.

19 Q And whenever you're evaluating the
20 economics of obtaining wind power from a source,
21 you need to look at not only the cost of the
22 generation, but also the transmission from the
23 source, do you not?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And are you familiar with multi value

1 projects in MISO?

2 A Yes, generally.

3 Q And are the costs of those spread out
4 among the members of MISO in charge, whether or not
5 the member is using that transmission facility?

6 A What was the last phrase?

7 Q Let me put it this way. Do you know
8 how the cost of those projects are allocated in
9 MISO?

10 A In general fashion, yes.

11 Q And how are they allocated?

12 A They're allocated to those in
13 proportion, theoretically at least, to those
14 members of MISO, participants in MISO that are
15 presumably benefiting from those and for a
16 multi-value project, it would be broadly.

17 Q Well, let me give you an example.
18 Let's say Union Electric Company has a generation
19 source in Iowa that it's going to take power from
20 and bring that power into its load in Missouri. If
21 it's bringing that power across MVP facilities,
22 would it pay an additional amount for that
23 transmission service? Or is it already paid by the
24 cost allocation?

25 A If it's across existing facilities,

1 they are there for general purposes, it's already
2 paying that.

3 **Q What if there are facilities being**
4 **built but they are multi-value project facilities?**
5 **Same answer?**

6 A If they're multi-value projects,
7 well, I'm not sure I should -- I'm not an expert on
8 that. I'd probably defer to my Chief Operating
9 Officer.

10 **Q So if I want to follow up on that, I**
11 **should ask Mr. Grotzinger?**

12 A Certainly he would be better able to
13 follow up on that line of questioning, yes.

14 **Q Do you know if any Missouri utilities**
15 **who serve load are obtaining power from southwest**
16 **Kansas presently?**

17 A I'm not certain. I know City
18 Utilities of Springfield has some power in Kansas,
19 but exactly what part of Kansas, I'm not certain.

20 **Q You don't know anything about what --**
21 **where KCPL is obtaining any of its energy?**

22 A I'm not familiar with KCPL's
23 supplier.

24 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

1 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

3 MR. LINTON: No questions.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

5 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 CROSS-EXAMINATION

7 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

8 Q Good morning, Mr. Kincheloe. As I
9 understand your situation, MJMEUC plans to use 60
10 megawatts of the capacity in the Grain Belt for the
11 MoPEP group; is that correct?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Just for the sake of the reporter,
14 MJMEUC is M-J-M-E-U-C, correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And MoPEP is what?

17 A MoPEP? Missouri Public Energy Pool
18 Number 1.

19 Q And what's the acronym we're using?

20 A M-o-P-E-P.

21 Q Thank you. MJMEUC will basically
22 sell that 60 megawatts to individual municipal
23 systems which are members of MoPEP; right?

24 A That's generally right, yes.

25 Q And members of MJMEUC which are not

1 members of MoPEP could also purchase capacity on
2 the line, at least up to the 200 megawatt limit;
3 correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q And at this point Grain Belt is
6 saying they expect to energize the line in November
7 of 2021; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Do you consider that you and MJMEUC
10 have a fiduciary duty to the member systems in
11 MJMEUC?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And do you believe that your
14 fiduciary duty brings with it an obligation to
15 periodically review the possible alternatives which
16 might used in lieu of the Grain Belt contract?

17 A That might be used what?

18 Q In lieu of the Grain Belt contract?

19 A Well, that's an essential function of
20 MJMEUC is to stay abreast of power supply
21 opportunities and to present those opportunities to
22 our members for utilities.

23 Q So the answer would be yes?

24 A As I understand your question, yes.

25 Q We don't know at this point what will

1 be available even three years from now, do we?

2 A There will be additional occurrences
3 between now and three years from now, yes.

4 Q We don't have a crystal ball,
5 unfortunately?

6 A We do not.

7 Q Passing planning's a lot more
8 difficult now than it used to be, isn't it?

9 A Yes, I suppose that's true.

10 Q On a different subject, I assume you
11 weren't able to attend the local public hearings in
12 this case in Hannibal, were you?

13 A No, I was not.

14 Q That's one of the cities which has
15 shown an interest in signing up for power on the
16 Grain Belt line?

17 A We have a contract with the City of
18 Hannibal, yes.

19 Q If the officials from Hannibal
20 testified at those hearings that the lower cost
21 power from the Grain Belt line would allow them to
22 attract new investment and new jobs into their
23 city, would you agree with that?

24 A I would -- I would believe them if
25 they said that, yes.

1 **Q Do you believe that lower cost**
2 **electricity rates from the Grain Belt line will**
3 **allow participating cities to attract new**
4 **investment and new jobs?**

5 **A I think it improves the odds for**
6 **that. More importantly, I'm convinced it will help**
7 **many of the smaller communities, particularly in**
8 **northern Missouri, to retain the economic activity**
9 **that's currently in those cities.**

10 **Q By reason of these lower rates?**

11 **A Exactly.**

12 **Q Not all MJMEUC members will be taking**
13 **power from the Grain Belt line, will they?**

14 **A That's correct.**

15 **Q So some municipalities will get the**
16 **advantages of the discounted rate provided by a**
17 **contract with Grain Belt and others will not;**
18 **correct?**

19 **A Only those that choose to.**

20 **Q And so the cities, the ones without**
21 **the discounted rates, will be at a disadvantage in**
22 **attracting new investment vis-a-vis the cities**
23 **getting the discounted Grain Belt rate; right?**

24 **A Well, presumably they're making that**
25 **judgment based on their opportunities to take**

1 advantage of other supplies that are most
2 advantageous to them.

3 Q But if they don't take advantage of
4 the lower MJMEUC rate, they will be at a
5 disadvantage vis-a-vis the ones who get the
6 discounted rate?

7 A Well, as I say, I think every
8 municipal utility makes its judgment as to what the
9 most advantageous supply opportunity we can present
10 to them or they can find elsewhere.

11 Q But if you hit the 200 megawatt
12 limit, then that discounted rate is no longer
13 available to these other municipal systems;
14 correct?

15 A Okay. Yeah, if our opportunity is
16 limited to 200 megawatts.

17 Q On a different subject, you told us
18 that after this Commission's decision in the 2014
19 case, the first time Grain Belt approached you
20 again about buying capacity on their line was
21 September 22 of 2015. Is that about correct?

22 A I think that's the best knowledge we
23 could find based on somebody searching the records
24 for us.

25 Q So about two to three months,

1 roughly, after the order was issued?

2 A If that's what order was issued, yes.

3 Q And in January of 2015 Grain Belt
4 initiated their first open solicitation of bids for
5 capacity on the line; is that approximately right?

6 A Apparently so.

7 Q And Grain Belt made sure you were
8 aware of that bidding process, didn't they?

9 A In January of 2015 did you say?

10 Q January 2015 or within a couple
11 months thereafter?

12 A Yeah, I can't say I was made
13 personally aware of that.

14 Q Well, they made you aware of the fact
15 that there was an open solicitation that they were
16 accepting bids, did they not?

17 A I assume that they notified us. I
18 can't say I was aware of it at the time. Now.
19 Personally.

20 Q Mr. Kincheloe, I'm handing you a copy
21 of an e-mail which is dated February 25th of 2015
22 from someone at Clean Line and they do mention at
23 that point in their e-mail that they are taking
24 bids for capacity, do they not?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Despite the fact that submitting a
2 bid was risk free and cost free, did MJMEUC submit
3 a bid to Grain Belt in response to their January
4 2015 open solicitation?

5 A We were in the midst of a study at
6 that time, so I don't believe that we did.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Can I get you to
8 move a little closer to the mic? Thank you.

9 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) So you didn't see a
10 need at that point to buy capacity on the Grain
11 Belt line; is that correct?

12 A At that time, that's correct.

13 Q And just one more series of
14 questions. You mentioned some municipal systems
15 this morning, I believe, which expressed an
16 interest in signing up for the Grain Belt capacity?

17 A Yes.

18 Q You didn't mention the City of
19 Kirkwood, did you?

20 A I thought I had. Kirkwood has signed
21 a contract for 25 megawatts.

22 Q I take that back, I do see that. We
23 asked you for a copy of the documents which would
24 indicate an expression of -- or a binding contract
25 by your member utilities to take capacity from the

1 **Grain Belt line. Do you recall that?**

2 A I'm -- I think I'm generally aware of
3 that.

4 Q **And the only contract you provided**
5 **was the one with the City of Kirkwood, was it not?**

6 A If that's the state of the record,
7 I...

8 MR. HEALY: Judge, I'd object. We
9 actually supplemented that DR yesterday morning
10 with the Hannibal contract as well, and I'm not
11 sure opposing counsel may have seen the DR update.

12 MR. AGATHEN: So you gave us two
13 contracts at this point?

14 MR. HEALY: Total of three. The
15 commitment to MoPEP for 60, and then Hannibal for
16 15, and Kirkwood for 25; correct.

17 Q **(BY MR. AGATHEN) Mr. Kincheloe, I'm**
18 **handing you a copy of a document and asking you if**
19 **that's a copy of your contract with the City of**
20 **Kirkwood and MJMEUC to purchase the capacity on the**
21 **Grain Belt line?**

22 A Yes, it appears to be.

23 Q **And that contract was dated as of**
24 **March 15, 2017?**

25 A Yes.

1 Q Now, if you'd look on the third to
2 the last paragraph on the first page, it defines
3 the term, an acronym KWPI. Do you see that?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And what does KWPI mean, just so it's
6 clear later on?

7 MR. HEALY: Just for the record, it's
8 KWP1.

9 MR. AGATHEN: KWP1, I'm sorry.

10 A Yes. Kansas Wind Project Number 1.

11 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Now, if you turn to
12 page 4 of the contract under section 2.3, that's
13 titled Expected Duration of KWP1. Is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And in the middle of that paragraph
16 there's a sentence which states as follows:
17 "MJMEUC has certain early termination options with
18 respect to the TSA and the wind energy PPA. In the
19 event that MJMEUC, after consultation with KWP1
20 committee, exercises any such early termination
21 option, and as a result prematurely terminates
22 KWP1, MJMEUC will render a final invoice to city
23 under section point 59, and this agreement shall be
24 terminated upon city's payment of such invoice."

25 Is that what it says?

1 A Yes, that's what it says.

2 Q And when you say there, "with respect
3 to the TSA," that's the contract between MJMEUC and
4 Grain Belt?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the wind energy PPA is the
7 contract between MJMEUC and Infinity Wind for the
8 supply of energy?

9 A Yes, Iron Star Energy and Infinity.

10 Q If you turn to page 5, please? Under
11 section 3.1, there's a statement that says, "This
12 agreement is and shall remain identical to the
13 agreements between MJMEUC and all other member city
14 KWP1 participants." Is that correct?

15 A P1, yes.

16 Q So all the cities that sign up for
17 capacity on the Grain Belt line will have basically
18 the same provisions as this contract has?

19 A That's correct. Now, I should
20 distinguish that -- well. From the arrangement,
21 the basis for the arrangement with the MoPEP rule,
22 the circumstances are the same but the process of
23 contracting is different.

24 Q Right. But the contracts with the
25 additional cities would contain all these

1 provisions?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q Thank you. And then down at the
4 bottom of page 5 under section 3.5, it says, "The
5 parties expressly acknowledge that KWP1 does not
6 include and therefore this agreement provides city
7 no rights to use any of MJMEUC's rights under the
8 TSA to deliver certain quantities of energy to PJM
9 interconnection." Is that correct?

10 A That's right.

11 MR. AGATHEN: That's all the
12 questions I have, Judge. Thank you, Mr. Kincheloe.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by
14 Commissioners?

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, just a few.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

18 Q Good morning.

19 A Good morning.

20 Q I'm a little confused. Are -- is
21 there any overlap at all between the -- the MoPEP
22 cities and the MJMEUC cities? Are those two
23 separate sets of cities?

24 A No. All the cities that we serve are
25 MJMEUC cities. There is a subset of MoPEP.

1 **Q Okay. So the subset of the MJMEUC,**
2 **the MoPEP, that's 35 cities?**

3 A Correct.

4 **Q And there is a contract in place for**
5 **60 megawatts for those 35 cities; is that correct?**

6 A Yes. Essentially the 35 cities
7 constituting MoPEP have identical contracts, each
8 of them, with MJMEUC. And MJMEUC is obligated to
9 supply all of their power requirements on the same
10 basis.

11 So then MoPEP cities, as a collective
12 group of their committee, will make decisions as to
13 what resources MJMEUC should acquire or contract
14 for to serve them. And the MJMEUC will approve
15 those arrangements for whatever the portfolio of
16 supplies is to be and commit those resources
17 contracted by MJMEUC for MoPEP to the MoPEP cities.

18 **Q Okay. And so right now there is a**
19 **commitment of 60 megawatts for MoPEP and then 25**
20 **megawatts for Kirkwood and 15 for Hannibal?**

21 A Correct.

22 **Q And you've -- and that totals 100?**

23 A Yes.

24 **Q And you've mentioned a 35 megawatt**
25 **negotiation with Columbia; is that correct?**

1 A Yes. It's my understanding that
2 Columbia Water & Light personnel determined that 35
3 megawatts is what they want to serve their needs.
4 That the process of going through the various
5 departments, legal and finance at Columbia have not
6 yet been completed as they haven't been presented
7 to the council.

8 Q **And Columbia is a MJMEUC member?**

9 A Yes.

10 Q **And when would you expect that --
11 that would be finalized?**

12 A I, you know, the process at Columbia,
13 you know, as with the Iatan project, the Prairie
14 State Project, that Columbia also participants in,
15 they are a little slower than -- they're a larger
16 city, so more process, more people to go through, I
17 really shouldn't guess.

18 Q **Okay. And then you mentioned one
19 megawatt with Centralia?**

20 A Yes.

21 Q **Would you anticipate additional
22 cities signing up?**

23 A Certainly.

24 Q **Would you expect the full 200 to be
25 fully subscribed at some point in time?**

1 A I am optimistic that would be the
2 case, yes.

3 Q And each of the cities is getting --
4 up to the 200 is getting the same price?

5 A Right.

6 Q If for whatever reason the Grain Belt
7 line is not constructed, would -- would MJMEUC
8 consider continuing its contract with Illinois
9 Power Marketing?

10 A Well, those are basically two
11 different considerations. Basically, I mean, two
12 independent decisions. I think our commitments
13 under the contracts with Grain Belt and Infinity
14 are as they are. They aren't really dependent on
15 or connected to what happens with Illinois Power
16 Marketing contract in the future.

17 Illinois Power Marketing contract
18 expires in 2021. We've basically made the judgment
19 this is the time to look for the least cost
20 alternative to, you know, pursue in view of that
21 expiration in 2021, so we've made the other --
22 we've made these arrangements.

23 Q I guess I'm not sure I understand.
24 So there is a chance that you might continue that
25 contract with Illinois Power regardless of what

1 **happens with Grain Belt?**

2 A Well, we would -- very unlikely we'd
3 continue it, you know, at the current quantities or
4 certainly on the same terms. But not the same
5 terms I think, that's for certain. The -- the
6 quantities would depend on our needs at that time
7 with, you know, given by 2021 where our loads might
8 be, whether there might be our municipalities that
9 join the MoPEP, or other things that might happen
10 between now and then, I shouldn't prejudge what
11 those developments might be or what we might do
12 with Illinois Power Marketing, but that would be,
13 you know, a separate determination that would be
14 taken into account given the status of what other
15 arrangements we've made between now and then,
16 including these arrangements.

17 Q **Concerning the cost savings to the**
18 **retail rate payers in your 68 cities, would that --**
19 **should I ask those questions to you or should I ask**
20 **those questions to Mr. Grotzinger?**

21 A I think I understand the bottom
22 lines. I don't do calculations, so --

23 Q **I'll just ask this question and we**
24 **will see how it goes. When you do your analysis**
25 **for the cost savings, are you comparing the price**

1 **you're paying under the Grain Belt contract with**
2 **the price you're currently paying for Illinois**
3 **Power Marketing? Or what are you comparing it to?**

4 A There are at least two different sort
5 of measurements of savings that we've offered. One
6 of them is strictly with respect to transmission
7 service, and that is, we have identified the wind
8 contract here, through an RFP process, as our
9 lowest cost energy alternative.

10 And so in terms of serving that,
11 bringing that power to our municipal utilities,
12 there is a savings in transmission costs.

13 **Q Savings compared from what to what?**

14 A Well, as compared to the applicable
15 SPP tariffs and associated circumstance of using
16 that transmission versus the Grain Belt Express
17 alternative.

18 And so those savings, given our best
19 estimates of circumstances at that time, is
20 probably in the range of 9 to \$11 million. On
21 transmission costs. There is a different
22 calculation that is pertinent to the MoPEP service
23 and with regard to that calculation which, when we
24 look at the decision that the MoPEP committee made
25 in exercising this alternative, we're looking at

1 the differential, the cost of the wind power -- the
2 wind energy, the wind power, and the associated
3 Grain Belt service and comparing that to the
4 Illinois Power Marketing contract that will expire
5 about the time this power becomes available through
6 Grain Belt.

7 Coincidentally, that savings for both
8 power and transmission service combined, primarily
9 for the power difference, for the MOPEP cities
10 comes to just under \$11 million, as we currently
11 would expect to combine this wind power with other
12 resources to, you know, provide the equivalent
13 service to the Illinois Power Marketing contract.

14 **Q And would you expect all those**
15 **savings to be passed through dollar for dollar to**
16 **the retail -- I mean, to residential and commercial**
17 **rate payers, and industrial I guess?**

18 **A** The municipal and utilities that
19 participate in the project will receive those
20 savings dollar for dollar. So, you know, there are
21 either rate relief, there's probably also, you
22 know, some deferred maintenance.

23 We have in our utilities,
24 particularly some of the utilities that are
25 smallest in communities that are struggling

1 economically currently and that this will help
2 address, there's probably some deferred maintenance
3 and other things that need to be addressed by those
4 utilities.

5 So I can't say to what extent those
6 utilities and municipal governance, Boards of
7 Aldermen and so forth, would determine to provide
8 rate relief versus other investment in their
9 distribution systems.

10 **Q What is your understanding of**
11 **MJMEUC's obligations under the -- under the TSA to**
12 **purchase the -- to purchase the energy?**

13 A Well, we have -- we have signed the
14 contract with Infinity Iron Star. We are obligated
15 to take that power and pay for it, assuming the
16 Grain Belt Express line is built and is available
17 for service. Our obligation to take service over
18 Grain Belt exists contingent only on --

19 **Q So you don't believe that you could**
20 **-- you -- tomorrow you could sign another contract**
21 **and revoke the TSA? You feel like you have a**
22 **contractual obligation under that?**

23 A Yes, absolutely.

24 **Q Are there any liquidated damages or**
25 **any -- any discussion of what the damages would be**

1 for your -- for taking -- if you were to try to
2 revoke that contract?

3 A I can't say that I'm personally
4 familiar with that right now. It's not our
5 expectation to revoke or breach that contract and
6 so I -- I can't say that I have in mind at the
7 moment what damages might apply.

8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you. I have no
9 further questions.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:

12 Q Good morning. I just have one
13 question.

14 A Yes, sir.

15 Q You said 10 to 11 million dollar
16 savings to the folks that live -- that would
17 receive this power, and I didn't catch over what
18 period. Is that over the life of contract?

19 A No, no, that's an annual number.
20 Those were annual numbers I was referring to, yes.

21 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thank
22 you.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
24 bench questions?

25 Grain Belt Express?

1 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.
2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?
3 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.
4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?
5 MR. BRADY: No, thank you, sir.
6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?
7 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.
8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?
9 MR. MILLS: No questions.
10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?
11 MR. WILLIAMS: No, thank you.
12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?
13 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.
14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?
15 MR. LINTON: No questions.
16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?
17 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
18 Honor.
19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by MJMEUC?
20 MR. HEALY: Just a few questions,
21 Judge. Both Staff and Chairman Hall asked about
22 the contract status, and if I could distribute
23 what's been marked as Exhibit 478 and 479.
24 (Wherein, Exhibits 478 and 479 were
25 introduced.)

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

3 Q Mr. Kincheloe, if you could look at
4 Exhibit 478, can you identify what that is?

5 A Yes. It's a -- it's a question posed
6 to John Grotzinger, data request basically.

7 Q Okay. On the third page there is a
8 second supplemental response, paragraph A. Can you
9 read what that is, please?

10 A Read it?

11 Q Yes.

12 A "Please see attached final minutes
13 from the December 2016 meeting of MJMEUC."

14 Q And are you familiar with that
15 meeting in December 2016?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And what those minutes reflect?

18 A Yes.

19 Q In the significance of this
20 Commission, what do those minutes reflect?

21 A Those minutes would reflect the
22 commitment of the -- for the benefit of the MoPEP
23 pool, participation of the Grain Belt project, and
24 the -- yes. 60 megawatt, the 60 megawatts.

25 MR. HEALY: Okay, I move for the

1 introduction of 478.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

3 Hearing none, that's received.

4 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Mr. Kincheloe, you've
5 been handed Exhibit 479, it's data request JG-.55
6 and that data request requested copies of documents
7 showing commitment from the municipalities.

8 Can you identify Exhibit 479, what it
9 concludes?

10 A Yes. It's the MJMEUC contract with
11 the City of Kirkwood for participation in this
12 project.

13 Q And is there a second contract at the
14 back of that exhibit? For another city? I think
15 if you go to the last page of that exhibit.

16 A Yes. That would be the contract
17 executed with the City of Hannibal, same project.

18 MR. HEALY: I move for the
19 introduction of 479.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

21 Hearing none, it is received.

22 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Mr. Agathen asked you
23 earlier about all the cities receiving the
24 benefits. Would you agree that the cities that are
25 able to implement a power supply depends on a lot

1 of things, including existing power supply as well
2 as to which the transmission network is connected
3 to?

4 A Certainly.

5 Q Would that influence their decision
6 whether to enter into additional power supply
7 contracts?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And if I can refer you back to
10 Exhibit 479, Mr. Agathen asked you about a
11 particular provision of the contract that's all the
12 same, that's provision 2.3 of that contract. And
13 it's 2.3 is the same, both the Hannibal and
14 Kirkwood contract. Would you turn to that please?

15 A Yes.

16 Q The early termination provisions that
17 he referenced, that would include the out that
18 MJMEUC has if GBX does not receive the CCN from
19 this Commission; is that correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And it is your understanding it's the
22 intent of 273 that if the line is not built and
23 doesn't receive regulatory approval, that these
24 contracts would not be fulfilled; is that correct?

25 A That's correct.

1 MR. HEALY: No further questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Kincheloe, that
3 completes your testimony, sir. You may step down.

4 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

5 (Witness excused.)

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Ready for the next
7 witness.

8 MR. HEALY: Call John Grotzinger to
9 the stand.

10 JOHN GROTZINGER,
11 having been called as a witness, was sworn
12 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
13 as follows:

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

16 Q State your name for the record,
17 please?

18 A John Grotzinger.

19 Q Who is your employer, Mr. Grotzinger?

20 A MJMEUC, otherwise known as Missouri
21 Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission.

22 Q And what's your position there?

23 A Chief Operating Officer.

24 Q And did you cause rebuttal and
25 surrebuttal testimony to be filed in this

1 particular case that's been marked Exhibit 476?

2 A Yes, I did.

3 Q 477?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q Okay. If I asked you the questions
6 contained in Exhibits 476 and 477, would your
7 answers be the same today as when you initially
8 completed that testimony?

9 A Yes, they would.

10 (Wherein, Exhibits 476HC NP and 477HC
11 NP were introduced.)

12 MR. HEALY: I move for the
13 introduction of Exhibits 476 and 477.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?
15 Hearing none, 476HC NP and 477HC NP are received.

16 MR. HEALY: Tender the witness for
17 cross.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Grain Belt?

19 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

21 (No audible response.)

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

23 MR. BRADY: No questions.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

25 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions, Judge.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

2 MR. MILLS: No questions.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff?

4 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. Just a
5 few.

6 CROSS-EXAMINATION

7 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

8 Q Good morning, Mr. Grotzinger.

9 A Good morning.

10 Q Do you know if any load serving
11 entities in Missouri are obtaining any wind energy
12 out of southwest Kansas, currently?

13 A There are some that, depending on how
14 you define "southwest Kansas," both Springfield and
15 Independence do receive wind out of Kansas. South.
16 Southern Kansas.

17 Q And do you know when they started
18 obtaining that wind energy?

19 A I'm not completely familiar, but it's
20 been several years ago.

21 Q Do you know why they elected to take
22 that wind energy?

23 A I believe it was a combination of
24 price and other reasons that made -- made sense to
25 them in their portfolio.

1 Q Do you know why they haven't added
2 additional wind to the portfolios?

3 A They have.

4 Q Since that point in time?

5 A Yes, they have.

6 Q And I assume that's wind from some
7 other source?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And do you know why they would have
10 elected to take wind from a different source than
11 southwest Kansas?

12 A That was an initial entry into the
13 market for them. They have continued to expand
14 that.

15 Q You're talking about taking wind in
16 general when you say that?

17 A Yes. Not necessarily from that
18 location.

19 Q What I'm trying to get at is do you
20 know why that location would not be a location they
21 continued to source from?

22 A It has significant congestion in that
23 area in spite of being a very good wind resource.

24 Q When you say "congestion," you're
25 talking about transmission availability?

1 A Transmission limitations that are
2 modeled in the market with congestion as a method
3 of relief with the new markets.

4 **Q And from where are -- well, I'll**
5 **start with Springfield. Do you know where it's**
6 **subsequently getting its wind energy?**

7 A I believe it's a wind farm in
8 Oklahoma.

9 **Q And Independence, do you know where**
10 **it's getting its wind from?**

11 A Northern Kansas.

12 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.
13 Thank you.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Rockies
15 Express?

16 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

18 MR. LINTON: Thank you, Judge.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

21 **Q Good morning, Mr. Grotzinger.**

22 A Good morning.

23 **Q If the Commission were to disapprove**
24 **this application, that wouldn't keep MJMEUC from**
25 **being able to get its resources, get its supply to**

1 **meet its reserve obligation and its load?**

2 A It would not prevent it, but we would
3 expect that it would likely raise the cost of being
4 able to supply that.

5 Q At page 5, line 16 of your rebuttal
6 testimony, you assume congestion prices in the
7 range of \$2 per megawatt to \$10 per megawatt. Is
8 that correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And you also, you also indicate on
11 line 23 of that same page that congestion prices
12 are hard to predict?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And would you say that they're harder
15 to predict the further you go out into the future?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And why is that?

18 A The compilation of factors.
19 Additional resources being added, transmission
20 improvements being made, other units being retired
21 in other regions. So there's a variety of reasons.

22 Q And the transmission components that
23 you talk about would be the MVP from MISO?

24 A In the MISO footprint, yes.

25 Q The priority projects from SPP?

1 A Those would be -- both of those would
2 be included in the relative regions, yes.

3 Q And then the possibility of an
4 interregional transmission project that FERC Order
5 1000 might facilitate?

6 A That could be, depending on your time
7 frame, if you're talking ten years, but it does
8 take a significant lead time for much of this
9 project.

10 Q Thank you. Now your range of \$2 to
11 \$10 per megawatt, that's a pretty broad range,
12 isn't it?

13 A Yes.

14 Q If we look at the midpoint of that
15 range being \$6 per megawatt, the range is larger
16 than -- than the actual estimate of the congestion
17 charge; correct?

18 A The range is, the high end of the
19 range is larger.

20 Q But the range itself is 2 to 10.
21 That's 8. And the actual midpoint is 6.

22 A Yes.

23 Q So the range is larger than the
24 actual estimate.

25 A Yes.

1 Q Okay. So take a look at your JG- --
2 Schedule JG-3, please. That's your comparison
3 between Grain Belt project versus SPP to MISO.

4 A I'm looking for that schedule.

5 Q Okay.

6 A Okay. Got it. Yes.

7 Q So your -- your columns, and the
8 columns starting out with the term to the left,
9 approximately, your columns there are your
10 assumption of the SPP transmission rate?

11 A That's the second column, yes.

12 Q And the capacity factor of 50 percent
13 for the regeneration, I assume?

14 A That's the conservative assumption I
15 made.

16 Q Okay. And then your contract price
17 for your assumed wind generation rate at that time?

18 A Right.

19 Q The Infinity Wind contract is
20 different from that; correct?

21 A That would approximate the delivered
22 price.

23 Q Okay. And then going across, those
24 are your congestion prices, those are your 2 to 10
25 that you identify in your rebuttal testimony;

1 correct?

2 A That's the first of the -- each of
3 those rows, yes.

4 Q Then on the left-hand side you come
5 up with four scenarios for transmission through
6 SPP; is that correct?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q Okay. And then you come up with two
9 scenarios for Grain Belt Express project for the
10 cost of that; right?

11 A That's correct, yes.

12 Q And then finally in the red down at
13 the bottom you calculate the difference between the
14 various scenarios?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Okay. So if we go on across and just
17 take the example in column number 2, or column for
18 congestion with \$2 per megawatt, what you do there
19 is you multiply your congestion charge of \$2 per
20 megawatt hour times your energy generated megawatt
21 hours to come up with the five twenty-five six
22 hundred; is that right?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And then you add that to your
25 transmission charge and your energy charge; is that

1 right? To come up with the number immediately
2 below the congestion charge?

3 A The energy losses charge, yes. In
4 addition to that, yes.

5 Q And that gets you your SPP cost and
6 if you go on down to and compare that calculation
7 with the first one under Grain Belt Express of 60
8 megawatts TSA Grain Belt cost, if you subtract the
9 3.4 million -- no excuse me. Strike that.

10 If you subtract the \$1,020,000 from
11 the \$2.7 million above in that column, you come up
12 with your difference, your cost saving; is that
13 right?

14 A Yes, for the 60 megawatt example,
15 yes.

16 Q Okay. Now, turn to your Schedule
17 JG-5.

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q Strike that. JG-6, I'm sorry. What
20 was the congestion factor you calculated in JG-6?

21 A It depended on -- it depended on the
22 site.

23 Q For SPP?

24 A Excuse me, you're looking at JG-6,
25 comparing the different wind resources to Grain

1 Belt?

2 Q Right. What was the congestion adder
3 you had for SPP in JG-6?

4 A Oh, in this one I assumed, for the
5 point to get out of SPP, the congestion of \$2.

6 Q Okay. What would happen to your
7 calculation in Schedule JG-3 if you included a
8 column with 1 as your congestion charge?

9 A That would lower it significantly,
10 but that would essentially limit it to the
11 congestion essentially at the interface between SPP
12 and MISO, or very close to it.

13 Q Now what was your basis for
14 concluding that the range from 2 to 10 was a
15 reasonable range for congestion?

16 A Historical information and
17 experience.

18 Q What historical information?

19 A Pulling from the SPP resources there
20 as far as congestion from a variety of points
21 within the SPP footprint.

22 MR. LINTON: Your Honor, I previously
23 filed what has been marked as Exhibit 406HC, and
24 I've given it to the court reporter.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Very good.

1 (Wherein, Exhibit 406 was
2 introduced.)

3 MR. LINTON: I've also made copies of
4 the relevant pages that I'd like to ask the witness
5 some questions on and I've already provided a copy
6 of that to opposing counsel.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Very good.

8 MR. HEALY: I would ask if the
9 questions are going to be HC in nature, we go in
10 camera.

11 MR. LINTON: I would rely on you to
12 make that call, but I would assume so myself.

13 MR. HEALY: Judge, since the exhibit
14 is HC in its entirety, if there's going to be
15 questions on it, I would ask that it go in camera.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. We're
17 going into closed session. Anybody in the audience
18 that's not authorized to listen to highly
19 confidential information will need to step outside
20 for a few minutes.

21 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an
22 in-camera session was held, which is contained in
23 Volume 17 - Pages 1019 through 1039.)

24

25

1 (REPORTER'S NOTE: Back in open
2 session.)

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Back on the record
4 and back in open session. And ready for
5 cross-examination by Missouri Landowners.

6 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Judge.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

9 Q Good morning, Mr. Grotzinger.

10 A Good morning.

11 Q Grain Belt first approached you at
12 least two to three years ago about buying capacity
13 on their line, did they not?

14 A I don't know that I personally had
15 contact. I think it was late '15 that I personally
16 was involved.

17 Q Right. But some -- they contacted
18 someone earlier than that?

19 A Yes.

20 Q All right. And as Mr. Kincheloe just
21 testified, when they first approached you about
22 buying capacity on the line, you declined to buy
23 any; is that correct?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q At about the time that Grain Belt

1 initiated their first open solicitation for bids in
2 early 2015, they approached you again, did they
3 not?

4 A I believe they approached someone,
5 yes.

6 Q It wouldn't have cost you a dime to
7 submit a bid for that first open solicitation,
8 would it not?

9 A That's my understanding.

10 Q And submitting a bid would not have
11 committed you to buy any capacity at all, would it?

12 A That's my understanding.

13 Q Basically risk free?

14 A Yes.

15 Q But MJMEUC decided it wasn't
16 interested enough in buying capacity on the Grain
17 Belt line to even submit a bid in that early 2015
18 open solicitation; correct?

19 A That is correct. We were engaged --
20 engaging in the IRP and really wanted to have some
21 additional results from that process before we
22 expanded.

23 Q So then after that first open
24 solicitation was completed and you hadn't bid, they
25 came back again; right?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And they were also contacting
3 individual municipalities in an attempt to sign
4 them up, were they not?

5 A That's my understanding, yes.

6 Q And asking basically those individual
7 municipalities to try and support Grain Belt
8 through MJMEUC?

9 A I think there was different requests
10 but I think it was consistent that they were
11 looking for support from municipalities.

12 Q Let's go back to late -- late in the
13 year of 2015, say, November of 2015. At that point
14 was it apparent to you that Grain Belt thought it
15 was important to sign up a utility in Missouri
16 before they went back to this Commission?

17 MR. HEALY: Objection, Judge, that's
18 calling for speculation. He doesn't know what
19 Grain Belt thought or knew.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

21 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Mr. Grotzinger, I'm
22 going to hand you a copy of a data request we sent
23 to you and your response to it which includes a
24 series of e-mails. These things are always put in
25 reverse order, unfortunately, but if we look at the

1 first e-mail the bottom of page 2, it was sent from
2 Chad Davis on October 29, 2015. Is that correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Who is Chad Davis?

5 A He was the utility director at
6 Trenton, Missouri.

7 Q And it was sent to you and to Mr.
8 Kincheloe and Floyd Glizow, G-l-i-z-o-w (sic)?

9 A Floyd Gilzow, yes.

10 Q And who is he?

11 A He was formerly our VP of member and
12 government relations.

13 Q And the e-mail says in part, looking
14 at the first paragraph, quote, "Clean Line energy
15 contacted me yesterday to request getting together
16 to talk about the Grain Belt Express project. I
17 get the feel they are contacting a lot of cities in
18 northern Missouri. Not sure but I assume they are
19 focusing on those with electric operations."

20 Correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And then down the bottom, last
23 paragraph, he says, "I also wanted to pass this
24 alert along in case you may start getting calls
25 from other cities, trying to figure out why they're

1 being called about this project," et cetera.

2 Correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q The second e-mail right above that is
5 from Mr. Gilzow dated October 29, 2015, sent to Mr.
6 Chad Davis and yourself and Mr. Kincheloe; right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And he says, "Chad, thanks. As you
9 are probably aware, Clean Line lost an important
10 vote before the PSC by a narrow margin in the last
11 few months to allow their project to proceed. I
12 suspect they will be attempting to line up support
13 for the next attempt. Would love to know what they
14 present and what they are asking you to do." Is
15 that correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And then the next e-mail, if you look
18 over at the other page, it indicates that it was
19 sent from you on October 29, 2015, to Mr. Gilzow,
20 to Chad Davis, and to Duncan Kincheloe; correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And looking back at the contents of
23 the e-mail, you said, "Chad," quote, "to pile on
24 what Floyd said, they are clearly looking for
25 support after losing vote. What they don't get is

1 that the Missouri munis are already engaged in wind
2 and other renewables. They don't really add value
3 for Missouri since most get value on east and skips
4 Missouri. They are not willing to share that value
5 of transmission on east (I asked). Not that it
6 would justify commitment, but that is academic
7 since they are not willing to include. They are
8 not fixing transmission issues, only trying to
9 bypass responsibility and leave others with the
10 cost of underlying transmission system." Signed,
11 "John." Is that correct?

12 A Yes. There was some additional
13 information attached to this. I don't see in what
14 -- what you've given me.

15 Q Well, that's because we weren't given
16 the additional information.

17 And then finally, there is one other
18 e-mail from Mr. Davis dated November 9, 2015. You
19 see that?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And he says, "While Clean Line is
22 definitely trying to get local support in an effort
23 to get PSC approval in Missouri, attached is some
24 information they provided today. They did not say
25 any of this is confidential but I assume we want to

1 keep it close to the vest. With that said, though,
2 I did also mention that I think they are to try to
3 get support for the PSC from communities like
4 Trenton and MoPEP membership. The most viable path
5 seems to go through MJMEUC and not individual
6 cities since very few individual cities would have
7 the ability to tap into this resource directly or
8 in a cost effective manner unless they were
9 presumably very close to the converter station
10 where the tie would be fairly short, either direct
11 or through another system. I think they have
12 definitely realized the complexity of city electric
13 supplies at MJMEUC and, therefore, interest in the
14 project is a lot more complicated than they had
15 anticipated." Is that correct?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Thank you.

18 A Trenton -- Trenton is a member of
19 MoPEP, I might clarify that.

20 Q Sure. So as late as November of 2015
21 you saw no need to buy capacity on the Grain Belt
22 line; right?

23 A Based on the information I had
24 available at that time as to what they were
25 offering, and that gets to the page I referenced of

1 the information they were indicating for pricing
2 and availability and so forth.

3 Q You saw no need based on what they
4 were telling you?

5 A Based on that information.

6 Q From Grain Belt.

7 A From -- that I received from Chad
8 that I believe was from Grain Belt.

9 Q Thank you. Grain Belt opened up a
10 second round, or a second window of bidding in
11 February of 2016, did they not?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Had you come to at least a tentative
14 terms on a deal with Grain Belt even before they
15 opened up that second round of bidding in February
16 of 2016?

17 A We had had some discussions. I'm not
18 sure I would go so far as your description. But we
19 had had some discussions and they had provided some
20 additional information, which, frankly, did change
21 my perspective from what I offered to Chad.

22 Q And had you come to at least
23 tentative terms on any of the provisions in the
24 contract?

25 MR. HEALY: Object to that, Judge,

1 it's already been asked, Mr. Grotzinger answered it
2 to his ability.

3 MR. AGATHEN: I'll remove the
4 question.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right.

6 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) On a different
7 subject, MJMEUC currently has a contract with an
8 Illinois Power Marketer which is set to expire in
9 the year 2021; correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q What month does that contract expire?

12 A It expires the end of May.

13 Q And is that for 100 megawatts?

14 A Correct.

15 Q And that basically supplies the power
16 for the MoPEP group; is that correct?

17 A That contract is allocated to MoPEP,
18 yes.

19 Q Is that a full requirements contract?

20 A No, it is not.

21 Q The peak load of MoPEP is about 60
22 megawatts, is it not?

23 A No.

24 Q What is the peak?

25 A The all-time peak is 572 megawatts.

1 Q Oh, I'm sorry. So that Illinois
2 contract supplies a portion of the requirements?

3 A Correct.

4 Q At some point you realized you'd need
5 to start seriously looking for a means of replacing
6 that Illinois contract; right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And eventually you selected on the
9 Grain Belt line as a means of replacing that
10 contract?

11 A As a portion of the replacement for
12 that contract, yes.

13 Q When you signed up with Grain Belt to
14 replace the Illinois contract, what was your next
15 best alternative as far as pricing went?

16 A Well, it's a portfolio. I mean,
17 that's -- it was not a single source that we were
18 considering.

19 Q Well, what was the next best
20 alternative to Grain Belt?

21 A From the, if you're -- I'm not sure I
22 understand your perspective.

23 Q Well, there are various sources
24 available to you at any point to supply power for
25 the MoPEP group; right?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And I'm asking what was the next best
3 alternative among those sources to the Grain Belt
4 line?

5 A We, to replace the IPM contract, we
6 were looking at a portfolio of resources to replace
7 that, not a single source supply.

8 Q Mr. Grotzinger, I have handed you
9 copies of two data requests and your responses to
10 those data requests. Do you recognize those?

11 A Yes.

12 Q The first one, which is data request
13 JG.32, the question was, "At the time you signed
14 the recent TSA and PPA contracts with Grain Belt
15 and Infinity, what was your next best alternative
16 from a pricing standpoint to replacing the Illinois
17 Power Marketing contract?" Is that the question?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And your response was, "We had not
20 made a request for proposals to replace the
21 Illinois Power Marketing contract." Is that
22 correct?

23 A That's correct. We have not made a
24 request for proposals focused solely on replacing
25 the Illinois Power Marketing contract.

1 Q And then the next document, which is
2 MJM.17, says, "Please provide a copy of all
3 documents, correspondence, and communications in
4 which MJMEUC submitted a request for bids or a
5 similar invitation for proposals for power which
6 could be utilized in whole or in part in lieu of
7 the power expected to be delivered over the Grain
8 Belt project."

9 Do you see that?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And your response was?

12 A It reads, "None."

13 Q Thank you. Speaking of Infinity, you
14 have the right under section 2.1B of your contract
15 with them to cancel the contract if for some reason
16 the Grain Belt project is canceled; is that
17 correct?

18 A That's correct. Given the exposure
19 for the CCN and the potential, we wanted to include
20 that, yes.

21 Q Could you go, please, to Schedule
22 JG-3 of your rebuttal testimony?

23 A I haven't found it yet, I'm sorry.

24 Okay.

25 Q First question, you have a series in

1 the columns on the right of congestion costs;
2 correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q What point -- from what point to what
5 point are those congestion costs being calculated
6 or estimated?

7 A Those are estimating from a -- from a
8 wind source somewhere within SPP to the SPP MISO
9 interface.

10 Q Okay. So it doesn't include any
11 congestion cost for MISO?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q In general, Schedule JG-3 is a
14 comparison on a per megawatt basis, per megawatt
15 hour basis, of the cost of the Grain Belt capacity
16 versus the capacity or the cost of bringing in
17 Kansas wind over the SPP system; is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And for using the SPP system, you
20 include a range of estimated congestion costs
21 between \$2 and \$10. Correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Now, if you'd turn please to page 5
24 of your rebuttal testimony.

25 A Yes, sir.

1 Q You say that, at lines 3 to 4, the
2 use of the Grain Belt option will save your
3 customers approximately \$10 million in transmission
4 costs. Is that right?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the figure at Schedule JG-3 which
7 comes closest to that 10 million assumes congestion
8 costs of about \$6 per megawatt hour; correct?

9 A Yes, for the full 200 megawatts, yes.

10 Q Right. That cost would be about 12.7
11 million?

12 A Yes.

13 Q I'm now going to show you a copy of
14 our data request number MJM-13. Do you have a copy
15 of that document in front of you?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q This asked you for a copy of the
18 study referenced by Mr. Lawlor in which he said
19 that MJMEUC estimated that it would save \$10
20 million with the Grain Belt contract versus the
21 cost of the Illinois contract. Correct?

22 A Could you repeat the question?

23 Q Sure. The question is, with
24 reference to page 3, line 16 to 18 of the direct
25 testimony of Mr. Lawlor, "Please provide a copy of

1 the studies or analyses, including work papers in
2 which MJMEUC estimated the \$10 million in annual
3 savings to its members," which was the Grain Belt
4 contract vis-a-vis the Illinois contract.

5 A I'm not sure I understand your
6 reference to the Illinois contract.

7 Q That was in Mr. Lawlor's testimony.
8 He said, the lines I'm quoting, that your \$10
9 million savings was the estimate provided to him by
10 MJMEUC for the cost of the Grain Belt contract
11 vis-a-vis the Illinois contract. And then I've
12 asked in this data request for copies of the
13 studies which support his statement.

14 A I'm not as familiar to the direct
15 reference to the Illinois contract. The numbers we
16 had discussed was in transmission savings for the
17 SPP, and that's what I supplied here.

18 Q Right. You did not supply us with
19 anything to do with the Illinois contract in answer
20 to this data request, did you?

21 A No. I was referring to the savings
22 that we referenced to the \$10 million.

23 Q I understand, but that's not what Mr.
24 Lawlor was talking about, was it?

25 MR. HEALY: Objection, Judge, I don't

1 think Mr. Grotzinger knows what Mr. Lawlor was
2 thinking. Speculation.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

4 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) What do you show on
5 the attachment to our data request MJM-13 to be the
6 most probable level of congestion costs in terms of
7 dollars per megawatt hour?

8 A I think that was underlined, the \$2,
9 there are several differences between this and the
10 other exhibits you were discussing.

11 Q Right. So it's \$2; right?

12 A That was the assumption here.

13 Q Thank you. Did you ever send us a
14 copy of the comparison -- strike that -- of the
15 savings between your contract with Grain Belt
16 vis-a-vis the Illinois coal contract?

17 A For the MoPEP group?

18 Q Yes.

19 A There is an exhibit that references
20 that, yes.

21 Q Did you ever send us a copy of the
22 work papers in response to any of our data
23 requests?

24 A I don't think that was in response to
25 a data request.

1 Q Okay. Thank you. I'm handing you
2 now a copy of a data request MJM-15 and ask if you
3 recognize that?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And our question to you was, quote,
6 "Please provide a copy of all studies and analyses
7 compiled by or available to MJMEUC comparing the
8 projected cost to MJMEUC members of electricity
9 from the project versus the projected cost to
10 MJMEUC members of electricity from other available
11 or potentially available sources." Is that
12 correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And your answer was, "Please see
15 response to MJM.13," which we've already discussed;
16 right?

17 A Right.

18 Q And you went on --

19 A The Leidos report, yes.

20 Q It says, "Please see response to
21 MJM-13, which was incorporated here by reference,
22 and the attached highly confidential document."
23 Correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And what was the highly confidential

1 **document?**

2 A Oh, the regional market report.
3 Their projections of market prices.

4 Q Which was eventually submitted by you
5 in your testimony; correct?

6 A Yes. I believe -- was the date
7 November 7 on that, as I recall.

8 Q The date of the data request was
9 November 7, 2016. Correct?

10 A Yes. Yes. That's what we had
11 available at that time, yes.

12 Q And just so it's clear, MJM.13, which
13 is referenced in that last data request, that was a
14 comparison of the cost of the Grain Belt power
15 versus your estimate of the cost to bring in Kansas
16 power over the AC system; right?

17 A I don't recall it, are you talking
18 the -- I'm sorry. I lost track of which data
19 request we're talking about here. 13?

20 Q Yes.

21 A Concerning the savings to our
22 members. Yes. That was -- the savings comparison
23 was for SPP transmission savings.

24 Q In other words, Kansas wind brought
25 into Missouri.

1 A (Witness nods.)

2 Q You have five different scenarios as
3 Schedule JG-3 for the assumed congestion costs;
4 correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Are you familiar with the testimony
7 of Mr. Goggin in this case where he talks about the
8 ability to hedge congestion costs using, quote,
9 financial transmission rights, end quote?

10 A I am not familiar with the testimony,
11 no.

12 Q What are financial transmission
13 rights?

14 A The ability to secure those within
15 MISO for a hedging mechanism for transmission that
16 you're paid for, paid for or paying for,
17 differences in prices between two different
18 locations.

19 Q Did you do an analysis of how much of
20 the congestion costs shown on your Schedule 3 could
21 have been hedged with financial transmission
22 rights?

23 A Financial transmission rights are a
24 MISO mechanism, and I was comparing SPP, so there's
25 no opportunity.

1 Q Are there no similar means of hedging
2 in SPP?

3 A There is something similar.

4 Q Did you do an analysis of that
5 something similar as to how much it could save in
6 congestion costs?

7 A I did not because those require
8 purchase, which you're usually, if you're just
9 buying those resources, then there's usually an
10 analysis done by other parties as to what the value
11 is when they sell those.

12 Q So you didn't make any analysis?

13 A I did not.

14 Q On your Schedule 3, looking at the
15 bottom row under the \$6 congestion costs, you have
16 a figure of about \$9.2 million in savings, \$9.3
17 million in savings; correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And that assumes that you get the
20 discounted rate provided for in your contract with
21 Grain Belt; right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Do you know what the Grain Belt
24 normal rate is expected to be for the service from
25 Kansas to Missouri, as opposed to your discounted

1 **rate?**

2 A I've heard it referenced in this
3 case, yes.

4 Q **How about \$5,670 per megawatt per**
5 **month; does that sound correct?**

6 A That sounds like the right number.

7 Q **And that would equal 68,004 per**
8 **megawatt per year. Does that sound right?**

9 A I haven't done that math. Subject to
10 check, I'll --

11 MR. HEALY: Judge, I'm sure Mr.
12 Agathen is doing the math correctly, but I'm just
13 objecting to relevance. I'm not sure what this is
14 relevant to lead to for determination by the
15 Commission.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Your response?

17 MR. AGATHEN: It's going to show the
18 impact of the totally discounted rate vis-a-vis
19 what would normally be applied by Grain Belt.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled.

21 A I don't have a reason to disagree
22 with your math.

23 Q **(BY MR. AGATHEN) Okay. And for 200**
24 **megawatts, then the cost under the normal rate**
25 **would be about 13.6 million; does that sound right?**

1 A Again, I have no reason to disagree
2 with your math.

3 Q And under the column of the \$6
4 congestion cost, the cost for bringing in the 200
5 megawatts over the SBC system -- SPP system is only
6 12.7 million; correct?

7 A Yes. That's what I was using, yes.

8 Q So assuming my math was right, under
9 the normal rate, the cost of transmission for the
10 Grain Belt option would be nearly a million dollars
11 higher than your best estimate of importing 200
12 megawatts over the SPP system; is that correct?

13 A Based on the information you relayed,
14 yes.

15 Q Could you turn please to page 5 of
16 your rebuttal? Are you there?

17 A Yes.

18 Q At lines 13 to 14 you testify that in
19 developing your Schedule JG-3, you assumed a
20 capacity factor of only 50 percent for the
21 southwest Kansas wind farm; correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And as you testified, that was based
24 upon your past knowledge and experience of wind
25 farms in Kansas; right?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Are you aware of the fact that Mr.
3 Berry used a capacity factor of 55 percent in its
4 levelized cost of energy analysis?

5 A I am aware of that, yes.

6 Q So about 10 percent higher than your
7 figure of 50 percent; right?

8 A Right. Mine was intended to be a
9 conservative average of wind farms in that region
10 that I had exposure to.

11 Q Did someone at Grain Belt, by any
12 chance, ask you to insert the next sentence into
13 your testimony which says, "That capacity factor
14 may increase in the future due to improved
15 technology"?

16 A They did not ask me to insert that.
17 I'm aware of technology improvements that are
18 continuing to increase -- increase the capacity
19 factor and efficiency of winter.

20 (Discussion off the record.)

21 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) I'm handing you a
22 copy of our data request JG-11 dated February 6,
23 2017, and it was sent -- or the response was sent
24 from you; correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And the question is, at page 5 of
2 your testimony, lines 15 to 16, you state that,
3 quote, "These capacity factors may increase in the
4 future due to improved technology," end quote. Was
5 this statement or something similar thereto
6 included at the suggestion of someone at Grain
7 Belt? And what was your response?

8 A Yes, it was referenced that they did
9 suggest to remind me of the potential improvements.

10 Q So they suggested adding that
11 additional sentence?

12 A Well, they referenced that there
13 would be additional improvements, yes.

14 Q Thank you. Just so the record is
15 clear, your response was, "Without waiving any
16 objection, yes." Correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Do you know who at Grain Belt made
19 suggestion to you?

20 A I don't recall.

21 Q Would you turn please to page 6 of
22 your rebuttal testimony?

23 A Okay.

24 Q Are you there?

25 A Yes.

1 Q At lines 3 to 4 you state that,
2 "Schedule 3 does not reflect any future rate
3 increases in SPP." Is that correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q And that those costs are expected to
6 increase over the next 20 years?

7 A Correct.

8 Q I've got two questions about that
9 statement. First, isn't it true that Schedule 3
10 also does not reflect any increases in Grain Belt
11 rate?

12 A Yes. Neither of those show
13 increasing rates.

14 Q And the Grain Belt rates do increase
15 by 2 percent every year?

16 A Yes, our contract does increase at 2
17 percent.

18 Q And second, to the extent that the
19 increase in the SPP rates are for additions to
20 their transmission system, isn't it true that those
21 cost increases should lead to decreases in the
22 congestion costs that you were complaining about?

23 A There is other factors that increase
24 the costs within SPP. In addition to improvements.
25 And improvements can have the impact of decreasing

1 congestion costs, or not, depending on overall
2 changes to the -- to the grid.

3 Q I hand you another copy of a data
4 request and your response. Do you recognize that?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the question was, with reference
7 to page 6, lines 4 to 8 of your testimony, "If the
8 SPP transmission system expands in the future,
9 would you expect that to lead to a decrease in
10 congestion costs on that system? If not, please
11 explain."

12 And your answer was, subject to an
13 objection, "Congestion costs could decrease if
14 further investments in the SPP system, transmission
15 system are made, but whether the additional
16 investment costs would be less or more than
17 possible congestion cost savings would be
18 speculative and on a case-by-case basis." Is that
19 correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q So you're saying you couldn't tell?

22 A Not completely.

23 Q Well, you're saying you couldn't
24 tell; right?

25 A I couldn't tell what the direction

1 would be entirely.

2 Q On a different subject, would you
3 turn, please, to page 7 of your rebuttal testimony?

4 A Okay. I'm there.

5 Q Are you there?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Beginning at line 8, you state that
8 you have examined other options to supply the 60
9 megawatts needed by your MoPEP group; correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Those are shown at Schedule JG-6?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And you provide a calculation of the
14 cost of the Grain Belt option and then you show the
15 cost of seven other options; right?

16 A I believe that's right.

17 Q Is it true these other options were
18 all evaluated after the fact, after you had already
19 signed the contract with Grain Belt?

20 A For this comparison, for the MoPEP
21 savings?

22 Q Yes.

23 A Yes.

24 Q And is it true that all of the
25 alternative sources of supply that you show at that

1 **schedule show only the cost of energy, not the cost**
2 **of transmission?**

3 A I am not looking at that schedule but
4 I believe it includes both.

5 Q **We're talking about JG-6?**

6 A Those include both capacity and
7 energy.

8 Q **So they include the cost of**
9 **transmission?**

10 A No. They do not.

11 Q **Okay. Thank you.**

12 A Well, let me rephrase that. With a
13 couple of exceptions.

14 Q **So some do and some don't?**

15 A The -- let me try to make this clear.
16 The SPP options include transmission costs to be
17 able to deliver it into MISO. Those connected to
18 MISO or presumed to connect to MISO, do not, since
19 I was referencing this for load that's being served
20 within MISO. In which case those loads could use
21 the same network transmission service -- excuse me,
22 service in any case.

23 Q **So just to be clear, the alternatives**
24 **listed under MISO do not include transmission, and**
25 **the two under SPP do include transmission?**

1 A Right. They do not include a
2 separate transmission beyond the network service
3 that's already embedded to the serve load.

4 Q Gotcha. One option you show on your
5 Schedule JG-6 is for Crystal Lake II; is that
6 correct?

7 A That's right.

8 Q That's a wind farm in Iowa?

9 A Yes, it is.

10 Q Is there also a Crystal Lake III wind
11 project in Iowa?

12 A I believe there is.

13 Q And in fact, the City of Columbia
14 recently signed a contract to take energy from
15 Crystal Lake III, did they not?

16 A Yes.

17 Q For 45 megawatts?

18 A I am not certain of the quantity, but
19 yes.

20 Q And they're only buying 25 megawatts
21 from Grain Belt; right?

22 A 35.

23 Q 25?

24 A Columbia's -- discussions with
25 Columbia indicate their interest at 35 megawatts.

1 Q 35. Thank you. And as shown on your
2 Schedule JG-6, the cost of energy from Crystal Lake
3 II is \$22 per megawatt hour; correct?

4 A Yes. In -- erroneously, that
5 probably should have been labeled Crystal Lake III
6 -- or could have been labeled Crystal Lake III.

7 Q Well, the cost of energy from the
8 Crystal Lake III project is only \$20.75, is it not?

9 A I don't believe so. And understand
10 I'm in reference to the year 2021.

11 Q Handing you a copy of a data request
12 JG-54, which you sent to us March 3, 2017; is that
13 correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And the question is, how does the
16 price of the Crystal Lake II PPA included in your
17 Schedule JG-6 compare to the price of the City of
18 Columbia wind contract referred to in data request
19 JG-37; is that correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And your response was the energy
22 costs in the year 2016 are \$22 for Crystal Lake II
23 versus \$20.75 in the year 2021 for Crystal Lake
24 III. Is that correct?

25 A That's the beginning of 2021, yes.

1 Q You were aware of the City of
2 Columbia contract with Crystal Lake III when you
3 prepared your Schedule JG-6 in this case, were you
4 not?

5 A Generally.

6 Q Were you aware of the price?

7 A I believe I had seen the price. It
8 was not certain as to the start year I think at the
9 time I prepared this.

10 Q Looking again at your Schedule JG-6,
11 in the far right column you show the option for a
12 combined cycle unit; is that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And you use a capacity factor for
15 this unit of only 50 percent, do you not?

16 A Yes. To match -- to match the -- the
17 comparison here, yes.

18 Q I'm sorry, could you explain that?

19 A I was attempting to compare these as
20 much as an apples to apples basis as possible for
21 the -- for the energy cost here. Or for the cost
22 here between the Grain Belt project -- or Grain
23 Belt supplied wind and these other alternatives.

24 Q What's the usual capacity factor for
25 the combined cycle units?

1 A It can depend highly. Our share of a
2 combined cycle facility in western Missouri I think
3 is -- set a record this year at something less than
4 30 percent.

5 **Q Is that a capacity factor or**
6 **utilization rate?**

7 A That's the net capacity factor it
8 performed at.

9 **Q Is that typical for a combined cycle**
10 **unit?**

11 A I am not sure how you would define
12 typical. I think it varies. But I think it would
13 not be that unusual. That unit's dispatched in the
14 SPP market.

15 **Q What's the, just for clarification,**
16 **the difference in meaning between capacity factor**
17 **and utilization rate?**

18 A I'm not sure I'm clear on what you're
19 defining as utilization rate. Capacity factor is
20 meaning the use of a facility against the -- the
21 average generation against the potential
22 generation.

23 **Q And you're not familiar with the term**
24 **"utilization rate"?**

25 A I am not certain of the way in which

1 you're using that.

2 Q Well, are you familiar with the term?

3 A I've heard that used, but I'm not
4 clear of your definition.

5 Q I'm not asking if you're clear about
6 mine. I'm asking what your definition of the term
7 is.

8 MR. HEALY: Objection, just a point
9 as argumentative. If Mr. Agathen wants to define
10 the term so my witness understands, I'm sure he'd
11 be happy to explain.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled.

13 A I do not normally use, see the term
14 "utilization factor" used.

15 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) So you don't know
16 what the definition is?

17 A I don't know your definition, no.

18 Q If you turn your Schedule JG-7 for a
19 moment, in the fourth column there, what capacity
20 factor do you use for the combined cycle unit?

21 A I believe that was at 30 percent.

22 Q That was based on your experience
23 with the one unit?

24 A Yes. With the expectation that would
25 continue to rise.

1 Q On a different subject, would you
2 turn, please, to page 8 of your rebuttal?

3 A Okay, I'm there.

4 Q Lines 7 to 9 you say that in
5 conjunction with the Grain Belt contract, you'll
6 also need to purchase additional gas generation; is
7 that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Could you explain why you'll need to
10 purchase additional gas generation to supplement
11 the Grain Belt contract?

12 A To supply the additional capacity
13 needs we would have.

14 Q In other words, the capacity from the
15 Grain Belt line will not make up for the capacity
16 from the coal contract in Illinois?

17 A It will not one for one. As we were
18 getting into earlier, the amount that can be
19 credited to meet SPP reserve requirements or
20 capacity requirements do not allow for the full
21 name plate of a wind unit.

22 Q If you go to Schedule JG-7, I've got
23 some questions just for clarification.

24 A Okay, I'm there.

25 Q How much capacity are you going to

1 lose, a credited capacity, from the contract with
2 the Illinois coal supplier?

3 A 100 megawatts.

4 Q Now, the first source for replacing
5 that 100 megawatts that you have listed is the
6 Grain Belt contract; correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q For capacity planning and reliability
9 purposes, how many megawatts would you get credit
10 for from that contract?

11 A In this I included the expectation
12 that we would get, for the 60 megawatts, we would
13 get 6 megawatts credited within SPP.

14 Q Okay. Now, that 6 megawatt figure
15 doesn't show up anywhere on the schedule, does it?

16 A It does not.

17 Q Okay. So let's go through these one
18 by one. The next one is SPP wind. How much
19 capacity credit did you assume you would be given
20 for that?

21 A 2.5.

22 Q And for the SPP combined cycle?

23 A That's 50.

24 Q And then going over to the existing
25 units, the SPP Higginsville? What's the assumed

1 **capacity credit there?**

2 A 38.

3 Q **And for the SPP Marshall wind?**

4 A 2.

5 Q **And MC Power solar?**

6 A I believe that was 3.2.

7 Q **And the total should end up equaling**
8 **the 102 that you have shown on the far right?**

9 A In round, in whole megawatts, yes.

10 Q **Sure. Thank you. So some of the**
11 **capacity credits that you're going to use to make**
12 **up for the Illinois contract, you're assuming are**
13 **going to come from existing units; right?**

14 A Existing as in constructed under
15 contract today.

16 Q **Are they actually existing today?**

17 A Yes.

18 Q **So they're running on your system?**

19 A Yes, they are. Those were added in
20 the last year or so.

21 Q **Is MJMEUC or MoPEP required to**
22 **maintain some minimum level of reserves by the SPP?**

23 A Yes.

24 Q **Does that amount to approximately 77**
25 **megawatts?**

1 A I haven't done the calculation in
2 front of me but that sounds about right. It's a
3 load based, so depending on the projected load, it
4 varies.

5 Q **Right. On a different subject, your**
6 **contact with Grain Belt allows you to purchase up**
7 **to 50 megawatts of service for Missouri to PJM;**
8 **correct?**

9 A Yes.

10 Q **And according to Grain Belt, that**
11 **gives you the option to sell excess energy and**
12 **capacity into the PJM system if the prices are**
13 **right?**

14 A It would give us that opportunity,
15 yes.

16 Q **You didn't mention that option in**
17 **your testimony anywhere, did you?**

18 A I don't believe I did.

19 Q **Nor did Mr. Kincheloe?**

20 A I don't believe he did.

21 Q **Have you done any kind of study to**
22 **calculate what the value might be to your member**
23 **utilities of this service from Missouri to PJM?**

24 A Not in any detail, no.

25 Q **Another data request. Surprise, huh?**

1 **This is data request MJM.62. Correct?**

2 A Yes.

3 **Q And we're asking you to "Please**
4 **provide a copy of all studies and analyses used by**
5 **MJMEUC or its member utilities in calculating the**
6 **value to MJMEUC and its members of the optional**
7 **Missouri to Sullivan substation service on the**
8 **Grain Belt line." Is that correct?**

9 A Yes.

10 **Q And your response was?**

11 A "None."

12 **Q Do you have any documents or other**
13 **correspondence which didn't address the possibility**
14 **any of member utility utilizing this proposed**
15 **service from Missouri to PJM?**

16 A I don't believe so.

17 **Q Have any of your member utilities**
18 **even expressed an interest in buying capacity on**
19 **the line for the Missouri to PJM service?**

20 A Not in any detail. I think when
21 explaining it to the MoPEP folks, they were aware
22 of it.

23 **Q Did they express any interest?**

24 A Interest in being curious about the
25 potential but not as in any commitments, let me say

1 it that way.

2 Q So they have not expressed an
3 interest in buying capacity on the Grain Belt line
4 for the Missouri to PJM service?

5 A They have not yet, no.

6 Q I have just a few questions now about
7 your surrebuttal testimony, Exhibit 477, I believe.
8 Do you have that?

9 A Just a moment. All right. What was
10 the page again?

11 Q Page 4, and at lines 12 to 16 or so,
12 you say that certain opposing witnesses should have
13 realized before they filed their rebuttal testimony
14 that what you call the final all-in price for the
15 wind energy delivered over the Grain Belt project
16 would be approximately \$23 per megawatt hour. Is
17 that correct?

18 A Could you reference again the lines
19 to make sure I'm on the right --

20 Q 12 to 16 or so.

21 A I think you're summarizing, but yes.

22 Q When you say all-in, does that mean
23 the cost of the Grain Belt capacity plus the cost
24 of the energy?

25 A The capacity and energy delivered

1 into MISO, yes.

2 Q So in total, the number supposedly
3 was \$23 per megawatt hour; right?

4 A That was an early indication that we
5 had and had provided to some.

6 Q The document you're relying on was
7 written at the same time that the MJMEUC contract
8 with Grain Belt was signed; is that correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Which was about June 2 of 2016?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And that all-in number also had you
13 include the price of energy then from one of the
14 wind farms; right?

15 A It had an indicative number there to
16 use as a proxy.

17 Q At that point you hadn't even put out
18 a request for bid for wind power, had you?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Do you recall that early on in the
21 discovery process we asked MJMEUC for documents
22 related to its negotiations with wind farms for the
23 cost of energy?

24 A I believe that's right.

25 Q And we were told at that time that

1 **you were in the midst of negotiations with**
2 **Infinity; correct?**

3 A I believe so. I'd have to look back
4 at the timing to be sure of that, but yes.

5 Q And do you recall that the MLA, my
6 group, voluntarily withdrew its request for
7 documents related to the negotiations with Infinity
8 so as not to interfere with those negotiations. Is
9 that correct?

10 A I think counsel made me aware of
11 that, yes.

12 Q And that was back in November of
13 2016; correct?

14 A I believe that was the time frame.

15 Q Some two months before our rebuttal
16 was due; right?

17 A Sounds correct.

18 Q Do you recall, sir, that when we
19 voluntarily withdrew our request for documents
20 related to your negotiations with Infinity --

21 MR. HEALY: Judge, I object, it's
22 already been asked and answered.

23 MR. AGATHEN: It's leading up to
24 another question.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll let you finish

1 your question.

2 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) -- that we
3 submitted a different data request to you, MJM.28?

4 A I believe so.

5 Q And in that data request we said,
6 quote, "Please inform the Missouri Landowners
7 Alliance as soon as the negotiations between
8 Infinity Wind Power and MJMEUC for the possible
9 purchase of wind energy to be transmitted over the
10 proposed Grain Belt line are concluded or
11 terminated." Correct?

12 A That's what it says, yes.

13 Q And the date this document was served
14 was November 11, 2016?

15 A Okay.

16 Q Isn't it true, Mr. Grotzinger, that
17 we didn't hear word one back in response to this
18 data request until you filed the actual Infinity
19 contract with your rebuttal testimony?

20 A That's probably true. I think we
21 finished it shortly before that rebuttal was due.

22 Q So your actual contract was not
23 finished until you filed your testimony?

24 A I think it was -- I think it was in a
25 close proximity to that time frame.

1 Q But you're blaming our witnesses for
2 not assuming that some number six months before
3 that was an accurate portrayal what your cost was
4 going to be?

5 MR. HEALY: Objection, argumentative.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

7 MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, my only
8 other questions deal with documents marked as
9 highly confidential.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right, we'll go
11 into closed session, then. Folks in the audience
12 that are not authorized to listen to highly
13 confidential information will need to step outside
14 for a few minutes.

15 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an
16 in-camera session was held, which is contained in
17 Volume 17 - Pages 1083 through 1095.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (REPORTER'S NOTE: Back in open
2 session.)

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're back in open
4 session and ready for questions from Commissioners.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

7 Q Morning.

8 A Morning.

9 Q I have a few clarifying questions, I
10 believe. From my perspective it's -- it's -- it's
11 really important that the record is clear as to the
12 savings that would inure to your member cities
13 under transmission and energy contracts that are at
14 issue in your testimony.

15 So I understand your estimate for the
16 -- for the MoPEP savings to be approximately \$10
17 million a year, and that is both transmission and
18 energy; is that correct?

19 A Capacity and energy, yes.

20 Q Okay. And for MJMEUC, I understand
21 your estimate to be that the transmission savings
22 are \$10 million a year?

23 A That was a -- just looking at the
24 transmission comparison for -- as if it was all
25 sourced from SPP, yes. That did not include the

1 additional benefits that are highlighted to the
2 MoPEP -- that MoPEP discussion.

3 **Q Well, have -- is there somewhere in**
4 **your testimony or somewhere else in the record**
5 **where -- where -- where the total savings for**
6 **MJMEUC, transmission and energy, or capacity, is**
7 **set forth?**

8 A No, not in the entirety of the
9 membership because we've identified that for MoPEP,
10 but for the other cities that are entering into it,
11 or will enter into it, we have not done a specific
12 savings. So it would be in addition to the 10
13 million for MoPEP. We have not identified exactly
14 what that number would be.

15 **Q Is there an estimate somewhere?**

16 A Call it maybe back-of-the-envelope
17 estimates. I did take a look just simply at how it
18 lowers their cost to serve their loads on an annual
19 basis just by having the additional 500 megawatts
20 of Grain Belt inserted into MISO and --

21 **Q Now, that's -- that's -- that's**
22 **separate and apart from -- from the 200 megawatts**
23 **that -- that MJMEUC has available.**

24 A Right. That simply is a part of the
25 project, if anybody had -- if it goes forward at

1 all. And that's almost 2 million a year.

2 Q So there's -- so there's nothing in
3 the record that explains or describes or -- what --
4 what the overall savings could be to MJMEUC with
5 this 200 megawatts of energy delivered by Clean
6 Line?

7 A We haven't quantified beyond the
8 approximately 10 million a year from MoPEP. So
9 it's -- it's 10 million plus whatever the
10 additional 76 megawatts or more we anticipate would
11 occur. So that's for the first 60 megawatts of it.

12 Q Well, that's unfortunate, because I
13 think that would have been quite an asset to your
14 case.

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
17 bench questions? Grain Belt?

18 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

20 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

22 MR. BRADY: One question.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADY:

25 Q Did you say there was \$10 million

1 **savings for the first 60 megawatts?**

2 A That's for the MoPEP group's 60
3 megawatts, and I referred to that as the first 60.

4 Q **And in other words, there was the 76**
5 **megawatts that you don't have a quantified savings**
6 **for?**

7 A I have not quantified what the
8 individual city savings would be.

9 MR. BRADY: Okay. Thank you.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

11 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

13 MR. MILLS: No questions.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

18 Q **Mr. Grotzinger, could you do the**
19 **calculation that Chairman Hall asked you about?**

20 A I would need to coordinate with the
21 members to understand better what they're
22 replacing, what their alternatives would be, to
23 fully quantify that.

24 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

1 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

3 MR. LINTON: No questions.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau?

5 MR. HADEN: None, Judge.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

7 MR. AGATHEN: None, Judge.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by MJMEUC?

9 MR. HEALY: Just a few questions.

10 I'll start with Chairman Hall's question, it's a
11 pretty good one.

12 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

13 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

14 Q The energy portfolios of members not
15 in the full requirement pool, what is MJMEUC's
16 responsibility to those members?

17 A MJMEUC is not responsible for
18 arranging their full requirements. What I have
19 addressed with MoPEP is what we are responsible for
20 arranging for the full requirements. For the other
21 cities, they are in charge of their own portfolio
22 arrangement. We're available for their help, but
23 they're in charge of self providing that.

24 Q It would be fair to say, though, that
25 MJMEUC does provide a significant quantity of both

1 energy and capacity to those cities already, or at
2 least some of them?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Just not all of it?

5 A Just not all.

6 Q And neither you yourself nor MJMEUC
7 has their full bills, energy cost for their entire
8 portfolio; is that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q And does that complicate quantifying
11 the savings for particular cities?

12 A Absolutely.

13 Q Okay. And would you agree that due
14 to the timing, in fact, Hannibal got signed last
15 night, been a bit of a fire drill pulling this deal
16 together?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Okay. I want to take you back to the
19 Leidos study.

20 MR. HEALY: And we don't need to go
21 in camera, Judge, just some general questions that
22 are public, I think. I just want to make a few
23 clarifications.

24 Q (BY MR. HEALY) How many pages was
25 the Leidos study in full?

1 A I did not identify or do a page count
2 but it was about two inches thick, double-sided
3 print.

4 Q And that was provided to both
5 opposing counsel and the experts?

6 A I believe so.

7 Q Exhibit 368HC, that was one you just
8 looked at in camera a minute ago. That was for one
9 particular future; correct?

10 A Right.

11 Q Okay. Did that include all scenarios
12 ran by Leidos?

13 A This page does not.

14 Q Okay. The cohort groups in that
15 study, they represented different groups that had
16 different strategies, and did they also have
17 different resource portfolios?

18 A Absolutely.

19 Q Would you expect their needs to all
20 be identical?

21 A No. Not at all.

22 Q Was congestion pricing part of the
23 overall Leidos study?

24 A No.

25 Q Was it included in the results of the

1 analysis?

2 A Not in the Leidos study, no.

3 Q If I could have you turn just briefly
4 to JG-3? And that was the calculation of the price
5 difference between different transmission paths,
6 GBX and the traditional SPP into MISO.

7 The first figure you relied on was
8 \$2,880 per megawatt month. How did you arrive at
9 that number?

10 A I pulled that from -- rounded up from
11 a sample bill in January of 2016.

12 Q Does that reflect SPP through an out
13 pricing?

14 A Yes, it does.

15 Q And just for the Commission's benefit
16 and my edification, what's that mean?

17 A Well, that was a sample based on
18 bills that we are taking from a source with inside
19 of SPP out -- out of SPP into another region.

20 Q Okay. Do you still consider that
21 number accurate?

22 A Well, it -- it's increased. I think
23 we supplied as one of the data requests a selection
24 of bills that we received and noted that the
25 January of 2017 was substantially higher than the

1 example I used.

2 Q How much that was number?

3 A From memory, I think it was, instead
4 of the 2,880, it was more like 3,387.

5 Q Okay. Roughly 20 percent increase?

6 A Nearly 20 percent.

7 Q In your experience, does the SPP and
8 the MISO rate ever go down over time?

9 A Not that I'm aware of, unless there's
10 some outstanding circumstance.

11 Q Okay.

12 A Such as a settlement or something.

13 Q If you were to substitute the newer
14 number, more recent number, would that change the
15 final numbers or your opinion in JG-3?

16 A It would not change my opinion. It
17 would change the numbers.

18 Q What would it change?

19 A It would change the SPP transmission
20 costs. Increase the savings.

21 Q It would increase the savings?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Stay on JG-3 just a second. I don't
24 suppose you have a calculator up there with you, do
25 you?

1 A I do not.

2 MR. HEALY: If I may approach, Judge?

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay.

4 Q **(BY MR. HEALY) I'll hand you a**
5 **calculator. If you look at the column with the \$6**
6 **congestion pricing and the 200 megawatt usage at**
7 **the more recent SPP number, can you calculate the**
8 **all-in transmission cost from SPP at 200 megawatts?**

9 A Yes.

10 Q **What is that number?**

11 A Roughly 8.1 million.

12 Q **Okay. Do you have a pen up there,**
13 **Mr. Grotzinger?**

14 A Yes, I do.

15 Q **Can you mark on your exhibit that new**
16 **number? Actually, in your book there in front of**
17 **you?**

18 A Okay.

19 Q **What's that impact have on the**
20 **savings that are estimated using the GBX rate?**

21 MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, I'm going
22 to object to this line of questioning. Counsel is
23 attempting to supplement the record with new facts
24 that we have not had a chance to review, there's
25 been no chance for discovery, no chance for

1 verification.

2 MR. HEALY: Actually, Judge, the
3 numbers we've used have been turned over to
4 opposing counsel. I'm just demonstrating they
5 cross-examined on these rates and the accuracy of
6 the schedule. I think I should be afforded a
7 little bit of latitude to show the numbers can
8 indeed go both ways.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled.

10 A That would show an additional 1.2
11 million a year in savings.

12 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Okay. Do you know
13 what the GBX full price rate is from your
14 discussion with Mr. Agathen earlier?

15 A 56 -- I didn't write that down, but
16 5,600 and change a month.

17 Q Okay. If you put that into your
18 schedule, using that updated SPP number, are there
19 still savings at the full tariff rate versus SPP
20 and the MISO?

21 A Just a moment.

22 MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, could I
23 ask, just for clarification, what number is being
24 used for the full rate?

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I will ask as soon

1 as he's finished.

2 A I'm sorry, I interrupted, what -- I
3 started with 5,688. I'll be glad to correct that
4 and redo it.

5 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Mr. Grotzinger, isn't
6 that the correct tariff rate?

7 A I'll use that. I believe that would
8 drop it to 7.2 million.

9 Q Let me just walk you through your
10 schedule, might be a little bit easier. And I know
11 I have the advantage of your spreadsheet and your
12 work papers here in front of me.

13 Under your congestion table 6, or
14 column 6, Schedule 3, and subject to checking my
15 math and your spreadsheet, of course, but if you
16 use the number that you just used on SPP for the
17 January bill underlying losses, the total cost
18 would be \$13,701,600, assuming congestion pricing
19 in the median at 6.

20 A Okay.

21 Q And subject to check, if you accept
22 my numbers and using the math you gave me in the
23 basis and using the number that I just gave Mr.
24 Agathen for the full tariff, Grain Belt TSA rate,
25 comes to 13,608,000.

1 So on a 200 megawatt path, would you
2 then agree the savings would still be cheaper at
3 the full tariff rate using GBX versus using the
4 traditional SPP and the MISO tariff?

5 A Yes.

6 MR. LINTON: Objection, Your Honor.
7 Not only is he introducing new testimony at this
8 point, he's leading the witness to new testimony.

9 MR. HEALY: Judge, I'm just doing the
10 math for him. I understand it's subject to check.
11 If he thinks the math is wrong using his work
12 papers --

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: This is information
14 I think is important to the Commission. Overruled.

15 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Would you agree with
16 that analysis, Mr. Grotzinger?

17 A Yes, I would. Subject to check.

18 Q Subject to check. Fair enough. And,
19 of course, using the fully tariffed GBX rate is not
20 what MJMEUC will be using; correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q If I can turn you to JG-6?

23 A Yes.

24 Q There was some question as to why you
25 added transmission charges under the SPP resources

1 versus why there were no transmission charges under
2 the MISO resources.

3 In your analysis there, do the MISO
4 options need additional transmission to be
5 delivered?

6 A Not into MISO.

7 Q Okay. So the SPP generation options
8 need additional transmission to be delivered to
9 load?

10 A Yes, for delivering into MISO load
11 yes.

12 Q And that's what's reflected towards
13 the bottom of that spreadsheet on the SPP side
14 versus SPP trans; correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q You were shown a data request
17 earlier, JG-54, reflecting the price of Crystal
18 Lake III?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Does that reflect the price of
21 Crystal Lake III in 2021 December, or January?

22 A I believe that's in January.

23 Q Do you know what the price is in
24 December of 2021?

25 A I believe it's twenty-two oh two, if

1 memory serves.

2 Q Roughly 10 percent higher than the
3 all-in option here of GBX and Iron Star?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And that's just a contract price;
6 correct?

7 A That's it.

8 Q Does that reflect any congestion
9 price differences in delivery points?

10 A It does not.

11 Q Are those significant?

12 A Yes. That was shown in one of the
13 exhibits.

14 Q Would that be your Schedule JG-8?

15 A Yes.

16 Q So how does MoPEP add resources? Do
17 they do it in large blocks or incrementally?

18 A Well, it has to be in relatively
19 large blocks. I mean, you can't add one megawatt
20 at a time. It's got to be larger blocks.

21 Q And when replacing an existing
22 resource, can you just, in large, kinda broad
23 overtones, describe how that is accomplished or
24 done?

25 A We'll look at increasing their

1 portfolio with the added opportunity to try to make
2 it as diverse and robust as possible.

3 Q And under Schedule JG-7, some of
4 those resources are labeled "existing." How
5 recently were those resources added?

6 A I believe I stated within the last
7 couple years.

8 Q Was that part of the process of
9 moving away from the IPM contract?

10 A Absolutely.

11 Q And there was some discussion
12 regarding PJM, will also some sale opportunities be
13 addressed when they become available?

14 A Yes, we have not addressed those yet.

15 Q That's because it doesn't serve load;
16 is that right?

17 A That's correct. We don't serve any
18 load inside of PJM.

19 Q Okay. And just a couple follow-up
20 questions. I don't know, you're roughly aware that
21 the day after negotiations were completed with Iron
22 Star, that both Missouri Landowners Association and
23 Show Me were provided a copy of the contract a day
24 after; correct?

25 A Yes, it was very shortly thereafter,

1 yes.

2 Q And we've talked a lot here today
3 again about the energy and capacity and
4 transmission savings. Does any of your analysis
5 reflect emission savings?

6 A No, we have not included any
7 environmental effects or benefits, RECs or any of
8 those things.

9 Q And do they include any of the
10 potential benefits to the MoPEP group of their
11 ability to offer renewable retail products?

12 A No. And we're currently
13 oversubscribed on our offering today and limited in
14 being able to offer more until we add additional
15 resources of that sort.

16 Q What does MoPEP currently have in way
17 of an offering to its wholesale customers to offer
18 retail renewable products?

19 A We're currently offering to those
20 with a high load factor, typically commercial,
21 industrial ability to identify and correlate
22 directly with renewable resources. Specifically
23 our -- our current Kansas wind project.

24 Q Are those projects fully subscribed?

25 A They are oversubscribed.

1 Q How long did it take to sell those
2 products when they were offered?

3 A We made an offering and it was filled
4 the closing date of that with more than we had
5 available to be able to provide.

6 Q So it would be fair to say there's an
7 outstanding demand for renewables from those cities
8 not currently being met?

9 A Yes, and that was just the initial
10 offering there with the relatively short time
11 window for them to even entertain the offering.

12 MR. HEALY: No further questions.
13 Thank you.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you for your
15 testimony, Mr. Grotzinger, you may step down.

16 (Witness excused.)

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Robertson, is
18 Mr. Gupta still available? You had mentioned he
19 would be available until noon, and we are at noon.

20 MR. ROBERTSON: We could go probably
21 as late as 1:00 as long as we don't break for
22 lunch.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we take a
24 short recess while we set up the telephone and then
25 we will have Mr. Gupta testify.

1 MR. BRADY: I just want to point out
2 I had mentioned yesterday Mr. Goggin has a conflict
3 between 2:00 and 3:00 today, so it would be after 3
4 o'clock if you wanted him.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We can probably do
6 it, we'll have to take a lunch break after Mr.
7 Gupta.

8 MR. BRADY: Okay.

9 (Short recess.)

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go back on the
11 record. Our next witness by telephone for NRDC.
12 Mr. Robertson?

13 MR. ROBERTSON: Thank you, Judge.

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. ROBERTSON:

16 Q Ashok, can you hear me?

17 A Yes, I can.

18 Q Would you state your name for the
19 record, please?

20 A Yes. My name is Ashok Gupta, which
21 is spelled A-s-h-o-k G-u-p-t-a.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Just a second.
23 Before you get too far, I need to put him under
24 oath.

25 ///

1 ASHOK GUPTA,
2 having been called as a witness, was sworn
3 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
4 as follows:

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may proceed, Mr.
6 Robertson.

7 (Wherein, Exhibit 725 was
8 introduced.)

9 Q (BY MR. ROBERTSON) Did you prepare
10 rebuttal testimony in this case on behalf of the
11 natural resources defense counsel, sir?

12 A Yes, I did.

13 Q And that's been designated Exhibit
14 725. Are there any changes or corrections you
15 would make to that testimony at this time?

16 A None.

17 Q If I were to ask you the same
18 questions today, would your answers be the same?

19 A Yes.

20 MR. ROBERTSON: Judge, I move the
21 admission of Exhibit 725.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?
23 Hearing none, 725 is received into
24 the record.

25 MR. ROBERTSON: And I tender the

1 witness for cross.
2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
3 Grain Belt?
4 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.
5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?
6 MR. HEALY: No questions, Judge.
7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?
8 MR. BRADY: No questions.
9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?
10 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.
11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?
12 MR. MILLS: No questions.
13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?
14 MR. WILLIAMS: No questions, thank
15 you.
16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?
17 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.
18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?
19 MR. LINTON: No questions.
20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau?
21 MR. HADEN: No questions, Judge.
22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?
23 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Judge.
24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Agathen, you'll
25 have to get right on top of that microphone.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

3 Q Good morning, Mr. Gupta, my name is
4 Paul Agathen. I represent the Missouri Landowners
5 Alliance. Are you able to hear me?

6 A I can.

7 Q Would you turn, please, to page 1 of
8 your rebuttal testimony?

9 A Yes.

10 Q At lines 20 and 21 you state that the
11 Grain Belt project will bring low cost renewables
12 to Missouri; correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Have you conducted any kind of study
15 or analysis of the cost to Missouri utilities of
16 power transmitted over the Grain Belt project
17 compared to the cost of renewable energy from other
18 sources?

19 A My comments are based on my
20 experience and general knowledge and not on any
21 specific original research or analysis that I did.

22 Q So your answer is no?

23 A Yes. So basically it was based on
24 general knowledge and experience and not on any
25 original research or analysis.

1 **Q At lines 21 to 22 of page 1 you also**
2 **state that the Grain Belt project will help to**
3 **lower system costs for all customers; correct?**

4 A Correct.

5 **Q Have you conducted any kind of study**
6 **or analysis which supports that statement?**

7 A Similar to my other answer and I
8 think generally my whole testimony is based on my
9 experience and knowledge of the fact that we have,
10 you know, low cost wind in western Kansas and the
11 fact that this is a merchant line which will
12 determine what the costs are to customers.

13 So both those statements are based on
14 my general knowledge and experience and not on any
15 specific original research or analysis.

16 **Q So maybe I can save some time here.**
17 **If I went through basically line by line of your**
18 **testimony and asked if that statement was supported**
19 **by any study or analysis you did in this case, your**
20 **answer would be no?**

21 A Correct. Basically I have been
22 working on these issues for 30 plus years and all
23 my comments related to benefits, whether it's
24 reliability costs or environmental, are based on my
25 experience and not on any specific analysis that

1 was done by me.

2 MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Your
3 Honor. Thank you, Mr. Gupta.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from
5 Commissioners?

6 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no
7 questions.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by NRDC?

9 MR. ROBERTSON: No further questions.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Gupta, that
11 completes your testimony, sir. You are excused.
12 Thank you for participating.

13 THE WITNESS: Thank you all very
14 much.

15 (Witness excused.)

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. This
17 seems like a good time to break for lunch. Why
18 don't we stand in recess until approximately 1:15.

19 (Lunch recess.)

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're back on the
21 record. We're now ready for Wind on the Wires Wind
22 Coalition witness, Michael Goggin.

23 Mr. Goggin, can you hear me?

24 MR. GOGGIN: Yes, I can.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Goggin is

1 appearing by telephone.

2 MICHAEL GOGGIN,

3 having been called as a witness, was sworn
4 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
5 as follows:

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you. Mr.
7 Brady, whenever you're ready.

8 MR. BRADY: Thank you.

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADY:

11 Q Mr. Goggin, can you please state your
12 name for the record and spell your last name for
13 the court reporter, please?

14 A Sure. My name is Michael Steven
15 Goggin, and my spelling of the last name is
16 G-o-g-g-i-n.

17 Q And by whom are you employed?

18 A The American Wind Energy Association.

19 Q And what is your position with the
20 American Wind Energy Association?

21 A I am the senior director of research.

22 Q And did you prepare testimony for
23 this case on behalf of Wind on the Wires and The
24 Wind Coalition?

25 A Yes, I did.

1 (Wherein, Exhibit 675 was
2 introduced.)

3 Q (BY MR. BRADY) Do you have in front
4 of you a document that states in the upper
5 right-hand corner Exhibit Number 675 with the
6 following heading on the cover: Rebuttal Testimony
7 of Michael Goggin submitted on behalf of Wind on
8 the Wires and The Wind Coalition?

9 A Yes, I do.

10 Q And does that document include a
11 cover page, a Table of Contents, 34 pages of
12 questions and answers, and seven schedules
13 identified as MG-1 through MG-7?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Were these documents prepared by you
16 or under your direction?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Are there any corrections to your
19 rebuttal testimony?

20 A There is one. On lines 99 to 100, I
21 state that "Kansas's wind resource could not
22 provide enough electricity to meet the equivalent
23 of the current electricity needs of the US at least
24 two times over." That should be corrected to read
25 "Kansas's wind resources could provide enough

1 electricity to meet the equivalent of the current
2 electricity needs of the US."

3 And in addition, it's my
4 understanding that an errata for this testimony was
5 filed on March 17, and I have no changes to my
6 testimony in schedules -- in addition to what has
7 been identified in that errata.

8 Q So if I were to ask you the questions
9 in your testimony, your rebuttal testimony today,
10 would your answers be the same?

11 A Yes.

12 (Wherein, Exhibit 676 was
13 introduced.)

14 Q (BY MR. BRADY) Putting that document
15 aside, do you have before you two documents that
16 state in the upper right-hand corner Exhibit Number
17 676 with the following heading on the cover, Cross
18 Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Goggin Submitted
19 on Behalf of Wind on the Wires and The Wind
20 Coalition?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And in the middle of the cover page
23 on one of those documents does it state that it's
24 "Highly confidential" and the other states that it
25 is "Public"?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And do both documents include a cover
3 page, a Table of Contents and ten pages of
4 questions and answers?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Were these documents prepared by you
7 or under your direction?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And are there any corrections to your
10 cross-surrebuttal testimony?

11 A None other than the errata to the
12 testimony that was filed on March 17, I have no
13 changes beyond that.

14 Q If I were to ask you the questions in
15 your cross-surrebuttal testimony today, would your
16 answers be the same?

17 A Yes.

18 MR. BRADY: With that, Your Honor, I
19 move that Exhibits 675 and 676 with their attached
20 schedules be moved into the record, and I also move
21 for the admission of the errata sheet for rebuttal
22 testimony of Michael Goggin, we'll identify that as
23 Exhibit Number 677, and I'll move for the admission
24 of errata sheet for cross-surrebuttal testimony of
25 Michael Goggin. We'll identify that as Exhibit 678

1 and I'll -- so I move Exhibits 675, 676, 677, and
2 678 into the record.

3 (Wherein, Exhibits 677 and 678 were
4 introduced.)

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

6 MR. AGATHEN: I do, Your Honor. Paul
7 Agathen for the Missouri Landowners Alliance. In
8 lieu of reading my objections into the record at
9 this point, we've distributed copies of our
10 objections in advance and I would ask that the
11 Missouri Landowners Alliance objections 384 be made
12 part of the record.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Since those are
14 already a part of a motion that was already ruled
15 on, I will overrule the objections designated as
16 number 384 and receive into the record Exhibits
17 675, 676, 677, 678.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, if I might add?
19 Were those objections to both exhibits? 675 and
20 676?

21 MR. AGATHEN: The objections identify
22 which specific portions of the testimony they note
23 -- they go.

24 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

25 MR. BRADY: So with that, Your Honor,

1 I make Michael Goggin available for
2 cross-examination.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
4 by Grain Belt.

5 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

7 MR. HEALY: No questions, Judge.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

9 MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Judge.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 QUESTIONS BY MR. ROBERTSON:

12 Q Mr. Goggin, can you hear me?

13 A Yes, I can.

14 Q My name is Henry Robertson, I am the
15 attorney for Sierra Club and Natural Resources
16 Defense Council. I'd like to refer to you page 12
17 of your rebuttal.

18 A Okay. I'm there.

19 Q And you have there a calculation of
20 what Ameren would need to meet the renewable energy
21 standard in Missouri. You say 4 million megawatt
22 hours of non-solar renewable RECs which could be
23 provided by approximately 1,200 megawatts of wind
24 with a capacity factor of 38 percent; is that
25 right?

1 A That's correct.

2 **Q What is the basis for that capacity**
3 **factor?**

4 A That was just a rough number I used.
5 You know, within this situation there wasn't
6 clarity on what type, you know, where the resource,
7 the wind resource would be located and so, you
8 know, if it was an end region, you know, closer to
9 Missouri, you'd probably have a lower capacity
10 factor. If it was, you know, of the resource type
11 delivered via Grain Belt, it would essentially be a
12 higher capacity factor.

13 But for the purposes here it wasn't
14 clear which of those resource types it was, so I
15 just used a somewhat arbitrary middle number.

16 **Q Now, is this calculation to meet**
17 **renewable energy standard of 10 percent of sales or**
18 **15 percent?**

19 A I believe this is the 15 percent by
20 2021.

21 **Q Would you be open to the suggestion**
22 **that your 4 million megawatt hour figure is an**
23 **underestimate?**

24 A That's possible. I'm not as fully up
25 to speed on late developments in this case, so

1 that's possible.

2 (Wherein, Exhibit 201 was
3 introduced.)

4 Q (BY MR. ROBERTSON) I want to refer
5 to Staff's rebuttal report. I can't show it to you
6 so you'll have to take my word for it, but on page
7 -- I believe it's been marked Exhibit 201.

8 On page 17 Staff performed a similar
9 calculation and then found, based on Ameren's 2015
10 sales, their non-solar 2021 RES requirements 5.274
11 million megawatt hours. Does that sound reasonable
12 to you?

13 A It does sound reasonable, yes.

14 Q Now, you consulted Ameren's own 2016
15 RES compliance plan, did you not?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Do you recall what figure Ameren gave
18 for its own requirement?

19 A I do not recall.

20 Q All right. I am going to refer you
21 to an excerpt from Ameren's 2016 to '18 compliance
22 plan which I'll label Exhibit 726, if you'll bear
23 with me.

24 You still there?

25 A Yes.

1 (Wherein, Exhibit 726 was
2 introduced.)

3 Q (BY MR. ROBERTSON) I just excerpted
4 Table 2 from Ameren's report and for the year 2018
5 with a 10 percent RES requirement Ameren estimated
6 its non-solar renewable revenue requirement at
7 watts 3,157,757 megawatt hours.

8 Now, if that increases to 15 percent
9 and we assume that Ameren's sales remain the same,
10 then by 2021 they would need a little less than
11 1,600,000 additional megawatt hours, which adds up
12 to roughly 4,700,000 megawatt hours.

13 Did you assume that Ameren's sales
14 would decline by that much to get down to 4 million
15 megawatt hours?

16 A No, I did not.

17 Q Okay. Well, there are now three
18 figures in evidence concerning the 15 percent
19 non-solar requirement for Ameren and yours is the
20 lowest. So it could be, would you agree, more than
21 1,200 megawatts of wind that would be needed to
22 make that requirement?

23 A I agree.

24 Q And are you familiar with Ameren's
25 existing renewable energy resources?

1 A Generally.

2 Q All right. Well, I can refer to
3 Staff summary 102.3 megawatts of wind coupled with
4 approximately one million RECs from Ameren Missouri
5 owned renewable facilities.

6 If we were to add to that 500
7 megawatts of Missouri wind, and assume that Ameren
8 bought all of the unbundled RECs from that 500
9 megawatts in Missouri wind, they would still be
10 well short of meeting their renewable energy
11 requirement; would you agree?

12 A Yes, I would agree.

13 MR. ROBERTSON: All right. That's
14 all I have. Thank you.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Infinity
16 Wind?

17 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: By MIEC?

19 MR. MILLS: No questions.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

21 MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

23 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

25 MR. LINTON: Just a few, Your Honor.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

3 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Goggin, my name
4 is David Linton, I represent Show Me Concerned
5 Landowners.

6 A Good afternoon.

7 Q I would like to direct your attention
8 to page 19 of your rebuttal testimony.

9 A I'm there.

10 Q Line 394, you state, "A weak electric
11 grid makes it possible for generation owners in
12 constrained sections of the electric grid to exert
13 market power and charge excessive prices."

14 Do you see that?

15 A Yes, I do.

16 Q I assume that's a bad thing?

17 A In general, higher prices are bad for
18 consumers, yes.

19 Q Okay. And who is responsible for
20 designing the electric grid?

21 A It's, in regions such as Missouri,
22 it's the ISOs take the lead in planning
23 transmission.

24 Q And how do they get funds to build
25 and enhance the electric grid?

1 A Those are collected from rate payer
2 payments, basically loads or entities clock those
3 through their bills and those are, you know,
4 aggregated to the ISO and used to pay for those
5 upgrades.

6 Q So as customers use the system,
7 whether that's generators or load-serving entities,
8 the -- the loads pay for the use of the system via
9 charges in the tariff?

10 A That's how it works in MISO, yes.

11 Q Would you agree that's how it works
12 in SPP as well?

13 A Yes, I would.

14 Q Now, if transmission service is
15 diverted from SPP and MISO to an HVDC line, that
16 will be revenue that SPP, MISO, and their member
17 transmission owners will lose; correct?

18 A I don't know that it would be
19 diverted. You know, there are still -- I mean, I
20 guess are you talking about revenue associated with
21 future wind deployment?

22 Q Right. If the wind generator
23 connects to SPP and/or MISO and SPP and/or MISO
24 have to upgrade the network to provide service to
25 that service, to that request for transmission

1 service, take that as one scenario. And as a -- an
2 alternate scenario you take a transmission or a
3 wind generator that generates in Kansas and
4 provides that service via an HVDC line, the
5 transmission revenue will go to the merchant
6 provider of the HVDC line and not go to SPP or
7 MISO. Correct?

8 A That would be true, but at the same
9 time the ISO would not be incurring the cost of
10 those AC system upgrades that would be necessary to
11 facilitate those new projects and since, you know,
12 their revenue is necessary and kept at the level to
13 only recover the cost, it should have no net impact
14 because both the cost and the revenue would not go
15 up by the same amount.

16 Q And I think what you said is that in
17 not responding to that request, SPP and MISO would
18 not incur the cost of building an upgrade on the
19 system?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q And not -- that would also not
22 enhance the grid?

23 A The AC system. The DC system would
24 be enhanced through the construction of the line.

25 MR. LINTON: Thank you very much. No

1 further questions.

2 THE WITNESS: Sure.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Farm
4 Bureau?

5 MR. HADEN: None, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

7 MR. AGATHEN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank
8 you.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

11 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Goggin.

12 A Good afternoon.

13 Q My name is Paul Agathen, I am
14 appearing on behalf of the Missouri Landowners
15 Alliance and four other Intervenors. Can you hear
16 me?

17 A Yes, I can.

18 Q You're testifying on behalf of both
19 Wind on the Wires and The Wind Coalition; correct?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Are there any members on the board of
22 Wind on the Wires from Clean Line?

23 A I believe there are. I'm not a --
24 you know, I don't work for Wind on the Wires, but
25 I've seen publicly available information that

1 indicates there are.

2 Q Are there any members on the board of
3 The Wind Coalition from Clean Line?

4 A Again, I believe so based on public
5 information.

6 Q And does Clean Line make annual
7 financial contributions to both of those
8 organizations?

9 A I believe so. That's the nature of
10 how those organizations work.

11 Q Your actual employer is the American
12 Wind Energy Association; correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Is it correct that Mr. Skelly of
15 Clean Line is an officer with the American Wind
16 Energy Association?

17 A He is on the board. That's correct.

18 Q And that Clean Line contributes
19 regularly to the American Wind Energy Association?

20 A Yes, as all wind industry members who
21 are members of AWEA do, yes.

22 Q In conjunction with this case, did
23 you perform an independent study or analysis of the
24 relative costs to utilities in Missouri of
25 purchasing Kansas wind energy transmitted over the

1 **Grain Belt line versus other sources of supply?**

2 A I consulted industry data sources and
3 used my expert opinion to provide information about
4 the relative cost of different wind energy
5 resources in both Kansas and, you know, other, you
6 know, less high quality wind resources.

7 Q Did you perform an actual study or
8 analysis of that situation?

9 A I did not.

10 Q Did you do such an analysis of the
11 ability of Ameren Missouri to purchase additional
12 renewable energy without exceeding the rate cap in
13 Missouri?

14 A I did not.

15 Q Did you do an analysis of the impact
16 of the Grain Belt project on wholesale electricity
17 prices in Missouri?

18 A I did not.

19 Q Did you do such an analysis on the
20 impact of the Grain Belt project on transmission
21 congestion in Missouri?

22 A I did not.

23 Q And finally, did you do such an
24 analysis of congestion costs associated with
25 delivering Kansas wind energy into Missouri on the

1 AC system?

2 A I qualitatively spoke to that in my
3 testimony but I did not do independent analysis.

4 Q You're familiar with the document
5 titled Wind Technologies Market Report published by
6 the US Department of Energy, are you not?

7 A Yes, I am.

8 Q We're going to distribute a copy of
9 here what's been marked as Exhibit 374 and that
10 consists of certain pages of that Wind Technology
11 Market Report.

12 (Wherein, Exhibit 374 was
13 introduced.)

14 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) You have a copy of
15 the full document there with you, do you not?

16 A I do.

17 Q And that was issued in August of last
18 year; is that correct?

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Did you hear that
20 question, Mr. Goggin?

21 THE WITNESS: No, I didn't.

22 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Was that issued in
23 August of last year?

24 A Yes, it was.

25 Q So at this point that would be the

1 latest version of that publication; correct?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q Could you turn, please, to Roman
4 Numeral page IX of the report, Roman Numeral IX, I
5 guess, near the beginning.

6 A Yes, I'm there.

7 Q And the heading of the last bullet
8 point on that page states that the relative
9 economic competitiveness of wind power declined in
10 2015 with the drop in wholesale power prices; is
11 that correct?

12 A That's correct, due to the abnormally
13 low natural gas prices that were present in 2015.

14 Q Right. And the report goes on to
15 explain that heading there, does it not?

16 A It does.

17 Q If you'd look at the first bullet
18 point on the next page, this may be in the record
19 already but just to be clear, the last sentence of
20 that bullet point says that the production tax
21 credit will phase down the increments of 20
22 percentage points per year for projects starting
23 construction in the year 2017 (80 percent
24 production tax credit), and then 2018, 60 percent,
25 and 2019, 40 percent. Is that correct?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q **Could you briefly explain what an**
3 **interconnection queue is for proposed generation**
4 **projects?**

5 A Sure. When a wind project developer
6 is planning a project and proposing to interconnect
7 it to the transmission system, they must apply for
8 interconnection. And that starts a study process,
9 they're placed in a queue of projects basically
10 that are waiting for interconnection and are going
11 through that study process, and then at the
12 successful termination of those studies there will
13 be a signing of an interconnection agreement which
14 allows the interconnection of that generator to go
15 forward.

16 Q **Thank you. Can you turn to page 13**
17 **of the market report we've been talking about?**

18 A Yes.

19 Q **In the last three lines the following**
20 **statement is made: A total amount of wind, coal,**
21 **and nuclear power in the sample interconnection**
22 **queues (considering gross additions in project**
23 **dropouts) has generally declined in recent years;**
24 **whereas, natural gas and solar capacity has**
25 **increased or held steady. Is that correct?**

1 A Yeah, that's what it says.

2 Q Has the decline in wind generation
3 costs over the last decade or so been due in part
4 at least to the increasing sizes of the turbines?

5 A That has been a factor, yes.

6 Q Could you turn to page 31 of the
7 report, please?

8 A Sure.

9 Q The dark black line on the bar chart
10 there shows the change in the size of the average
11 name plate capacity for wind turbines, does it not?

12 A It does, yes.

13 Q And it states beginning at line 3 of
14 that page, the average name plate capacity of newly
15 installed wind turbines has largely held steady
16 since the year 2011; is that correct?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q And the report we've been discussing
19 generally breaks a lot of the data down into
20 different regions of the country, does it not?

21 A It does.

22 Q Could you turn to page 38 of the
23 report? That's a map there which depicts the
24 boundaries of those regions, is it not?

25 A It does.

1 Q And both Missouri and Kansas are
2 included in what they call an interior region?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q One of the issues in this case
5 concerns the relative costs of different sources of
6 energy available to Missouri; you are aware of
7 that?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And would you agree in that regard
10 that the projected capacity factor of the Kansas
11 wind farms is an important consideration in
12 estimating the cost of the energy from Kansas?

13 A Yes, it is.

14 Q Mr. Berry uses a projected capacity
15 factor for the Kansas wind farms of 55 percent in
16 his levelized cost analysis. Do you recall that?

17 A Yes, I do.

18 Q Could you turn, please, to page 42 of
19 the market report? The graph there shows the
20 actual capacity factors for wind farms for the last
21 year that the data was available, in year 2015; is
22 that correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And it's broken down by the year that
25 the wind project was installed?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q So just for example, the bar on the
3 far left depicts capacity factors for wind farms
4 built in the years 1998 to 1999. Correct?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q And then on the far right are the
7 capacity factors for wind farms built in 2014.

8 A That's correct.

9 Q And that would be the last year for
10 which the data is available; correct?

11 A That is correct.

12 Q And does this chart show that not one
13 of the several hundred wind farms had capacity
14 factors of 55 percent?

15 A That's correct. I mean, this is data
16 for 2014 and as you can see, there's a steadily
17 increasing trend and, you know, we were -- evidence
18 I've seen, looking at production more recently
19 shows they steadily increasing trend as well. So I
20 believe a 55 percent estimate is reliable for, you
21 know, the type of wind resource that would be
22 accessed for Grain Belt.

23 I should also note that the capacity
24 factor information here includes curtailment of
25 generation, that is a major problem in western

1 HBPs, and limiting the output of many of the wind
2 projects that are included in this sample and
3 obviously that would not be the case with wind
4 resources that had firm transmission capacity on
5 the Grain Belt Express line.

6 Q According to this chart, it does not
7 show that -- maybe one of the wind farms achieved a
8 50 percent capacity factor?

9 A That's right, there are numbers in
10 the high 40s and it looks like one is approaching
11 50 percent.

12 Q Would you turn now to page 44 of the
13 report?

14 A Okay, I'm there.

15 Q Do you see the last sentence of the
16 first full paragraph there?

17 A Yes.

18 Q It says, "Looking ahead to 2016, 2015
19 vintage projects are likely to perform similarly to
20 those built in 2014 on average, given only modest
21 changes in these three underlying drivers among the
22 2015 fleet."

23 Do you see that?

24 A Yes, I see that.

25 Q Now turn to page 48 of the report.

1 The graph there shows a breakdown of capacity
2 factors by the various geographic regions we
3 referred to earlier; correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q And this chart includes only the
6 projects built in year 2014. Again, that's the
7 latest year for the -- for which we have available
8 data; is that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q And if you look at the bar on the far
11 right for the region which includes Kansas, there
12 were 24 projects built that year; correct?

13 A That's correct, yes.

14 Q And the capacity factors shown there
15 are for the year 2015?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q And again, with one possible
18 exception, none of those projects had a capacity
19 factor in year 2015, which exceeds even 50 percent;
20 is that correct?

21 A Um, no, there's one approaching 50
22 percent but not exceeding.

23 Q If you turn to page 64 of the report,
24 please?

25 A Okay, I'm there.

1 Q The heading on the top of the page
2 says: The relative economic competitiveness of
3 wind power declined in the year 2015 with a drop in
4 wholesale power prices. Is that correct?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q And the shaded area on the chart
7 itself depicts the range in wholesale power prices;
8 is that correct?

9 A Yes. The -- that's correct, yes.

10 Q And the orange color shows the
11 wholesale prices in the interior region?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q And for the last year shown, 2015,
14 the wind PPA rose to what looks like something just
15 under \$40 per megawatt hour; is that correct?

16 A I would -- that is correct. Noting
17 the very bottom of the table shows that this was a
18 small sample size for that year. Much smaller than
19 preceding years. And so, yeah, I think appropriate
20 caveat should go with, you know, extrapolating from
21 a single year of, you know, sparse data when there
22 were larger data sets available in previous years
23 that showed lower prices.

24 Q If you'd look at the last paragraph
25 on that page, the report says, starting in 2009,

1 however, the sharp drop in wholesale electricity
2 prices (driven primarily by lower natural gas
3 prices) squeezed average wind PPA prices out of the
4 wholesale power price range on a nationwide basis.
5 Is that correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q And then the report says, beginning
8 in the fourth line, page 65, subsequently, the
9 sharp drop in average wholesale electricity prices
10 in 2015 has made it somewhat harder for wind to
11 compete in the market. Is that correct?

12 A That's correct. And again, this is
13 referring to the anomalous drop in natural gas
14 prices that occurred in 2015.

15 Q One more question on this report. If
16 you turn to page 70, in the paragraph below the
17 map, the report makes the following observation:
18 Of all wind power capacity built in the United
19 States from the year 2000 through the year 2015,
20 roughly 51 percent is delivered to load-serving
21 entities with RPS obligations. In recent years,
22 however, the role of state RPS programs and driving
23 incremental wind power growth has diminished at
24 least on a national basis. Is that correct?

25 A That's correct. Yeah, and with the

1 key term there being "on a national basis" because
2 the RPS programs are still critical drivers in many
3 regions including PJM and parts of MISO as well.

4 MR. AGATHEN: I'll offer Exhibit 374,
5 Your Honor.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

7 MR. BRADY: I just -- the only
8 objection I have is this -- a copy of this Wind
9 Technology Report is already -- or will be moved
10 into the record as part of Infinity -- it's part of
11 Mr. Langley's testimony. He hasn't testified yet,
12 it hasn't been moved into the record, but this
13 whole report is part of his testimony.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Well, since I
15 haven't -- since it's not part of the record yet, I
16 think I'll go ahead and allow this to be received
17 into the record. 374 is received.

18 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) You're familiar
19 with at least some of the wind data basis compiled
20 by the US Department of Energy's Natural (sic)
21 Renewable Energy Laboratory, are you not?

22 A I am.

23 Q And is this organization sometimes
24 referred to as simply NREL?

25 A That's correct.

1 Q Do you recall testifying in the last
2 Grain Belt case here at this Commission how the
3 NREL data can be used to calculate a capacity
4 factor for wind generators on a state by state
5 basis?

6 A An average capacity factor, yes.

7 Q All right. Do you have a copy there
8 with you of your rebuttal testimony from the last
9 case here in Missouri?

10 A Yes, I do.

11 Q That's EA 2014-0207.

12 A Yes.

13 Q Could you turn to page 8 of that
14 testimony, please?

15 A Okay, yes.

16 Q Beginning at line 215, you state that
17 the NREL's database includes estimates of potential
18 wind energy production for each state as well as
19 potentially installed wind capacity; is that
20 correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Then beginning in the middle of line
23 217, you state that the potential wind production
24 can be divided by the potential wind capacity to
25 arrive at an estimated average capacity factor for

1 the total wind energy resources for each state; is
2 that correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q It's a simple mathematical
5 calculation basically, isn't it?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you stated in a number of other
8 cases how the NREL data can be used to estimate
9 these average annual capacity factors; correct?

10 A Yes, I have.

11 Q I'm distributing here a copy of
12 what's been marked as Exhibit 342, and the same
13 document is Exhibit 327 from the last Grain Belt
14 case consisting of three pages and the cover is
15 entitled New US Wind Energy Potential Estimates.

16 (Wherein, Exhibit 342 was
17 introduced.)

18 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Do you have a copy
19 of that document with you?

20 A Yes, I do.

21 Q Following your explanation of how to
22 calculate the estimated capacity factor for a given
23 state, I made some calculation shown in the
24 right-hand margin for several states on that
25 document. Do you see those?

1 A Yes, I do.

2 Q **And based on my calculations, this**
3 **data shows an estimated capacity factor for the**
4 **State of Kansas of 45 percent; is that correct?**

5 A That's what's shown, yes.

6 Q **Does that sound correct to you?**

7 A For this data set, I would note that
8 this is including all land that has a capacity
9 factor greater than 40 percent. And the numbers
10 that I had -- the data that I had used in doing
11 those calculations for the -- my 2014 testimony had
12 a lower capacity factor cutoff.

13 Basically it allowed -- I don't know
14 exactly where the cutoff was but allowed --
15 clearly, you know, my number, my average was 33.7
16 percent for Missouri. So it allowed areas with
17 lower wind speeds and lower capacity factors into
18 the data set.

19 Whereas, this one is excluding those
20 because it only -- it starts at 40 percent and up
21 and that has a major impact on the average you get
22 because when you have this higher threshold, a
23 state like Missouri in particular that has a major
24 impact because Missouri has only a small amount of
25 land that exceeds 40 percent.

1 And as a result, the average comes
2 out, you know, if you're only looking at areas
3 above 40 percent the average comes out artificially
4 high because you've limited the amount of land that
5 -- you know, you can exclude all the lower quality
6 wind areas from the data set.

7 That has a less -- that exclusion has
8 a -- tends to reduce the capacity factor in states
9 like Kansas because they have very high quality
10 wind resources at the top end of that. But they
11 have, you know, basically the entire state is of
12 sufficient quality that it would be above 40
13 percent. So that artificially brings down their
14 average.

15 But I think when you're looking at,
16 you know, basically with a transmission line like
17 the Grain Belt Express line that's designed to
18 access the highest quality of those resources, a
19 more meaningful metric can be looking at the best
20 capacity factors in those regions.

21 And I've looked at the NREL data that
22 underlies these calculations, and when you look at
23 those numbers, it shows that the best wind
24 resources in Kansas do have a capacity factor
25 around 55 percent and those in Missouri, at best,

1 are just over 40 percent.

2 And so what we're seeing in this
3 table here because it only starts at 40 percent is
4 capturing only the best of those Missouri wind
5 resources, but for Kansas it's capturing a whole
6 range of some of the lower quality resources that,
7 you know, range down to 40 percent.

8 **Q Well, is it fair to assume, sir, that**
9 **if you're going to build a wind farm in Missouri,**
10 **that you're going to build it in one of the better**
11 **portions of the state as far as the capacity factor**
12 **goes?**

13 A Subject to transmission access and
14 siting considerations that, you know, as NREL notes
15 here, and as, you know, any developer would state
16 in practice, there are a number of factors that can
17 prevent you from developing the best wind
18 resources.

19 Typically you'll develop the best
20 wind resources that you can, but that means you
21 have to have the transmission, it means you have to
22 have -- you know, be able to pass any siting
23 obstacles, you have to be able to procure the land,
24 and all those criteria are actually met.

25 **Q Given all of that, the objective**

1 would be to build it in the areas with the highest
2 wind speeds, would it not?

3 A If -- if you can.

4 Q I think I had asked you about the
5 figure for Kansas which I believe you said sounded
6 reasonable based on the data here. Does the
7 capacity factor for Iowa also look reasonable?

8 A The same factor that I discussed with
9 Kansas as to why, given, you know, the range of
10 data that's covered here, you know, in the 40
11 percent threshold, yeah, I think that would also
12 apply there.

13 Q But the math is right?

14 A I'm sorry?

15 Q The math is correct?

16 A The math is correct, yes.

17 Q And also correct for Missouri?

18 A Yes. Again, subject to the, you
19 know, the threshold kind of distorting the view
20 provided by that.

21 Q Do you have with you there your
22 direct testimony for the Rock Island case at the
23 Illinois Commerce Commission, Docket Number
24 12-0560?

25 A Yes, I do.

1 Q Your testimony there generally
2 addressed the virtues of the wind resources in some
3 of the MISO states; is that correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q Could I direct your attention,
6 please, to page 2 of that testimony?

7 A Okay.

8 Q Beginning at line 48, you state,
9 "Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Minnesota have
10 some of the best wind energy resources in the
11 United States"?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q And those are all states in the MISO
14 footprint, are they not?

15 A Yes, they are. I would note that
16 there are in the event transmission constraints
17 that limit the deliverability of wind from those
18 states to other parts of MISO.

19 Q Directing your attention to page 3 of
20 your testimony beginning at line 56, did you state
21 there is enough wind potential from just those four
22 states to meet the current electricity needs of the
23 US at least two times over?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And that those four MISO states have

1 a combined wind energy potential equal to around 26
2 percent of the total onshore wind potential in the
3 country?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q On a different subject, do you recall
6 testifying in a case at the Oklahoma Commission
7 where you addressed the decision of Oklahoma Gas &
8 Electric to exclude wind generation from
9 consideration in its Integrated Resource Plan?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Oklahoma Gas & Electric is the
12 largest electric utility in that state, are they
13 not?

14 A I believe so, yes.

15 Q Do you have a copy of that testimony
16 with you?

17 A I do.

18 Q And that's dated December of 2014;
19 correct?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Directing your attention to page 27
22 of your testimony.

23 A Okay, I'm there.

24 Q Beginning at line 1, you describe the
25 first reason given by Oklahoma Gas & Electric for

1 **excluding wind generation from its IRP; correct?**

2 A That's correct.

3 Q And what you say there, generally, is
4 that OG&E concluded it should exclude wind because
5 SPP only recognizes approximately 5 percent of name
6 plate wind generation capability for capacity
7 margin purpose.

8 MR. BRADY: Mr. Agathen, hold up for
9 a second because the document I have isn't matching
10 up with -- so maybe I've got the wrong -- you said,
11 is it line number 1 on that page? Or just the
12 first line on that page?

13 MR. AGATHEN: Page 27, beginning at
14 line 1.

15 MR. BRADY: Okay, because I've got
16 line number 721 at the top of page 27, you said;
17 right?

18 MR. AGATHEN: Yes.

19 A There might be a slightly different
20 version. I see what he's referring to.

21 MR. BRADY: I think I do see it now.
22 You mentioned approximately 5 percent of name plate
23 wind generation? I think I'm on the right page
24 now. That's on my page 26. So go ahead. Sorry.

25 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Let me start over.

1 **Generally, what you say there is that OG&E**
2 **concluded it should exclude wind because SPP only**
3 **recognizes approximately 5 percent of name plate**
4 **wind generation capability for capacity margin**
5 **purposes; is that correct?**

6 A I -- what I say here is that that was
7 OG&E's argument and I explained that that was not
8 correct, that there was a new method at that time
9 SPP was developing that awarded simply higher
10 capacity credit and, as I explained, it's 14
11 percent is one of the numbers that comes out of
12 that new method.

13 Q **We were just about to get to that.**
14 **Thank you.**

15 A Okay.

16 Q **So what does that 14 percent that you**
17 **were arguing for, what does that represent? What**
18 **does that mean?**

19 A So that's a credited capacity, and
20 again, this is SPP's method. I think it does
21 somewhat understate the actual capacity value of
22 wind projects. Those are typically calculated
23 using an effective load carrying capability method
24 or loss of load probability method that looks more
25 at, you know, shorter periods of the year and other

1 periods not just the peak hours of the year and
2 calculates the total capacity value of wind across
3 the entire year.

4 But the both -- the old and the new
5 method that SPP had and was proposing and then
6 discussing in this testimony used a different
7 method and exceed its method that is viewed as less
8 reliable and it does tend to result in a lower
9 capacity value accreditation than the ELCC method
10 that is generally regarded as the best.

11 **Q So, just so it's clear, even your 14**
12 **percent figure means that the wind generation**
13 **facility would be only given 14 percent of its name**
14 **plate rating for reliability purposes and capacity**
15 **planning purposes?**

16 **A** That's correct, but again, that
17 number -- that method that they use to arrive at
18 that 14 percent is arriving at a low number
19 relative to better methods like the effective load
20 carrying capability method.

21 **Q On a different subject, would you**
22 **agree that if the Grain Belt line is built, each**
23 **megawatt hour of wind energy from the line would in**
24 **fact displace a megawatt hour that would have been**
25 **provided by a conventional generator?**

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Are you generally familiar with the
3 fact that one issue in this case involves the
4 relative costs of generation and transmission for
5 wind projects in Kansas compared to MISO states?

6 A Yes.

7 Q You've testified in other cases
8 involving the costs and benefits of wind generation
9 from Iowa, have you not?

10 A I have.

11 Q And one of those cases was the
12 Illinois Commerce Commission case where you
13 testified on behalf of the Illinois River project?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Do you have a copy of that testimony
16 with you?

17 A I do. One second, let me find it.
18 One second. Okay, I have it.

19 Q Can you explain very briefly what
20 that case was all about?

21 A Yes. It was in support of a AC
22 transmission project, the Illinois Rivers project,
23 that was one of the multi-value projects put
24 forward by MISO to help relieve congestion and
25 improve reliability and also support public policy

1 requirements in the MISO region. And it -- those
2 -- the project in that case crossed the state of
3 Illinois to facilitate kind of the eastward
4 delivery of wind resources from western MISO.

5 Q And you were testifying in support of
6 the line there; right?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q Could you turn to page 2 of your
9 testimony, please?

10 A Yes. I'm there.

11 Q Starting at line 32, you testified as
12 follows: "By providing additional supply to the
13 PJM market, the Grain Belt Express project is
14 alleviating the high demand for PJM RECs that could
15 lead to higher REC prices in Illinois."

16 A Can you give me the line number?

17 Q Well, perhaps I have the wrong
18 document.

19 MR. BRADY: You said it was his
20 direct testimony? Or --

21 MR. AGATHEN: One moment. I've got
22 the wrong document. One moment, excuse me. Okay,
23 Got it.

24 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Can you turn to
25 page 2 of your testimony?

1 A Okay.

2 Q And starting at line 50.

3 A Okay.

4 Q You testified, "Illinois and the
5 parts of MISO to the west of Illinois have some of
6 the best wind energy resources in the United
7 States." Correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then at page 3, beginning at line
10 61, you state: "NREL's data indicates that North
11 Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, and Iowa
12 combined have wind energy potential of 2,838,000
13 megawatts, around 34 percent of the total onshore
14 potential in the lower 48 United States, or enough
15 to meet in the lower 48 US states, or enough to
16 meet the current electricity needs of the US at
17 least two times over." Correct?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q And going over to page 7, line 175,
20 you state, "MISO worked with stakeholders in the
21 RGOS," all caps, "process to identify zones where
22 future wind development is likely to occur and
23 would most cost effectively occur. To identify the
24 most cost effective wind resource mix, the RGOS
25 analysis carefully balanced generation costs and

1 transmission costs to arrive at the optimal mix of
2 wind resources." Is that correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q And just by way of explanation, what
5 is the RGOS analysis that you're referring to
6 there?

7 A That was a MISO study, it was, it
8 stands for the Regional Generation Outlet Study.
9 It was done, I think going back to 2010 or 2011,
10 and kind of preceded the multi-value project
11 analysis.

12 Q And down in footnote 5 of that same
13 page, you testify as follows: "The goal of the
14 RGOS analysis was to design transmission portfolios
15 that would enable RPS mandates to be met at the
16 lowest deliverable wholesale energy cost. The cost
17 calculation combined the expenses of the new
18 transmission portfolio with the kite (sic) full of
19 costs of the new renewable generation balancing the
20 tradeoffs of a lower transmission investment to
21 deliver wind from low wind availability areas,
22 typically closer to large load centers, against a
23 larger transmission investment to deliver wind from
24 higher wind availability areas, typically located
25 further from load centers." Is that correct?

1 A That's correct. And I would note
2 that the MVP transmission lines that were approved
3 and are in the process of being built, there's
4 minimal delivery of wind resources to the State of
5 Missouri from those lines. You know, the line that
6 comes down, MVP 7 and 8 that comes down from Iowa
7 into Missouri, then routes into the Illinois Rivers
8 project and transfers that energy across Illinois
9 and to by basically the Indiana border. And so
10 there is not a large amount of delivery of wind to
11 Missouri from the transmission that resulted from
12 that process.

13 Q Could you turn to page 10 of your
14 **testimony there, please?**

15 A Sure.

16 Q You see starting at line 258, you
17 **state: "As the MISO MVP project report indicates,**
18 **the Illinois River project and the broader MVP**
19 **portfolio greatly reduce consumer energy costs as**
20 **adjusted production cost savings are achieved**
21 **through reduction of transmission congestion costs**
22 **and more efficient use of generation resources**
23 **across the system." Is that correct?**

24 A That's correct.

25 Q And then the next paragraph you go on

1 to say, "This is not surprising as the Illinois
2 River project was designed by MISO as part of a
3 portfolio to satisfy states' RPS requirements at
4 the lowest cost for consumers. As the MISO MVP
5 report explains, the goal of the RGOS analysis was
6 to design transmission portfolios that would enable
7 RPS mandates to be met at the lowest deliverable
8 wholesale energy cost." Is that correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 MR. BRADY: Mr. Agathen -- that's all
11 right.

12 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Then turning to
13 page 12, line 292, you testified, "MISO's analysis
14 found that the Illinois River project was the
15 optimal solution for resolving a number of economic
16 reliability and public policy considerations such
17 as state RPS requirements and was found to be
18 superior to alternative solutions." Is that
19 correct?

20 A That's correct, and again, I note
21 that this is looking within MISO and the wind
22 resources that were available within MISO. It did
23 not evaluate resources from outside of the MISO
24 region.

25 Q Sure. And turning to page 27, line

1 680, question: "Is the equitable allocation of
2 benefit to requirement for a transmission project
3 to be included in the MISO MVP portfolio?"

4 Answer: "Yes. The MVP report
5 explains that the key principle of the MISO
6 planning process is that the benefits from a given
7 transmission project must be spread commensurate
8 with its costs. The MVP cost allocation
9 methodology distributes the costs of the portfolio
10 on a load ratio share across the MISO footprint so
11 that the recommended MVP portfolio must be shown to
12 deliver a similar spread of benefits."

13 Is that accurate?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q On a different subject, could you
16 turn, please, to page 12 of your rebuttal
17 testimony?

18 A In this case?

19 Q Yes.

20 A Okay.

21 Q Finally, huh?

22 A Okay, I'm there.

23 Q With regard to your discussion there
24 at lines 237 to 241, could you briefly explain why
25 the three investor owned utilities in the western

1 part of state do not have a need for renewable
2 energy for compliance with the RES?

3 A That's simply what was indicated by
4 their compliance plan reports. I'm not sure why
5 that's case.

6 Q They're certainly located closer to
7 Kansas, are they not?

8 A That's true.

9 Q Could you please turn to page 14 of
10 your rebuttal testimony?

11 A Yes, I'm there.

12 Q In this case. With reference to line
13 294 there, could you please explain why capacity is
14 being exported by MISO utilities into PJM?

15 A I believe that that would simply be a
16 product of market outcomes. You know, capacity
17 would tend to follow, you know, higher prices,
18 where they're available, relative to lower prices.

19 Q So prices are higher in PJM than in
20 MISO?

21 A I believe so, yes. I would note that
22 the -- within MISO there are different zones. And
23 similarly within PJM, there are different zones.
24 So that's not, you know, necessarily true across
25 the entire footprint.

1 Q **Sure. But on average, obviously, if**
2 **they're exporting power to PJM, then, on average,**
3 **the prices are higher in PJM than in MISO; right?**

4 A Likely. It could be that one of the
5 zones, or, you know, zones that happen to be right
6 across the seam, and, you know, it could be the
7 opposite. If that MISO, what happened to that zone
8 happened to be higher than the adjacent PJM zone.

9 Q **I've got just a few questions dealing**
10 **with your cross-surrebuttal testimony in this case,**
11 **Exhibit, I think it's 676. Do you have a copy of**
12 **that handy?**

13 A Yes, I do.

14 Q **And this may be a minor point but**
15 **could you turn, please, to page 3 of your**
16 **cross-surrebuttal?**

17 A Okay, yes.

18 Q **Line 62 you talk about a comparison**
19 **of CO2 emission reductions made by Mr. Jaskulski,**
20 **J-a-s-k-u-l-s-k-i; is that correct?**

21 A That's correct.

22 Q **He never addressed the CO2 emissions**
23 **issue, did he?**

24 A I believe he did.

25 Q Okay. So you stand by that

1 **statement?**

2 A I, that -- um, that -- that could be
3 a mistake. Maybe it was supposed to be a reference
4 to Mr. Shaw. That might be a mistake because it
5 isn't a question that relates to witness Shaw's
6 testimony.

7 Q Okay. So the -- Mr. Jaskulski's
8 testimony will speak for itself then in that
9 regard; right?

10 A I believe so. I'd have to check.

11 Q Near the bottom of page 9 of your
12 cross-surrebuttal testimony beginning at line 184,
13 you say that the energy provided by the Grain Belt
14 line would be at the low end of energy rates Ameren
15 Missouri charges its customers; right?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q When you refer to the cost of energy
18 from the Grain Belt line, are you referring to just
19 cost of the energy? Or the cost of the
20 transmission as well?

21 A I believe that was the all-in cost.
22 Energy plus transmission.

23 Q Is there anything else included in
24 the cost of energy from the Grain Belt line other
25 than the costs related to generation and

1 **transmission?**

2 A I believe that's the majority of the
3 -- the cost I'm relying on, those are the numbers
4 that have been provided in this case by Grain Belt
5 Express.

6 Q Okay. And you compare that to the
7 Ameren rates and let's just look at the one for a
8 summer residential rate. That's 12.0 cents per
9 kilowatt hour; correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q Isn't it true that that rate includes
12 the cost of a wide variety of elements which aren't
13 even included in the service provided by Grain
14 Belt?

15 A That's true. That would also
16 include, you know, distribution costs.

17 Q And storm restoration expenses?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q And, of course, Grain Belt wouldn't
20 have all the holes and lines and underground
21 conduits involved in a major distribution system,
22 would it?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q Those costs would all be absorbed by
25 the load-serving utilities which buy the capacity;

1 right?

2 A That's correct, and typically
3 distribution is less than half, essentially less
4 than half of the total delivered cost of retail
5 rates.

6 Q Do the Grain Belt rates which you
7 compare to Ameren's include the cost of bad debt
8 write-offs?

9 A I'm sorry, I didn't hear, what type
10 of write-offs? Bad debt?

11 Q Bad debt. Are those included in the
12 Grain Belt rates?

13 A I'm not sure.

14 Q But they would be included in the
15 Ameren rates, would they not?

16 A I believe so. They seem to be total
17 comprehensive retail rates, so yes.

18 Q How about collection expenses?

19 A I believe that would be in there,
20 yes, but that's typically pretty small.

21 Q There's a whole host of different
22 expenses that are included in that Ameren rate
23 which are not included in the Grain Belt rate, are
24 they not?

25 A That's true, but again, you know,

1 generation and transmission are the large majority
2 of retail rate costs.

3 MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Your
4 Honor. Thank you, Mr. Goggin.

5 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Did you intend to
7 offer Exhibit 342?

8 MR. AGATHEN: I did, Your Honor.
9 Thank you.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to
11 its receipt?

12 MR. BRADY: No, Your Honor.

13 MR. ROBERTSON: I'd also like to move
14 the admission of 726 the table from Ameren's RES
15 compliance plan.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: 342 is received.
17 Exhibit 726 has been offered. Any objections to
18 its receipt?

19 MR. BRADY: No objections.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Exhibit 726 is
21 received. We're ready for questions from
22 Commissioners. No questions? Any redirect by wind
23 on the Wires?

24 MR. BRADY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank
25 you.

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADY:

3 Q Mr. Goggin, can you hear me?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Great. Thank you. Going back to Mr.
6 Agathen's cross-examination of you, he had asked
7 you about whether you had done specific analytical
8 -- specific analysis regarding wholesale
9 electricity prices.

10 Do you recall that, generally?

11 A Yes, I do. Yes.

12 Q And do you recall what your answer
13 was to that question?

14 A Um, I believe I said that, um, I had
15 reviewed information, um, that um, experts
16 reasonably rely on in the field and that it best
17 supported the conclusions that Grain Belt has made
18 in that case. This case.

19 Q Okay. That got to my point. Thank
20 you. And then same with -- no, that, that is --
21 give me one second.

22 Do you, Mr. Goggin, do you have the
23 copy of the Wind Technologies Market Report that --
24 well, in front of you?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And let's see. Mr. Agathen had
2 referred to page 42, figure 32.

3 A Okay, yes.

4 Q And in there he had noted the
5 capacity factors for 2014. Do you see that?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Now, Grain Belt Express used a higher
8 capacity factor of 55 percent. Is it your -- is it
9 -- well. What other -- are there other factors
10 that you would see going forward that would account
11 for a higher capacity factor from -- in the wind
12 industry after 2014?

13 A Certainly. As I noted in the
14 cross-examination, there is a strong upward trend
15 here in the average capacity factors. The 2012
16 installed projects came in at about 33 percent.
17 The 2013 projects came in at about 37 percent, it
18 was up 4 percent, and then the trend continuing,
19 the 2014 projects were up to about 41 percent.

20 So you see a 4 percent capacity
21 factor increase per year going from 2012 to 2014,
22 is had an increase of 8 percentage points going
23 from 33 to 41 just in those two years. And that
24 trend is continuing.

25 We're seeing the deployment of larger

1 turbines, particularly longer rotor turbines, but
2 also to some extent taller tower turbines that
3 result in higher energy capture and a much higher
4 capacity factor by capturing more wind at low wind
5 speed periods.

6 And that trend is continuing. We're
7 seeing even larger rotors being installed on
8 turbines going into the field today and, you know,
9 that's expected to continue into the future.

10 So I believe that trend makes a 55
11 percent capacity factor assumption reasonable for
12 Kansas.

13 MR. BRADY: Thank you. No further
14 questions, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right, Mr.
16 Goggin, that completes your testimony. You may
17 hang up now. Thank you for your help today.

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
19 (Witness excused.)

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. We need
21 to take Mr. Shaw out of order, I believe, he has to
22 be done today. Why don't we let Mr. Shaw testify
23 next then. Then we'll go to Mr. Langley.

24 DONALD SHAW,
25 having been called as a witness, was sworn

1 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
2 as follows:

3 DIRECT EXAMINATION

4 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

5 Q Good afternoon. Please state your
6 name for the record.

7 A Donald Shaw.

8 Q And who are you employed by?

9 A No one.

10 Q You're retired then?

11 A I am retired.

12 (Wherein, Exhibit 402 was
13 introduced.)

14 Q (BY MR. LINTON) Have you prepared
15 what has been marked as Exhibit 402?

16 A You have to show that to me. I'm not
17 sure which 402 is. Yes.

18 Q So you do have a copy of what has
19 been marked as Exhibit 402?

20 A Yes, I do.

21 Q And you prepared that; correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q If I were to ask you the questions
24 contained in that document today, would your
25 answers be the same?

1 A That, yes, along with the
2 supplemental answers provided in data requests
3 afterward. There were other filings.

4 Q You do not need to attest to that.

5 A Okay.

6 Q Do you have any corrections to make
7 to that testimony?

8 A No, not in the context it was made
9 in.

10 Q Just to notify the Commission, Show
11 Me Concerned Landowners did file an errata that
12 changed on page 7, line 20, 2,000 divided by 35,99.
13 That should be 35,699.

14 Are your answers contained in this
15 document true and correct to the best of your
16 knowledge and belief?

17 A To the best of my knowledge, yes.

18 MR. LINTON: I offer Exhibit 402 into
19 evidence and tender the witness for
20 cross-examination.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to
22 the receipt of that exhibit? Hearing none, it is
23 received. First cross will be Missouri Landowners.

24 MR. AGATHEN: I have no questions,
25 Your Honor.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau?
2 MR. HADEN: No questions, Your Honor.
3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?
4 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.
5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?
6 MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.
7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?
8 MR. MILLS: No questions.
9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?
10 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.
11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?
12 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions, thank
13 you.
14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?
15 MR. BRADY: No questions, Your Honor.
16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?
17 MR. HEALY: Just a couple, Judge.
18 CROSS-EXAMINATION
19 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:
20 Q Mr. Shaw, how are you doing this
21 afternoon?
22 A Just fine, thank you.
23 Q Did you, in preparation of your
24 testimony, have a opportunity to review the Grain
25 Belt Express, MJMEUC, TSA, Transmission Service

1 **Agreement?**

2 A Yes.

3 Q **Did you have an opportunity review**
4 **the Iron Star, MJMEUC, power purchasing --**

5 A Portions of it, but yes.

6 Q **And would you agree, in combination,**
7 **that's a pretty good deal for delivering energy and**
8 **capacity into MISO?**

9 A Those numbers look very low and you
10 can't blame MJMEUC for subscribing it.

11 MR. HEALY: That's all the questions
12 I have, Judge.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Grain
14 Belt?

15 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

18 Q **Mr. Shaw, you did not file any**
19 **surrebuttal testimony in this case, did you?**

20 A Well, I have a filing in response, I
21 think, to some questions that were raised and I'm
22 not sure what that document is but it was filed
23 with the Commission.

24 Q **Right. Well, Mr. Shaw, the only**
25 **document that Mr. Linton put into evidence was your**

1 **rebuttal testimony marked Exhibit 402.**

2 A Yes, and I have a copy of that here.

3 Q **When did you learn about the Infinity**
4 **Wind contract?**

5 A It was subsequent to this filing.
6 Later. Afterward. Yes, it was after the date of
7 this filing.

8 Q **Can you remember whether it was**
9 **before surrebuttal testimony was due in this case?**

10 A I -- no, I don't know the answer to
11 that.

12 Q **Okay. So you did not file**
13 **surrebuttal testimony to discuss the need factor**
14 **after you became aware of the Infinity Wind**
15 **contract; correct?**

16 A I think there -- some of the
17 responses in the filing that is of record addresses
18 need.

19 Q **Right. But that's what I -- that's**
20 **my point. Exhibit 402, your rebuttal testimony,**
21 **did not discuss the need factor in terms of the**
22 **Infinity Wind contract?**

23 A No. No.

24 Q **Okay. Now, Mr. Shaw, you've overseen**
25 **transmission planning during your 42 years with**

1 Central Electric Power Cooperative; right?

2 A Yes, I have.

3 Q And is it fair to say you built the
4 bulk of the transmission for Central Electric
5 without having to go through an RTO process?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Now, let me just ask you a few
8 questions based upon the DR responses that you
9 provided in this case.

10 You testified, I believe, that you
11 have appeared in approximately 20 eminent domain
12 proceedings on behalf of Central Electric Power?

13 A Yes, as best I can recall, yes.

14 Q And you said in those data request
15 responses that you've testified in 12 Missouri
16 Circuit Court cases; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Well, let me rephrase that. You
19 couldn't tell me the number of cases except about
20 20, but you've testified in 12 circuit courts?

21 A I have specific recollections of
22 being in those counties, in those courthouses,
23 testifying about eminent domain.

24 Q Now, am I correct that Central
25 Electric Power did not prepare or follow any kind

1 of a landowner policy or protocol with regard to
2 the principles to be followed when acquiring
3 right-of-ways for its transmission projects?

4 A There are no written such documents,
5 but we had some guidelines that we used internally,
6 yes.

7 Q But you didn't publish a landowner
8 protocol or policy that you gave out to the people
9 whose land you --

10 A No. No, we did not.

11 Q Let me just finish my question, sir.
12 You did not produce to the public and issue to the
13 public a landowner protocol or policy that set
14 forth those principles; correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q And am I correct that you did not, in
17 your capacity as an officer at Central Electric
18 Power Cooperative, nor did the Cooperative itself
19 prepare or issue a code of conduct that would
20 govern the employees or the land agents who would
21 go out and talk with the public about the land that
22 you proposed to acquire?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And am I also correct that Central
25 Electric Power Cooperative did not prepare any kind

1 of an agricultural impact policy or statement that
2 it made public?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Now, with regard to easement
5 payments, what was the basis of the payments that
6 Central Electric would make to landowners during
7 the time that you were employed by Central
8 Electric?

9 A There was a -- an assessment made as
10 to what the fee value of the properties were that
11 were under consideration for acquiring the
12 easements from and the negotiations then were
13 conducted on the basis of those fee values, and it
14 varied depending on the character of the land and
15 the use, what percentage of fee would actually be
16 offered as compensation for a permanent easement.

17 Q Okay. And in the data request
18 responses you stated that the estimate range that
19 Central Electric would use was 70 percent to 110
20 percent; correct?

21 A Yes. If you had a parcel of land
22 that had no structures on it whatsoever, just wires
23 crossing it, it might be less than 100 percent. On
24 the other hand, if the property were heavily
25 impacted by the location of structures and the

1 placement of the easement, the -- you could go
2 above 100 percent.

3 Q Now, during the period of time that
4 you worked for Central Electric, did Central
5 Electric offer structure payments to landowners
6 regarding the types of transmission poles that were
7 used in the construction of its transmission
8 projects?

9 A I took that to mean in addition to
10 the per acre offer, and they weren't made in
11 combination. Some of the older easements were by
12 per pole, but it was a one-time payment.

13 Q And so you did not make a separate
14 easement payment and then a separate structure
15 payment correct?

16 A We did not, no.

17 Q And I'm correct that because you had
18 no structure payment, a landowner would not be
19 given the opportunity to choose between a one-time
20 payment or periodic payments over the time period
21 when that structure was on their property?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q Okay. And so you didn't have a
24 periodic payment policy that included any kind of
25 an escalator; correct?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q And am I also correct that in the
3 course of acquiring property for your transmission
4 lines, you did not offer landowners the opportunity
5 to go to binding arbitration in lieu of eminent
6 domain proceedings in Circuit Court?

7 A That's correct.

8 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Judge.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from
10 Commissioners? No. Redirect by Show Me
11 Landowners?

12 MR. LINTON: Just a couple, Your
13 Honor.

14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

16 Q You received a question from Mr.
17 Healy regarding the Iron Star --

18 A Iron Star purchase of a wind project,
19 yeah.

20 Q And you received a question from Mr.
21 Zobrist regarding whether or not you filed
22 surrebuttal testimony. And you answered Mr.
23 Healy's question that it looked like a pretty good
24 deal?

25 A Yes. The numbers looked pretty

1 attractive, I guess, from a utilities perspective.

2 Q Does that change your judgment on the
3 need for the project?

4 A Well, the need and the economic --
5 economics, in my view, are two different things.
6 In my experience, need meant that the voltage on
7 the transmission system was inadequate to provide
8 service or that the capacity of the transmission
9 system was inadequate to provide the energy needed
10 for the customers connected. Those are the things
11 we consider to be the need and those are the
12 reasons that we would go eventually to a new
13 project was to upgrade the capacity or the
14 performance of the network.

15 I can't recall a strict economic
16 situation where we would go to do an upgrade just
17 strictly because of economics. It always almost
18 invariably involved the technical performance of
19 the grid and whether or not we could continue to
20 operate reliably and adequately without an upgrade.

21 MR. LINTON: No further questions.
22 Thank you, Mr. Shaw.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Shaw, that's all
24 the testimony we need today. Thank you for your
25 support. Please step down.

1 THE WITNESS: And thank you for
2 taking me today instead of tomorrow. Thank you.

3 (Witness excused.)

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're ready for Mr.
5 Langley now.

6 MATT LANGLEY,
7 having been called as a witness, was sworn
8 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
9 as follows:

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 QUESTIONS BY MS. PEMBERTON:

12 Q Would you please state your name for
13 the record?

14 A Matt Langley.

15 Q And by whom are you employed?

16 A Infinity Renewables.

17 Q And what's your position with
18 Infinity?

19 A I'm the vice president of finance and
20 origination.

21 (Wherein, Exhibits 875 and 876 were
22 introduced.)

23 Q (BY MS. PEMBERTON) And in this
24 document did you file rebuttal testimony referenced
25 as Exhibit 875 and cross-surrebuttal and schedules

1 **referenced as Exhibit 876?**

2 A Yes, I did.

3 Q **And were those testimonies created by**
4 **you or at your direction?**

5 A Yes, they were.

6 Q **And do you have any corrections to**
7 **make to those testimonies?**

8 A No, I don't.

9 Q **And are your answers today, would**
10 **they still be true if I were to ask you those same**
11 **questions?**

12 A Yes, they would be.

13 MS. PEMBERTON: I would move to admit
14 Mr. Langley's rebuttal testimony and his
15 cross-surrebuttal testimony. We have a proprietary
16 and a non-proprietary version as Exhibit,
17 respectively, 875 and 876.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Am I correct that
19 the surrebuttal NP was 877? Or was that --

20 MS. PEMBERTON: My apologies. I
21 filed a amended exhibit list, so I had an error on
22 the numbering. So the correct numbering is the 875
23 is the rebuttal, and then the cross-surrebuttal
24 both will be 876, one is proprietary, one is
25 non-proprietary.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: So 876 is both
2 proprietary and NP.

3 MS. PEMBERTON: Yes, sir. Sorry for
4 that confusion.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Objections? Hearing
6 none, those two exhibits are received into the
7 record.

8 MS. PEMBERTON: And I tender Mr.
9 Langley for cross.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
11 Grain Belt.

12 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

14 MR. HEALY: No question, Your Honor.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

16 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

18 MR. BRADY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank
19 you.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 QUESTIONS BY MR. BRADY:

22 Q Afternoon, Mr. Langley. I'm Sean
23 Brady with Wind on the Wires. Can you turn to your
24 rebuttal testimony? Do you have that in front of
25 you?

1 A I do.

2 Q Let's see. Page 6, line 6. You
3 address -- let me know when you're there.

4 A I am.

5 Q In your testimony you address the
6 economic feasibility of the Grain Belt project?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Turning to page 7, on line 12?

9 A Mm-hmm.

10 Q You say here -- I'm sorry, let's
11 start with line 1. You say, "The lack of
12 sufficient pathways for exporting presents
13 challenges to obtain the financing needed to
14 construct or fully develop a wind farm"?

15 A Mm-hmm.

16 Q Did I say that accurately?

17 A You did.

18 Q Line 12 to 15, you say, "If we did
19 not have the Grain Belt Express project, we would
20 have to deliver the power from our farms over the
21 existing AC systems. The problem with the AC
22 approach is that the cost of moving power is
23 significantly higher and the way it is accomplished
24 is significantly more complicated."

25 Did I say that correctly?

1 A You did.

2 Q So I want to focus on "the AC
3 approach, moving power is significantly higher."
4 Can you explain what are the components that you're
5 relying on when you talk about what is
6 significantly higher?

7 A Sure. And some of this was also
8 addressed by Mr. Grotzinger earlier, but we would
9 need to move the power from our wind farms in
10 western Kansas to the border between MISO and SPP
11 through what -- by acquiring what's called a
12 Transmission Service Request.

13 We have looked at doing that and
14 actually have gone through that process in previous
15 wind farms in SPP. Typically, that process can
16 take up to five years to get throughout SPP system
17 with significant development expenses. Once we
18 obtain that right, that transmission service right,
19 we then have to pay what's called a through-and-out
20 rate, and the through-and-out rate is a combination
21 of the costs incurred by SPP to move the power out
22 of the system in addition to the amortized costs of
23 any upgrades necessary with the existing AC system
24 to support that additional load coming out.

25 So, for instance, the minimum

1 through-and-out rate in 2012 was \$878 a megawatt
2 month. So that is sort of the minimum it would
3 cost, but when you look at where we were in western
4 Kansas and the number I think that was brought up
5 earlier was that the SPP study that came back with
6 us at the time was more like \$2,500 a megawatt
7 month, which is obviously a significant expense.

8 If we back calculate that into our
9 wind farm at a dollar per megawatt hour number,
10 that would essentially add an additional 9 to \$13
11 per megawatt hour to the cost of the power that
12 we're generating.

13 Q And I guess I want to take kind of a
14 step back. It's -- it's my understanding that the,
15 and correct me if I'm wrong, the kind of the costs
16 in addition -- the cost for delivery, you've got
17 your through-and-out rate and you've got the
18 congestion costs.

19 A Mm-hmm.

20 Q How does the -- and you just talked
21 about the through-and-out rate. How does that
22 compare to congestion costs and relative rates?
23 Relativity, I guess.

24 A The congestion pricing is governed by
25 the SPP market and the SPP rules. Part of the

1 challenge is that that price can change, given the
2 characteristics of the system in that given hour.
3 So if there were significant demand for power and
4 very little supply, those costs would be low. If
5 there were significant supply for power and very
6 little demand, those costs would be high.

7 What the TSR and through-and-out rate
8 allows us to do is avoid those costs by agreeing to
9 this fixed price that is -- that is guaranteed for
10 a five year period. So the challenge, if you were
11 not to get a TSR, the two issues, you don't really
12 know what those costs are because they're changing,
13 which makes it very difficult for us to finance a
14 project. Because when we go to a bank or lender,
15 the lender would say, what are your congestion
16 costs, and there's really very few people that can
17 project that further out than say a year or so.

18 What we expect is as wind continues
19 to be developed in western Kansas, because it is
20 one of the best resources for wind in the United
21 States, in fact the world, that those congestion
22 costs would actually go up, which is in fact what
23 we've seen in other markets.

24 So the other -- so -- so that the TSR
25 allows us to avoid those costs but it does so at a

1 high cost itself. We avoid the variability by
2 incurring a high fixed cost that we can then
3 predict and bank against.

4 Q So TSRs, you get -- is a TSR
5 something you get with each -- for each segment of
6 a transmission line?

7 A We would need two. Well, we would
8 need one to get out of SPP and into MISO, and then
9 we would likely need another one from where we
10 enter the MISO market at the seam to wherever our
11 customer would be. So in the case of MJMEUC, it
12 would be them. So we would -- it's based on which
13 RTO.

14 And then the further challenge with
15 doing that is that the MISO process and the SPP
16 process are, by tariff, different. They don't
17 necessarily line up with each other. So I could be
18 in a situation where I got the SPP TSR but the MISO
19 TSR was delayed by 24 months and I'd be, you know,
20 I'd be able to get the power halfway there and then
21 have to wait another 24 months to get it all the
22 way home. Or vice versa.

23 MR. BRADY: Okay. That's all the
24 questions I have. Thank you.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by MIEC?

1 MR. MILLS: No questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

3 MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

5 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

7 MR. LINTON: Thank you, Judge, a few
8 questions.

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

11 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Langley.

12 A Good afternoon.

13 Q Can I direct your attention to your
14 cross-surrebuttal testimony?

15 A Mm-hmm.

16 Q Page 3. And let's see, starting at
17 line 16. You say first, the 2015 Wind Technologies
18 Market Report published by the Department of Energy
19 shows that the capacity weighted average installed
20 project cost in 2015 is \$1,690 per kilowatt.

21 A Mm-hmm.

22 Q It says, "See page 53 as compared
23 to," and I won't go any further. Then you -- you
24 say further on the next page on line -- starting on
25 line 1, "For ease of reference, I have also

1 attached a copy of DOE report as Exhibit ML-2."

2 So what you're referring to in line
3 18 and 19 is provided in Exhibit ML-2; right?

4 A Correct.

5 Q Attached. Okay. Let's turn there.
6 And go to page small i. First page after the title
7 page. What's the first sentence in that report?

8 A "This report is being disseminated by
9 the US Department of Energy (DOE)."

10 Q Okay. And go down to Notice.

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q Read the second sentence under the
13 Notice.

14 A "Neither the United States government
15 or any agency thereof nor any of their employees
16 make any warranty, express or implied, or assumes
17 any legal liability or responsibility for the
18 accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any
19 information, apparatus, product, or process
20 disclosed, or represents that its use would not
21 infringe privately owned rights."

22 Q Turning to page 2 of the report, this
23 is in the introduction.

24 A Okay. I'm there.

25 Q Last paragraph on that page, the only

1 paragraph on that page. Who is this -- who is the
2 data supplied by for this report?

3 A Lawrence Berkeley National
4 Laboratory. They get things from AWEA, the
5 American Wind Energy Association, the US Energy
6 Information Administration, and the Federal Energy
7 Regulatory Commission.

8 Q And the data is supplied by who?

9 A The data are supplied by those
10 entities. Right?

11 Q Well, go on down to where it says
12 "Data on wind, sources used in this report"? Or --

13 A I'm sorry, so the data are supplied
14 by the American Wind Energy Association.

15 Q Okay. Thank you very much. Turning
16 to page 53 of the report. The first sentence --
17 well, let's go up to the top of the page. What
18 does the first full sentence on that page say?

19 A "Data sources are diverse; however,
20 and are not all of equal credibility, so emphasis
21 should be placed on overall trends in the data
22 rather than on individual project level estimates."

23 Q Okay. Now go down to the first
24 sentence after the chart. After the figure 40.

25 A Yeah.

1 Q And just, is that where you got the
2 figure of \$1,690 per kilowatt?

3 A Correct. Yeah, I think that's the
4 one that I said. Yes. Correct.

5 Q Now go to the next page. And the --
6 starting with the word "Although."

7 A I'm sorry, what paragraph?

8 Q The first paragraph on page 54.

9 A Yes. Okay.

10 Q The sentence starting with
11 "Although," take that to the end of the paragraph,
12 would you?

13 A "Although, the EIA's capacity
14 weighted average cost for 2013 is higher than that
15 derived from our sample (which is perhaps skewed to
16 the low side by one sizeable project in a year when
17 little capacity was built) it is nevertheless
18 aligned with the declining cost trend from 2009 to
19 2015. The EIA plans to report average data for
20 2014 and 2015 later in 2016. We will include these
21 additional data points in future editions of this
22 report."

23 MR. LINTON: Thank you, Mr. Langley.
24 I have no further questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Farm

1 Bureau?

2 MR. HADEN: None, Your Honor.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

4 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

7 Q Good afternoon, sir.

8 A Good afternoon.

9 Q Is it fair to say that Infinity is
10 not in the business of operating wind farms?

11 A That's correct. Today our motto has
12 been to develop and then sell to other operators.

13 Q So the Commission won't know who's
14 actually going to be operating the wind farm after
15 it gets built; right?

16 A Today, no.

17 Q You were required to post a security
18 deposit of sorts with MJMEUC, were you not?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q Does that have a end date or
21 expiration date to it?

22 A Not in and of itself. I suppose, if
23 by expiration you mean the return of, it would be
24 in the event that Grain Belt is not built.

25 Q And is there any other end date to

1 **it? Is there any other termination date to it?**

2 A Under the contract, if, if -- 240
3 days after December 31, 2021, there is an option to
4 terminate the contract, at which point some or all
5 of that may be returned depending on damages that
6 may have occurred to date.

7 **Q Was your bid for energy to MJMEUC**
8 **from the Iron Star project based on the assumption**
9 **that the product had already locked in 100 percent**
10 **of the investment tax credit?**

11 A We don't use the investment tax
12 credit. We use the production tax credit. And it
13 was based on that, yes.

14 **Q Could you explain what steps you took**
15 **to lock that in?**

16 A We, through advice of our counsel,
17 our tax counsel, examined the guidelines that were
18 promulgated by the IRS and updated from time to
19 time since 2013, and opted to qualify the project
20 through a methodology that's commonly referred to
21 as the start of construction methodology.

22 Specifically in our case what we did
23 was procure -- the company procured 19 main power
24 transformers, the 345 kilovolt voltage, some of
25 which would be used for the Iron Star project and

1 some of its sister projects. All of that was done
2 in accordance with the guidelines issued by the
3 IRS, supported by our counsel and independent
4 engineers.

5 **Q And have you done that for all of the**
6 **projects which would supply MJMEUC?**

7 A For the one project, that's correct.

8 **Q How about the other projects that**
9 **would be connected to the Grain Belt line?**

10 A A portion of them.

11 **Q I'm not sure what you mean.**

12 A In -- we currently control land that
13 could supply up to 3,000 megawatts on the -- for
14 the Grain Belt Express project. We opted to
15 qualify approximately 2,000 of that.

16 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you. Your Honor,
17 that's all I have except for some questions on a
18 highly confidential document.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. We'll go
20 into closed session. People in the audience that
21 are not authorized to listen to confidential
22 information will need to step outside, please.

23 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point an
24 in-camera session was held which is contained in
25 Volume 17 - Pages 1200 through 1207.)

1 (REPORTER'S NOTE: Back in open
2 session.)

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're back in open
4 session.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

7 Q Good afternoon.

8 A Good afternoon.

9 Q Is the Iron Star wind project
10 constructed?

11 A No.

12 Q Are you waiting on resolution of this
13 case?

14 A Yes. In part.

15 Q In part. And what else?

16 A Resolution of the case, which would
17 then allow us to finalize and execute interconnect
18 agreements with the Grain Belt Express and Clean
19 Line organization. Once we have those in place, we
20 can begin a financing process to raise tax equity,
21 debt, the other components of the capital stack,
22 and then we would begin construction.

23 Q And how long would all that take?

24 A From the point, to -- to, from the --
25 let's see. From the commencement of capital

1 raising until commercial operation is probably a 12
2 to 18 month period for a project of this size. So
3 then we have to back in when the Commission, when
4 this Commission approves and we can go back, you
5 know, start from that point.

6 Q Okay. So 12 to 18 months upon
7 resolution of this case, if it's favorable to your
8 position, you could start operation of Iron Star?

9 A We could, yeah, complete
10 construction, right.

11 Q Turning to page 2 of your
12 cross-surrebuttal, you mentioned at lines 3 and 4
13 and 5 a security payment that was made to secure
14 performance into the contract?

15 A Correct.

16 Q Is it -- are you -- is it -- is it --
17 is this a highly confidential topic?

18 MR. HEALY: Yes, it is HC.

19 CHAIRMAN HALL: The amount?

20 MR. HEALY: The amount is, yes, sir.

21 CHAIRMAN HALL: It's the amount

22 that's --

23 MR. HEALY: It is the amount, sir.

24 Yes, sir.

25 CHAIRMAN HALL: I guess I want to

1 inquire into it so I guess we're going to need to
2 go in camera.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: For those folks who
4 just came in --

5 (Discussion off the record.)

6 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point an
7 in-camera session was held which is contained in
8 Volume 17 - Pages 1211 through 1214.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 (REPORTER'S NOTE: Back in open
2 session.)

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
4 bench questions? And we're in open session, Grain
5 Belt Express?

6 MR. ZOBRIST: Just give me a moment
7 I'm not sure. No questions, Judge.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

9 MR. HEALY: No questions, Your Honor.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

11 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

13 MR. BRADY: No questions.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Department of
15 Economic Development?

16 MR. BEAR: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

18 MR. MILLS: No questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

20 MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

22 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Concerned
24 Landowners?

25 MR. LINTON: Just a couple, Your

1 Honor.

2 RE CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 QUESTIONS BY MR. LINTON:

4 Q The chairman had a question about
5 what you were waiting on to proceed and you
6 mentioned the approval of this Commission. What
7 about the appeal of the Illinois Commerce
8 Commission's decision of the Clean Line case?

9 A Oh, I'm sorry, you're right, I forgot
10 about that, that that had been appealed. That's in
11 the process right now and obviously that we need to
12 wait for that to be resolved as well.

13 Q And then you said -- what was the
14 time frame that you said after -- you decided to go
15 ahead after you decided to go ahead, that you would
16 start construction, or finish?

17 A 18 months, for this size project, 18
18 months to finish.

19 Q To finish. From the time you decide
20 to go ahead?

21 A Right.

22 Q Negotiated all the financing and
23 then --

24 A Right. That would be negotiating the
25 financing, purchasing the remainder of the

1 equipment, mobilizing to site, and building the
2 project.

3 MR. LINTON: Thank you.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from Farm
5 Bureau?

6 MR. HADEN: No, Your Honor.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

8 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by
10 Infinity?

11 MS. PEMBERTON: I think I just have a
12 couple. Mr. Langley --

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Can you come up to
14 the mic, please.

15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 QUESTIONS BY MS. PEMBERTON:

17 Q Just briefly, you were asked earlier
18 by Show Me counsel about the 2015 Wind Technologies
19 Market Report. Do you remember that line of
20 questioning?

21 A I do.

22 Q And he had you read a couple excerpts
23 into the record and my question with regard to this
24 report is what is the date that you show on the
25 front of the report?

1 A August of 2016.

2 Q And to your knowledge, at the time
3 you drafted your testimony, was there an updated
4 version of this report out?

5 A I was not aware of one at the time.

6 Q Okay. And with regard to the
7 entities who provide information to the government
8 to help compile this report, is that information
9 vetted?

10 A I believe so, yes. I mean, I can
11 attest to the information that AWEA collects for
12 sure and for LBNL, the Lawrence Berkeley National
13 Lab issues surveys to developers that we fill out
14 and then they triangulate that with the FER, the
15 Federal -- yeah, most of it's with FER.

16 Q So there is some type of reality
17 check, if you will, with regard to the numbers that
18 are submitted to compile the report?

19 A Yes. Yes.

20 Q Okay. And just to be clear with
21 regard to the way projects are developed and with
22 regard to capacity on the Grain Belt line, would it
23 be typical for you to enter into a TSA with Grain
24 Belt or would you leave that to the entity that
25 you're serving like you have with MJMEUC?

1 A I think it will depend a lot on the
2 type of entity with whom we transact. Obviously
3 3,000 -- if we built all 3,000, we expect to have
4 not only multiple customers but multiple types of
5 customers.

6 And so the three largest would be
7 load-serving entities like MJMEUC, who may or may
8 not purchase that transmission service. Corporate
9 customers, such as some of the intervenors in this
10 case, like Walmart, who most likely would not, and
11 we would be responsible for purchasing that.

12 And then the third one would be
13 financial institutions that we would engage in
14 hedging or other bilateral financial deals with,
15 with swaps, and in that case, we would be buying
16 that capacity as well.

17 Q **And you don't have current, any**
18 **existing TSAs in place with Grain Belt; correct?**

19 A No, we do not.

20 Q **Okay. And with regard to Exhibit**
21 **364, and I don't want you to talk about any of the**
22 **numbers, but can you explain to us why the price**
23 **that you may have indicated for the PJM area would**
24 **be higher than that that you had identified for the**
25 **MISO area?**

1 A We really broke it into a couple.
2 One was we felt like the PJM price should be higher
3 because, you know, because the line is longer, so
4 they're incurring more capital costs and they
5 obviously need to obtain a fair rate of return.

6 The second reason is the power
7 pricing in PJM tends to be higher, so we feel like
8 we can charge a higher price and still be
9 competitive in that market.

10 And then the third one is, although
11 it is a DC technology, you still incur transmission
12 losses going from this source to the sink and we
13 need a slightly higher price in order to account
14 for the additional losses or, you know, fewer
15 megawatts that ultimately make it to the customer.
16 Or megawatt hours. Excuse me.

17 MS. PEMBERTON: Okay. That's all I
18 have. Thank you.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Langley, that
20 completes your testimony. You're excused.

21 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
22 (Witness excused.)

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we take a
24 break, take a recess for about 15 minutes.

25 (Short recess.)

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're back on the
2 record and ready for the first economic development
3 witness. Raise your right hand, please.

4 BARBARA MEISENHEIMER,
5 having been called as a witness, was sworn
6 by the Court, upon her oath, and testified
7 as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. BEAR:

10 Q This is Brian Bear on behalf of the
11 Department of Economic Development. Could you
12 please state your name for the record?

13 A Yes, my name is Barbara Meisenheimer.

14 Q And how are you employed?

15 A I am employed with the Division of
16 Energy within the Department of Economic
17 Development. I am here today presenting testimony
18 on behalf of the Department of Economic
19 Development.

20 Q And did you cause to be filed in this
21 proceeding written testimony in the form of
22 rebuttal testimony?

23 A Yes, I did.

24 Q And if I were to ask you the
25 questions that are set forth in that written

1 document, would your answers be the same today as
2 it was when you filled that out?

3 A They would, with a couple of minor
4 changes.

5 Q Could you please state which changes
6 you would make?

7 A Yes. On page 6, footnote 6, the page
8 reference should be 211.

9 Q Any further changes beyond that?

10 A Yes. On page 3, line 4, to clarify
11 something that I received today to request about,
12 I'd like to change the word "Missouri" on line 4 to
13 "MISO."

14 Q And are there any further
15 clarifications beyond that?

16 A The only other clarification is with
17 respect to page 4, line 16, I was in the hearing
18 room when I heard cross-examination of Clean Line's
19 witnesses regarding the height of towers, and my
20 testimony is generally talking about what would be
21 typical for passing through fields, and I think
22 there was clarification that in fact there may be
23 higher towers placed to cross river -- the river.
24 Potentially other applications.

25 Q Are there any other further

1 **clarifications beyond that?**

2 A No. I am also, however, prepared to
3 respond to Exhibit 206, which is the agreed to
4 conditions between green -- or between Clean Line
5 regarding the Grain Belt project and the Staff.

6 Q **And that's a document that was**
7 **circulated very recently; correct?**

8 A Yes. I saw that during the hearing.

9 Q **Thank you.**
10 **(Wherein, Exhibit 525 was**
11 **introduced.)**

12 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I would move
13 for the admission of Exhibit 525 with the
14 modifications that were just placed on the record.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

16 MR. AGATHEN: I do, Your Honor. In
17 lieu of reading the objections at this point into
18 the record, I would just offer MLA's objections
19 385.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Since those have
21 been ruled previously in another order, I will
22 overrule the objections designated as MLA
23 objections number 385 and receive Exhibit 525 into
24 the record.

25 MR. BEAR: Thank you, Your Honor. I

1 tender the witness.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First
3 cross-examination would be Grain Belt Express.

4 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

6 MR. HEALY: Just a couple, Judge.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

9 Q Miss Meisenheimer?

10 A Hi.

11 Q How are you today?

12 A Good.

13 Q Doing well. I'd like to direct you
14 to page 6 of your rebuttal, line 8.

15 A Yes.

16 Q You discuss in that question and
17 answer meeting corporate goals. Were you in the
18 courtroom earlier when MJMEUC witness, Mr.
19 Grotzinger, testified?

20 A I think I was here for part of it.

21 Q Okay. Did you hear his testimony
22 regarding renewables that were offered by MoPEP and
23 the demand for those renewables by corporate
24 industrial customers?

25 A Yes.

1 **Q Is that consistent with your**
2 **testimony which you seem to state?**

3 A I think it is.

4 **Q And you think there is a need and**
5 **demand for additional renewables by corporations**
6 **inside these cities?**

7 A Yes.

8 MR. HEALY: No further questions.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Sierra
10 Club?

11 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

13 MR. BRADY: No questions, Your Honor.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

15 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLS:

19 **Q Good afternoon, Miss Meisenheimer.**
20 **Kinda seems like old times, me sitting here and you**
21 **sitting there, doesn't it?**

22 A Yeah.

23 MR. MILLS: I don't have any
24 questions, Your Honor.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

1 MS. MYERS: Yes, Judge, just briefly.
2 Jamie Myers on behalf Commission Staff.

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

4 QUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:

5 Q Miss Meisenheimer, in regards to page
6 11 of your rebuttal, and this is lines 15 through
7 17, you discuss how DED was reserving the
8 opportunity to review Staff's recommendations; is
9 that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And then you also mentioned upon
12 direct that you were prepared to talk about Exhibit
13 206; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 (Wherein, Exhibit 206 was
16 introduced.)

17 Q (BY MS. MYERS) And would you like to
18 explain what Exhibit 206 is at this moment?

19 A Sure. Exhibit 206 is entitled
20 Conditions Agreed to by Grain Belt Express Clean
21 Line LLC and the Staff of the Missouri Public
22 Service Commission.

23 Q And now that you have had a chance to
24 review Staff's recommendations, do you support
25 Staff's recommendations?

1 A Generally, yes. There are a couple
2 of items where I have some concern. In our
3 position statement I think that we express support
4 for the Staff's conditions. Since that time, the
5 Staff has come to an agreement with Clean Line on
6 some of the language that was in dispute previously
7 and we were supporting the Staff's position.

8 In particular there is, with respect
9 to -- it's under the section 7, Landowner
10 Interactions and Right-of-way Acquisition, number
11 one relates to allowing flexibility for the line to
12 move within 500 feet, and I think that's 500 feet
13 either direction.

14 And so I wanted to just point out
15 that within my rebuttal testimony at page 4, line
16 16, from the company's routing study, they
17 projected that, I believe on their chosen path for
18 the line, that there could be 51 residences within
19 500 feet of the line. And so to allow them
20 flexibility without landowner agreement to move the
21 line as much as 500 feet in either direction seems
22 significant.

23 Q So, Miss Meisenheimer, bottom line,
24 in general, you support Staff's recommendations;
25 correct? In Exhibit 206?

1 A Well, that was one of them I was
2 going to talk about.

3 Q That was your statement in general,
4 you support, yes? You started with that statement;
5 correct?

6 A And I think I finished with a couple
7 of exceptions.

8 Q You did, and the exception was 500
9 feet?

10 A That was one of the exceptions.

11 Q Were you also in the room when Dr.
12 Berry was testifying? I think it was yesterday,
13 but I've forgotten what day it is, honestly.

14 A I was in the room for some of his
15 testimony.

16 Q And were you here when he was
17 discussing that they would not go onto another
18 residence without approval?

19 A I understand that they will not go to
20 another landowner's property under the condition
21 agreed to by the Staff. But I think that this
22 allows --

23 Q And that doesn't alleviate any of
24 your concern there?

25 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I think the

1 witness should be allowed to finish her answer. I
2 think that would be fair under these circumstances.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yeah, I think that
4 would be good. You may finish your answer, Miss
5 Meisenheimer.

6 A Okay. And I don't view those as
7 inconsistent at all. The -- I was aware at the
8 time when I indicated that I do have concern about
9 this, that it would be within the same property, or
10 the same landowner's property.

11 And so I think that I still have a
12 concern to the extent that this could occur within
13 a single landowner's property and still have that
14 much leeway without some kind of either landowner
15 consent or some kind of recourse for the landowner
16 to let the Commission know that they still have
17 concerns with the line. With the location of the
18 line. As they do in this case and as they did at
19 public hearings.

20 MS. MYERS: Okay. And that's all the
21 questions I had, Miss Meisenheimer. Thank you.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

23 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Concerned
25 Landowners?

1 MR. LINTON: No questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau?

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

4 QUESTIONS BY MR. HADEN:

5 Q In your testimony you cited to DED
6 economic study and it sets out the expectations in
7 general about the other economic realities with the
8 line. Correct?

9 A Um, yes. I summarize findings from
10 our other witness.

11 Q So you didn't do that study yourself,
12 that's going to be the next witness; is that right?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Okay. Do you know -- just as to your
15 personal knowledge, if you don't, it's fine -- who
16 asked DED to study this?

17 A I -- I was not with the department I
18 don't think at the time that that was initiated.
19 So I -- I don't know. I think he would be better
20 to answer that question.

21 MR. HADEN: Thank you, that's all I
22 had, Your Honor.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

24 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor,
25 I have just a few questions.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

3 Q Good afternoon, Miss Meisenheimer.

4 A Good afternoon.

5 Q If you turn to page 6 of your
6 rebuttal testimony, please? Near the top of the
7 page you refer to the benefits of diversifying the
8 state's energy resources; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And are you talking there about the
11 addition of wind generation?

12 A Additional wind generation would be
13 one way to diversify our energy resources and I
14 think as well diversity of the infrastructure that
15 serves the state.

16 Q Is it fair to say that the diversity
17 of benefits could be achieved by bringing in the
18 same amount of wind generation from Iowa or other
19 MISO states?

20 A That would be an additional way to
21 diversify our portfolio.

22 Q Or through wind farms in Missouri?

23 A Sure. That would be another
24 opportunity for diversification, to increase wind
25 generation.

1 Q Based on the type of analysis done by
2 Mr. Spell, building the wind farms in Missouri
3 would have additional economic benefits, would it
4 not?

5 A It could. I would suggest that that
6 question be directed to him.

7 Q At page 1 of your testimony you
8 mention a comprehensive state energy plan; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Isn't one goal of that plan to
11 increase the number of wind generation facilities
12 within the State of Missouri?

13 A I -- I think that we would be
14 supportive of that, yes.

15 Q Isn't that one element of the plan?
16 One recommendation?

17 A Um, I think looking for opportunities
18 to do that, yes.

19 MR. AGATHEN: That's all the
20 questions I have, Your Honor.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from
22 Commissioners?

23 CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions, thank
24 you.

25 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions,

1 thank you.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Economic
3 Development?

4 MR. BEAR: No redirect, Your Honor.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Ms.
6 Meisenheimer, you may step down, that completes
7 your testimony.

8 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

9 (Witness excused.)

10 ALAN SPELL,

11 having been called as a witness, was sworn
12 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
13 as follows:

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 QUESTIONS BY MR. BEAR:

16 Q Could you state your name for the
17 record, please, sir?

18 A Alan Spell.

19 Q And, Mr. Spell, how are you currently
20 employed?

21 A I am the Economic & Workforce
22 Research Manager for the Department of Economic
23 Development.

24 Q And, sir, did you cause to be filed
25 in this proceeding written testimony?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And if I were to ask you the
3 questions contained within that written testimony
4 today, would your answer be the same?

5 A Yes.

6 (Wherein, Exhibit 526 was
7 introduced.)

8 MR. BEAR: Okay. Your Honor, I would
9 move for the admission of Exhibit 526 into the
10 record.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

12 MR. AGATHEN: I do, Your Honor, in
13 lieu of reading those into the record, I would
14 offer MLA's objections 386.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Since those have
16 already been the subject of a previous order, I
17 will overrule MLA objections designated as number
18 386 and receive Exhibit 526 into the record here.

19 MR. BEAR: I tender the witness.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
21 Grain Belt.

22 MR. ZOBRIST: No questions, Judge.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

24 MR. HEALY: No questions, Your Honor.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sierra Club?

1 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

3 MR. BRADY: No questions.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

5 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

7 MR. MILLS: No questions.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

9 MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

11 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

13 MR. LINTON: No questions.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau?

15 MR. HADEN: I do have some questions,

16 Your Honor, thank you.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. HADEN:

19 Q You said you've been with the
20 Department of Economic Development since 2005; is
21 that correct?

22 A Actually since 1999. I started there
23 then and worked in different positions and started
24 in my current role in terms of analyzing economic
25 impacts in 2005.

1 **Q And what -- what's your educational**
2 **background for economic analysis?**

3 A I have a Bachelor's Degree in
4 economics. I have a graduate degree in landscape
5 architecture. I spent, in terms of experience, I
6 spent my first part of my career in economic
7 development as a land developer -- or land planner,
8 sorry, and a site analyst.

9 Coming to Missouri, I did a
10 geographic information systems works when I
11 initially got here, and then in 2005 started doing
12 impact modeling. I actually started out on
13 contract with the Department of Transportation to
14 do transportation studies and impacts, did that for
15 a couple years, was promoted to manager with
16 Economic & Workforce Research.

17 So I have been doing economic impact
18 modeling for about 12 years.

19 **Q Now, with the landscape architecture**
20 **side of your background, you have real world**
21 **experience in siting projects?**

22 A Yes. Yes, I do. I was also a
23 engineer in the National Guard, so I did work with
24 that as well. So I -- that -- that landscape
25 architecture, it's sometimes just seen as a design,

1 but it's also the groundwork and stuff like that.

2 Q Have you -- do you have any
3 experience in siting utility projects?

4 A No, I do not.

5 Q Okay. Now, the economic impact
6 study, or I -- for shorthand, is it fair to call
7 that what your work is in this case?

8 A Yes.

9 Q If you know, who asked the Department
10 of Economic Development to do that study?

11 A I don't know. I know the Director of
12 Economic Development asked me to do that study.

13 Q Who was that person?

14 A Mike Downing.

15 Q Is he still the director?

16 A Yes, acting director.

17 Q When did he ask you to do this study?

18 A I think it was the fall of 2015 was
19 the initial one, I believe. I could be wrong,
20 though. I'd have to check that.

21 Q And did he ask you to do that study
22 shortly before -- I mean, I guess let me back up.

23 Was that done in fairly short order
24 from the time he asked you to do it until the time
25 you finished it?

1 A I can't recall. It -- it wasn't a
2 quick project, but I can't recall. I'd have to go
3 back and look at my notes.

4 Q The methodology on this -- and I know
5 you've got a segment on this, but I want to go
6 deeper into the questions that I had on
7 methodology. You talk about the Regional Economics
8 Model, Inc., model?

9 A Correct.

10 Q That's REMI for short?

11 A Yes.

12 Q If I say REMI, we know what we're
13 talking about?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q That REMI model, have you had any
16 sort of, and I know it may not have been formal,
17 in-school training, but education on that, as far
18 as continuing education, since you came to DED?

19 A Yes. I have -- I've been trained
20 continuously on REMI. I have attended the user
21 conferences. I also have REMI economists that come
22 by our office regularly and we work on projects. I
23 talked to one today on a project as a matter of
24 fact.

25 And we do hundreds of impact studies

1 a year. Mostly on business cases that are coming
2 into the state. Almost all of those projects
3 include some construction elements, mostly vertical
4 construction, but again, with horizontal, and by
5 horizontal, I mean stuff like roadwork and
6 utilities. We do have those occasionally. And so
7 I am familiar with that.

8 And, of course, doing the work with
9 MoDOT, I was very familiar with some of those more
10 horizontal activities. When you're doing
11 construction like that, it's more capital
12 intensive. So it's not as labor intensive. So
13 those things will impact the model. So I know how
14 to model those.

15 **Q Sure. Now, those -- those studies,**
16 **are they all, the REMI studies, are they always**
17 **prospective, forward-looking?**

18 **A** Most of them are because it's a
19 business coming to the state, so their activities
20 aren't actually on the ground yet. Some of the
21 reports we do are looking back. So -- so, for
22 example, the quality jobs report that we do every
23 year takes information that's verified from
24 companies and we do a report with that as well.

25 **Q When you do, and I understand, you**

1 know, a broad -- a broad smear in terms of what the
2 job data would look like, I understand that, but in
3 terms of discrete projects, do you ever do
4 backward-looking or postmortem studies on projects
5 for which you also did prospective studies?

6 A Yes, the quality jobs is a perfect
7 example. It's no longer a program that the
8 department offers but through years 2005 to 2015,
9 and there are still some that are being redeemed,
10 there's been hundreds of projects. We -- we
11 analyze the -- every project when it comes in
12 because it's discretionary, so we'll analyze this
13 project. So that's before it happens.

14 This annual report requires us to
15 look at those 300 plus projects and the verified
16 data that the department receives, we are able to
17 plug that in there and generate a report with that.
18 So that's a public report that's on our website.

19 Q The projects within -- and I don't
20 want to get too far off track on that, but the
21 projects involved in that, that setup, that system
22 and that study, are those -- was that for -- it was
23 an incentive for employers to hire? Or were those
24 actual construction projects that had hard assets
25 and capital investment as well?

1 A Usually all the projects -- not all,
2 that's an overstatement, but usually most of the
3 projects have an investment phase, what we call a
4 -- well, investment phase and an operations phase,
5 so they are usually involving some type of building
6 or land improvements, some purchases of capital
7 equipment, and then jobs that are typically ramped
8 up over a certain period of time. So that's kind
9 of the typical business that happens.

10 **Q With that, are you able to, I mean, I**
11 **assume in those models you do something similar to**
12 **what you did here, which is project income and tax**
13 **revenue, et cetera?**

14 A Correct.

15 **Q So when you go back to do your**
16 **postmortems, how do you figure out -- I mean,**
17 **because you're trying to figure out whether your**
18 **projection was correct; right?**

19 A Well, what we're trying to figure out
20 is was the direct amount of activity that that
21 business proposed, did that -- did that happen as
22 it was expected?

23 The indirect part of that, that's the
24 -- that may be the part you're talking about. The
25 indirect part is trying to estimate by a model what

1 those indirect spending supply chain purchases are
2 happening. There's actually -- there's -- there's
3 actually no way to go out and count all those
4 people out in the economy because it's an indirect
5 supply chain type of activity.

6 So it estimates on average that a
7 chemical manufacturer needs to buy other chemical
8 manufacturing products, steel products, petroleum
9 products, so forth, and they'll estimate jobs off
10 that. It will also estimate jobs from those
11 workers and their spending using personal
12 consumption expenditures. So every dollar that you
13 spend, you spend some on food and retail and so
14 forth.

15 So it's impossible to actually go out
16 there and check did those jobs actually happen at
17 all those places that the model would estimate. So
18 it's a -- it's a simulation of the economy. So
19 there's not a putting everybody in a room and
20 saying, yeah, we counted all of them.

21 **Q How do they get at, if you know, how**
22 **do they get adequate controls in to figure out**
23 **whether the models actually work?**

24 **A** Well, you know, you have economists
25 that obviously build these models. You have many

1 entities that use the model and provide feedback.
2 You -- you know, have other models, so we also have
3 the in plan model so we know if things are
4 consistent.

5 Every year we get updates from REMI
6 and when we do, we check those models for general
7 consistency. So there's never a perfect answer.
8 It is a simulation of the model -- or I'm sorry, of
9 the economy, but it's just like any -- any entity
10 that's going to study something that could happen
11 in the future, you have to have these models as a
12 basis for understanding what reasonable
13 expectations you can have for development and
14 impact.

15 So the information is again updated
16 with data from the bureau of economic analysis on
17 input/output figures, income, the Census Bureau,
18 population, migration data and the BLS industry and
19 wage data. Sorry for the long-winded answer.

20 **Q No, that's okay, and I mean, we don't**
21 **-- I know we always have to strike a balance**
22 **between information and getting into a narrative**
23 **and so I'll try to constrain my questions enough to**
24 **give you easier answers, or shorter answers here.**

25 **But I guess the -- specifically to**

1 this sort of modeling, I understand your answer,
2 you say that obviously if you generate -- if you
3 predict you'll have X gross for the actual
4 enterprise, it can be pretty easy to go verify
5 that, assuming they'll share the information with
6 you; correct? And by that I mean down chain,
7 looking backwards, if they'll tell you how much
8 money they made, it can be pretty easy to see if
9 you were right; right?

10 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, I want to
11 object, and I apologize if I'm not hearing the
12 question right, but if we're still dealing with
13 retroactive or backward-looking studies, that's not
14 what the evidence in this case is about, so I would
15 object to relevancy for only dealing with these
16 retrospective postmortem analysis. I have no
17 problem with looking at the forward-looking ones.

18 MR. HADEN: Judge, if there's not
19 really a good way to retroactively tell whether
20 this model is actually valid, then it would be fair
21 to question its validity looking forward.

22 They've presented a scenario here
23 saying we're going to make X amount money, and they
24 do that in other cases as well, but in all these
25 other cases he's telling me it's pretty much

1 impossible to determine what the knock on effects
2 down chain are, so what value does this model have.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I think verifying
4 the validity would be a reasonable inquiry, so I'll
5 overrule the objection.

6 Q (BY MR. HADEN) Now, you'll see the
7 question I'm asking you here. So you understand
8 the question? I mean, how do we know that the
9 modeling you're doing prospectively is valid,
10 especially as to knock on effects within the
11 economy? By that I mean not the direct, what does
12 the enterprise take down in its gross, but what
13 does the butcher and the baker and everybody down
14 chain make.

15 If it's impossible to go back and,
16 from your own testimony you said, I think, and
17 determine where that money went and whether those
18 other enterprises made money, then how do we ever
19 determine the validity of the model?

20 A The best way that I can answer that
21 is that you have to rely on the user community, the
22 economists that use this model. All the equations
23 are published and have been reviewed in peer review
24 journals, so you rely on those, of course, experts.
25 It's used by over -- by state and local governments

1 in over 40 states. In the State of Missouri we
2 have used it for almost two decades. The auditor's
3 office used to use it until they lost a person who
4 was able to operate it.

5 So it is -- it's a model that with
6 the use that -- that it has with the published data
7 that goes along with it, no model is perfect and no
8 model can claim to know exactly what's going to
9 happen, but it's -- it's a model that can produce
10 reasonable expectations of what is likely to
11 happen.

12 Q Or everybody could be wrong together,
13 though, couldn't they? I mean, I understand you're
14 saying economists review it, but that sounds more
15 like an appeal to the fallacy of authority.

16 MR. BEAR: I'm going to object,
17 that's getting a little argumentative, Judge. I
18 object.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I think he has
20 answered the question about validity. So to that
21 extent, I think it's ready to move on.

22 MR. HADEN: I guess a clarifying
23 question then, just so I'm clear because I think
24 there is a distinction here, if I may, Judge, and I
25 guess they could object again, but do I have a

1 clarifying questioning.

2 Q (BY MR. HADEN) As between -- you're
3 saying lots of economists use it, I understand
4 that. Do you know of a single time where they have
5 gone into the down chain situation to see where
6 else the money went after a project's been built,
7 where they actually have done -- have gotten a
8 controller or double blind study where they have
9 been able to say -- where they did round everybody
10 up and say who paid who what and found that out?
11 Do you know?

12 A No.

13 Q Okay. All right. So to talk
14 specifics about this study, you said in your
15 testimony that you expected in the construction
16 phase this to create \$246 million in personal
17 income and \$476 million in GDP. Correct?

18 A Sounds correct.

19 Q Tell me the distinction between those
20 two numbers.

21 A Okay. Personal income is the -- is
22 an estimate of the wages and employee compensation
23 and any additional wage supplements that employers
24 may have. It's a concept that the Bureau of
25 Economic Analysis uses for personal income. So

1 it's kind of like when you do your taxes and have
2 you to report your wages and your Social Security
3 wage and all those different distinctions, that's
4 what that is. So it's really about wages and
5 supplement wages and your compensation, health
6 insurance and so forth.

7 GDP is the -- I'm sorry, did you ask
8 for GDP?

9 **Q Yes. The distinction, why is there a**
10 **difference.**

11 A GDP is the total output expected in
12 that economy based on this direct spending, minus
13 the intermediate inputs. So it is the inputs to
14 that process. So if you're building a table and
15 you need wood, that wood is the input.

16 **Q Now that number would be -- the**
17 **actual GDP number would be highly dependent on**
18 **where the other places the money gets spent; is**
19 **that fair?**

20 A It follows the expected spending
21 patterns, yes.

22 **Q Well, and so, for example, but even,**
23 **as to the Missouri economy -- well, just so I'm**
24 **clear, the \$476 million GDP, that's GDP within the**
25 **Missouri economy?**

1 A That's correct.

2 Q So it's not a federal number?

3 A No.

4 Q Okay. Did you study what the actual
5 impact would be to the federal economy across the
6 board?

7 A No, I do not have that model.

8 Q Fair enough. So the \$476 million,
9 though, whether or not some of the intermediary
10 products or the end product, the cash stayed in
11 Missouri or went out of state, that can make a
12 difference to that number; correct?

13 A Yes, and the model estimates that.

14 Q And it estimates then how much,
15 whatever it is, how many widgets are going to be
16 bought from some other state as opposed to within
17 Missouri?

18 A It estimates how much is going to
19 leak out of economy. Imports and export. So it
20 does -- it's the idea of cross hauling. So we make
21 F-150s in the state but not everybody buys F-150s,
22 so it estimates that people and companies will
23 purchase stuff from outside the state.

24 Q Okay. Now, the inputs that you use
25 to make this determination for all the phases,

1 where do those -- where do the initial numbers and
2 estimates come from for you to make your estimates?

3 A The initial numbers came from Clean
4 Line, from their numbers and from the -- Dr.
5 Linden's report.

6 Q Did you have direct communication
7 with the company when you do your study?

8 A I had a call with Mr. Lawson to
9 understand the timing of the construction and to
10 understand the landowner payments for that first
11 year because the operations phase, what I call the
12 operations phase, after the construction had two
13 different types of incomes, the first year expected
14 income and second year moving forward. So that was
15 only call I had.

16 Q Mr. Lawson or Mr. Lawlor?

17 A I'm sorry, it may be Mr. Lawlor.
18 Mark. Mark Lawlor. Sorry.

19 Q I assume that's right. I just wanted
20 to make sure we were talking about the same person.
21 Other than speaking with him about -- from Clean
22 Line, did you speak to anybody else about these
23 inputs or these numbers that you used to make your
24 calculations?

25 A No.

1 Q And so you didn't have any other
2 competing data sets as part of your study; is that
3 fair?

4 A I had Dr. Loomis's study and the
5 information from Clean Line; that's it.

6 Q Do you know where Dr. Loomis got his
7 information?

8 A I know that -- I'm sure he discussed
9 that -- those inputs with Clean Line as well to
10 understand his impact.

11 Q So you think it's fair that all front
12 end information used in these equations came from
13 the company that's trying to build the project; is
14 that fair?

15 A Generally sounds fair.

16 Q You did not, and I think your
17 testimony says, I mean, you didn't take into
18 account lost activities in local economies where
19 the project will be built while it's being built;
20 is that right?

21 A Could you clarify, what do you mean
22 by that?

23 Q So while this project is being built,
24 I mean, sometimes in the real world you have a
25 place where you literally can't have two activities

1 going on at once; correct?

2 A I don't know that to be the case, I'm
3 sorry.

4 Q So you've worked on, for example,
5 highways you said. And while you're building a
6 highway, where that's going in, there's not other
7 economic activity going on there, is there?

8 A That's -- I guess I don't understand
9 the question. Is there -- can only one thing
10 happen in the economy at one time?

11 Q So in this case we -- I mean, I don't
12 think it's a secret. These easements will go over,
13 in many places, heavily agricultural areas. Is
14 that part of your knowledge of this project?

15 A I understand that to be the case.

16 Q And while this project is being built
17 in those easements, farming activity is going to
18 stop. Correct?

19 A I would assume that would be the
20 case, it would be disruptive.

21 Q Did you take into account as part of
22 your study what that, you know, what's the number
23 on that loss to economic activity?

24 A I understand you now. No, I did not
25 take that into account.

1 Q Why not?

2 A I didn't have that information.

3 Q Did you ask anybody for that
4 information?

5 A No, I did not.

6 Q Do you know anybody that would have
7 that information?

8 A No, I do not.

9 Q Missouri is a relatively heavy
10 agricultural state. Is there anybody at DED that
11 studies the impact of agriculture within Missouri?

12 A We do an agri business impact
13 contribution to the state periodically. We did one
14 just a couple of years ago, I believe. But the --
15 I think to get to your direct question of do I
16 understand what that impact to those farmers would
17 have been during that time, I don't have the
18 resources to go, you know, find out what that
19 information would be.

20 I wouldn't -- it -- it is certainly
21 something I understand would be a negative impact,
22 but to quantify, that's the secondary question, and
23 so to quantify that would require me to -- to have
24 that information or -- or research that pretty
25 detailed and I didn't have that resource.

1 Q So that number could be small, you
2 think?

3 A I really don't know.

4 Q I mean, could it be as big or bigger
5 than the economic impact you've predicted for the
6 project?

7 A In my past experience, I, and
8 knowledge of doing impacts, I would doubt it would
9 be more than that.

10 Q But you don't know what it nets out
11 to?

12 A No.

13 Q So is this just a gross? I mean,
14 this report, are these just gross numbers without
15 any netting back the other direction?

16 A Well, there is -- there is a feature
17 of REMI that is unlike any other model. It assumes
18 whenever you have an activity, you bring in people
19 from outside the area to work. So those are called
20 economic migrants. And those people bring in
21 families and so there is a population impact.

22 And so when you bring in a family,
23 you have general expenditures for schooling, for
24 police services, for other general expenditures,
25 that statement account or schooling, so it does do

1 that. So it at least has those impacts. So it
2 does -- it nets out the, I guess, the effect, in
3 other words.

4 Q Does it net out, though, opportunity
5 costs? You're anticipating we're getting X type of
6 economic activity, but --

7 A What would be your opportunity cost?

8 Q Well, here, I mean, for example, if
9 you can't farm the ground because you're putting in
10 a utility line or a, you know, you're putting in
11 Clean Line's project, there's one type of economic
12 activity been lost, another one's been put in;
13 correct?

14 A For that term of the construction
15 where they're doing the construction, there would
16 be loss probably of, you know, the ability to farm
17 crops there, but I did not put that in my report.
18 I didn't have that information to put in there.

19 Q And I understand that. Just so I'm
20 clear on terminology, that would be fair to call
21 that a type of opportunity cost, though; right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. And I am going back to like
24 tenth grade economics here, just wanted to make
25 sure I'm using the right terminology. So with that

1 opportunity cost, are there any other type of
2 opportunity costs that you considered, that --
3 non-agricultural opportunity costs, that may also
4 be incurred by this project?

5 A No. There's -- because that term is
6 used to mean a lot of things. Opportunity cost
7 could be just keeping that money and putting it in
8 the stock market or building something somewhere
9 else. And so, you know, while it's a economic
10 concept, it's something that a lot of times really
11 relies on hard data that is hard to find, and so if
12 we don't know the opportunity cost, you really
13 can't model suggest don't know.

14 Q Well, what's your level of confidence
15 then that Missouri is going to come out ahead with
16 this project, that being the case?

17 A I think this will have a positive
18 benefit based on the impact from the construction
19 and the operation.

20 Q I understand that. What's your level
21 confidence that's true?

22 A It's pretty high.

23 Q What, I mean, can you put a
24 percentage on it?

25 A No.

1 Q Just sorta high? It feels good, like
2 it's going to happen?

3 A I do many impacts and I've done them
4 for many years and I feel like there are always
5 things that we don't know when we do impact
6 modeling, that's just always the case. I don't
7 know exactly what those impacts will be, negative
8 or positive, but I do feel like, at least in my
9 past experience, those -- when we do find that
10 there is some other impact that might be less
11 direct, they don't seem to outweigh the larger
12 impacts.

13 Q Which -- do you -- does DED have any
14 metrics on what its mean accuracy rate is on these
15 types of analysis over the years as you've been
16 doing them?

17 A Mean accuracy rate.

18 Q So let's say if you say a project is
19 going to bring in 100 million dollars and you go
20 back and do your postmortem and find out it brought
21 in 85 million or brought in 115 million. You've
22 got over or under 15 percent. If you kinda tallied
23 those up and looked and said, okay, how right --
24 what's the mean of how right we are? What would
25 you say that number is?

1 A I think it gets back to that first
2 question of can we know what the economic model is,
3 you know. Looking -- looking at all those indirect
4 effects and spending, again we don't -- it's a
5 simulation of the economy. So it's, by its very
6 nature, an abstraction of the economy. We can't
7 possibly know if all those things are exactly
8 right.

9 Q **But a simulation's value is in its
10 predictive value; correct?**

11 A It's in its ability, my opinion, it's
12 in its ability to give you reasonable estimates to
13 help you make decisions.

14 Q **Right. And, I mean, I think we're
15 saying the same thing, its ability to accurately
16 predict what's going to happen?**

17 A I don't know that prediction is the
18 right word, though, because if it can predict the
19 exact future, then I would basically be able to
20 make a lot of money off of that and I can't do that
21 with that model.

22 Q **I understand that, and I'm not trying
23 to hold DED to some superhuman standard. What I'm
24 saying, though, is would you agree with me that you
25 have a model -- this happens in economics, we all**

1 know it does. You have a model that after you
2 apply it to the real world retroactive, you realize
3 it has very little value. That happens, right?

4 A I don't know that anybody has the
5 answer to what those larger economic indirect --
6 I've never come across anyone who's done a
7 postmortem of any analysis that was able to track
8 every single thing that an economic model would
9 estimate.

10 Q Okay. And I --

11 A I'm not aware of it. Now, it may be
12 that there's something out there, but I'm not aware
13 of that.

14 Q I understand that. I'm asking a more
15 basic question, though, is that the value of a
16 model in economics, it has to be tied necessarily
17 to its predictive ability; isn't that fair?

18 A It has to be tied to does it produce
19 reasonable estimates of what you would expect to
20 happen.

21 Q And so, I mean, if you're trying to
22 prognosticate with them, which ultimately is what
23 we're trying to do with this, you would hope that
24 it does have some relatively close tie to reality;
25 right?

1 A Well, yes.

2 Q Okay. So this is my problem then, is
3 if that's true, but you're telling me nobody could
4 -- well, it's very difficult or we don't have a way
5 to go back and actually tell if it's true, how can
6 we tell whether the model actually works?

7 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, objection,
8 cumulative. I think we've been over this like five
9 minutes ago.

10 MR. HADEN: Well, first of all, this
11 not being Mr. Zobrist's witness, I don't know if
12 it's proper for him to object, and I don't know
13 what the Chair's rule is on that.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll take the
15 objection. I think you're starting to get to the
16 point where you're going over the same ground
17 again, but I'll allow one more question on that if
18 you want to.

19 Q (BY MR. HADEN) With that objection,
20 you need me to restate it for you?

21 A Yes, please.

22 Q Okay. Here's the simplest way I can
23 ask this. If there is not a way to tell whether
24 the model works when you look retroactively,
25 whether it's predictive, then what value does it

1 **have?**

2 A It has value, in my opinion, of
3 estimating what the reasonable impacts of an
4 activity could be in your economy for a certain
5 activity. So take -- taking a new company that
6 comes to the state, for example, has new jobs, you
7 can use the model to try to understand will that
8 have different impacts by different industries in
9 different regions and to what magnitude those
10 impacts will be. That helps in the decision-making
11 process to understand is this an activity that
12 seems like it's going to have positive outcomes?

13 The REMI model, because it does have
14 these costs that it adds in, which is unlike any
15 other model, it can sometimes tell you that an
16 activity isn't going to produce new jobs. So, for
17 example, it has displacement for jobs like retail.
18 So if we put in new retail jobs, they'll say, well,
19 you're going to also compete with other retailers.

20 So sometimes there's not a positive
21 effect. Is it 100 percent accurate, though? We
22 can never know that because we can't follow those
23 indirect and, in our terminology, intermediate
24 induced impacts because they're just so disperse.
25 We just don't have all that information.

1 Q Let's go back to direct impacts
2 because I think you said it is easier to go back
3 and look at those; correct?

4 A Well, sure, yes.

5 Q Okay. Have you followed up on any of
6 the projects you've worked on to see whether your
7 estimate on direct impact, how accurate -- so let's
8 say, for example, you say a company -- this company
9 is expected produce -- this company is expected to
10 produce X dollars of tax income for the state. Or
11 tax revenue for the state.

12 Do you go back then on those sorts of
13 estimates and look five years later and say did
14 they do that?

15 A I -- there's two parts to that
16 answer. One is that there is -- you know, you're
17 asking about taxes. We -- we, because of
18 confidential information, we can't actually go and
19 see what somebody pays in taxes. What we can check
20 on is jobs.

21 And so, for example, with the Quality
22 Jobs Program, and the Missouri Works has set up
23 this way, too, there is required reporting of those
24 companies who receive those tax incentives to
25 report those jobs, and so they are verified.

1 So that's a case where the department
2 would be able to look back and say did you -- you
3 said you were going to create 100 jobs. Did you
4 create 100 jobs? And so that's a direct -- and
5 also the wages that they anticipate.

6 So that's a -- that's a way that
7 directly the department can know. Not all programs
8 are set up that way, but that one is.

9 **Q Right. So, for example, this**
10 **project, though, you won't be able -- you won't**
11 **know in your office on the back end how much tax**
12 **revenue it actually generates; right?**

13 A We will not get a report, no.

14 **Q And there's no way to -- and I'm not**
15 **saying there should be, to be clear, but there's no**
16 **way to force the company to produce those sorts of**
17 **records; right?**

18 A Not that I'm aware of.

19 **Q Now, in other projects you've worked**
20 **on, I mean, have there been any that -- any**
21 **estimates that you can look back and say we know**
22 **this was a massive failure in terms of the**
23 **projection?**

24 A No.

25 **Q Did you work on the Mamtek project at**

1 **all?**

2 A Yes.

3 **Q And what did the model say that was**
4 **going to generate?**

5 A I can't recall. But the important
6 thing about the models is, and especially with
7 credits, a lot of the tax incentive programs, it's
8 a performance-based program. So if a -- for
9 example, and this is not from that example, but,
10 for example, if the company says they are going to
11 create 100 jobs and the state says we will
12 incentivize that with a million dollars over five
13 years or whatever. If by the end of five years
14 they created 50 jobs and they got half the
15 incentives, then it's a pretty linear equation.
16 The benefit cost ratio is what we're looking at in
17 those cases where tax revenue would be relatively
18 consistent.

19 So in the case of Mamtek you project
20 out here's what the company said they were going to
21 do and, of course, economies change and companies'
22 fortunes change, but if your incentive is
23 performance based, they don't get the incentive
24 until they perform, then those will be pretty
25 linear and our evidence is that has been the case.

1 Q Okay. So back to the basic question.
2 Did they get anywhere close to what they were
3 projected to bring in in that case?

4 A That company did not successfully
5 come to Missouri, no. My -- my job is to analyze
6 the benefit cost to tax revenue. So if they -- if
7 they did not come and didn't produce revenue, they
8 did not get credits. So you got the denominator
9 and the numerator that are both at a very -- you
10 know, zero level.

11 Q And I understand, and I understand
12 that was also a special case that involved criminal
13 fraud. I mean, there are a lot of different
14 factors there. I just throw that out there as --
15 to ask.

16 You projected the revenue into the
17 state, you're saying, because they just didn't make
18 it at all, then it doesn't go into the hopper?

19 A Right. Exactly.

20 Q So talking about loss of agricultural
21 activity, I think you said you don't know what that
22 number is; correct?

23 A Correct.

24 Q And you don't have any way to find
25 out; right?

1 A I don't have that information.

2 Q And you have no idea whether that
3 activity might actually -- the lost activity might
4 actually outstrip the economic activity created by
5 this project?

6 MR. ZOBRIST: Objection, that was
7 asked and answered about ten minutes ago.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

9 MR. HADEN: I don't know that I
10 remember the answer but if you say so, Mr. Zobrist,
11 I believe you.

12 MR. ZOBRIST: You probably didn't
13 like the answer, so.

14 Q (BY MR. HADEN) As to any other lost
15 business activity, not agricultural, any other lost
16 business activity in the counties or the areas that
17 will be affected by this project? Have you done
18 any projections on that?

19 A No. I don't have any information
20 about any other lost business activities.

21 Q And then could -- I mean, you assume
22 there will be other lost business activities, not
23 agricultural, since that's been asked and answered,
24 that would also result from this project?

25 A I don't assume any, no.

1 Q So do you know that there will be or
2 won't be, or you just don't know?

3 A I don't assume there will be. I
4 don't know.

5 Q But there could be. Is that fair?

6 A Could be, yes.

7 Q Okay. And you don't -- those aren't
8 in the equation either; correct?

9 A Again, I don't have any information
10 about that. So, no, they are not in the equation
11 because I don't have any information on that.

12 Q Okay. So this leads me back, and I
13 don't think I did get an answer. Is this number a
14 gross or a net number of what's going to come into
15 the economy? Your projection?

16 A Which number?

17 Q Any of them? I know that you've got
18 various phases, but all of them you're telling me
19 don't take into account loss of agricultural
20 activity, don't take into account other lost
21 business opportunity, if it exists.

22 So is your projection as to any of
23 those phases, is that a gross number or a net
24 number to the state's economy?

25 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I'm going to

1 object, I think the witness has made clear it
2 depends on the number and, you know, that's a vague
3 -- that's a vaguely constructed question as it is.
4 I think Mr. Haden wants to break it out as to each
5 number which is in his testimony, I think we'd be a
6 lot more clear in the record of the Commission.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll let the witness
8 answer to the extent that he has knowledge of it.

9 A Okay. So like I referred to before,
10 REMI does include what they call economic migrants.
11 It's the idea that when you stimulate an activity,
12 not all of those workers are in the local area.
13 Many of them come from other places.

14 And so it estimates how many people
15 come in. Those people bring in population. The
16 population numbers affect the general expenditures
17 to the state. So that general revenue figure is a
18 net figure.

19 Q (BY MR. HADEN) Okay. And I
20 understand, so let's -- maybe this is definitional
21 problem then as to what grosses and nets. I
22 understand that it's got -- REMI has some netting
23 function as it involves that, but in the sense that
24 you have a number that you say Clean Line project
25 will bring into the state or how it will impact the

1 state's economy.

2 A Correct.

3 Q But you have not backed out the
4 impact of lost agricultural activity from that
5 number; correct?

6 A Correct. I did not take out lost
7 agricultural activity.

8 Q And I think you've acknowledged, Mr.
9 Zobrist has a better memory than me, but I think
10 you've acknowledged that there's at least some
11 number there; correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. And you don't know what that
14 number is; correct?

15 A I do not know what that number is.

16 Q So in your study that number is
17 functionally zero; correct? The number of lost
18 activity?

19 A Is not in there. That's correct.

20 Q Okay. But in the real world that
21 number is something bigger than zero; correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. So when I'm talking about
24 grosses and nets, that's what I mean. That number
25 in your study is being assumed to be zero but in

1 the real world it's not zero; correct?

2 A That's correct, yeah, I am not taking
3 into account the lost agricultural.

4 Q Okay. This is a long road then for
5 me to ask, is -- so how do we -- so whatever that
6 number is, that number could be the same as these
7 economic impacts here; correct?

8 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I'll object, I
9 think he's answered that now three times at this
10 point. As to the offset with agricultural jobs.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I believe he has, so
12 I'll sustain the objection.

13 MR. HADEN: Just one moment, Your
14 Honor.

15 Q (BY MR. HADEN) I want to talk
16 briefly with you about something Ms. Meisenheimer
17 talked about in terms of the Staff conditions.
18 They're a recent development in the case. Have you
19 looked at those at all?

20 A No, I have not.

21 Q And so she talked -- well, were you
22 in for her testimony? I don't want to summarize if
23 you don't have knowledge of it.

24 A I was.

25 Q She talked about the issue with

1 basically having 500 feet of leeway on either side
2 of the line to make adjustments. Did you hear that
3 testimony?

4 A Yes, I did hear it.

5 Q Have you looked at that issue at all
6 within the Staff?

7 A No.

8 Q And you don't have any knowledge of
9 that one way or the other?

10 A No.

11 Q And you don't have any knowledge, you
12 don't have a position or any knowledge of DED's
13 position on that question?

14 A No.

15 MR. HADEN: Okay, that's all I have,
16 Judge.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Landowners?

18 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 QUESTIONS BY MR. AGATHEN:

21 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Spell.

22 A Good afternoon.

23 Q Are you aware of the fact that if the
24 grain line project is actually built, that their
25 own studies show there is going to be a decline in

1 coal production at virtually every coal plant in
2 Missouri?

3 A Am I -- I'm sorry, could you pose the
4 question again, please?

5 Q Are you aware of that fact?

6 A And the fact is again?

7 Q That according to Grain Belt's own
8 studies, there's going to be a decline in output at
9 virtually every coal plant in Missouri.

10 A No, I am not aware of that study.

11 Q So that decline in output was not
12 factored into your analysis?

13 A I did not have that information.

14 Q Were the decline in revenues to the
15 owners of those plants factored into your analysis?

16 A Again, I did not have that
17 information, no.

18 Q Did you ask for it?

19 A No.

20 Q Do you have any estimate at all as to
21 what the loss of profits would be for the investor
22 owned utilities?

23 A No.

24 Q Did you make any kind of
25 investigation into how much the owners of the

1 plants might suffer in terms of lost profits or
2 margins for municipal systems and co-ops?

3 A No.

4 Q Could a loss of profits by a Missouri
5 corporation lead to a reduction in state income
6 taxes paid by that company?

7 A I would assume yes.

8 Q Was that factored into your analysis?

9 A No, I did not have that information.

10 Q Did you look for it?

11 A No.

12 Q Did you look into the potential
13 impact on state income taxes as a result of the
14 displacement of coal generation in Missouri?

15 MR. ZOBRIST: Asked and answered,
16 Judge. He's already responded to that question.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Agathen, what's
18 your response?

19 MR. AGATHEN: I didn't think he had
20 talked about state income taxes, Your Honor.

21 A The answer is no.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Go ahead.

23 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Did you look into
24 how much margin would be lost by the co-ops from a
25 decline in coal production at their plants?

1 A No.

2 Q Did you look at the potential impact
3 that the reduced generation from coal plants might
4 have on the rates paid by retail customers of
5 investor owned co-op and municipal systems?

6 A No.

7 Q Did you look into how many jobs might
8 be lost at the Missouri coal plants if generation
9 there is displaced by generation from the Grain
10 Belt project?

11 A No.

12 Q Would your model have been capable of
13 estimating the reduction in sales and jobs at coal
14 plants in Missouri if you had the necessary input
15 data?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And you did not look for it?

18 A I did not receive that information
19 and did not make any calls to inquire about that.

20 Q Did you look at what impact the
21 displacement of coal generation by the Grain Belt
22 line might have on coal suppliers such as Peabody
23 Energy and Arch Mineral in St. Louis?

24 A No.

25 Q Presumably, the less coal that's

1 **burned at these plants, the less coal they will be**
2 **buying from the suppliers like Peabody; correct?**

3 A That is a good assumption.

4 Q **And the less coal that's sold, the**
5 **lower the profits of the coal companies are likely**
6 **to be; right?**

7 A I would assume less sales in coal
8 would lower their profits.

9 Q **Was that factored into your analysis?**

10 A No.

11 Q **Did you look at the potential job**
12 **losses at coal suppliers such as Peabody and Arch**
13 **Mineral?**

14 A No, I did not.

15 Q **Did you look at the impact that**
16 **displacing coal would have on the rail lines which**
17 **carry coal to the plants in Missouri?**

18 A No.

19 Q **Did you look into the possibility, as**
20 **Grain Belt suggests, that its project could mean**
21 **fewer generating plants would be built in the**
22 **future?**

23 A No.

24 Q **Did you look into the number of**
25 **construction jobs which would be lost in Missouri**

1 if Grain Belt line results in fewer generating
2 plants being built?

3 A No, I did not. And I am assuming
4 that you are asking if this -- this is created,
5 then there will be a savings to those companies who
6 do not have to generate those, or build those new
7 plants; is that correct?

8 Q I'm just asking you whether you
9 factored it into your analysis.

10 A Okay. No.

11 Q Did you look at the impact on
12 property tax revenues if new construction of
13 generating plants comes to a halt?

14 A No.

15 Q Did you look into the possibility
16 that the Grain Belt line might mean that other
17 transmission lines might not be built in Missouri?

18 A No.

19 Q Or that existing lines might not be
20 upgraded?

21 A No.

22 Q Did you look into the number of jobs
23 which might not be created in Missouri as a result
24 of other transmission lines not being built or
25 upgraded?

1 A No.

2 Q Did you look into the impact on
3 property tax revenues if those transmission lines
4 are not built or upgraded?

5 A No.

6 Q Is it logical to assume that if an
7 additional 500 megawatts of power delivered into
8 Missouri by the Grain Belt line, that fewer solar
9 generating facilities might be built in Missouri?

10 A I don't know the answer to that.

11 Q Did you look into that?

12 A No.

13 Q Did you look into the impact which
14 would result if there are fewer solar generating
15 plants built in Missouri?

16 A No.

17 Q How about the possibility, if the
18 Grain Belt line is built in Missouri, that fewer
19 wind farms might be built in this state? Did you
20 look at that?

21 A No.

22 Q So you didn't look at the economic
23 impact that that might have as far as the lack of
24 building of new wind farms?

25 A That would require the assumption

1 that I would -- that, that there's a -- an equal
2 case to be made for building a wind farm wherever
3 you want to. I don't have those expertise where
4 wind farms need to be built, so I did not factor
5 that in.

6 Q Did you look at how many jobs in
7 Missouri might be lost as a result of fewer solar
8 or wind facilities being built in Missouri?

9 A No.

10 Q Are you aware of the preference in
11 the state renewable standards for local renewable
12 generation in Missouri over renewable generation
13 imported from other states?

14 A I have heard of that standard before.

15 Q So it's certainly possible that the
16 approval of the Grain Belt line could have a
17 negative impact on the development of local
18 renewable generation; correct?

19 A I can't make that assumption. I
20 don't know that.

21 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I was going to
22 object to that question, I think it's asking for
23 something outside his expertise, he wasn't
24 presented on that subject, and I think Mr.
25 Agathen's going outside of his expertise in asking

1 these questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Well, I'll overrule
3 the objection to the extent the witness can say if
4 he has knowledge of that information.

5 A I don't have knowledge of that
6 information.

7 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) So it was not
8 factored into your analysis?

9 A No.

10 Q Did you do any kind of analysis at
11 all to determine the negative impacts on jobs and
12 tax revenues which might result from the Grain Belt
13 line being built?

14 MR. ZOBRIST: Objection, Judge, this
15 has been asked in different forms for about the
16 last five minutes. It's becoming argumentative.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

18 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) Did your study
19 factor in the costs of the capacity of the Grain
20 Belt line which would be passed on by the utilities
21 in Missouri to the retail customers?

22 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, I object as
23 that assumes facts not in evidence.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: What's your
25 response?

1 MR. AGATHEN: There's been plenty of
2 testimony, Your Honor, that if the line is built
3 and it's used by utilities in Missouri to supply
4 their retail customers, that the cost of the line
5 would then be passed on to those retail customers.
6 A number of witnesses have testified to that
7 effect.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And paying for
9 energy consumed; correct?

10 MR. AGATHEN: Correct.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: To that extent, I'll
12 overrule the objection. You may answer, sir, if
13 you know.

14 A No, I do not have that information
15 and I did not have that in the impact.

16 Q **(BY MR. AGATHEN) It was not factored**
17 **into your analysis?**

18 A Correct.

19 Q **Did your study factor in the**
20 **potential negative impacts on property values in**
21 **the area of the proposed line?**

22 A No.

23 Q **Did your study factor in the**
24 **potential negative impacts the line might have on**
25 **other businesses such as crop dusting?**

1 A No.

2 Q Did Grain Belt ask you to look at
3 potential negative economic impacts which might
4 result from the proposed line?

5 A Grain Belt didn't ask me for the
6 study. The department director did.

7 Q Fair enough. Did anyone ask you to
8 look at the potential negative impacts which might
9 result from Grain Belt line?

10 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, it's been asked
11 and answered. It's cumulative and becoming
12 argumentative.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Sustained.

14 Q (BY MR. AGATHEN) For any new
15 construction, whatever it is, even a bridge to
16 nowhere, your model would show an economic benefit,
17 wouldn't it?

18 A If there is construction, it will
19 show a benefit.

20 Q And the higher the cost of the
21 project, the more the benefits?

22 A Yes.

23 MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Your
24 Honor.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from

1 Commissioners?

2 CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions, thank
3 you.

4 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Economic
6 Development?

7 MR. BEAR: Just a few, Your Honor.

8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. BEAR:

10 Q How are you doing, Mr. Spell?

11 A Doing well.

12 Q Okay. I'd like to go back through
13 some of the questions that you were asked.
14 Surprisingly, we brought up Mamtek earlier.

15 Mamtek, would you agree with me that
16 that's a unique case that involved fraud by the
17 CEO?

18 A Yes, very much so.

19 Q Okay. And so your model assumes that
20 we're dealing with companies that are not engaging
21 in active securities fraud; right?

22 A That's correct.

23 Q Okay. And you have no reason to
24 believe that there's active securities fraud in
25 this case?

1 A I do -- you're correct, I have no
2 reason to believe that.

3 Q Okay. You were asked as well about
4 offsets that may occur with agricultural interest.
5 Do you recall that, sir?

6 A I do.

7 Q If an interested party such as Farm
8 Bureau was to provide you with data regarding
9 potential losses in agricultural activity due to
10 Grain Belt, would you be willing to put that into
11 your model and submit it to the Commission?

12 MR. HADEN: Objection, calls for
13 speculation.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Can you repeat the
15 question, please?

16 MR. BEAR: Absolutely.

17 Q (BY MR. BEAR) If an interested party
18 such as Farm Bureau was to provide you with data
19 that would substantiate agricultural losses, would
20 you be willing to put that into your model and
21 submit that to the Commission?

22 MR. HADEN: Hearing it a second time,
23 I'll withdraw my objection, I guess to the extent
24 it's asking him about his intentions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Very good. You may

1 answer.

2 A Yes. I could put those inputs into
3 the model, assuming they're reasonable estimates,
4 yes.

5 Q (BY MR. BEAR) Okay. And you were
6 also asked about coal generation as well. Do you
7 recall that, sir?

8 A I do.

9 Q If an interested party was to present
10 you with data regarding potential coal losses with
11 current coal jobs in Missouri, would you be willing
12 to put that into your model and submit a version of
13 that to the Commission?

14 MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, I'm going
15 to object to this one. There's absolutely no
16 evidence that any interested party has access to
17 that data.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled.

19 A Yes.

20 Q (BY MR. BEAR) You mentioned that you
21 had been running REMI for a number of years;
22 correct?

23 A Correct.

24 Q Are you aware of any better modeling
25 software available on the market right now as a

1 **predictive tool for economic activity?**

2 A I am not. I have had the benefit to
3 use several models through my career, and REMI is
4 the one model that has features such as the costs
5 that I referred to earlier which no other model
6 has, helps produce more conservative figures.

7 It includes displacement, which no
8 other model has. It's commercially available and
9 that's really important to make sure we don't
10 overestimate jobs. It allows us to calibrate the
11 model each year to the state office of
12 administration, budget and expenditures, which we
13 do. Takes about a month, but we do that and test
14 it, and allows us to also have more conservative
15 numbers.

16 We have implant as well, so we're
17 able to use both of those models to make sure they
18 are consistent, but REMI is by far the preferred
19 model.

20 The Pew Center on states did research
21 a few years back and recommended that states use
22 models like REMI and end plan to understand the
23 cost benefit of their business incentives and
24 Missouri was one of the top ten states in doing
25 those cost benefit analysis.

1 Q And I want to break that out just so
2 it's clear to the Commission. You mentioned REMI
3 outputs a lot of different metrics; correct?

4 A Correct.

5 Q So, for instance, one of the metrics
6 is revenue to the state budget; right?

7 A Correct.

8 Q And we do verify that on a basis by
9 looking at the Office of Administration?

10 A We -- we make sure that those revenue
11 and expenditures are calibrated to make sure that
12 they come in line with what the -- those
13 expenditures and revenues are, yes.

14 Q And one of the metrics REMI outputs
15 is also direct benefits; correct?

16 MR. HADEN: Judge, I'm going to
17 object, and I really don't want to hold this up but
18 I'd ask that -- I mean, it's leading the witness in
19 the form of the questions.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You want to rephrase
21 the question?

22 MR. BEAR: Sure.

23 Q (BY MR. BEAR) Does REMI output
24 direct costs? Or direct benefits? You mentioned
25 indirect, direct benefits?

1 A Well, models -- models are really
2 there for one thing, to estimate the indirect. You
3 have to input the direct to -- to get the
4 indirects.

5 So what we do with the model is put
6 in, in the case of most of our projects, jobs and
7 wages, and that outputs the jobs and indirect
8 effects and so forth.

9 In the case of this project we had
10 spending, we had money investments. So what we do
11 is go in and put in those spending by the
12 categories and it creates -- and it does estimate
13 those -- those impacts.

14 There are direct ones. So, for
15 example, estimate the number of construction
16 workers that are needed and the number of machinery
17 manufacturing jobs needed and retail needed and so
18 forth.

19 **Q Okay. Grain Belt had provided you**
20 **with some data that went into your modeling;**
21 **correct?**

22 A Correct.

23 **Q Okay. If you were to remove the**
24 **Grain Belt data, would you still be able to run a**
25 **REMI model?**

1 A No, I would have no direct input to
2 put in there.

3 Q Okay. So that's a necessary
4 ingredient just in order to run the analysis, is to
5 have numbers from somewhere?

6 A Yes, you have to have a direct shock
7 to the economy, new spending to the economy to
8 estimate any kind of impact. Yes.

9 Q Okay. And did you find any basis,
10 using your knowledge and expertise, to find that
11 Grain Belt's numbers that they provided you were
12 unreasonable?

13 A I did not believe those numbers were
14 unreasonable. I did a basic search of, you know,
15 what generally do power line construction costs
16 range from. Those numbers seemed within reason of
17 that.

18 Q And I know I'm never supposed to ask
19 a question I don't know the answer to but we were
20 talking about coal. You've received hundreds of
21 applications for new businesses over the years to
22 run modeling on; correct?

23 A Correct.

24 Q When is the last time you saw a coal
25 plant in this state?

1 A I have never seen one. That I have
2 had to model.

3 MR. BEAR: Thank you.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you for your
5 testimony, Mr. Spell. You may be excused now.

6 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

7 (Witness excused.)

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we go
9 ahead and start with Staff's witnesses and see how
10 far we get.

11 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, the Department
12 is waiving the remainder of cross-examination,
13 seeing as we have no further witnesses, may I ask
14 if I be excused so I can attend other Department
15 business?

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Certainly, you may
17 be excused.

18 MR. BEAR: And my witnesses, Your
19 Honor?

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes.

21 MR. BEAR: Thank you very much.

22 (Mr. Brian Bear is no longer
23 present.)

24 MR. MILLS: Judge, I have had some
25 inquiries of counsel who have witnesses scheduled

1 for tomorrow about how long we're likely to go
2 tonight and where you think we'll end up on the
3 schedule.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You know,
5 considering how far behind we are, it seems
6 physically impossible to finish today's witnesses
7 today. I'm thinking that since, if you go too
8 late, the evidence becomes not productive, so I
9 think we can go for a little while longer and take
10 a witness or two, depending on how we get. And
11 then we'll have -- if the parties have witnesses
12 tomorrow that need to happen tomorrow, I would
13 suggest that you consult with each other and make
14 arrangements to rearrange the schedule.

15 It looks like we have Mr. White and
16 Mr. Chriss that are required to be tomorrow. I
17 don't know if there are any others. Depending on
18 travel arrangements, you may want to have those
19 conversations among yourselves.

20 MR. HADEN: Judge, if we could very
21 briefly on that, then, I can say Mr. Hurst actually
22 will have better availability if he doesn't go
23 tomorrow and I know he's toward the end of the
24 list.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: He has been waived

1 and already had his testimony admitted.

2 MR. HADEN: Fair enough. I thought I
3 heard that somebody wanted it read in but if
4 everybody's fine on that, that's even easier.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We admitted that
6 into the record, so he's done, and I believe Mr.
7 Parkinson has been withdrawn; is that correct?

8 MR. HADEN: Yes, that is correct.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. We're
10 ready. Any other -- anybody else want to make a
11 comment about scheduling?

12 MR. AGATHEN: Yes, Your Honor, I've
13 got three witnesses coming in from out of town and
14 are probably here now already. Mr. Jaskulski, Mr.
15 Kielisch, and Don Lowenstein.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We may have to take
17 the out of town witnesses out of order and do the
18 in town witnesses afterwards. I really don't see
19 how we get by not going on Monday. No matter how
20 late we go tonight or tomorrow night, I don't think
21 we can get all those done unless something dramatic
22 happens that would surprise me.

23 MR. LINTON: Let me throw one into
24 the mix too. Mr. Justis is here for Show Me and
25 would prefer to go on tomorrow if possible.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Well,
2 we'll just have to see how we go. For now, I guess
3 let's try and get some Staff witnesses in for this
4 evening. Miss Dietrich?

5 NATELLE DIETRICH,
6 having been called as a witness, was sworn
7 by the Court, upon her oath, and testified
8 as follows:

9 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 QUESTIONS BY MR. THOMPSON:

12 Q State your name, please.

13 A Natelle, N-a-t-e-l-l-e, Dietrich,
14 D-i-e-t-r-i-c-h.

15 Q I'm sorry, my name is Kevin Thompson.
16 How are you employed, Miss Dietrich?

17 A Commission Staff Director for the
18 Public Service Commission.

19 Q And are you the same Natelle Dietrich
20 who prepared or caused to be prepared rebuttal
21 testimony?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And you are also sponsoring, I
24 believe, a report marked as Staff's rebuttal
25 report?

1 A That's correct.

2 MR. THOMPSON: And your testimony has
3 been marked as Exhibit 200. Pass a copy of that to
4 the reporter.

5 (Wherein, Exhibit 200 was
6 introduced.)

7 Q **(BY MR. THOMPSON) Now, with respect**
8 **to your testimony, Exhibit 200, do you have any**
9 **changes or additions to that testimony?**

10 A No, I do not.

11 Q **If I were to ask you those same**
12 **questions today, would your answers be the same?**

13 A Yes, they would.

14 Q **And to the best of your knowledge and**
15 **belief, the contents of that testimony are true and**
16 **correct?**

17 A That's correct.

18 MR. THOMPSON: I offer Staff's
19 Exhibit 200 at this time.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?
21 Hearing none, 200 is received.

22 (Wherein, Exhibit 201HC and NP was
23 introduced.)

24 Q **(BY MR. THOMPSON) Now, with respect**
25 **to this report, Exhibit 201HC and NP, and also an**

1 appendix, you are sponsoring that report but you
2 were not the only contributor to it, were you?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q Various other Staff members
5 contributed to it as well as yourself?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q And they are also going to be
8 testifying at this hearing; isn't that right?

9 A Yes.

10 Q With respect to your contribution to
11 that report, do you have any corrections or
12 additions?

13 A No, I do not.

14 Q And if I were to ask you questions
15 with respect to that report, would your answers be
16 the same?

17 A Yes, they would.

18 Q And as far as you know, to the best
19 of your knowledge and belief, are the contents of
20 that report true and correct?

21 A Yes.

22 MR. THOMPSON: Your Honor, as we do
23 in rate cases with Staff reports, we'll wait to
24 offer it until all of the contributors have had a
25 chance to testify.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That would be my
2 preference too.

3 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. At
4 this time I will tender Ms. Dietrich for
5 cross-examination.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First
7 cross-examination will be Missouri Landowners?

8 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
9 Honor.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

11 MR. LINTON: No questions.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Farm Bureau? Not
13 here. Rockies Express?

14 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

16 MR. MILLS: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

18 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

20 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions, Judge.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

22 MR. BRADY: No questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

24 MR. HEALY: Yes, Judge, just a couple
25 of questions for Miss Dietrich.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

3 Q How are you this afternoon?

4 A Just fine, thank you.

5 Q Did you read the rebuttal and
6 surrebuttal testimony offered by MJMEUC in this
7 case?

8 A Parts of it, yes.

9 Q Not all of it?

10 A Not thoroughly.

11 Q Okay. And did you engage in any
12 discovery, sending data requests or asking
13 questions of MJMEUC to explain their testimony?

14 A I did not, no.

15 MR. HEALY: No further questions of
16 this witness, Judge.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Grain
18 Belt Express?

19 MR. ZOBRIST: We have no questions,
20 Judge.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by
22 Commissions?

23 CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions, thank
24 you.

25 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff?

2 MR. THOMPSON: I have no redirect.

3 Thank you.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Miss Dietrich, that
5 completes your testimony.

6 (Witness excused.)

7 MS. MYERS: Judge, Staff would call
8 Dave Murray.

9 DAVID MURRAY,

10 having been called as a witness, was sworn
11 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
12 as follows:

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION

14 QUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:

15 Q Mr. Murray, please state your name
16 for the record.

17 A David Murray, M-u-r-r-a-y.

18 Q Where are you employed and what is
19 your job title?

20 A Employed by Missouri Public Service
21 Commission as a utility regulatory manager of the
22 financial analysis unit.

23 Q Did you prepare or cause to prepare a
24 portion of Staff's rebuttal report, NP and HC,
25 that's been marked as Exhibit 201?

1 A I did.

2 Q Do you have anything you wish to
3 correct to that testimony?

4 A No.

5 Q With that in mind, if I asked you the
6 same questions today, would your answers be the
7 same?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Is the information in that document
10 correct and true to the best of your knowledge?

11 A Yes.

12 MS. MYERS: Your Honor, Staff tenders
13 Mr. Murray for cross.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
15 Missouri Landowners?

16 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
17 Honor.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

19 MR. LINTON: No questions.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

21 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

23 MR. MILLS: No questions.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

25 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

2 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

4 MR. BRADY: No questions, Your Honor.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

6 MR. HEALY: Just a couple, Judge.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

9 Q Mr. Murray, how are you this
10 afternoon?

11 A Good how are you doing?

12 Q Doing fine. I just want to confirm
13 that in the Staff report you didn't opine or give
14 any opinion as to the public interest of this
15 project; is that correct?

16 A I did not.

17 MR. HEALY: Okay. No further
18 questions, Judge.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Grain
20 Belt Express?

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

23 Q Mr. Murray, is it true that the Staff
24 and Grain Belt Express have agreed to the financing
25 conditions that you recommended in the Staff

1 **report?**

2 A Yes.

3 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Judge.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from
5 Commissioners?

6 CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions, thank
7 you.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff?

9 MS. MYERS: No redirect, Judge.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr.
11 Murray.

12 (Witness excused.)

13 SARAH KLIETHERMES,

14 having been called as a witness, was sworn
15 by the Court, upon her oath, and testified
16 as follows:

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

19 Q **Please state and spell your name.**

20 A Sarah Kliethermes, S-a-r-a-h
21 K-l-i-e-t-h-e-r-m-e-s.

22 Q **Did you prepare narrative testimony**
23 **that's been included in Staff rebuttal report which**
24 **has been marked as Exhibit 201?**

25 A Yes.

1 Q And are the portions of that report
2 that is your narrative testimony appear on pages 29
3 to 32 and 37 to 41?

4 A That sounds correct.

5 Q And does the Appendix at pages 9 to
6 13 reflect your credentials and experience?

7 A That sounds correct.

8 Q And you verified that testimony at
9 the time it was refiled? It was an affidavit;
10 correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And would that -- those portions of
13 that exhibit be your testimony here today or would
14 you have some changes that you would make?

15 A There is one typographical error on
16 page --

17 Q Where does that appear?

18 A Page 40, of the bottom of the third
19 paragraph, the statement is "This would increase
20 reserve margin requirements." The word "margin"
21 should be struck.

22 Q Is that the only change?

23 A Yes.

24 MR. ZOBRIST: Could you give me that
25 line again, please? Or area?

1 MR. WILLIAMS: Here.

2 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you.

3 Q (BY MR. WILLIAMS) With that change,
4 are those pages of what's been marked as Exhibit
5 Number 201, and this is an HC and a public version
6 of that document, your testimony here today?

7 A Yes.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: With that, I tender
9 the witness.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
11 Missouri Landowners.

12 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
13 Honor.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

15 MR. LINTON: No questions.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

17 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

19 MR. MILLS: No questions.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

21 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

23 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions, Judge.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

25 MR. BRADY: No questions.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

2 MR. HEALY: Just a couple of
3 questions, Judge.

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

6 Q Miss Kliethermes, how are you this
7 afternoon?

8 A Good, yourself? Thanks.

9 Q I'd like to direct you to page 37 of
10 the Staff report and it is titled towards the
11 bottom of that page, Public Interest? Actually
12 it's number 5, Public Interest?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And is that a section of the Staff
15 report that you caused to be prepared?

16 A It is -- I'm not certain if it was in
17 its entirety, but yes.

18 Q Okay. Are you the correct person to
19 ask questions to about that?

20 A I believe so. There may be specific
21 paragraphs that were handled by another witness.

22 Q Okay.

23 A As identified.

24 Q Okay. When preparing this, did you
25 review the Grain Belt, MJMEUC, Transmission Service

1 **Agreement prior to preparing this?**

2 A I don't believe as it pertains to the
3 public interest portion.

4 Q Okay.

5 A I would have -- I would have reviewed
6 either the contract or the draft contract. I do
7 not recall if it had been finalized at that point
8 or not.

9 Q Okay. Did you review the rebuttal
10 testimony filed by MJMEUC in this case?

11 A Prior to filing my rebuttal
12 testimony? No.

13 Q Okay. After filing it?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And did you review the surrebuttal
16 testimony filed by MJMEUC in this case?

17 A I know I looked at it. I don't
18 recall if I looked at it in detail.

19 Q Okay. And you did not file any
20 surrebuttal; is that correct?

21 A I did not.

22 Q Were you present this morning when
23 Mr. Grotzinger was testifying?

24 A For much of it.

25 Q Okay. And did you hear discussion of

1 **Schedule JG-3? That was the SPP to MISO versus the**
2 **Grain Belt Express transmission path?**

3 A I heard some of that discussion, yes.

4 Q **And would you generally agree with**
5 **his analysis?**

6 A I don't have an opinion.

7 Q **Okay. Did you cause to be issued any**
8 **data request to MJMEUC regarding claims made in**
9 **rebuttal or surrebuttal testimony?**

10 A I don't believe so.

11 MR. HEALY: No further questions,
12 Judge.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Grain
14 Belt Express?

15 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

18 Q **Am I correct that Staff did not**
19 **conduct a loss of load expectation study in this**
20 **case?**

21 A I wouldn't have been the witness to
22 do that but I don't believe we did, no.

23 Q **And to your knowledge, did Staff**
24 **retain a third party to conduct such an analysis?**

25 A Not to my knowledge.

1 Q Now, am I also correct that Staff
2 itself did not prepare a production cost model
3 analysis similar to what Mr. Copeland prepared?

4 A Staff did not do a production cost
5 analysis.

6 Q And you didn't retain any third party
7 to conduct such an analysis; correct?

8 A Not to my knowledge.

9 Q Now, did have you an opportunity to
10 meet with Mr. Copeland about the inputs that he
11 used in his production cost analysis?

12 A Prior to the filing of the case,
13 correct.

14 Q Do you know on how many occasions you
15 or members of Staff met with Mr. Copeland to
16 discuss those inputs?

17 A After the issuance of the report and
18 order in the prior case and prior to the filing of
19 this case I believe we met twice, although I am not
20 certain on that. There may have been some
21 telephone calls or e-mails exchanged as well.

22 Q Okay. Now, do you have any DR
23 responses to Grain Belt Express data requests that
24 you were responsible for in your possession?

25 A I believe I do. If you could

1 indicate which ones?

2 Q Sure. There was a DR response with
3 regard to the effect the 500 megawatt converter
4 station in Missouri, and I believe that you issued
5 a data response to that DR that stated that Staff
6 does not claim that the 500 megawatt injection from
7 the Missouri converter station has any impact to
8 increase or decrease the reserve margin
9 requirements for the region.

10 A I'm sorry, could you direct me to
11 which DR you're referring to?

12 Q Yes. It was in 9E, which I've got a
13 copy here, it's actually on page A of the DRs
14 directed to you personally.

15 A This is the string regarding my
16 responses to Miss Kelly's testimony?

17 Q They were not, well, they maybe but
18 it was on page 8, they were DRs that were directed
19 to you. I can show you a copy if you don't have
20 one handy.

21 A Could you repeat the question? I
22 think I have the right section. I just...

23 Q Yeah. The question, "Was a request
24 to provide study results performed for or by Staff
25 where the 500 megawatt injection from the Missouri

1 converter station has been considered and resulted
2 in an increase in the reserve margin requirements
3 for the region?"

4 And the Staff response, which I
5 believe you supplied, stated, "Staff has not stated
6 or alleged that the 500 megawatt injection from the
7 Missouri converter station has any impact to
8 increase or decrease the reserve margin
9 requirements for the region as described by Ms.
10 Kelly."

11 A Yes, I believe you read that
12 correctly.

13 Q Okay. And that's Staff's position;
14 correct?

15 A That, I believe you read that
16 correctly.

17 Q I know I read it correctly but my
18 question is that it's accurate that Staff has not
19 stated or made that allegation; correct?

20 A I'm sorry, I'm not following the
21 question.

22 Q Have you changed, or do you have any
23 basis to change the response that I just read into
24 the record?

25 A No.

1 Q Okay. That's all I was getting at.
2 Now, we also asked a -- in that -- in that same
3 data request set certain questions about the
4 interconnection process, and you were asked whether
5 you were aware of the MISO high voltage, direct
6 current task team that was studying interconnection
7 procedures form merchant HVDC projects. Do you
8 recall those?

9 A Can you direct me to which number
10 that is?

11 Q I believe it's DR 14.

12 A I find DR 14, yes.

13 Q Okay. And you were asked if any
14 members of Staff have been engaged in the MISO
15 merchant HVDC task team and Staff stated that it
16 did not have any members engaged in that task team;
17 correct? I believe it's on page 12.

18 A Yes. Sorry, I'm a little confused by
19 how this appears here, let me read it. Yes, you
20 are correct.

21 Q So Staff is aware of this process but
22 it's not itself participating in it; is that
23 correct?

24 A Not at this time. Correct.

25 Q The Staff monitoring the HVDC task

1 team process that MISO was conducting?

2 A Not in the formal manner, that I'm
3 aware of.

4 Q Okay. Now, let me direct your
5 attention to some DRs earlier in that set, looking
6 at DR 4, which appears on page 6?

7 A I'm there.

8 Q And the question asked Staff to
9 provide its understanding of the in-service data,
10 the most recent extra high voltage, meaning voltage
11 of 345kV or above, transmission line projects built
12 from, into, or across Missouri between a series of
13 following transmission providers and that included
14 SPP and Associated Electric, SPP and MISO, MISO and
15 Associated Electric, SPP and the Southwestern Power
16 Administration and two others, and Staff's response
17 was that this is not information that is readily
18 available to Staff; correct?

19 A Correct.

20 Q Does Staff have any ability to get
21 this kind of information?

22 A To ask for a specific date? I did
23 have discussion with other members of Staff who
24 have longer history than I do here. In fact, we
25 had some confusion as to your question. For

1 example, the Lutzville Heritage line, you know, you
2 have one terminal that is in one RTO and one
3 terminal that is in another. Is that through -- it
4 was -- it was -- as this question was worded, we
5 did not have a ready answer.

6 There -- there have been high voltage
7 lines built, and compounding the confusion is that
8 the regions identified to some extent are later
9 invention in the transmission lines that span the
10 regions, if you will.

11 **Q Now, in the next data request, number**
12 **5, Staff was asked does it believe that there is a**
13 **need for construction of new transmission**
14 **interconnections or facilities between transmission**
15 **providers that operate in Missouri, and Staff's**
16 **response was that it did not have an opinion;**
17 **correct?**

18 **A Correct.**

19 **Q Let me switch gears on you just a**
20 **minute. Do you recall the condition that we've --**
21 **we discussed, I believe the chairman did with one**
22 **of the Grain Belt Express witnesses, about cost**
23 **allocation that Grain Belt Express would not cost**
24 **allocate the process except if it came before the**
25 **Commission and Staff disagrees with that?**

1 A I would not refer to that as a
2 condition, but I do recall that discussion being
3 had earlier.

4 Q In any event, even though Staff and
5 Grain Belt Express disagree on this issue, the
6 company, Grain Belt Express, has stated that it
7 will not propose or attempt to cost allocate any
8 portion of the process unless the Missouri
9 Commission gives its authorization; correct?

10 A I don't agree with that. I believe
11 Grain Belt Express disagrees with itself on that
12 issue and Staff has not expressed an opinion.

13 Q All right. Fair enough. Finally,
14 with regard to Mr. Copeland's surrebuttal
15 testimony, he asserted that his study did take into
16 consideration off-system sales.

17 Does Staff have any basis to quarrel
18 with that statement?

19 A Staff does not quarrel with that
20 statement.

21 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you. Nothing
22 further, Judge.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by
24 Commissioners?

25 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah just a few.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

3 Q Good afternoon.

4 A Good afternoon. Evening.

5 Q Yes, it is evening. So if -- if this
6 line is approved and constructed, there will be a
7 MISO interconnection study that will be -- there
8 will be an interconnection study; correct?

9 A There will need to be an
10 interconnection study prior to there being a MISO
11 interconnection.

12 Q Do you have any reason to believe
13 that -- well, and so that -- that study may require
14 certain upgrades; is that correct?

15 A It could.

16 Q Do you have any reason to believe
17 that Clean Line's estimate for what those upgrades
18 might be is unreasonable?

19 A Can I give a preface that I think
20 would be helpful to your understanding of this
21 situation?

22 Q Sure.

23 A It's not only will the MISO study
24 indicate that upgrades are necessary. It's what
25 may the MISO study indicate that the line cannot

1 operate in the manner that Clean Line has proposed
2 it be operated, and as those two relate together,
3 you could have a greater or lesser impact.

4 **Q So tell me why you think it is**
5 **possible that the interconnection study might say**
6 **that the line cannot be operated the way that Clean**
7 **Line intends to operate it?**

8 A Well, I think we have SPP and their
9 interconnection agreement says you can operate this
10 line in the way that you want as long as it doesn't
11 really interface with any other SPP facilities, and
12 you have PJM saying you can interconnect this line
13 if you operate it on our terms.

14 The entity that hasn't spoken out
15 there and is literally stuck in the middle is MISO.
16 I don't know what that study will or won't say.

17 **Q What is your fear? Or what is your**
18 **concern?**

19 A I would be concerned if either the
20 limitations that MISO would place on the operation
21 of this project --

22 **Q Such as?**

23 A Such as what has been looked at in
24 the thermal analysis so far, to my understanding,
25 has been operation on a peak day and operation on a

1 secondary peak day. What has been looked at that
2 is in my understanding that has not yet been looked
3 at is operation of this -- of these facilities for
4 importing wind.

5 As in on a shoulder month, in the
6 evening, when the wind is blowing and Missouri
7 demand is low, what impact will that have on the
8 Missouri system? I am not aware of a study that
9 has looked at that yet.

10 **Q And what is your fear that such a**
11 **study might show?**

12 A That you can't do it.

13 **Q Please explain that to me. What do**
14 **you mean, you can't do it?**

15 A This, the details of this are better
16 handled by other Staff personal, but I'll do my
17 best.

18 If the purpose of the line is
19 literally to bring in wind energy in hours when the
20 wind is blowing, I think that we have studies
21 related to the Mark Twain line that says Missouri
22 cannot currently take that.

23 I think that with the Mark Twain
24 line, we have studies saying that we can take some
25 of that. What details concerning operation will

1 fall out of that is not something that I know and
2 I'm not aware of how you would know that without
3 doing the sort of detailed study that is required
4 under the MISO interconnection process.

5 **Q And what is your understanding as to**
6 **the status of that interconnection study?**

7 A Grain Belt has not yet requested it.

8 **Q So your fear is that that study will**
9 **essentially say that you can't drop the 500 in**
10 **Missouri?**

11 A Fear is a strong word. I would be
12 concerned if the cost benefits that are assumed at
13 this point for the Missouri converter station may
14 not play out once the project has been more
15 robustly studied.

16 **Q Who -- is -- is Mr. Beck the witness**
17 **who would be more --**

18 A He would be a witness that could
19 handle that.

20 **Q You said a moment ago that you're not**
21 **sure you're the right witness for this, so I'm**
22 **wondering who, in your mind, is the right witness**
23 **for this.**

24 A Unfortunately, this is one of those
25 areas where you're asking a very good question,

1 which means it's very complex. There are aspects
2 of that that would fall under Mr. Beck, Mr.
3 Stahlman, and Mr. Lange.

4 **Q Do you believe that as a general rule**
5 **when you increase access to additional energy, that**
6 **that results in enhanced reliability?**

7 A I am assuming you're meaning within a
8 given region?

9 **Q Yes.**

10 A I think that any time you show
11 additional energy or additional capacity is added
12 to a region, you will have fewer contingency events
13 that will show up, unless you have one massive
14 generator.

15 **Q So do you believe -- I mean, I know**
16 **that you and Staff take some issue with the Lowell**
17 **study in this case, but do you believe that there**
18 **-- that there is a reliability benefit from -- from**
19 **this project?**

20 A Mr. Beck would be the better witness
21 to address that question.

22 **Q What role should the levelized cost**
23 **of energy analysis play in our analysis as to -- as**
24 **to whether there is a need for this project?**

25 A That is really something that I have

1 struggled with, you know, in assessing -- it has
2 been presented that that is a factor pointing to
3 public interest in that utilities have -- or MJMEUC
4 in particular is taking advantage of that, to take
5 advantage of the project.

6 You know, if we were to do a giant
7 Chapter 22 study for the State of Missouri, is that
8 what we would look at? Possibly. You know, that's
9 not something that we have done.

10 To the extent that the Commission is
11 interested in, you know, what is a -- the levelized
12 cost of energy with or without, you know, the
13 market cost of capacity figured in, with or without
14 renewable energy credits figured in, with or
15 without the, you know, Missouri adder under the
16 RES, I don't have a good answer for you as to which
17 -- how you should weigh those factors.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
20 bench questions? Missouri Landowners?

21 MR. AGATHEN: No.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

23 MR. LINTON: No questions.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

25 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

2 MR. MILLS: No questions.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

4 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

6 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

8 MR. BRADY: No questions.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

10 MR. HEALY: Just a couple, Judge,
11 based on Chairman Hall's questions and Miss
12 Kliethermes's answers.

13 RE CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

15 Q Just hypothetically assume the
16 delivery of additional 500 megawatts into MISO is
17 something that can be done or the upgrades achieved
18 to make that happen. Wouldn't you agree it's in
19 the public interest if 300,000 Missourians can get
20 \$20 renewable energy?

21 A I think that that question assumes
22 kind of a option A versus option B. I'm not sure
23 that I can answer that without knowing what option
24 B is if --

25 Q Option B would be it's not done.

1 There is no CCN and the line's not constructed. I
2 would think option A would be the delivery of this
3 energy at very low cost assuming that, as you
4 mentioned, the MISO interconnection process is
5 completed. We're talking about MJMEUC, which is a
6 non-profit, so the savings and benefits are passed
7 through directly to the municipalities.

8 And I'm just asking your opinion if
9 that would be the public benefit if those 300,000
10 Missouri citizens could receive the benefit of that
11 low cost renewable energy.

12 A I don't see that that fits in with
13 how this Commission has in the past looked at
14 public interest and I don't have an answer beyond
15 that.

16 Q And not to argue, but is that a legal
17 standard you're referring to? As to public
18 interest?

19 A It is one of the tartan criteria.

20 Q And it's your opinion, though, that
21 -- and just to make sure I understand -- that the
22 Missouri citizens and utilities not regulated by
23 this Commission are not counted as public benefit;
24 is that correct?

25 A That is not my testimony.

1 **Q Okay. Can you explain then what it**
2 **is that you're getting at?**

3 A Well, I don't think you can look at
4 -- you've used the terms "public interest" and
5 "public benefit" and -- interchangeably and to me,
6 public benefit is one side and cost is the other.
7 Or some other form of negative.

8 So to determine public interest, I
9 think you need not only is this doing a good thing
10 but is this the -- an efficient or an effective --
11 effective is probably a better word -- means of
12 achieving that end.

13 So to answer in the abstract is
14 energy good, I can't really say that that
15 contributes to a public interest determination one
16 way or the other.

17 **Q Okay. Would it be fair to say that**
18 **you're not able to answer the question? Or you**
19 **have no opinion? Or is that your -- maybe I don't**
20 **understand if you do have an opinion as the**
21 **question in the hypothetical presented.**

22 A If the hypothetical is energy at a
23 given price good, I don't have an opinion on that
24 question in the abstract.

25 MR. HEALY: Okay. No further

1 questions, Judge.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Grain Belt Express?

3 MR. ZOBRIST: Just a couple.

4 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

5 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

6 Q Miss Kliethermes, are you aware MISO
7 has done one of the shoulder period studies for
8 some other interconnection?

9 A I'm sorry, say that again?

10 Q You talked about a shoulder period
11 study that you thought MISO might --

12 A A shoulder peak.

13 Q I'm sorry, I misheard you. Are you
14 aware of a shoulder peak study that MISO has done
15 under similar circumstances in the past?

16 A Other than the one that Grain Belt
17 requested in this case?

18 Q I'm not sure they called it a
19 shoulder peak study. They had a system impact
20 study that they requested and that was completed.

21 A And I'm sorry, I believe the term
22 maybe secondary peak. I'm sorry.

23 Q Okay. In any event, if MISO conducts
24 a study that it is required to conduct under its
25 tariff and it results in a necessary upgrade, who

1 is responsible for that upgrade?

2 A Well, it depends, and in this case in
3 particular it depends on whether or not given
4 portions of the interconnection, or of the
5 transmission system are or are not present.

6 Q To kinda cut to the chase, regardless
7 of what PJM and SPP and MISO do, they are the ones
8 that are responsible for making certain that the
9 interconnection at each of the converter stations
10 is safe and reliable; correct?

11 A They are responsible for putting in
12 places operations that will cause it to be safe and
13 reliable.

14 Q Then as the interconnector, Grain
15 Belt Express looks at those studies and if there
16 are upgrades they are required to construct,
17 they'll have to do that; right?

18 A If they move forward, correct.

19 Q Okay. And just one other question.
20 The Mark Twain project that you were referring to,
21 that's an alternating current project; correct?

22 A It is.

23 Q And this is a DC, a high voltage,
24 direct current project that has very different
25 properties; correct?

1 A They're both intended to move wind
2 from a windy region to the eastern half of MISO or
3 PJM, so I disagree.

4 **Q Well, there's no converter station**
5 **involved with the Mark Twain project, is there?**

6 A I think you're requesting that there
7 be one.

8 **Q The Mark Twain --**

9 A No. I understand what you're saying.
10 There -- there is not. It is part of the AC
11 transmission system.

12 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you. Nothing
13 further, Judge.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff?

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

18 **Q Chairman Hall asked you about the**
19 **interconnection study concerns that Staff has?**

20 A Yes.

21 **Q Has Staff taken any action in this**
22 **case with regard to conditions or otherwise to**
23 **address that concern?**

24 A I know Staff has a condition
25 concerning the interconnection agreements. I don't

1 have the final wording in front of me.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: May I approach?

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may.

4 (Wherein, Exhibit 206 was
5 introduced.)

6 Q (BY MR. WILLIAMS) What I am handing
7 you is what's been marked as Exhibit 206. And if
8 you take a look at the bottom of the first page?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Is that wording between Grain Belt
11 and Staff that's been agreed upon the condition?

12 A That's my understanding.

13 Q And does that condition then address
14 Staff's concerns, or at least help alleviate them?

15 A This condition helps address Staff's
16 concerns, correct.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Miss
19 Kliethermes, you may step down.

20 (Witness excused.)

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we take
22 the next Staff witness, please?

23 SHAWN LANGE,

24 having been called as a witness, was sworn
25 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified

1 as follows:

2 DIRECT EXAMINATION

3 QUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:

4 Q Mr. Lange, please state your full
5 name for the record.

6 A My name is Shawn, S-h-a-w-n; Lange,
7 L-a-n-g-e.

8 Q Mr. Lange, where are you employed and
9 what is your job title?

10 A I am a Utility Engineering Specialist
11 III with Missouri Public Service Commission.

12 Q And did you prepare or cause to be
13 prepared portions of Staff's rebuttal report that's
14 been marked as Exhibit 201?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Do you have anything you wish to
17 correct in that testimony?

18 A There is one correction.

19 Q What page is that correction on?

20 A Page 57. In the third set of bullet
21 points, the third bullet point where it states "The
22 Palmyra Tap, Palmyra 345kV line," that should be
23 deleted.

24 Q Besides that correction, do you have
25 any others?

1 A No.

2 Q So if I asked you the same questions
3 today, would your answers be the same?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And is the information in this
6 document true and correct to the best of your
7 knowledge?

8 A Yes.

9 MS. MYERS: Okay. Judge, Staff
10 tenders Mr. Lange for cross.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be
12 Missouri Landowners?

13 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
14 Honor.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

16 MR. LINTON: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

18 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

20 MR. MILLS: No questions.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

22 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

24 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

1 MR. BRADY: No questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

3 MR. HEALY: No questions of this
4 witness, Judge.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Grain Belt Express?

6 MR. ZOBRIST: Just a couple of
7 questions, Judge.

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

10 Q Mr. Lange, is it true that Staff is
11 not aware of a transmission project that has
12 executed contracts for spare parts or other
13 restoration equipment prior to receiving a
14 certificate of convenience and necessity from this
15 Commission?

16 A I am not aware of any.

17 Q And is it also true that Staff is not
18 aware of a transmission project that has had such
19 contracts in place for spare parts or other
20 restoration equipment before the project's final
21 engineering and design were achieved?

22 A I am not aware of any.

23 Q I've got a question about short
24 circuit ratio that I think we had some discussion
25 of in the set of data requests that are directed to

1 you. Do you recall those?

2 A Yes.

3 Q I am looking at data request number
4 10.

5 A Okay.

6 Q You were essentially asked about
7 short circuit ratio studies, and Grain Belt Express
8 asked that if the short circuit ratio at the chosen
9 point of connection is much higher than 2.0, if the
10 studies showed that a short circuit ratio for 500
11 -- for the 500 megawatt Missouri HVDC converter
12 station at the chosen point of interconnection was
13 2.0 or higher, that would alleviate Staff's
14 concerns; correct?

15 A That was what was asked, yes.

16 Q And that's Staff's position; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And then if you go to data request
19 16, which is after the diagrams in your data
20 request response, I believe it may be the next to
21 last page or perhaps three pages from the end.

22 A Okay.

23 Q Grain Belt Express had indicated
24 that, and has indicated in this case that it
25 intends to register with NERC and its various

1 functions within the NERC reliability functional
2 model as outlined in one of Dr. Galli's schedules,
3 and the company asked you if you believe that a
4 NERC reliability functional model entity would
5 design equipment that is considered part of the
6 bulk electricity system without consideration of
7 the IEEE, NERC, N-E-R-C, and the IEC standards.

8 Do you remember that?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay. And you indicated there that
11 you were not alleging and Staff was not alleging
12 that there were -- that there was any belief that
13 Grain Belt Express has not followed or taken into
14 consideration those three standards; is that
15 correct?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q Just for the record, what is the
18 IEEE?

19 A The --

20 Q It's in the record; correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And NERC, of course, is the North
23 American Electric Reliability Corporation?

24 A Correct.

25 Q And IEC stands for? It's set forth

1 in the Commission's regulations with regard to safe
2 adherence to electricity standards; correct?

3 A Correct.

4 Q Okay. That's fine. Finally,
5 switching gears here, in the Staff report at pages
6 16 and 17, I believe you were the person that spoke
7 of the ability of Missouri utilities to purchase
8 renewable energy credits; correct?

9 A No. I don't believe so.

10 MS. MYERS: Mr. Zobrist, if I may,
11 that's Dan Beck.

12 MR. ZOBRIST: You're right. I'll
13 save that for Mr. Beck. Nothing further, Judge.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from
15 Commissioners?

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions, thank
17 you.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff?

19 MS. MYERS: Just briefly, Judge.

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 QUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:

22 Q Mr. Lange, are you familiar with
23 Staff Exhibit 206, the conditions agreed to with
24 Staff and Grain Belt Express Clean Line?

25 A Yes.

1 Q Do you have a copy of that?

2 A Yes. I do.

3 Q Now, you were asked questions by Mr.
4 Zobrist regarding contracts for spare parts,
5 engineering plans, et cetera?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Did Staff come to an agreement with
8 Grain Belt upon providing information such as this?

9 A We did.

10 Q Also, Mr. Zobrist asked you questions
11 about NERC and Commission Rules for safety; is that
12 correct?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q Did we also come to a condition on
15 that with Staff or with Grain Belt?

16 A Yes, we did.

17 MS. MYERS: Thank you Mr. Lange. No
18 further questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, you may
20 step down.

21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

22 (Witness excused.)

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go ahead and
24 take another Staff witness.

25 ///

1 MICHAEL STAHLMAN,
2 having been called as a witness, was sworn
3 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
4 as follows:

5 DIRECT EXAMINATION

6 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSON:

7 **Q Could you please state your name for**
8 **the record and spell it for the court reporter?**

9 A Michael Stahlman, M-i-c-h-a-e-l
10 S-t-a-h-l-m-a-n.

11 **Q Where are you employed, in what**
12 **capacity?**

13 A Missouri Public Service Commission as
14 a regulatory economist.

15 **Q And did you prepare or cause to be**
16 **prepared narrative testimony that is a portion of**
17 **the Staff rebuttal report marked as Staff Exhibit**
18 **Number 201, both NP and HC?**

19 A Yes.

20 **Q And do you have any changes or**
21 **corrections to that testimony?**

22 A No.

23 **Q Are the sections of Staff's rebuttal**
24 **report that you authored true and correct to the**
25 **best of your knowledge and belief?**

1 A Yes.

2 Q And if you were to present the same
3 testimony today, would your testimony be the same?

4 A Yes.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I tender the witness
6 for cross.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross by
8 Missouri Landowners?

9 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
10 Honor.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

12 MR. LINTON: No questions.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

14 MS. GIBONEY: No questions.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

16 MR. MILLS: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

18 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind Power?

20 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

22 MR. BRADY: No questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

24 MR. HEALY: Just a few, Your Honor.

25 ///

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

3 Q Mr. Stahlman, how are you this
4 afternoon?

5 A Good, thank you.

6 Q I'd like to direct you to the Staff
7 report, page 41, and towards the bottom of that
8 page in bold print it says Economic Benefits.

9 A Yes.

10 Q Is that the section of the Staff
11 report that you authored?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. Did you read the MJMEUC
14 rebuttal testimony in this case?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Did you read the MJMEUC surrebuttal
17 testimony in this case?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And did you review the MJMEUC Grain
20 Belt TSA agreement?

21 A Partially, as I am not a full lawyer,
22 it's hard for me to fully understand all the terms
23 that are used.

24 Q I understand. Did you send any data
25 requests to MJMEUC asking for any further

1 **explanation of the claim benefits MJMEUC had in**
2 **their testimony?**

3 A No, I reviewed the data requests sent
4 by other parties.

5 Q I notice you didn't include the
6 **benefits that MJMEUC expects to receive. Is there**
7 **a particular reason why?**

8 A Generally, this was in response to
9 the study that was provided, well, wasn't provided
10 until rebuttal, I believe, by the DED but Grain
11 Belt cited it in its application.

12 Q **And it would be fair to say that you**
13 **produced no opinion or produced no testimony**
14 **examining the potential benefit of this contract to**
15 **Missouri municipalities and their rate payers; is**
16 **that correct?**

17 A I think Staff witness Sarah
18 Kliethermes addressed the contract in further
19 details.

20 MR. HEALY: No further questions.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Grain Belt Express?

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION

23 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

24 Q **Mr. Stahlman, you don't dispute the**
25 **findings set forth in the study by the Department**

1 of Economic Development, do you?

2 A I urged caution in their use.

3 Q You didn't run a similar study
4 yourself, did you?

5 A I did not run a similar study.

6 Q Okay. If you could go to page 37 of
7 the Staff report? The upper portion of that page
8 that you authored?

9 A Yes.

10 Q You state there that "Staff
11 recognizes that obtaining finances," I think that's
12 the word, but I think you may have meant financing,
13 "may provide supporting evidence of economic
14 feasibility."

15 Do you see that, sir?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q Now, and financing includes raising
18 financial support from both equity investors and
19 through the issuance of debt; correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Now, you don't disagree with Staff
22 witness David Murray's conclusions in this case, do
23 you?

24 A No.

25 Q And Mr. Murray found that Grain Belt

1 is financially capable to be granted a CCN;
2 correct?

3 A I believe that's his testimony, yes.

4 Q And Grain Belt Express has agreed to
5 Staff's condition that it will not begin
6 construction of the project until it provides
7 evidence that it has secured financing commitments
8 that ensure there will be sufficient capital to
9 complete the project; correct?

10 A Correct.

11 Q And you don't have any basis to doubt
12 that highly confidential figure that's on page 20
13 of the report indicating the level of financial
14 investment by three major investors in Clean Line
15 Energy Partners, the ultimate parent of Grain Belt
16 Express?

17 A I do not doubt Mr. Murray's numbers.

18 Q Now, on page 37 you have a reference
19 to a website called Statistic Brain. Do you see
20 that, sir?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And you were asked in a data request
23 to identify the companies that were included in
24 that Statistic Brain survey, and you stated that
25 Staff did not seek further documentation about

1 **which companies were included in those -- in the**
2 **category that you looked at which was**
3 **transportation, communications, and utilities;**
4 **correct?**

5 A Correct, as I also note in my
6 testimony that I believe the category was broad.

7 Q **And I think you also told us that, to**
8 **your knowledge, Staff had never relied on Statistic**
9 **Brain in another Public Service Commission**
10 **proceeding; correct?**

11 A Correct.

12 Q **How did you find that? Did you just**
13 **do a Google search or what?**

14 A I started trying to find the concept
15 of what is the likelihood of companies that obtain
16 financing would be like, or have -- have failed,
17 and this kinda goes to the concept. It was, as I
18 admit, it was an overly broad category. It was
19 just -- but the point is that not all companies
20 receive financial support to begin their company
21 continue on to -- toward success.

22 Q **Well, in the course of that broad**
23 **research of this Statistic Brain website, you**
24 **weren't able to determine whether any of the**
25 **companies in there were electric transmission**

1 **companies; correct?**

2 A I did not seek further, I didn't
3 think that it deterred from the point and
4 immediately Grain Belt Express is a unique company,
5 so I think it would be hard to find a category
6 specific to a Grain Belt Express like project.

7 Q You didn't even find if there were
8 any other transmission companies, if they were
9 investor owned utilities or merchant products or
10 other companies that engage in electric
11 transmission?

12 A I could not find any readily
13 available data on those.

14 Q Shifting to a new topic, you agree
15 that the concept of a purchase power agreement
16 between a wind generator and a load-serving entity
17 like MJMEUC is a typical business model that's
18 followed in the industry; correct?

19 A That was in a data request you sent?

20 Q Right, yeah, was in data request 6 C,
21 if you have that in front of you?

22 A Yeah, just a second.

23 Q And these may have been general data
24 requests.

25 A I'm thinking it's in the first set to

1 me. I can't remember. Okay. Yes. So the --
2 "Does Staff consider a purchase power agreement
3 between a wind generator and a load-serving entity
4 to be a typical business model?" Answer, "Yes."

5 Q And would you also agree that a
6 Transmission Service Agreement between a
7 load-serving entity like MJMEUC and an electric
8 transmission company like Grain Belt Express is a
9 standard and accepted business model?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And those kinds of agreements can
12 show the economic feasibility of a project like the
13 Grain Belt Express?

14 A Not in and of themselves. But they
15 could. Assist towards a finding of such.

16 Q Have you examined the Infinity
17 contract that MJMEUC has entered into with regard
18 to the Iron Star project?

19 A No.

20 Q And you haven't done any analysis of
21 how that contract fits in with the MJMEUC Grain
22 Belt Express Transmission Service Agreement, have
23 you?

24 A Sarah Kliethermes addressed with
25 specific to the TSA between MJMEUC and Grain Belt

1 that there is a question on whether that would
2 provide sufficient revenue for that station to be
3 economically feasible.

4 Q Well, my question was have you done
5 any analysis of the relationship of the Infinity
6 Wind MJMEUC contract with the MJMEUC Grain Belt
7 TSA?

8 A No.

9 MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Nothing further,
10 Judge.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by
12 Commissioners?

13 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, I think I have
14 a couple.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

17 Q Good evening.

18 A Good evening.

19 Q You are the author of the portion of
20 the report on page 22; is that correct?

21 A Let me get to it to make sure. I
22 believe that's correct. Yes.

23 Q So about a third of the way down the
24 page where it says, "Because these studies,"
25 referring to RTO interconnection studies, "are

1 incomplete, any potential necessary transmission
2 upgrades are unknown and Staff is unable to
3 determine the economic feasibility of the project."

4 Is that correct?

5 A Correct.

6 Q So are you -- are you familiar with
7 Exhibit 206, which is a set of conditions agreed to
8 between Staff and Clean Line?

9 A Generally, yes. I don't have the
10 specific knowledge in front of me.

11 MR. JOHNSON: I have a copy.

12 Q (BY CHAIRMAN HALL) So the condition
13 at the bottom of page 1 concerning interconnection
14 studies and safety where there is an agreement
15 between Grain Belt and Staff, does that agreement
16 satisfy Staff's concerns related to economic
17 feasibility?

18 A I think that helps mitigate much of
19 Staff's concerns. There is still, even though I
20 can -- there -- there's kind of a question on
21 whether we were going to discuss the economic
22 feasibility of the project versus the station and
23 it would be, the station in particular, and so
24 while, as we've heard other testimony in this case,
25 that there's a pretty reasonable evidence that

1 there -- that the plan is good to go straight from
2 SPP areas to PJM, the -- a lot of the questions
3 really come down to how does that -- how would
4 adding a MISO converter station impact that
5 analysis.

6 Q So Staff's feasibility concerns,
7 based upon the lack of interconnection agreements,
8 exists, though, it's mitigated, this condition?

9 A Yes.

10 Q In your discussion with Mr. Zobrist,
11 you discussed, I think it was his term, a
12 participant funded model?

13 A I'm familiar with it.

14 Q Okay. Maybe I'm remembering a
15 different discussion. Does that -- what I don't
16 understand is when you have that type of model, and
17 you have a company that essentially all the parties
18 agree is financially able to finance the project,
19 why that type of agreement doesn't totally take the
20 concern of feasibility off the table?

21 A I still -- part of this would have to
22 deal again if we're looking at the entire project
23 or the Missouri converter station in particular, it
24 is quite possible that even with the entire line
25 being economically feasible and it's going to be

1 participant funded, it's -- it -- there are
2 scenarios where if the converter station, which is
3 -- had been kind of acknowledged to be less
4 economic than the entire line, if that station is
5 not as viable as the entire line itself, is that
6 likely to lead to that plant being abandoned in the
7 future should a situation arise? Or if -- or if
8 Grain Belt is struggling, you tend to cut the least
9 economic portion of a project in whole.

10 So it's really a question on -- I
11 guess there's a question on do we want to examine
12 the benefits of the line as a whole or how focused
13 are we on, with regard to the Missouri converter
14 station.

15 **Q So implicit in that analysis is that**
16 **the public benefit is focused solely on those rate**
17 **payers that could benefit from those 500 megawatts?**

18 **A** A lot of my analysis tended to look
19 more specific at the impacts on the Missouri
20 portion rather than the entire project.

21 **Q So the answer was yes?**

22 **A** Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commissioner Rupp?

25 COMMISSIONER RUPP: No. I'm okay.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
2 bench questions?

3 Missouri Landowners?

4 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
5 Honor.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

7 MR. LINTON: No questions, Your
8 Honor.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

10 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

12 MR. MILLS: No questions.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

14 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

16 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

18 MR. BRADY: No questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

20 MR. HEALY: No questions, Judge.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Grain Belt?

22 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Judge.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you Judge, just
25 briefly.

1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. JOHNSON:

3 Q Mr. Stahlman, Mr. Zobrist brought up
4 a statement you made on page 37 of the Staff
5 rebuttal report regarding financing and use of a
6 website.

7 Were you questioning the company's
8 financial ability to construct the line in this
9 instance?

10 A No.

11 Q What was the purpose of your
12 statement?

13 A The purpose was to state that
14 obtaining the financing to initiate the project
15 does not necessarily mean that the project is
16 likely to continue towards success in the future.
17 I know one example that was brought up, although it
18 was bad by fraud, was Mamtek.

19 That that did have initial financing
20 and I'm not saying that Mamtek is anything
21 reminiscent of what the Grain Belt is proposing.
22 It's just that the concept that projects do fail on
23 occasion.

24 Q And also just to clarify, if you
25 could take a look at Staff Exhibit 206, I believe

1 Chairman Hall asked you about the condition at the
2 bottom of the first page.

3 Would that condition also require
4 Grain Belt to provide a plan to address any new
5 issues that should arise out of those studies?

6 A Yes.

7 MR. JOHNSON: That's all. Thank you,
8 Judge.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr.
10 Stahlman. You may step down.

11 (Witness excused.)

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's do one more
13 tonight. Call the next witness.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, for the record,
15 I believe that the data request that Mr. Zobrist
16 referred to whenever he was asking questions of
17 Sarah Kliethermes is attached to Mr. Galli's, I
18 don't know if it's direct or surrebuttal, but some
19 of his testimony is Schedule AWG-13.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you for
21 clarifying.

22 DANIEL BECK,
23 having been called as a witness, was sworn
24 by the Court, upon his oath, and testified
25 as follows:

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS:

3 Q Would you please state and spell your
4 name.

5 A Daniel I. Beck, B-e-c-k.

6 Q Mr. Beck, did you contribute to
7 Staff's rebuttal report that has been marked as
8 Exhibit 201?

9 A I did.

10 Q And are your contributions to that
11 report at pages 8 to 9, 10 to 18, 42 to 45, and 67
12 to 69? And if you need me to repeat that, I
13 certainly can.

14 A And I agree with those cites.

15 Q And do -- does your experience and
16 credentials appear on the Appendix at pages 1 to 3?

17 A They do.

18 Q And for that to be your testimony
19 here today, would you have any changes to make to
20 it?

21 A Not at this time.

22 Q Then page -- those pages I
23 identified, that are your testimony before the
24 Commission here today?

25 A Yes.

1 MR. WILLIAMS: With that, I'll tender
2 Mr. Beck for examination.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Missouri
4 Landowners?

5 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your
6 Honor.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

8 MR. LINTON: No questions.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

10 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

12 MR. MILLS: No questions.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC? He's gone.
14 Infinity Wind?

15 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

17 MR. BRADY: No questions.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

19 MR. HEALY: Just a few questions.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

22 Q Mr. Beck, how are you doing this
23 evening?

24 A Doing good. I Googled it, and
25 evening does not actually start until 6:00.

1 Q We're nine minutes away.

2 A I hope that isn't a -- a
3 foreshadowing.

4 Q I plan on being done with you before
5 evening starts, how about that?

6 A Okay.

7 Q I can have you turn to page 16 of the
8 Staff report and look at the last three lines.
9 Also what I'm looking at is on 17, your discussion
10 of RECs within the State of Missouri, and I have
11 just a couple of follow-up questions.

12 Did you consider the needs and
13 requirements of Missouri municipalities on meeting
14 their own renewable energy credit goals or
15 renewables?

16 A No, there were actually drafts of the
17 initiative petition that created the renewable
18 energy standard that would have included the munis,
19 but those didn't get passed. So I did not consider
20 that as part of this discussion.

21 Q And are you aware of the renewable
22 requirements that the City of Columbia have in
23 place through ordinance?

24 A Generally aware. I don't know all
25 the specifics, but...

1 Q And are you generally aware of the
2 desire of the MoPEP group the last few years and
3 the addition of solar and wind they have made in a
4 move toward a different diversified portfolio?

5 A And, yeah, for example, specific
6 projects that have been carried out on both solar
7 and wind come to mind.

8 Q Okay. Did you read the MJMEUC
9 rebuttal testimony in this case?

10 A Seems like a long time ago, but yes.

11 Q Did you read the MJMEUC surrebuttal
12 testimony?

13 A I don't know that I read it all.

14 Q Do you recall the MJMEUC rebuttal
15 testimony discussing the need and the desire for
16 members for additional renewable energy?

17 A I do.

18 Q Did you send any data requests or
19 have caused to be sent any data requests to MJMEUC
20 for further elicitation in understanding that
21 topic?

22 A No.

23 MR. HEALY: That's all the questions
24 I have, thank you.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Grain Belt Express?

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

3 Q Mr. Beck, just a couple of follow-up
4 questions on renewable energy credits.

5 If a utility purchases RECs to
6 fulfill its renewable energy standard requirements
7 but does not purchase any renewable energy, is it
8 true that that would not be able to lead to any
9 lower wholesale energy prices if the renewable
10 energy is low cost?

11 A I think your question is premised
12 that it would be lower cost than the existing, than
13 their existing portfolio, and I guess under that
14 scenario then it would -- they would not get the
15 economic benefit of that.

16 Q Okay. And if a utility purchases
17 RECs, is it also true that it would do nothing to
18 improve that utility's fuel diversity?

19 A It wouldn't change their fuel
20 diversity at all.

21 Q And generally Staff favors utilities
22 having a diverse fuel and resource mix; is that
23 fair to say?

24 A In general, yes.

25 Q Let me just ask you a couple of

1 questions about the decommissioning fund proposal
2 that Grain Belt Express has made in this case.

3 A Okay.

4 Q Is it true as a, not just a general
5 proposition but an absent proposition, that up
6 until this case at least, the Commission has never
7 required any kind of a decommissioning fund with
8 regard to granting a CCN and an electric
9 transmission line?

10 A Not that I'm aware of.

11 Q And is it true that no transmission
12 line that you're aware of has been decommissioned
13 in the first 20 years of its operation?

14 A Again, I'm not aware of any.

15 Q Is it fair to say that the only
16 decommissioning funds that you're personally
17 familiar with are the decommissioning funds at
18 nuclear plants like Callaway or Wolf Creek?

19 A As far as electric facilities go,
20 that would be a true statement.

21 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Your
22 Honor.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by
24 Commissioners?

25 ///

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

3 Q Good afternoon. So if the line is
4 built, including the converter station, so there is
5 under my hypothetical 500 megawatts available at
6 the converter station, does that in and of itself
7 improve reliability for, I want to say for the
8 Missouri portion of the MISO region?

9 A I'm struggling with the idea of
10 reliability. If you -- if you look at Missouri as
11 just a total region and inserting more electricity
12 into that, would that -- and provide another
13 source, would that provide more reliability, yes.

14 If, on the other hand, the
15 reliability you're talking about is the effect that
16 that has on specific power lines in a given area
17 and the -- that -- that's the -- that's the part
18 that -- that I -- that the scenario wouldn't give
19 you enough information to know the answer to.

20 Q Well, what type of reliability is
21 being analyzed related to a -- to a loss of load
22 expectation?

23 A So the loss of load expectation study
24 basically is attempting to model -- it's really
25 more of a generation analysis. It is simply saying

1 if you put this new generator in this area, it has
2 this effect.

3 Now, so you say why -- why was that
4 even entered in the record here? The reason is is
5 because this particular transmission line is tied
6 to generation and in fact sort of looks like
7 generation if you try to model it, and so that's
8 what they did in that analysis.

9 And it's, you know -- in my
10 experience it's fairly unique to see loss of load
11 study applied to a transmission line, but it's
12 quite common to see that applied to a -- to a
13 generation plant.

14 Q So -- so I understand that the -- the
15 analysis is not typical when we're looking at a
16 transmission line, but -- and I understand why
17 we're looking at it here.

18 What my question, though, was the --
19 the result of a load -- of a loss of load
20 expectation analysis leads to some number that is
21 compared with a base case to make a reliability
22 analysis, is it not? Or to look at a reliability
23 benefit from additional generation?

24 A It's the reliability of additional
25 generation where normally, when I think of

1 reliability, I either think of it as the
2 reliability for customers, and that's, you know,
3 whether my lights are on or not, or it's the
4 reliability of something like a transmission
5 grid --

6 **Q Okay, well, then, let's look at it**
7 **from each.**

8 **A Okay.**

9 **Q From the perspective of a customer in**
10 **the Missouri portion of the MISO footprint, would**
11 **the addition of 500 megawatts at the converter**
12 **station result in increased reliability?**

13 **A I think you would see no change in**
14 **the SAIDI, SAIFI, CAIDI, CAIFI --**

15 **Q I have no idea what any of those are.**

16 **A Okay.**

17 **Q But that's okay.**

18 **A Basically we have a rule that**
19 **requires that the utilities report various**
20 **reliability statistics and those statistics measure**
21 **how often they have outages, how long those outages**
22 **are, whether that's for a system or whether that's**
23 **for a customer, and it's those measures, and the**
24 **simple reality is if you -- you know, they've been**
25 **filing those since 2009, I believe, and there's**

1 never been the situation where we have had a
2 generator down and people -- or so many generators
3 were down that you literally didn't keep the lights
4 on.

5 So the statistics would be the exact
6 same and, you know, the average customer is going
7 to see the same reliability before and after unless
8 we really do get to this catastrophic event.

9 Q Okay, let me -- so I guess not from
10 the perspective of would a particular rate payer's
11 lights go off, but the likelihood.

12 A Okay.

13 Q Is there -- is there -- is it
14 reasonable to assume that, with additional
15 generation, or additional energy available, that it
16 is less likely that a Missourian in the MISO
17 footprint's lights would go off?

18 A I guess if it is -- when we're
19 talking about, you know, a process where you get
20 one day in ten years as your base, as your standard
21 that you want to meet, and then you lower that
22 number a little bit -- it -- it does have an effect
23 there. It's just --

24 Q And that's all I'm asking.

25 A Okay.

1 Q Would it lower that number a little
2 bit?

3 A It lowers that little portion of risk
4 that people experience for -- that's out there for
5 keeping your lights on.

6 Q And, of course, whether the cost
7 would justify that is a whole other question?

8 A Yeah.

9 Q Okay. Were you in the hearing room
10 when Miss Kliethermes and I were discussing the
11 levelized cost of energy and the role that that
12 could play in our analysis here?

13 A I was actually sitting at my desk.

14 Q Googling evening?

15 A Doing the amazing things we can do.
16 I needed to actually charge my cell phone, for the
17 record.

18 Q Then you won't benefit from her
19 insightful answer.

20 A But I was able to listen to some --
21 to most of it.

22 Q I'll ask you the same question. What
23 role should that analysis play in -- in -- in the
24 Commission's view of whether or not this particular
25 project is needed?

1 A So maybe I can relate my experience
2 with levelized costs, and that is they're, you
3 know, we specify levelized cost analysis in the
4 Integrated Resource Planning process and it's a
5 valuable tool.

6 Typically, when a utility makes a
7 resource decision, though, you'd expect a more
8 robust analysis. That would be more -- would be
9 typically used to levelize cost analysis for a
10 screening tool.

11 So, you know, I think it has value
12 but I think it's not the end-all, be-all. And this
13 is where I think, you know, as a Staff member with
14 29 years of experience, this particular project
15 tests our ability to analyze something that we
16 haven't seen before. And so, you know, at this
17 point in this project, I don't know that we really
18 do have specific information about each generator.
19 I don't think anybody -- there's not -- you know,
20 that information is being, to the extent that it's
21 available, is being shared, but it's just not
22 there.

23 And so, you know, the levelized cost
24 analysis may be the most detailed analysis
25 available at this time, given the data we have.

1 Q So if that were to show that the
2 energy flowing from the Clean Line transmission
3 line dropped into Missouri had the lowest levelized
4 cost of energy available, would that in and of
5 itself -- what -- what would that tell you?

6 A I think it -- I think it would tell
7 you that, you know, that, for what was looked at,
8 that's what the numbers showed. I think the harder
9 part is, is that, that, you know, to do a more
10 robust, integrated resource type model of hourly
11 loads and -- and hourly production and how that all
12 affects, that's the -- that's the hard part that --
13 and -- and it's particularly difficult, by the way,
14 it's almost unfair for -- for a company like GBE
15 because they can't get Ameren Missouri's detailed
16 data about their plants. They can get publicly
17 available information but there's only so much
18 information they're going to have.

19 So, I mean, it's, you know, it's --
20 it's not an easy analysis, and it's, you know,
21 ultimately your analysis is as good as the data you
22 have. So, I mean, to be fair, the type of detailed
23 information I'm talking about is very hard when
24 you're not the incumbent utility.

25 Q So if -- if instead of transporting

1 wind, Clean Line was transporting energy from a gas
2 plant in Kansas.

3 A Okay.

4 Q So obviously higher capacity factor,
5 but other than that, are there significant
6 differences that would cause Staff either
7 additional concerns or would that mitigate the
8 Staff's concerns? Or is the source of generation
9 really not the source of the concern?

10 A I think that the way I guess maybe I
11 would characterize it then would be the natural gas
12 plant would be dispatchable where in our experience
13 at least wind has not been up until this point and
14 -- and this is where the operation, though, of an
15 AC line, or a DC line, excuse me, may well be that
16 it is dispatchable. That that decision is made by
17 the RTOs, that they control it that way. We just
18 -- that, in essence, decision hasn't been made yet
19 as to how that converter station will function, but
20 it could be. It would be treated as dispatchable
21 and that would certainly change how things are
22 done.

23 Q Okay. Last line of questioning.
24 Miss Kliethermes also suggested that it was
25 possible that MISO could study the project and the

1 converter station and conclude that the line could
2 not function or the converter station could not
3 function as Clean Line is proposing.

4 Can you explain to me how, from your
5 perspective, how that might be possible, or is it
6 simply a function of what you said just a moment
7 ago? That -- that MISO might say that the wind is
8 not dispatchable?

9 A You know, I think that -- I think
10 that's part of it. If -- if, and I don't want to
11 -- I'm just going off my recollection, but I also
12 remember that the discussion also discussed the
13 idea of Mark Twain line being done or not done.
14 And right now the particular location that's being
15 picked to put the energy into Missouri is -- is a
16 constrained area.

17 So putting more energy into that area
18 at the wrong time is going to be more of a problem.
19 So but -- and so I think there's -- so I think you
20 end up with two scenarios. The other scenario then
21 is the Mark Twain project going through. I think
22 that helps move power. It's not specifically, this
23 -- this doesn't directly tie into Mark Twain but
24 it's just a few miles, I mean, maybe ten, fifteen
25 miles from the Mark Twain line, but it ties into a

1 345, specifically the -- the 345.

2 So, you know, I think that -- that
3 the -- that -- that -- that the, you know,
4 reliability under the Mark Twain line existing gets
5 much better than you do the study to get the real
6 results and make those determinations.

7 I guess there's one last little thing
8 and that is when the testimony that you all heard
9 for the Mark Twain line talked about Missouri wind
10 and, you know, at some point, as a previous witness
11 described, when new lines get built, you're
12 competing for those. And -- and I'd like to give
13 you an example. I appreciate your indulgence in
14 letting me talk here, but the Transource line that
15 the Commission approved and then you recently had a
16 couple of switch station requests.

17 What -- what basically took place
18 there was that line went in, Missouri went from
19 467, I think point 5 megawatts of wind to, after
20 these two requests that we just approved, that was
21 another 500 megawatts of wind. So that, by putting
22 that -- I mean, what -- what happened was that
23 transmission line got approved, and now we have two
24 wind units that are hooked to that that more than
25 doubled Missouri's wind capacity. One, the Osborn

1 wind farm is completed and then the second wind
2 farm will -- I think in June of this year is
3 expected to come online.

4 So by putting in that new line,
5 Missouri's wind prospects, or realities changed
6 dramatically overnight. And, you know, I am
7 hopeful that similar things could happen for the
8 Mark Twain line. But this will compete with that.

9 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on
11 bench questions? Missouri Landowners?

12 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Show Me Landowners?

14 MR. LINTON: No questions.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Rockies Express?

16 MS. GIBONEY: No questions, Judge.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

18 MR. MILLS: No questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: NRDC?

20 MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Infinity Wind?

22 MS. PEMBERTON: No questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Wind on the Wires?

24 MR. BRADY: No questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MJMEUC?

1 MR. HEALY: Just a few follow-up on
2 bench questions, Your Honor.

3 REXCROSS-EXAMINATION

4 QUESTIONS BY MR. HEALY:

5 Q You mentioned a Transource line. Are
6 you generally familiar with the contract rates that
7 are being moved across that capacity?

8 A I am not.

9 Q Okay. Are you generally familiar
10 with the capacity factor of the wind farms that are
11 using that path?

12 A I am not.

13 Q Okay. Would you agree with the
14 general proposition that competition usually drives
15 prices down in RTO markets? Let me rephrase that.

16 Does extra energy usually result in
17 lower energy prices?

18 A The general economic concept I agree
19 with. The fact that you brought in RTOs and there
20 are such things as the congestion makes it hard for
21 me to give a definitive answer on that.

22 Q Let me take a step back. Let's take
23 out negative proxy. Where you have to actually pay
24 obviously to know. Let's just look at your general
25 LMP at a delivery point and LSE.

1 **There's usually extra energy**
2 **available at that LMP. Does the delivery point**
3 **increase or decrease price usually?**

4 A If you're going to stick with that
5 LMP, that works fine. The problem I have is that
6 when you have a negative pricing LMP, it's very
7 likely that there is going to be some other area
8 that's constrained and -- and the LMPs are the
9 total opposite direction.

10 **Q Isn't it true that MISO has the**
11 **ability to turn back their wind generators and**
12 **reduce those opportunities and those occurrences?**

13 A I don't know that I -- since you're
14 referring to all MISO wind generators, I don't know
15 the answer to that.

16 **Q Okay. Did you participate in MISO**
17 **HVDC task force?**

18 A No.

19 **Q Did you have a chance to review**
20 **Schedule JG-8 in the surrebuttal testimony of John**
21 **Grotzinger?**

22 A I am proud to say I do not recall
23 what JG-8 is.

24 **Q Well, that's fine. I'll tell you,**
25 **it's HC, but without getting into the numbers which**

1 make it HC, it's a projection of LMP points inside
2 Missouri in 2021 and this follows up on what you
3 mentioned about the Mark Twain line.

4 It's projecting that if the Mark
5 Twain line is put into service as MISO predicts in
6 their TEP, that that coupled with Grain Belt will
7 reduce LMPs to several delivery points inside
8 Missouri, versus if Grain Belt is not built, the
9 LMPs being even higher even with the Mark Twain
10 project in place.

11 Would you agree with that general
12 proposition that's likely to be true?

13 A I am surprised by the second part of
14 that, but I -- I did not look at the analysis to
15 have any reasonable comment. I'm sorry.

16 Q That's fine. Were you present
17 earlier today when Mr. Grotzinger was testifying?

18 A At least for part of his testimony.

19 Q And did you have an opportunity to
20 hear the redirect on Schedule JG-3 which compared
21 the price of SPP and a MISO transmission versus the
22 Grain Belt Express Pricing?

23 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm going to object to
24 that, I think he's getting beyond the scope of
25 Commissioner questions.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: What's your
2 response?

3 MR. HEALY: I think Chairman Hall
4 talked about initially reliability, but he did ask
5 about levelized cost questions and how that would
6 impact particularly MISO.

7 I think this goes back into that
8 showing that Grain Belt Express does actually help
9 reduce overall energy costs.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled. You may
11 answer.

12 MR. HEALY: I'll just rephrase or
13 reask the question.

14 Q (BY MR. HEALY) Mr. Grotzinger had
15 made some discussions in redirect regarding his
16 Schedule JG-3, which was the comparison between SPP
17 and MISO rates versus the Grain Belt Express tariff
18 rates.

19 Were you present or watching for that
20 part of the direct?

21 A I don't recall that discussion.

22 MR. HEALY: That's fine, Judge. I
23 have no further questions.

24 MR. ZOBRIST: I just have a couple of
25 follow-up.

1 REXCROSS-EXAMINATION

2 QUESTIONS BY MR. ZOBRIST:

3 **Q Mr. Beck, to the Chairman's question**
4 **about the Missouri converter station, if MISO**
5 **studies that and finds there is an impact and**
6 **mitigation is required, Grain Belt Express, if it**
7 **wants to interconnect, would have to mitigate that**
8 **impact; correct?**

9 A That's my understanding of MISO's
10 open access tariffs.

11 **Q And if the impact is mitigated by**
12 **Grain Belt Express, is it true that reliability**
13 **would be enhanced with the injection of power by**
14 **the project?**

15 A It would certainly be enhanced after
16 the improvements were made. Whether that
17 enhancement -- I think the kind of overall intent
18 is that, sort of a do no harm idea. That you
19 improve the system to the point where the current
20 reliability is maintained.

21 **Q And isn't it true that MISO has to**
22 **allow Grain Belt Express to interconnect if it's**
23 **willing to fund those upgrades that lead to the**
24 **mitigation? That's NERC policy, isn't it?**

25 A That's, I think, again, the idea of

1 open access.

2 Q Now, you were talking a little bit in
3 the context of the LCOE, that it's a valuable tool
4 but then you related it to a resource decision.
5 Now, this is not a resource case. This is a
6 certificate of convenience and necessity case;
7 correct?

8 A This is a certificate of convenience
9 and necessity. I guess certificates of convenience
10 and necessity can involve transmission lines or
11 generation resources, so.

12 Q And isn't it true a decision has been
13 made by a party to this case, by MJMEUC, that they
14 want to take advantage of this potential resource?

15 A That's my understanding.

16 Q New topic. Are you aware that MISO
17 has established a mechanism known as DIRs,
18 Dispatchable Intermittent Resources?

19 A I am not an expert on that.

20 Q Are you just aware that MISO has this
21 tool that it uses to manage intermittent resources
22 that's called Dispatchable Intermittent Resource
23 tool?

24 A To be honest, the last time I
25 remember hearing about that was when it was kind of

1 a discussion, and I -- so I didn't follow the --

2 Q Fair enough. Fair enough. Final
3 question. You talked about the Transource line and
4 the two wind farms that interconnected there that
5 the Commission approved within the last six months.
6 Do you remember that?

7 A And just to be clear, the Commission
8 actually approved the switch stations that connect,
9 and it's a very subtle distinction.

10 Q Thank you for reminding me.

11 A I suspect you knew that.

12 Q I did know that. I forgot, and Mr.
13 Harden probably would have thrown something at me
14 if you hadn't corrected me. But wasn't that the
15 point Mr. Berry was making yesterday, saying that
16 when you had these new transmission lines, the new
17 transmission fills up with interconnections?

18 A And that's why I made a slight
19 reference in that I wasn't sure, to be honest, I
20 didn't remember which witness it was, but I think
21 that was his testimony was, is, is sort of the if
22 you build it, they will come scenario.

23 And I think if I -- my understanding
24 of Grain Belt's theory is that the same would work.
25 It's just the trick is that the generation would be

1 out in Kansas and -- by building this line. That
2 is the proposal here.

3 Q Right, but one of the resource points
4 would be the 500 megawatt converter station in
5 Missouri?

6 A That's correct.

7 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Judge.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect?

9 MR. WILLIAMS: No, thank you.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr. Beck.

11 I think that's enough for today. We're off the
12 record.

13 (Witness excused.)

14 (Adjourned for the day at 6:21 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1		
2	INDEX OF WITNESSES	
3		PAGE
4	DUNCAN KINCHELOE	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Healy	978
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams	980
7	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	984
8	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	994
9	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Stoll	1002
10	Redirect Examination by Mr. Healy	1004
11		
12	JOHN GROTZINGER	
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Healy	1007
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams	1009
15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Linton	1011
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1040
17	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	1096
18	Cross-Examination by Mr. Brady	1098
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams	1099
20	Redirect Examination by Mr. Healy	1100
21		
22	ASHOK GUPTA	
23	Direct Examination by Mr. Robertson	1114
24	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1117
25		

1		PAGE
2	MICHAEL GOGGIN	
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Brady	1120
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Robertson	1125
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Linton	1130
6	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1133
7	Redirect Examination by Mr. Brady	1171
8		
9	DONALD SHAW	
10	Direct Examination by Mr. Linton	1174
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1176
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1177
13	Redirect Examination by Mr. Linton	1183
14		
15	MATT LANGLEY	
16	Direct Examination by Ms. Pemberton	1185
17	Cross-Examination by Mr. Brady	1187
18	Cross-Examination by Mr. Linton	1193
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1197
20	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	1208
21	Recross-Examination by Mr. Linton	1216
22	Redirect-Examination by Ms. Pemberton	1217
23		
24		
25		

1		PAGE
2	BARBARA MEISENHEIMER	
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Bear	1221
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1224
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	1225
6	Cross-Examination by Ms. Myers	1226
7	Cross-Examination by Mr. Haden	1230
8	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1231
9		
10	ALAN SPELL	
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Bear	1233
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Haden	1235
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	1271
14	Redirect Examination by Mr. Bear	1282
15		
16	NATELLE DIETRICH	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson	1292
18	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1296
19		
20	DAVID MURRAY	
21	Direct Examination by Ms. Myers	1297
22	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1299
23	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1299
24		
25		

1		PAGE
2	SARAH KLIETHERMES	
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Williams	1300
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1303
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1305
6	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	1313
7	Recross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1319
8	Recross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1322
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Williams	1324
10		
11	SHAWN LANGE	
12	Direct Examination by Ms. Myers	1326
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1328
14	Redirect Examination by Ms. Myers	1331
15		
16	MICHAEL STAHLMAN	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Johnson	1333
18	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1335
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1336
20	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	1342
21	Redirect Examination by Mr. Johnson	1347
22		
23		
24		
25		

1		PAGE
2	DANIEL BECK	
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Williams	1349
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1350
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1353
6	Cross-Examination by Chairman Hall	1355
7	Recross-Examination by Mr. Healy	1366
8	Recross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	1370
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS		
2			OFFERED ADMITTED
3	Staff of Missouri Public Service Commission		
4	Exhibit 200	Rebuttal testimony of Natelle Dietrich	1293 1293
5	Exhibit 201HC NP	Staff's rebuttal report	---- ----
6	Exhibit 206	Agreed to conditions	
7		between Clean Line	
8		regarding the Grain Belt	
9		project and the Staff	--- ---
10			
11	Missouri Landowners Alliance		
12	Exhibit 342	New US Wind Energy Potential	
13		Estimates	1170 1170
14	Exhibit 364	Transmission service request	1207 1207
15		from Infinity	
16	Exhibit 367HC	Transmission service request	1092 1092
17		from MJMEUC	
18	Exhibit 368HC	MoPEP Resource Plan	1095 1095
19	Exhibit 374	Pages of Wind Technology	
20		Market Report	1146 1146
21	Show Me Concerned Landowners		
22	Exhibit 402	Rebuttal testimony of	
23		Donald Shaw	1175 1175
24			
25			

		OFFERED	ADMITTED
1			
2	Exhibit 406HC MJMEUC Response to Data		
3	Request	1039	1039
4			
5	Missouri Joint Municipal Electric		
6	Utility Commission		
7	Exhibit 475 Rebuttal testimony of		
8	Duncan Kincheloe	979	979
9	Exhibit 476HC NP Rebuttal testimony of		
10	John Grotzinger	1008	1008
11	Exhibit 477HC NP Surrebuttal testimony of		
12	John Grotzinger	1008	1008
13	Exhibit 478 MJMEUC responses to data		
14	requests	1005	1005
15	Exhibit 479 MJMEUC responses to data		
16	requests-contracts with		
17	Kirkwood and Hannibal	1005	1005
18			
19	Missouri Department of Economic Development		
20	Exhibit 525 Meisenheimer Rebuttal	1223	1223
21	Exhibit 526 Spell Rebuttal	1234	1234
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	The Wind Coalition			
2	Exhibit 675	Rebuttal Testimony of		
3		Michael Goggin	1124	1124
4	Exhibit 676HC NP	Surrebuttal Testimony		
5		of Michael Goggin	1124	1124
6	Exhibit 677	Errata sheet for rebuttal		
7		testimony of Michael Goggin	1124	1124
8	Exhibit 678	Errata sheet for		
9		surrebuttal testimony		
10		of Michael Goggin	1124	1124
11				
12			OFFERED	ADMITTED
13	NRDC			
14	Exhibit 725	Rebuttal testimony of		
15		Ashok Gupta	1115	1115
16	Exhibit 726	Excerpt from Ameren's		
17		2016 to '18 compliance		
18		plan	1170	1170
19				
20	Infinity Wind Power			
21	Exhibit 875	Rebuttal testimony of		
22		Matt Langley	1186	1187
23	Exhibit 876P NP	Surrebuttal		
24		testimony of Matt Langley		
25		and schedules	1186	1187

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, TARA SCHWAKE, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the Public Service Hearing aforementioned was held at the time and in the place previously described, and have hereunto set my signature this 26th day of March, 2017.



Tara Schwake
RPR, CRR, CSR

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

A	1102:18	1257:14,17	1255:6,12	1357:11
A-s-h-o-k	1111:10	accurate 1082:3	1261:4,5,11,16	additional
1114:21	1283:16	1103:21	1265:21	980:24 982:22
abandoned	1284:15	1164:13	1266:3,3,4,15	986:2 993:25
1345:6	absorbed	1261:21	1266:16	996:21 1006:6
ability 1046:7	1168:24	1262:7	1267:20	1010:2
1048:2 1058:8	abstract	1308:18	1268:11	1012:19
1058:14	1321:13,24	accurately	1269:4,7,18	1041:21
1112:11,21	abstraction	1188:16	1283:9 1285:1	1045:12,16
1135:11	1258:6	1258:15	actual 1013:16	1047:20
1255:16	AC 1057:16	achieved 1142:7	1013:21,24	1063:11,13
1258:11,12,15	1132:10,23	1162:20	1081:18,22	1065:15
1259:17	1136:1	1231:17	1134:11	1073:6,10,12
1310:20	1158:21	1319:17	1135:7	1097:1,19
1331:7 1347:8	1188:21,21	1328:21	1140:20	1098:10
1360:15	1189:2,23	achieving	1156:21	1106:10
1367:11	1324:10	1321:12	1240:24	1109:4,8
able 983:12	1362:15	acknowledge	1244:3	1112:14
986:11	academic	994:5	1248:17	1128:11
1005:25	1045:6	acknowledged	1249:4	1135:11
1011:25	accept 1107:21	1269:8,10	add 1015:24	1159:12
1012:4	accepted 1341:9	1345:3	1045:2	1189:24
1067:17	accepting	acquire 995:13	1110:16,19	1190:10
1112:14	989:16	1180:22	1112:14	1196:21
1113:5 1117:5	access 1150:18	acquiring	1124:18	1220:14
1151:22,23	1151:13	1180:2	1129:6	1225:5
1192:20	1284:16	1181:11	1190:10	1231:12,20
1240:16	1317:5	1183:3	added 1010:1	1232:3
1241:10	1370:10	1189:11	1012:19	1247:23
1246:4 1247:9	1371:1	Acquisition	1075:19	1277:7 1317:5
1258:19	accessed	1227:10	1108:25	1317:11,11
1259:7 1263:2	1141:22	acre 1182:10	1111:1,5	1319:16
1263:10	accomplished	acronym 984:19	1317:11	1352:16
1285:17	1110:23	992:3	adder 1017:2	1356:23,24
1287:24	1188:23	acting 1237:16	1318:15	1358:14,15
1321:18	account 998:14	action 1324:21	adding 1063:10	1362:7
1339:24	1172:10	active 1282:21	1344:4	additions
1344:18	1220:13	1282:24	addition 981:1	1064:19
1353:8	1251:18	activities	981:11 1016:4	1138:22
1359:20	1252:21,25	1239:10,19	1064:24	1293:9
abnormally	1254:25	1251:18,25	1097:12	1294:12
1137:12	1267:19,20	1266:20,22	1122:3,6	address 1001:2
abreast 985:20	1270:3	activity 987:8	1182:9	1077:13
absent 1354:5	accreditation	1241:20	1189:22	1188:3,5
absolutely	1157:9	1242:5 1252:7	1190:16	1317:21
1001:23	accuracy 1106:5	1252:17,23	1231:11	1324:23
1101:12	1194:18	1254:18	1352:3	1325:13,15

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1348:4	988:3 1107:11	1080:23	Agathen's	994:6 1138:13
addressed	1318:4,5	1081:2 1082:7	1171:6	1177:1 1227:5
1001:3	1371:14	1100:7	1278:25	1227:20
1100:19	advantageous	1105:21	agency 1194:15	1304:1 1314:9
1111:13,14	988:2,9	1106:14,22	agents 1180:20	1332:7
1153:2 1154:7	advantages	1107:24	aggregated	1335:20
1166:22	987:16	1116:23,24	1131:4	1340:15
1189:8	advice 1198:16	1117:2,4	ago 1009:20	1341:2,6,22
1336:18	affect 1268:16	1119:2 1124:6	1040:12	1343:14,15
1341:24	affidavit 1301:9	1124:7,21	1102:8	1344:19
addresses	afforded 1106:6	1133:7,10,13	1253:14	agreements
1178:17	aftermentioned	1136:14,22	1260:9 1266:7	993:13
adds 1128:11	1382:6	1146:4,18	1316:20	1208:18
1261:14	afternoon	1148:18	1352:10	1324:25
adequate	1130:3,6	1155:8,13,18	1363:7	1341:11
1242:22	1133:11,12	1155:25	agree 986:23	1344:7
adequately	1174:5	1159:21,24	1005:24	agri 1253:12
1184:20	1176:21	1163:10,12	1101:13	agricultural
adherence	1187:22	1170:3,8	1108:2,15	1181:1
1331:2	1193:11,12	1172:1	1128:20,23	1252:13
adjacent 1166:8	1197:7,8	1175:24	1129:11,12	1253:10
Adjourned	1208:7,8	1197:4,6	1131:11	1265:20
1373:14	1225:19	1199:16	1140:9	1266:15,23
adjusted	1231:3,4	1217:8	1157:22	1267:19
1162:20	1271:21,22	1223:16	1177:6	1269:4,7
adjustments	1296:3	1230:24	1258:24	1270:3,10
1271:2	1299:10	1231:2	1282:15	1283:4,9,19
administration	1303:7 1313:3	1232:19	1305:4	agriculture
1195:6	1313:4 1335:4	1234:12	1312:10	1253:11
1285:12	1355:3	1271:18,20	1319:18	ahead 1142:18
1286:9	afterward	1273:17,19,23	1340:14	1146:16
1310:16	1175:3 1178:6	1279:7,18	1341:5	1155:24
admission	Agathen 975:22	1280:1,10,16	1344:18	1216:15,15,20
1115:21	984:5,7 990:9	1281:14,23	1349:14	1256:15
1123:21,23	991:12,17	1284:14	1366:13,18	1273:22
1170:14	992:9,11	1291:12	1368:11	1289:9
1223:13	994:11	1295:8	agreed 1223:3	1332:23
1234:9	1003:17	1298:16	1226:20	Alan 1233:10,18
admit 1186:13	1005:22	1302:12	1228:21	1376:10
1339:18	1006:10	1318:21	1299:24	Aldermen
admitted 1291:1	1040:6,8	1327:13	1325:11	1001:7
1291:5 1379:2	1042:21	1334:9 1346:4	1331:23	alert 1043:24
1380:1	1048:3,6	1350:5	1338:4 1343:7	aligned 1196:18
1381:12	1055:4	1365:12	1379:6	all-in 1078:14
advance	1060:12,17,23	1374:7,16,24	agreeing 1191:8	1078:22
1124:10	1062:21	1375:6,19	agreement	1079:12
advantage 988:1	1072:9,15	1376:8,13	992:23 993:12	1105:8 1110:3

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1167:21	1323:21	1162:10	1355:25	1262:16
all-time 1048:25	alternative	1209:19,20,21	1356:8,15,20	1266:10,13
allegation	997:20 999:9	1209:23	1356:22	1267:13
1308:19	999:17,25	1231:18	1359:12,23	1268:8
alleged 1308:6	1049:15,20	1241:20	1360:3,8,9,24	1273:21
alleging 1330:11	1050:3,15	1244:23	1360:24	1277:10
1330:11	1066:25	analyses 1054:1	1361:20,21	1280:12
alleviate	1163:18	1056:6 1077:4	1368:14	1284:1
1228:23	alternatives	analysis 998:24	analyst 1236:8	1288:19
1325:14	985:15	1058:19	analytical	1311:5
1329:13	1067:23	1059:4,10,12	1171:7	1318:16
alleviating	1070:23	1062:4 1103:1	analyze 1240:11	1319:23
1159:14	1099:22	1108:16	1240:12	1320:14
Alliance 975:21	amazing	1109:3 1112:4	1265:5	1321:13,18
1081:7 1117:5	1359:15	1117:15,21,25	1360:15	1341:4
1124:7,11	amended	1118:6,15,19	analyzed	1345:21
1133:15	1186:21	1118:25	1355:21	1355:19
1379:11	Ameren	1134:23	analyzing	1359:19
allocate 1311:24	1125:20	1135:8,10,15	1235:24	1366:21
1312:7	1127:17	1135:19,24	and/or 1131:23	1367:15
allocated 982:8	1128:5,19	1136:3	1131:23	1369:11
982:11,12	1129:4,7	1140:16	annual 1002:19	answered
1048:17	1135:11	1160:25	1002:20	1048:1
allocation	1167:14	1161:5,11,14	1054:2	1080:22
982:24 1164:1	1168:7	1163:5,13	1097:18	1183:22
1164:8	1169:15,22	1171:8 1232:1	1134:6 1148:9	1246:20
1311:23	1361:15	1236:2	1240:14	1266:7,23
allow 986:21	Ameren's	1243:16	anomalous	1270:9
987:3 1044:11	1127:9,14,21	1244:16	1145:13	1273:15
1073:20	1128:4,9,13,24	1247:25	answer 983:5	1281:11
1146:16	1169:7	1257:15	985:23	answers 979:12
1208:17	1170:14	1259:7	1054:19	1008:7
1227:19	1381:16	1272:12,15	1056:14	1115:18
1260:17	American	1273:8 1275:9	1065:12	1121:12
1370:22	1120:18,20	1276:9 1279:8	1117:22	1122:10
allowed 1149:13	1134:11,15,19	1279:10	1118:7,20	1123:4,16
1149:14,16	1195:5,14	1280:17	1164:4	1174:25
1229:1	1330:23	1285:25	1171:12	1175:2,14
allowing	amortized	1288:4	1178:10	1186:9 1222:1
1227:11	1189:22	1297:22	1224:17	1243:24,24
allows 1076:6	amount 982:22	1305:5,24	1229:1,4	1293:12
1138:14	1073:18	1306:3,5,7,11	1230:20	1294:15
1191:8,25	1075:24	1314:24	1234:4 1243:7	1298:6
1228:22	1132:15	1317:23,23	1243:19	1319:12
1285:10,14	1138:20	1341:20	1244:1	1327:3
alternate 1132:2	1149:24	1342:5 1344:5	1245:20	anticipate
alternating	1150:4	1345:15,18	1259:5	996:21

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1098:10	applicable	1075:24	arrangement	1309:4,13
1263:5	999:14	1078:16	993:20,21	1310:8
anticipated	application	1096:16	1100:22	1311:12
1046:15	974:12	1098:8	arrangements	1324:18
anticipating	1011:24	1119:18	995:15 997:22	1327:2 1329:6
1255:5	1336:11	1125:23	998:15,16	1329:8,15
anybody	applications	1129:4 1155:5	1290:14,18	1330:3 1332:3
1018:17	1222:24	1155:22	arranging	1332:10
1097:25	1288:21	1156:3	1100:18,20	1338:22
1250:22	applied 1060:19	1179:11	arrive 1103:8	1348:1
1253:3,6,10	1356:11,12	1199:15	1147:25	asking 991:18
1259:4	apply 1002:7	arbitrary	1157:17	1042:6
1291:10	1138:7	1126:15	1161:1	1044:14
1360:19	1152:12	arbitration	arriving	1050:2 1072:5
apart 1097:22	1259:2	1183:5	1157:18	1072:6 1077:3
apologies	appreciate	Arch 1274:23	artificially	1245:7
1186:20	1364:13	1275:12	1150:3,13	1259:14
apologize	approach	architecture	Ashok 1114:16	1262:17
1244:11	1105:2	1236:5,19,25	1114:20	1276:4,8
apparatus	1188:22	area 1010:23	1115:1	1278:22,25
1194:19	1189:3 1325:2	1144:6	1374:22	1283:24
apparent	approached	1219:23,25	1381:15	1296:12
1042:14	988:19	1254:19	aside 1122:15	1316:25
Apparently	1040:11,21	1268:12	asked 979:10	1320:8
989:6	1041:2,4	1280:21	990:23	1335:25
appeal 1216:7	approaching	1301:25	1003:21	1348:16
1246:15	1142:10	1355:16	1005:22	1358:24
appealed	1143:21	1356:1	1006:10	aspects 1317:1
1216:10	appropriate	1363:16,17	1008:5 1045:5	asserted
appear 1301:2	1144:19	1367:7	1048:1	1312:15
1301:17	approval	areas 1149:16	1053:17	assessing 1318:1
1349:16	1006:23	1150:2,6	1054:12	assessment
APPEARAN...	1045:23	1152:1	1079:21	1181:9
975:1	1216:6	1161:21,24	1080:22	asset 1098:13
appeared	1228:18	1252:13	1099:19	assets 1240:24
1179:11	1278:16	1266:16	1118:18	Assist 1341:15
appearing	approve 995:14	1316:25	1152:4 1171:6	associated
1120:1	approved	1344:2	1217:17	974:16 981:5
1133:14	1162:2 1313:6	argue 1320:16	1230:16	999:15 1000:2
appears 991:22	1364:15,20,23	arguing 1156:17	1237:9,12,24	1131:20
1309:19	1372:5,8	argument	1266:7,23	1135:24
1310:6	approves 1209:4	1156:7	1273:15	1310:14,15
appendix	approximate	argumentative	1279:15	Association
1294:1 1301:5	1014:21	1072:9 1082:5	1281:10	1111:22
1349:16	approximately	1246:17	1282:13	1120:18,20
apples 1070:20	989:5 1014:9	1279:16	1283:3 1284:6	1134:12,16,19
1070:20	1053:3	1281:12	1298:5 1309:2	1195:5,14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

assume 986:10 989:17 1010:6 1012:6 1014:13 1018:12 1043:18 1045:25 1074:19 1128:9,13 1129:7 1130:16 1151:8 1241:11 1250:19 1252:19 1266:21,25 1267:3 1273:7 1275:7 1277:6 1319:15 1358:14	1198:8 1275:3 1277:25 1278:19 attached 1004:12 1045:13,23 1056:22 1123:19 1194:1,5 1348:17 attachment 1055:5 attempt 1042:3 1044:13 1312:7 attempting 1044:12 1070:19 1105:23 1355:24 attend 986:11 1289:14 attended 1238:20 attention 1130:7 1153:5,19 1154:21 1193:13 1310:5 attest 1175:4 1218:11 attorney 978:24 1125:15 attract 986:22 987:3 attracting 987:22 attractive 1184:1 audible 1008:21 audience 1018:17 1082:11 1199:20 auditor's 1246:2 August 1136:17 1136:23	1218:1 author 1342:19 authored 1333:24 1335:11 1337:8 authority 1246:15 authorization 1312:9 authorized 981:6 1018:18 1082:12 1199:21 Authorizing 974:14 availability 1010:25 1047:2 1161:21,24 1290:22 available 986:1 988:13 1000:5 1001:16 1046:24 1049:24 1056:7,10,11 1057:11 1097:23 1100:22 1111:13 1113:5,18,19 1125:1 1133:25 1140:6,21 1141:10 1143:7 1144:22 1163:22 1165:18 1284:25 1285:8 1310:18 1340:13 1355:5 1358:15 1360:21,25	1361:4,17 1367:2 average 1062:9 1071:21 1139:10,14 1142:20 1145:3,9 1147:6,25 1148:9 1149:15,21 1150:1,3,14 1166:1,2 1172:15 1193:19 1196:14,19 1242:6 1358:6 avoid 1191:8,25 1192:1 awarded 1156:9 aware 989:8,13 989:14,18 991:2 1044:9 1062:2,5,17 1070:1,6 1077:21 1080:10 1104:9 1111:20 1140:6 1178:14 1218:5 1229:7 1259:11,12 1263:18 1271:23 1272:5,10 1278:10 1284:24 1309:5,21 1310:3 1315:8 1316:2 1322:6 1322:14 1328:11,16,18 1328:22 1351:21,24 1352:1 1354:10,12,14 1371:16,20	AWEA 1134:21 1195:4 1218:11 AWG-13 1348:19 <hr/> B <hr/> B 1319:22,24,25 B-e-c-k 1349:5 Bachelor's 1236:3 back 990:22 1005:14 1006:9 1040:1 1040:3,4 1041:25 1042:12,16 1044:22 1080:3,12 1081:17 1096:1,3 1101:18 1114:10 1119:20 1161:9 1171:5 1190:5,8,14 1208:1,3 1209:3,4 1215:1 1221:1 1237:22 1238:3 1239:21 1241:15 1245:15 1254:15 1255:23 1257:20 1258:1 1260:5 1262:1,2,12 1263:2,11,21 1265:1 1267:12 1282:12 1285:21 1366:22 1367:11 1369:7
---	--	--	--	---

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

back-of-the-e... 1097:16	1215:3 1232:1 1248:12	1338:11	1120:23	1169:16,19
backed 1269:3	1256:18	be-all 1360:12	1121:7	1171:14
background 1236:2,20	1264:23 1318:19	bear 976:13	1122:19	1173:10,21
backward-loo... 1240:4 1244:13	1319:11 1344:7 1346:1 1365:10	1127:22 1215:16	1133:14,18	1179:10
backwards 1244:7	basic 1259:15 1265:1	1221:9,10	1158:13	1218:10
bad 1130:16,17 1169:7,10,11 1347:18	1288:14 basically 984:21 993:17 997:10	1223:12,25 1228:25	1179:12	1227:17
baker 1245:13	997:11,18	1233:4,15	1221:10,18	1237:19
balance 1243:21	1004:6	1234:8,19	1226:2	1253:14
balanced 1160:25	1041:13	1246:16	belief 1175:16	1266:11
balancing 1161:19	1042:6	1267:25	1293:15	1270:11
ball 986:4	1048:15	1270:8	1294:19	1282:24
bank 1191:14 1192:3	1117:23	1278:21	1330:12	1283:2
bar 1139:9 1141:2 1143:10	1118:17,21	1279:22	1333:25	1288:13
Barbara 1221:4 1221:13 1376:2	1131:2 1138:9 1148:5	1282:7,9	believe 985:13	1291:6
base 1356:21 1358:20	1149:13 1150:11,16 1162:9	1283:16,17	986:24 987:1	1292:24
based 987:25 988:23	1258:19 1271:1	1284:5,20	990:6,15	1303:20
1002:23	1355:24	1286:22,23	1001:19	1304:2
1046:23	1357:18	1289:3,11,18	1009:23	1305:10,22
1047:3,5	1364:17	1289:21,22	1011:7 1041:4	1306:19,25
1061:13,23	basis 993:21 995:10	1376:3,11,14	1047:8 1057:6	1307:4 1308:5
1072:22	1017:13	Beck 1316:16	1066:16	1308:11,15
1076:3	1052:14,15	1317:2,20	1067:4	1309:11,17
1098:16	1065:18	1331:11,13	1068:12	1311:12,21
1103:17	1070:20	1348:22	1069:9 1070:7	1312:10
1117:19,23	1097:19	1349:5,6	1072:21	1313:12,16
1118:8,13,24	1107:23	1350:2,22	1075:6	1317:4,15,17
1127:9 1134:4	1126:2 1145:4	1353:3 1370:3	1076:18,20	1322:21
1149:2 1152:6	1145:24	1373:10	1077:16	1329:20
1179:8	1146:1,19	1378:2	1078:7	1330:3 1331:6
1192:12	1147:5 1181:5	becoming 1279:16	1079:24	1331:9
1198:8,13	1181:13	1281:11	1080:3,14	1336:10
	1243:12	beginning 1066:7	1081:4	1338:3 1339:6
	1286:8 1288:9	1069:25	1096:10	1342:22
	1308:23	1137:5	1102:6 1107:7	1347:25
	1312:17	1139:13	1109:22,25	1348:15
		1145:7	1111:6	1357:25
		1147:16,22	1126:19	Belt 974:12
		1153:8,20	1127:7	975:2 980:2
		1154:24	1133:23	981:17,18
		1155:13	1134:4,9	984:10 985:5
		1160:9	1141:20	985:16,18
		1167:12	1152:5	986:16,21
		behalf 1115:10	1154:14	987:2,13,17,23
			1165:15,21	988:19 989:3,7
			1166:24	990:3,11,16
			1167:10,21	991:1,21 993:4
			1168:2	993:17 997:6

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

997:13 998:1	1135:1,16,20	1330:13	1359:18	1157:19
999:1,16	1141:22	1331:24	benefiting	1230:19
1000:3,6	1142:5 1147:2	1332:8,15	982:15	1269:9
1001:16,18	1148:13	1335:20	benefits 1005:24	1284:24
1002:25	1150:17	1336:11,21	1097:1 1112:7	1290:22
1004:23	1157:22	1337:25	1112:10	1315:15
1008:18	1159:13	1338:4,15	1118:23	1317:20
1014:3 1015:9	1167:13,18,24	1340:4,6	1158:8 1164:6	1321:11
1016:7,8	1168:4,14,19	1341:8,13,22	1164:12	1364:5
1017:1	1169:6,12,23	1341:25	1231:7,17	beyond 1068:2
1040:11,25	1171:17	1342:6	1232:3	1098:7
1041:17	1172:7	1343:15	1281:21	1123:13
1042:7,14,19	1176:25	1345:8	1286:15,24,25	1222:9,15
1043:16	1177:14	1346:21	1316:12	1223:1
1046:21	1187:11	1347:21	1320:6 1335:8	1320:14
1047:6,8,9,14	1188:6,19	1348:4	1336:1,6	1368:24
1049:9,13,20	1197:24	1352:25	1345:12	bid 990:2,3
1050:3,14	1199:9,14	1354:2 1368:6	Berkeley 1195:3	1041:7,10,17
1051:8,16	1208:18	1368:8,22	1218:12	1041:24
1052:15	1215:5	1369:8,17	Berry 1062:3	1079:18
1053:2,20	1218:22,24	1370:6,12,22	1140:14	1198:7
1054:3,10	1219:18	1379:8	1228:12	bidding 989:8
1055:15	1223:5 1224:3	Belt's 1272:7	1372:15	1047:10,15
1057:14	1226:20	1288:11	best 988:22	bids 989:4,16,24
1059:21,23	1234:21	1372:24	999:18	1041:1 1051:4
1060:19	1274:10,21	bench 1002:24	1049:15,19	big 1254:4
1061:10	1275:20	1098:17	1050:2,15	bigger 1254:4
1062:11	1276:1,16	1215:4	1061:11	1269:21
1063:7,18	1277:8,18	1318:20	1150:19,23,25	bilateral
1064:10,14	1278:16	1346:2	1151:4,17,19	1219:14
1066:14,19	1279:12,20	1365:11	1153:10	bill 1103:11
1068:21	1281:2,5,9	1366:2	1157:10	1107:17
1070:22,23	1283:10	benefit 1004:22	1160:6	bills 1101:7
1073:5,11,15	1287:19,24	1103:15	1171:16	1103:18,24
1074:6 1076:6	1296:18	1164:2	1175:15,17	1131:3
1076:10	1299:20,24	1256:18	1179:13	binding 990:24
1077:8 1078:3	1303:25	1264:16	1191:20	1183:5
1078:15,23	1305:2,14	1265:6	1245:20	bit 1101:15
1079:8	1306:23	1281:16,19	1293:14	1106:7
1081:10	1311:22,23	1285:2,23,25	1294:18	1107:10
1097:20	1312:5,6,11	1317:18	1298:10	1358:22
1098:17	1316:7 1322:2	1320:9,10,23	1315:17	1359:2 1371:2
1107:24	1322:16	1321:5,6	1327:6	black 1139:9
1116:3	1323:15	1336:14	1333:25	blame 1177:10
1117:11,16	1325:10	1345:16,17	better 983:12	blaming 1082:1
1118:2 1125:4	1328:5 1329:7	1353:15	1099:21	blind 1247:8
1126:11	1329:23	1356:23	1151:10	blocks 1110:17

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1110:19,20	1173:13	1117:11	built 983:4	983:25 984:2,4
blowing 1315:6	1176:15	1254:18,20,22	1001:16	990:7 994:13
1315:20	1187:18,21,23	1257:19	1006:22	1002:23
BLS 1243:18	1192:23	1265:3	1141:4,7	1003:2,4,6,8
board 1133:21	1215:13	1268:15,25	1142:20	1003:10,12,14
1134:2,17	1225:13	1315:19	1143:6,12	1003:16,19
1249:6	1235:3	bringing 982:21	1145:18	1005:2,20
Boards 1001:6	1295:22	999:11	1157:22	1007:2,6
bold 1335:8	1299:4	1052:16	1162:3 1179:3	1008:14,18,20
book 1105:16	1302:25	1061:4	1196:17	1008:22,24
border 1162:9	1319:8 1328:1	1231:17	1197:15,24	1009:1,3
1189:10	1334:22	brings 981:9	1219:3 1247:6	1011:14,17
bottom 994:4	1346:18	985:14	1251:19,19,23	1017:25
998:21	1350:17	1150:13	1252:16	1018:7,16
1015:13	1365:24	broad 1013:11	1271:24	1040:3
1043:1,22	1374:18	1110:22	1275:21	1042:20
1059:15	1375:3,7,17	1240:1,1	1276:2,17,24	1048:5 1055:3
1109:13	Brain 1338:19	1339:6,18,22	1277:4,9,15,18	1060:16,20
1144:17	1338:24	broader	1277:19	1072:12
1167:11	1339:9,23	1162:18	1278:4,8	1080:25
1227:23	breach 1002:5	broadly 982:16	1279:13	1082:6,10
1301:18	break 1113:21	broke 1220:1	1280:2	1096:3
1303:11	1114:6	broken 1140:24	1310:11	1098:16,19,21
1325:8 1335:7	1119:17	brought	1311:7 1355:4	1099:10,12,14
1343:13	1220:24	1057:24	1364:11	1099:25
1348:2	1268:4 1286:1	1190:4	1368:8	1100:2,4,6,8
bought 1129:8	breakdown	1257:20,21	bulk 1179:4	1105:3 1106:9
1249:16	1143:1	1282:14	1330:6	1106:25
boundaries	breaks 1139:19	1347:3,17	bullet 1137:7,17	1108:13
1139:24	Brian 976:13	1366:19	1137:20	1113:14,17,23
Brady 977:6	1221:10	budget 1285:12	1326:20,21	1114:5,10,22
980:9 1003:5	1289:22	1286:6	bureau 976:8	1115:5,22
1008:23	brian.bear@d...	build 1130:24	1100:4	1116:2,5,7,9
1098:22,24	976:14	1151:9,10	1116:20	1116:11,13,16
1099:9 1114:1	bridge 1281:15	1152:1	1133:4 1176:1	1116:18,20,22
1114:8 1116:8	briefly 1103:3	1242:25	1197:1 1217:5	1116:24
1120:7,8,10	1138:2	1251:13	1230:2	1119:4,8,10,16
1121:3	1158:19	1276:6	1235:14	1119:20,25
1122:14	1164:24	1372:22	1243:16,17	1120:6 1124:5
1123:18	1217:17	building	1247:24	1124:13
1124:25	1226:1	1132:18	1283:8,18	1125:3,6,8
1146:7 1155:8	1270:16	1217:1 1232:2	1295:12	1129:15,18,20
1155:15,21	1290:21	1241:5	burned 1275:1	1129:22,24
1159:19	1331:19	1248:14	BUSHMANN	1133:3,6
1163:10	1346:25	1252:5 1256:8	974:19 978:2	1136:19
1170:12,19,24	bring 982:20	1277:24	979:21 980:1,4	1146:6,14
1171:2	1057:15	1278:2 1373:1	980:8,10,12,14	1170:6,10,16

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1170:20	1283:14,25	1354:23	1076:22	1348:13
1173:15,20	1284:18	1365:10,13,15	1105:7 1147:3	Callaway
1175:21	1286:20	1365:17,19,21	1148:22	1354:18
1176:1,3,5,7,9	1289:4,8,16,20	1365:23,25	1190:8	called 978:12
1176:11,14,16	1290:4,25	1369:1,10	calculated	1007:11
1177:13	1291:5,9,16	1373:8,10	1016:20	1044:1 1115:2
1183:9	1292:1	business	1052:5	1120:3
1184:23	1293:20	1197:10	1156:22	1173:25
1185:4	1295:1,6,10,12	1239:1,19	calculates	1185:7
1186:18	1295:15,17,19	1241:9,21	1157:2	1189:11,19
1187:1,5,10,13	1295:21,23	1253:12	calculating	1221:5
1187:15,17	1296:17,21	1266:15,16,20	1077:5	1233:11
1192:25	1297:1,4	1266:22	calculation	1254:19
1193:2,4,6	1298:14,18,20	1267:21	999:22,23	1292:6
1196:25	1298:22,24	1285:23	1016:6 1017:7	1297:10
1197:3	1299:1,3,5,19	1289:15	1066:13	1300:14
1199:19	1300:4,8,10	1340:17	1076:1	1322:18
1208:3 1210:3	1302:10,14,16	1341:4,9	1099:19	1325:24
1215:3,8,10,12	1302:18,20,22	businesses	1103:4	1333:2
1215:14,17,19	1302:24	1280:25	1125:19	1338:19
1215:21,23	1303:1	1288:21	1126:16	1348:23
1217:4,7,9,13	1305:13	butcher 1245:13	1127:9 1148:5	1371:22
1220:19,23	1312:23	buy 990:10	1148:23	calling 1042:18
1221:1	1318:19,22,24	1040:22	1161:17	calls 1043:24
1223:15,20	1319:1,3,5,7,9	1041:11	calculations	1274:19
1224:2,5	1322:2	1046:21	998:22 1149:2	1283:12
1225:9,12,14	1324:14	1168:25	1149:11	1306:21
1225:16,25	1325:3,18,21	1242:7	1150:22	camera 1018:10
1229:3,22,24	1327:11,15,17	buying 988:20	1250:24	1018:15
1230:2,23	1327:19,21,23	1040:12,22	calculator	1101:21
1232:21	1327:25	1041:16	1104:24	1102:8 1210:2
1233:2,5	1328:2,5	1059:9	1105:5	cancel 1051:15
1234:11,15,20	1331:14,18	1068:20	calibrate	canceled
1234:23,25	1332:19,23	1077:18	1285:10	1051:16
1235:2,4,6,8	1334:7,11,13	1078:3	calibrated	cap 1135:12
1235:10,12,14	1334:15,17,19	1219:15	1286:11	capability
1245:3	1334:21,23	1275:2	call 978:9	1155:6 1156:4
1246:19	1336:21	buys 1249:21	1007:8	1156:23
1260:14	1342:11	bypass 1045:9	1018:12	1157:20
1266:8 1268:7	1345:24		1078:14	capable 1274:12
1270:11	1346:1,6,9,11		1097:16	1338:1
1271:17	1346:13,15,17	C	1140:2 1237:6	capacity 984:10
1273:17,22	1346:19,21,23	C 975:11	1241:3 1250:8	985:1 988:20
1279:2,17,24	1348:9,12,20	1340:20	1250:11,15	989:5,24
1280:8,11	1350:3,7,9,11	CAIDI 1357:14	1255:20	990:10,16,25
1281:13,25	1350:13,16,18	CAIFI 1357:14	1268:10	991:20 993:17
1282:5	1352:25	calculate	1297:7	1014:12
		1015:13		

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1040:12,22	1193:19	1148:14	1065:18	981:13 996:19
1041:11,16	1196:13,17	1152:22	cases 1148:8	cents 1168:8
1046:21	1218:22	1154:6 1158:3	1158:7,11	CEO 979:5
1052:15,16	1219:16	1158:12,20	1179:16,19	1282:17
1061:20	1279:19	1159:2	1239:1	certain 983:17
1062:3,13,18	1317:11	1164:18	1244:24,25	983:19 992:17
1063:3 1067:6	1318:13	1165:5,12	1264:17	994:8 998:5
1070:14,24	1333:12	1166:10	1294:23	1068:18
1071:5,7,16,19	1362:4	1168:4	cash 1249:10	1070:8
1072:19	1364:25	1171:18,18	catastrophic	1071:25
1073:12,14,15	1366:7,10	1177:19	1358:8	1078:12
1073:20,25	capital 1208:21	1178:9 1179:9	catch 1002:17	1136:10
1074:1,8,19	1208:25	1192:11	categories	1241:8 1261:4
1075:1,11	1220:4	1198:22	1287:12	1303:16
1076:12	1239:11	1208:13,16	category 1339:2	1306:20
1077:18	1240:25	1209:7 1216:8	1339:6,18	1309:3
1078:3,23,25	1241:6 1338:8	1219:10,15	1340:5	1313:14
1096:19	caps 1160:21	1229:18	cause 1007:24	1323:8
1097:6 1101:1	capture 1173:3	1237:7	1221:20	certainly 983:12
1112:3	capturing	1244:14	1233:24	996:23 998:4
1125:24	1151:4,5	1252:2,11,15	1297:23	1006:4 1165:6
1126:2,9,12	1173:4	1252:20	1305:7	1172:13
1138:24	career 1236:6	1256:16	1323:12	1253:20
1139:11,14	1285:3	1257:6 1263:1	1326:12	1278:15
1140:10,14,20	carefully	1264:19,25	1333:15	1289:16
1141:3,7,13,23	1160:25	1265:3,12	1362:6	1349:13
1142:4,8	carried 1352:6	1270:18	caused 979:6	1362:21
1143:1,14,18	carry 1275:17	1278:2	1292:20	1370:15
1145:18	carrying	1282:16,25	1303:15	certificate
1147:3,6,19,24	1156:23	1287:6,9	1352:19	974:13
1147:25	1157:20	1296:7	caution 1337:2	1328:14
1148:9,22	CARY 975:5	1304:10,16	caveat 1144:20	1371:6,8
1149:3,8,12,17	case 979:7	1305:20	CCN 1006:18	1382:1
1150:8,20,24	986:12 988:19	1306:12,18,19	1051:19	certificates
1151:11	997:2 1008:1	1317:17	1320:1 1338:1	1371:9
1152:7 1155:6	1043:24	1322:17	1354:8	certify 1382:5
1156:4,10,19	1058:7 1060:3	1323:2	cell 1359:16	cetera 1044:1
1156:21	1067:20,22	1324:22	Census 1243:17	1241:13
1157:2,9,14	1070:3	1329:24	Center 1285:20	1332:5
1165:13,16	1098:14	1335:14,17	centers 1161:22	Chad 1043:2,4
1168:25	1115:10	1337:22	1161:25	1044:6,8,20,23
1172:5,8,11,15	1118:19	1343:24	Central 1179:1	1047:7,21
1172:20	1120:23	1352:9 1354:2	1179:4,12,24	chain 1242:1,5
1173:4,11	1126:25	1354:6	1180:17,24	1244:6 1245:2
1177:8	1134:22	1356:21	1181:6,7,19	1245:14
1180:17	1140:4 1142:3	1371:5,6,13	1182:4,4	1247:5
1184:8,13	1147:2,9	case-by-case	Centralia	Chair's 1260:13

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

chairman	1106:16	1141:12	994:24,25	1247:1
974:20 994:15	1139:10	1142:6 1143:5	995:2,5,6,11	1348:21
994:17 1002:8	1184:2 1191:1	1144:6	995:17 996:22	clarity 1126:6
1003:21	1222:12	1195:24	997:3 998:18	Clean 974:12
1096:6	1264:21,22	chase 1323:6	1000:9	975:2 989:22
1098:15	1301:22	cheaper 1108:2	1005:23,24	1043:14
1099:19	1302:3	check 1060:10	1043:17,25	1044:9
1100:10	1308:23	1107:21	1046:6,6	1045:21
1208:6	1353:19	1108:10,17,18	1096:12	1098:5
1209:19,21,25	1357:13	1167:10	1097:10	1133:22
1216:4	1362:21	1218:17	1100:21	1134:3,6,15,18
1232:23	changed	1237:20	1101:1,11	1208:18
1282:2	1175:12	1242:16	1113:7 1225:6	1216:8
1296:23	1308:22	1243:6	citizens 1320:10	1222:18
1300:6	1365:5	1262:19	1320:22	1223:4
1311:21	changes 1065:2	checking	city 974:9 981:6	1226:20
1312:25	1115:14	1107:14	983:17 986:17	1227:5 1250:3
1313:2	1122:5	chemical 1242:7	986:23 990:18	1250:21
1318:18	1123:13	1242:7	991:5,19	1251:5,9
1319:11	1142:21	Chief 979:4	992:22 993:13	1255:11
1324:18	1222:4,5,9	983:8 1007:23	994:6 996:16	1268:24
1331:16	1293:9	choose 987:19	1005:11,14,17	1313:17
1342:13,16	1301:14	1182:19	1046:12	1314:1,6
1343:12	1333:20	chosen 1227:17	1068:13	1331:24
1345:23	1349:19	1329:8,12	1069:17	1338:14
1348:1 1355:2	changing	Chriss 1290:16	1070:1 1099:8	1343:8 1361:2
1365:9 1369:3	1191:12	circuit 1179:16	1351:22	1362:1 1363:3
1374:8,17	Chapter 1318:7	1179:20	city's 992:24	1379:7
1375:20	character	1183:6	claim 1246:8	clear 992:6
1377:6,20	1181:14	1328:24	1307:6 1336:1	1057:12
1378:6	characteristics	1329:7,8,10	claims 1305:8	1063:15
Chairman's	1191:2	circulated	clarification	1067:15,23
1370:3	characterize	1223:7	1071:15	1071:18
challenge	1362:11	circumstance	1073:23	1072:4,5
1191:1,10	charge 982:4	999:15	1106:23	1096:11
1192:14	1013:17	1104:10	1222:16,22	1126:14
challenges	1015:19,25,25	circumstances	clarifications	1137:19
1188:13	1016:2,3	993:22 999:19	1101:23	1157:11
chance 997:24	1017:8	1229:2	1222:15	1218:20
1062:12	1100:21,23	1322:15	1223:1	1246:23
1105:24,25,25	1130:13	cited 1230:5	clarify 1046:19	1248:24
1226:23	1220:8	1336:11	1222:10	1255:20
1294:25	1359:16	cites 1349:14	1251:21	1263:15
1367:19	charges 1108:25	cities 986:14	1347:24	1268:1,6
change 1047:20	1109:1 1131:9	987:3,9,20,22	clarifying	1286:2 1372:7
1104:14,16,17	1167:15	993:16,25	1096:9	clearly 980:16
1104:18,19	chart 1139:9	994:22,22,23	1246:22	1044:24

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1149:15	1134:3 1381:1	1074:22	1152:23	1318:10
clock 1131:2	code 1180:19	1154:1	1158:12	1320:13,23
close 1017:12	cohort 1102:14	1160:12	1216:7	1326:11
1046:1,9	Coincidentally	1161:17	commercial	1328:15
1081:25	1000:7	come 1015:4,8	1000:16	1332:11
1259:24	COLEMAN	1015:21	1112:20	1333:13
1265:2	974:22	1016:1,11	1209:1	1339:9
closed 1018:17	collected 1131:1	1047:13,22	commercially	1349:24
1082:11	collection	1075:13	1285:8	1354:6
1199:20	1169:18	1217:13	Commission	1364:15
closer 990:8	collective	1227:5	974:2,8 975:14	1372:5,7
1126:8	995:11	1238:21	976:2 979:2	1379:3 1380:6
1161:22	collects 1218:11	1250:2	980:14	Commission's
1165:6	color 1144:10	1256:15	1003:10	988:18
closest 1053:7	Columbia	1259:6 1265:5	1004:20	1103:15
closing 1113:4	981:12 995:25	1265:7	1006:19	1216:8 1331:1
Club 977:9	996:2,5,8,12	1267:14	1007:21	1359:24
980:5,6 1003:2	996:14	1268:13,15	1011:23	Commissioner
1008:20	1068:13,25	1286:12	1042:16	1002:11,21
1098:19	1069:18	1332:7,14	1060:15	1119:6
1125:8,15	1070:2	1344:3 1352:7	1099:14	1232:25
1187:15	1351:22	1365:3	1108:14	1282:4
1215:10	Columbia's	1372:22	1116:13	1296:25
1225:10	1068:24	comes 1000:10	1129:20	1345:24,25
1234:25	column 1014:11	1053:7	1147:2	1368:25
co-op 1274:5	1015:17,17	1107:25	1152:23	1374:9
co-ops 1273:2	1016:11	1150:1,3	1154:6	Commissioners
1273:24	1017:8 1061:3	1156:11	1158:12	974:23 994:14
CO2 1166:19,22	1070:11	1162:6,6	1175:10	1096:4 1119:5
coal 1055:16	1072:19	1240:11	1176:5	1170:22
1073:16	1105:5	1261:6	1177:23	1183:10
1074:2	1107:14	1276:13	1193:2 1195:7	1232:22
1138:20	columns 1014:7	coming 1189:24	1197:13	1282:1 1300:5
1272:1,1,9	1014:8,9	1236:9 1239:1	1209:3,4	1312:24
1273:14,25	1052:1	1239:19	1215:19	1331:15
1274:3,8,13,21	combination	1291:13	1216:6	1342:12
1274:22,25	1009:23	commencement	1225:25	1354:24
1275:1,4,5,7	1177:6	1208:25	1226:2,22	Commissions
1275:12,16,17	1182:11	commensurate	1229:16	1296:22
1284:6,10,11	1189:20	1164:7	1235:8 1268:6	commit 995:16
1288:20,24	combine	comment	1283:11,21	commitment
Coalition 977:5	1000:11	1291:11	1284:13	981:1 991:15
1119:22	combined	1368:15	1286:2	995:19
1120:24	1000:8	comments	1292:17,18	1004:22
1121:8	1070:12,25	1117:19	1297:21	1005:7 1045:6
1122:20	1071:2,9	1118:23	1311:25	commitments
1133:19	1072:20	Commerce	1312:9	981:10 997:12

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1077:25	1227:16	compilation	1311:7	concluding
1338:7	1347:7	1012:18	comprehensive	1017:14
committed	compare 1016:6	compile 1218:8	1169:17	conclusions
1041:11	1069:17	1218:18	1232:8	1171:17
committee	1070:19	compiled 1056:7	concept 1247:24	1337:22
992:20 995:12	1168:6 1169:7	1146:19	1256:10	condition
999:24	1190:22	complaining	1339:14,17	1228:20
common	compared	1064:22	1340:15	1311:20
1356:12	999:13,14	complete 1209:9	1347:22	1312:2
commonly	1117:17	1338:9	1366:18	1324:24
1198:20	1158:5	completed	concern 1227:2	1325:11,13,15
communication	1193:22	981:10 996:6	1228:24	1332:14
1250:6	1356:21	1008:8	1229:8,12	1338:5
communicatio...	1368:20	1041:24	1314:18	1343:12
1051:3 1339:3	comparing	1111:21	1324:23	1344:8 1348:1
communities	998:25 999:3	1320:5	1344:20	1348:3
987:7 1000:25	1000:3	1322:20	1362:9	conditions
1046:3	1016:25	1365:1	concerned	1223:4
community	1056:7	completely	975:10 1130:4	1226:20
1245:21	1058:24	1009:19	1175:11	1227:4
companies	comparison	1065:22	1215:23	1270:17
1239:24	1014:2	completeness	1229:24	1299:25
1249:22	1052:14	1194:18	1314:19	1324:22
1262:24	1055:14	completes	1316:12	1331:23
1275:5 1276:5	1057:14,22	1007:3	1379:21	1343:7 1379:6
1282:20	1066:20	1119:11	concerning	conduct 1180:19
1338:23	1070:17	1173:16	998:17	1305:19,24
1339:1,15,19	1096:24	1220:20	1057:21	1306:7
1339:25	1166:18	1233:6 1297:5	1128:18	1322:24
1340:1,8,10	1369:16	complex 1317:1	1315:25	conducted
companies'	compensation	complexity	1324:25	1117:14
1264:21	1181:16	1046:12	1343:13	1118:5
company 982:18	1247:22	compliance	concerns 1140:5	1181:13
1198:23	1248:5	1127:15,21	1229:17	conducting
1250:7	compete	1165:2,4	1324:19	1310:1
1251:13	1145:11	1170:15	1325:14,16	conducts
1261:5 1262:8	1261:19	1381:17	1329:14	1322:23
1262:8,9	1365:8	complicate	1343:16,19	conduits
1263:16	competing	1101:10	1344:6 1362:7	1168:21
1264:10,20	1251:2	complicated	1362:8	conferences
1265:4 1273:6	1364:12	1046:14	conclude 1363:1	1238:21
1312:6 1330:3	competition	1188:24	concluded	confidence
1339:20	1366:14	components	980:25 981:2	1256:14,21
1340:4 1341:8	competitive	1012:22	1081:10	confidential
1344:17	1220:9	1189:4	1155:4 1156:2	1018:19
1361:14	competitiveness	1208:21	concludes	1045:25
company's	1137:9 1144:2	compounding	1005:9	1056:22,25

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1082:9,13	connected	1148:14	1127:14	1010:13,21
1122:24	997:15 1006:2	consists 1136:10	1135:2	continues
1199:18,21	1067:17	constituting	consumed	1191:18
1209:17	1184:10	995:7	1280:9	continuing
1262:18	1199:9	constrain	consumer	997:8 1062:18
1338:12	connection	1243:23	1162:19	1172:18,24
confirm 1299:12	1329:9	constrained	consumers	1173:6
conflict 1114:2	connects	1130:12	977:1 1130:18	1238:18
confused 994:20	1131:23	1363:16	1163:4	continuously
1309:18	CONNIE 976:9	1367:8	consumption	1238:20
confusion	connie@show...	constraints	1242:12	contract 981:7
1187:4	976:10	1153:16	contact 1040:15	985:16,18
1310:25	consent 1229:15	construct	1076:6	986:17 987:17
1311:7	conservative	974:14	contacted	990:21,24
congestion	1014:14	1188:14	1040:17	991:4,10,19,23
1010:22,24	1062:9 1285:6	1323:16	1043:15	992:12 993:3,7
1011:2 1012:6	1285:14	1347:8	contacting	993:18 995:4
1012:11	consider 985:9	constructed	1042:2	995:13 997:8
1013:16	997:8 1103:20	997:7 1075:14	1043:17	997:16,17,25
1014:24	1184:11	1208:10	contain 993:25	999:1,8 1000:4
1015:18,19	1341:2	1268:3 1313:6	contained	1000:13
1016:2,20	1351:12,19	1320:1	979:11 1008:6	1001:14,20
1017:2,5,8,11	consideration	construction	1018:22	1002:2,5,18
1017:15,20	1140:11	1132:24	1082:16	1003:22
1052:1,5,11,20	1154:9	1137:23	1174:24	1005:10,13,16
1053:7 1055:6	1181:11	1182:7	1175:14	1006:11,12,14
1058:3,8,20	1312:16	1198:21	1199:24	1014:16,19
1059:6,15	1330:6,14	1208:22	1210:7 1234:3	1047:24
1061:4	considerations	1209:10	contents	1048:7,11,17
1064:22	997:11	1216:16	1044:22	1048:19
1065:1,10,13	1151:14	1239:3,4,11	1121:11	1049:2,6,10,12
1065:17	1163:16	1240:24	1123:3	1049:14
1102:22	considered	1247:15	1293:15	1050:5,17,21
1105:6	1256:2 1308:1	1250:9,12	1294:19	1050:25
1107:13,18	1330:5	1255:14,15	context 1175:8	1051:14,15
1110:8	considering	1256:18	1371:3	1053:20,21
1135:21,24	1049:18	1275:25	contingency	1054:4,4,6,10
1158:24	1138:22	1276:12	1317:12	1054:11,15,19
1162:21	1290:5	1281:15,18	contingent	1055:15,16
1190:18,22,24	consistency	1287:15	1001:18	1059:20
1191:15,21	1243:7	1288:15	continue 997:24	1064:16
1366:20	consistent	1311:13	998:3 1072:25	1066:19
conjunction	1042:10	1338:6	1173:9	1068:14
1073:5	1225:1 1243:4	consult 1290:13	1184:19	1069:18
1134:22	1264:18	consultation	1339:21	1070:2 1073:5
connect 1067:18	1285:18	992:19	1347:16	1073:11,16
1372:8	consisting	consulted	continued	1074:1,6,10

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1075:12,15	1199:12	1053:13,14,17	1040:23,24	1133:19,20
1079:7	1362:17	1053:25	1041:18,19	1134:12,13,14
1081:19,22	controller	1055:14,21	1043:2,20	1134:17
1110:5 1111:9	1247:8	1056:2,6	1044:2,15,20	1136:18
1111:23	controls	1062:22	1045:11	1137:1,2,11,12
1178:4,15,22	1242:22	1065:3	1046:15	1137:25
1198:2,4	convenience	1069:11	1048:9,14,16	1138:1,25
1209:14	974:13	1077:4	1049:3	1139:16,17
1236:13	1328:14	1111:23	1050:22,23	1140:3,22,23
1304:6,6	1371:6,8,9	1136:8,14	1051:17,18	1141:1,4,5,8
1336:14,18	conventional	1146:8 1147:7	1052:2,12,17	1141:10,11,15
1341:17,21	1157:25	1148:11,18	1052:21	1143:3,4,8,9
1342:6 1366:6	conversations	1154:15	1053:8,21	1143:12,13,16
contracted	1290:19	1158:15	1056:12,23	1143:20
995:17	converter	1166:11	1057:5,9	1144:4,5,8,9
contracting	974:16 1046:9	1171:23	1058:4	1144:12,15,16
993:23	1307:3,7	1174:18	1059:17	1145:5,6,11,12
contracts	1308:1,7	1178:2 1194:1	1060:5 1061:6	1145:24,25
980:25 981:2	1316:13	1293:3	1061:12,21	1146:25
981:10 991:13	1323:9 1324:4	1307:13,19	1062:24	1147:20,21
993:24 995:7	1329:11	1332:1	1063:16	1148:2,3,9
997:13 1006:7	1344:4,23	1343:11	1064:3,4,7	1149:4,6
1006:24	1345:2,13	corner 1121:5	1065:19	1152:15,16,17
1050:14	1355:4,6	1122:16	1066:9 1068:6	1153:3,4,12
1096:13	1357:11	corporate	1069:3,13,19	1154:4,19,20
1328:12,19	1362:19	1219:8	1069:24	1155:1,2
1332:4	1363:1,2	1224:17,23	1070:12	1156:5,8
contractual	1370:4 1373:4	corporation	1073:7 1074:6	1157:16
1001:22	convinced 987:6	1273:5	1076:8 1077:1	1158:1,14
contribute	Cooperative	1330:23	1077:8	1159:7 1160:7
1349:6	1179:1	corporations	1078:17	1160:17,18
contributed	1180:18,18,25	1225:5	1079:8,19	1161:2,3,25
1294:5	coordinate	correct 979:8,9	1080:2,9,13,17	1162:1,23,24
contributes	1099:20	981:17 984:11	1081:11	1163:8,9,19,20
1134:18	Copeland	984:12 985:3,4	1096:18	1164:14
1321:15	1306:3,10,15	985:7 987:14	1101:3,8,9	1166:20,21
contribution	Copeland's	987:18 988:14	1102:9 1107:3	1167:16
1253:13	1312:14	988:21 990:11	1107:6	1168:9,10,18
1294:10	copies 1005:6	990:12 991:16	1108:20,21	1168:23
contributions	1018:3 1050:9	992:13 993:14	1109:14,15	1169:2
1134:7	1054:12	993:19 994:2,9	1110:6	1174:21
1349:10	1124:9	995:3,5,21,25	1111:17,24	1175:15
contributor	copy 989:20	1006:19,24,25	1117:12,13	1178:15
1294:2	990:23 991:18	1012:8	1118:3,4,21	1179:16,24
contributors	991:19 1018:5	1013:17	1126:1	1180:14,15,16
1294:24	1042:22	1014:20	1131:17	1180:23,24
control 974:14	1051:2	1015:1,6,7,11	1132:7,20	1181:3,20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1182:15,17,22	1303:18	1308:12,16,17	1163:4,8	1160:25
1182:25	1304:20	correlate	1164:8	1161:1,19
1183:1,2,7	1305:18	1112:21	1167:17,19,19	1162:19,21
1186:18,22	1306:1,7,13	correspondence	1167:21,24	1164:8,9
1190:15	1308:14,19	1051:3	1168:3,12	1167:25
1194:4 1196:3	1309:17,20,23	1077:13	1169:4,7	1168:16,24
1196:4	1309:24	cost 981:21	1188:22	1170:2
1197:11,19	1310:18,19	982:8,24	1190:3,11,16	1189:21,22
1199:7	1311:17,18	986:20 987:1	1192:1,2	1190:15,18,22
1209:15	1312:9 1313:8	990:2 997:19	1193:20	1191:4,6,8,12
1219:18	1313:14	998:17,25	1196:14,18	1191:16,22,25
1223:7 1226:9	1320:24	999:9 1000:1	1255:7,21	1220:4 1255:5
1226:13	1323:10,18,21	1012:3	1256:1,6,12	1256:2,3
1227:25	1323:25	1015:10	1264:16	1261:14
1228:5 1230:8	1325:16	1016:5,8,12	1265:6 1280:4	1279:19
1230:13	1326:17	1041:6	1281:20	1285:4
1231:8 1232:8	1327:6	1045:10	1285:23,25	1286:24
1235:21	1329:14,16	1046:8	1306:2,4,11	1288:15
1238:9,14	1330:15,16,20	1052:11,15,16	1311:22,23	1360:2 1369:9
1241:14,18	1330:24	1053:10,21	1312:7	council 981:6
1244:6	1331:2,3,8	1054:10	1316:12	996:7 1125:16
1247:17,18	1332:12,13	1056:8,9	1317:22	counsel 991:11
1249:1,12	1333:24	1057:14,15	1318:12,13	1018:6
1252:1,18	1336:16	1060:24	1320:3,11	1080:10
1255:13	1337:19	1061:4,4,9	1321:6	1102:5
1258:10	1338:2,9,10	1062:4	1353:10,12	1105:22
1262:3	1339:4,5,10,11	1064:21	1359:6,11	1106:4
1265:22,23	1340:1,18	1065:17	1360:3,9,23	1115:11
1267:8 1269:2	1342:20,22	1066:14,15	1361:4 1369:5	1198:16,17
1269:5,6,11,14	1343:4,5	1067:1,1,8	costs 982:3	1199:3
1269:17,19,21	1370:8 1371:7	1069:2,7	999:12,21	1217:18
1270:1,2,7	1373:6	1070:21,21	1052:1,5,20	1289:25
1275:2 1276:7	corrected	1078:23,23	1053:4,8	count 1102:1
1278:18	1121:24	1079:23	1055:6 1058:3	1242:3
1280:9,10,18	1372:14	1082:3	1058:8,20	counted 1242:20
1282:22	correction	1097:18	1059:6,15	1320:23
1283:1	1326:18,19,24	1101:7 1105:8	1064:5,22,24	counties
1284:22,23	corrections	1107:17	1065:1,10,13	1179:22
1286:3,4,7,15	1115:14	1117:11,15,17	1065:16	1266:16
1287:21,22	1121:18	1118:10	1067:16	country 1139:20
1288:22,23	1123:9 1175:6	1132:9,13,14	1069:22	1154:3
1291:7,8	1186:6	1132:18	1104:20	couple 989:10
1293:1,16,17	1294:11	1135:4	1118:3,12,24	1067:13
1294:3,6,20	1333:21	1140:12,16	1134:24	1111:7,19
1298:3,10	correctly	1160:23,24	1135:24	1176:17
1299:15	1060:12	1161:16,16	1139:3 1140:5	1183:12
1301:4,7,10	1188:25	1162:20	1158:4,8	1215:25

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1217:12,22	cover 1121:6,11	1125:3	1305:16	current 974:15
1220:1 1222:3	1122:17,22	1129:15	1313:1 1328:8	981:14 998:3
1224:6 1227:1	1123:2	1175:23	1335:1	1112:23
1228:6	1148:14	1187:9,10	1336:22	1121:23
1236:15	covered 1152:10	1196:25	1342:15	1122:1
1253:14	create 1247:16	1222:23	1350:20	1153:22
1295:24	1263:3,4	1225:9	1353:1 1355:1	1160:16
1299:6 1303:2	1264:11	1234:20	1374:6,7,8,9	1219:17
1319:10	created 1186:3	1249:20	1374:14,15,16	1235:24
1322:3 1328:6	1264:14	1298:13,14	1374:17,18,19	1284:11
1342:14	1266:4 1276:4	1302:10	1374:24	1309:6
1351:11	1276:23	1327:10,11	1375:4,5,6,11	1323:21,24
1353:3,25	1351:17	1334:6,7	1375:12,17,18	1370:19
1364:16	creates 1287:12	1350:3	1375:19,20	currently 987:9
1369:24	credentials	cross-examina...	1376:4,5,6,7,8	999:2 1000:10
coupled 1129:3	1301:6	980:17 984:6	1376:12,13,18	1001:1
1368:6	1349:16	994:16	1376:22,23	1009:12
course 1107:15	credibility	1002:10	1377:4,5,6,13	1048:7
1108:19	1195:20	1009:6	1377:18,19,20	1112:12,16,19
1168:19	credit 1074:9,19	1011:19	1378:4,5,6	1113:8
1183:3 1239:8	1075:1	1040:5,7	cross-examined	1199:12
1245:24	1137:21,24	1096:5	1106:5	1233:19
1264:21	1156:10	1098:23	cross-surrebu...	1315:22
1330:22	1198:10,12,12	1099:16	1123:10,15,24	curtailment
1339:22	1351:14	1117:1 1125:2	1166:10,16	1141:24
1359:6	credited	1125:10	1167:12	customer
court 978:13,20	1073:19	1130:1 1133:9	1185:25	1192:11
1007:12	1074:1,13	1171:6	1186:15,23	1220:15
1017:24	1156:19	1172:14	1193:14	1357:9,23
1115:3 1120:4	credits 1075:11	1175:20	1209:12	1358:6
1120:13	1264:7 1265:8	1176:18	crossed 1159:2	customers
1174:1	1318:14	1177:16	crossing	1053:3
1179:16	1331:8 1353:4	1187:20	1181:23	1112:17
1183:6 1185:8	Creek 1354:18	1193:9 1197:5	CRR 974:25	1118:3,12
1221:6	criminal	1208:5	1382:13	1131:6
1233:12	1265:12	1222:18	crystal 986:4	1167:15
1292:7	criteria 1151:24	1224:3,7	1068:5,10,15	1184:10
1297:11	1320:19	1225:17	1069:2,5,6,8	1219:4,5,9
1300:15	critical 1146:2	1226:3 1230:3	1069:16,22,23	1224:24
1325:25	crop 1280:25	1231:1	1070:2	1274:4
1333:3,8	crops 1255:17	1235:17	1109:17,21	1279:21
1348:24	cross 979:25	1271:19	CSR 974:25	1280:4,5
courthouses	980:1 1008:17	1289:12	1382:13	1357:2
1179:22	1008:18	1295:5,7	cumulative	cut 1323:6
courtroom	1011:14	1296:1 1299:7	1260:8	1345:8
1224:18	1116:1,2	1299:21	1281:11	cutoff 1149:12
courts 1179:20	1122:17	1303:4	curious 1077:24	1149:14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

cycle 1070:12,25 1071:2,9 1072:20 1074:22	1175:2 1179:14 1181:17 1195:2,8,9,12 1195:13,19,21 1196:19,21 1240:2,16 1243:16,18,19 1246:6 1251:2 1256:11 1274:15 1283:8,18 1284:10,17 1287:20,24 1296:12 1305:8 1306:23 1307:5 1309:3 1310:9 1311:11 1328:25 1329:3,18,19 1335:24 1336:3 1338:22 1340:13,19,20 1340:23 1348:15 1352:18,19 1360:25 1361:16,21 1380:2,13,15	David 975:11 1130:4 1297:9 1297:17 1337:22 1376:20 Davis 1043:2,4 1044:6,20 1045:18 day 978:4 1111:21,23 1228:13 1314:25 1315:1 1358:20 1373:14 1382:8 days 1198:3 DC 1132:23 1220:11 1323:23 1362:15 deal 1047:14 1082:8 1101:15 1177:7 1183:24 1344:22 dealing 1166:9 1244:12,15 1282:20 deals 1219:14 debt 1169:7,10 1169:11 1208:21 1337:19 decade 1139:3 decades 1246:2 December 1004:13,15 1109:21,24 1154:18 1198:3 decide 1216:19 decided 1041:15 1216:14,15 decision 988:18 999:24 1006:5	1154:7 1216:8 1360:7 1362:16,18 1371:4,12 decision-maki... 1261:10 decisions 995:12 997:12 1258:13 decline 1128:14 1139:2 1271:25 1272:8,11,14 1273:25 declined 1040:22 1137:9 1138:23 1144:3 declining 1196:18 decommission... 1354:12 decommission... 1354:1,7,16,17 decrease 1065:9 1065:13 1307:8 1308:8 1367:3 decreases 1064:21 decreasing 1064:25 DED 1226:7 1230:5,16 1238:18 1253:10 1257:13 1258:23 1336:10 DED's 1271:12 deeper 1238:6 defense 1115:11 1125:16 defer 983:8 deferred 1000:22	1001:2 define 1009:14 1071:11 1072:9 defines 992:2 defining 1071:19 definitely 1045:22 1046:12 definition 1072:4,6,16,17 definitional 1268:20 definitive 1366:21 degree 1236:3,4 delayed 1192:19 deleted 1326:23 deliver 994:8 1067:17 1161:21,23 1164:12 1188:20 deliverability 1153:17 deliverable 1161:16 1163:7 delivered 1014:21 1051:7 1078:15,25 1098:5 1109:5 1109:8 1126:11 1145:20 1169:4 1277:7 delivering 1109:10 1135:25 1177:7 delivery 1110:9 1159:4 1162:4 1162:10 1190:16 1319:16
D				
D-i-e-t-r-i-c-h 1292:14				
Dakota 1153:9 1160:11,11				
damages 1001:24,25 1002:7 1198:5				
Dan 1331:11				
Daniel 974:20 1348:22 1349:5 1378:2				
dark 1139:9				
data 1004:6 1005:5,6 1042:22 1050:9,10,12 1053:14 1054:12,20 1055:5,22,25 1056:2 1057:8 1057:13,18 1062:22 1065:3 1069:11,18 1076:25 1077:1 1081:3 1081:5,18 1103:23 1109:16 1135:2 1139:19 1140:21 1141:10,15 1143:8 1144:21,22 1146:19 1147:3 1148:8 1149:3,7,10,18 1150:6,21 1152:6,10 1160:10	database 1147:17 date 1057:6,8 1081:13 1113:4 1178:6 1197:20,21,25 1198:1,6 1217:24 1310:22 dated 989:21 991:23 1044:5 1045:18 1062:22 1154:18 Dave 1297:8			

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1320:2	1005:25	1315:25	1243:13	1165:22,23
1366:25	1268:2 1323:2	1336:19	1270:18	1169:21
1367:2 1368:7	1323:3	determination	1278:17	1184:5
demand 1113:7	depicts 1139:23	998:13	1282:6 1337:1	1192:16
1159:14	1141:3 1144:7	1060:14	1380:19	1235:23
1191:3,6	deployment	1249:25	developments	1248:3
1224:23	1131:21	1321:15	998:11	1250:13
1225:5 1315:7	1172:25	determinations	1126:25	1261:8,8,9
demonstrating	deposit 1197:18	1364:6	diagrams	1265:13
1106:4	derived 1196:15	determine	1329:19	1279:15
denominator	describe	1001:7	Dietrich 1292:4	1286:3
1265:8	1110:23	1118:12	1292:5,13,16	1323:24
department	1154:24	1245:1,17,19	1292:19	1344:15
976:12 1136:6	described	1279:11	1295:4,25	1352:4
1146:20	1308:9	1321:8	1297:4	differential
1193:18	1364:11	1339:24	1376:16	1000:1
1194:9	1382:7	1343:3	1379:4	difficult 986:8
1215:14	describes	determined	difference	1191:13
1221:11,16,18	1098:3	996:2	1000:9	1260:4
1230:17	description	deterred 1340:3	1015:13	1361:13
1233:22	1047:18	develop 1151:19	1016:12	dime 1041:6
1235:20	design 1161:14	1188:14	1071:16	diminished
1236:13	1163:6	1197:12	1103:5	1145:23
1237:9 1240:8	1236:25	developed	1248:10	direct 974:15
1240:16	1328:21	1191:19	1249:12	978:15
1263:1,7	1330:5	1218:21	differences	1007:14
1281:6	designated	developer	1055:9	1046:10
1289:11,14	1115:13	1138:5	1058:17	1053:24
1336:25	1124:15	1151:15	1110:9 1362:6	1054:14
1380:19	1223:22	1236:7	different 986:10	1114:14
departments	1234:17	developers	988:17 993:23	1120:9 1130:7
996:5	designed	1218:13	997:11 999:4	1152:22
depend 998:6	1150:17	developing	999:21	1153:5
1071:1 1219:1	1163:2	1061:19	1010:10	1159:20
depended	designing	1151:17	1014:20	1174:3
1016:21,21	1130:20	1156:9	1016:25	1185:10
dependent	desire 1352:2,15	development	1042:9 1048:6	1193:13
997:14	desk 1359:13	976:12	1058:2,17	1221:8
1248:17	Despite 990:1	1160:22	1066:2 1073:1	1224:13
depending	detail 1076:24	1189:17	1076:5 1081:3	1226:12
1009:13	1077:20	1215:15	1102:15,16,17	1233:14
1013:6 1065:1	1304:18	1221:2,11,17	1103:5 1135:4	1241:20
1076:3	detailed 1253:25	1221:19	1139:20	1245:11
1181:14	1316:3	1233:3,23	1140:5 1154:5	1248:12
1198:5	1360:24	1235:20	1155:19	1250:6
1290:10,17	1361:15,22	1236:7	1157:6,21	1253:15
depends	details 1315:15	1237:10,12	1164:15	1257:11

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1262:1,7	1292:17	1359:10	1194:8	1053:15
1263:4	DIRs 1371:17	discussion	distinction	1056:22
1286:15,24,24	disadvantage	1001:25	1246:24	1057:1 1079:6
1286:25	987:21 988:5	1062:20	1247:19	1081:13
1287:3,14	disagree	1097:2	1248:9 1372:9	1121:4,10
1288:1,6	1060:21	1106:14	distinctions	1122:14
1292:10	1061:1 1312:5	1111:11	1248:3	1136:4,15
1297:13	1324:3	1164:23	distinguish	1148:13,19,25
1300:17	1337:21	1210:5	993:20	1155:9
1303:9	disagrees	1304:25	distorting	1159:18,22
1307:10	1311:25	1305:3	1152:19	1174:24
1309:5,9	1312:11	1310:23	distribute	1175:15
1310:4	disapprove	1312:2	1003:22	1177:22,25
1323:24	1011:23	1328:24	1136:8	1185:24
1326:2 1333:5	disclosed	1344:10,15	distributed	1199:18
1335:6	1194:20	1351:9,20	1124:9	1222:1 1223:6
1348:18	discounted	1363:12	distributes	1298:9 1302:6
1349:1	987:16,21,23	1369:21	1164:9	1327:6
1369:20	988:6,12	1372:1	distributing	documentation
1374:5,13,23	1059:20,25	discussions	1148:11	1338:25
1375:3,10,16	1060:18	1047:17,19	distribution	documents
1376:3,11,17	discovery	1068:24	1001:9	990:23 1005:6
1376:21	1079:21	1369:15	1168:16,21	1051:3
1377:3,12,17	1105:25	dispatchable	1169:3	1077:12
1378:3	1296:12	1362:12,16,20	diverse 1111:2	1079:21
directed 1232:6	discrete 1240:3	1363:8	1195:19	1080:7,19
1307:14,18	discretionary	1371:18,22	1353:22	1082:8
1328:25	1240:12	dispatched	diversification	1121:15
Directing	discuss 1178:13	1071:13	1231:24	1122:15,23
1153:19	1178:21	disperse	diversified	1123:2,6
1154:21	1224:16	1261:24	1352:4	1180:4
direction	1226:7	displace	diversify	DOE 1194:1,9
1065:25	1306:16	1157:24	1231:13,21	doing 1060:12
1121:16	1343:21	displaced	diversifying	1108:9
1123:7 1186:4	discussed	1274:9	1231:7	1149:10
1227:13,21	1054:16	displacement	diversity	1176:20
1254:15	1056:15	1261:17	1231:14,16	1189:13
1367:9	1152:8 1251:8	1273:14	1353:18,20	1192:15
directly 1046:7	1311:21	1274:21	diverted	1224:13
1112:22	1344:11	1285:7	1131:15,19	1236:11,17
1263:7 1320:7	1363:12	displacing	divided 1147:24	1239:8,10
1363:23	discussing	1275:16	1175:12	1245:9 1254:8
director 981:3	1055:10	dispute 1227:6	Division	1255:15
1043:5	1139:18	1336:24	1221:15	1257:16
1120:21	1157:6	disruptive	Docket 1152:23	1282:10,11
1237:11,15,16	1228:17	1252:20	document	1285:24
1281:6	1352:15	disseminated	991:18 1051:1	1299:11,12

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1316:3 1321:9	dramatically	1073:18	1247:25	1252:10
1350:22,24	1365:6	1106:14	1252:7,23	1258:5,6
1359:15	drill 1101:15	1109:17	1254:5,20	1261:4
dollar 1000:15	driven 1145:2	1143:3 1189:8	1255:6,11	1267:15,24
1000:15,20,20	drivers 1142:21	1190:5	1256:9 1258:2	1269:1 1288:7
1002:15	1146:2	1217:17	1259:5,8	1288:7
1190:9	drives 1366:14	1224:18	1266:4	edification
1242:12	driving 1145:22	1282:14	1268:10	1103:16
dollars 1055:7	drop 1107:8	1285:5 1310:5	1270:7	editions 1196:21
1061:10	1137:10	1312:3	1277:22	education
1257:19	1144:3 1145:1	1368:17	1281:3,16	1238:17,18
1262:10	1145:9,13	early 992:17,20	1282:5 1285:1	educational
1264:12	1316:9	1006:16	1335:8 1337:1	1236:1
domain 1179:11	dropouts	1041:2,17	1337:13	effect 1255:2
1179:23	1138:23	1079:4,20	1341:12	1261:21
1183:6	dropped 1361:3	ease 1193:25	1343:3,16,21	1280:7 1307:3
Don 1291:15	DRs 1307:13,18	easement	1345:4,9	1355:15
Donald 1173:24	1310:5	1181:4,16	1353:15	1356:2
1174:7 1375:9	due 1062:14	1182:1,14	1366:18	1358:22
1379:23	1063:4	easements	1380:19	effective 1046:8
double 1247:8	1080:16	1181:12	economically	1156:23
double-sided	1081:21	1182:11	1001:1 1342:3	1157:19
1102:2	1101:13	1252:12,17	1344:25	1160:24
doubled	1137:12	easier 1107:10	economics	1321:10,11
1364:25	1139:3 1178:9	1243:24	981:20 1184:5	effectively
doubt 1254:8	1283:9	1262:2 1291:4	1184:17	1160:23
1338:11,17	Duncan 978:9	east 1045:3,5	1236:4 1238:7	effects 1112:7
doug@healyla...	978:11,21	eastern 1324:2	1255:24	1245:1,10
976:5	1044:20	eastward 1159:3	1258:25	1258:4 1287:8
DOUGLAS	1374:4 1380:8	easy 1244:4,8	1259:16	efficiency
976:3	Duration 992:13	1361:20	economies	1062:19
Downing	dusting 1280:25	economic	1251:18	efficient
1237:14	duty 985:10,14	976:12 987:8	1264:21	1162:22
Dr 991:9,11		1137:9 1144:2	economist	1321:10
1179:8	E	1163:15	1333:14	effort 1045:22
1228:11	E 976:17 978:21	1184:4,15	economists	EIA 1196:19
1250:4 1251:4	e-mail 989:21,23	1188:6	1238:21	EIA's 1196:13
1251:6	1043:1,13	1215:15	1242:24	either 1000:21
1306:22	1044:4,17,23	1221:2,11,16	1245:22	1046:10
1307:2,5,11	1045:18	1221:18	1246:14	1227:13,21
1309:11,12	e-mails 1042:24	1230:6,7	1247:3	1229:14
1310:6 1330:2	1306:21	1232:3 1233:2	economy 1242:4	1267:8 1271:1
draft 1304:6	EA 1147:11	1233:21,22	1242:18	1304:6
drafted 1218:3	EA-2016-0358	1235:20,24	1243:9	1314:19
drafts 1351:16	974:15 978:5	1236:2,6,16,17	1245:11	1357:1 1362:6
dramatic	earlier 1005:23	1237:5,10,12	1248:12,23,25	ELCC 1157:9
1291:21	1040:18	1243:16	1249:5,19	elected 1009:21

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1010:10	emphasis	1081:9	1338:15	1218:23
electric 976:1	1195:20	1096:13,18,19	1351:14,18	entered 1341:17
979:2 982:18	employed	1097:6 1098:5	1352:16	1356:4
1007:21	1120:17	1100:14	1353:4,6,7,9	entering
1043:19	1174:8 1181:7	1101:1,7	1353:10	1097:10
1046:12	1185:15	1112:3	1358:15	enterprise
1130:10,12,20	1221:14,15	1117:17	1359:11	1244:4
1130:25	1233:20	1120:18,20	1361:2,4	1245:12
1154:8,11,12	1292:16	1125:20	1362:1	enterprises
1154:25	1297:18,20	1126:17	1363:15,17	1245:18
1179:1,4,12,25	1326:8	1128:25	1366:16,17	entertain
1180:17,25	1333:11	1129:10	1367:1 1369:9	1113:11
1181:6,8,19	employee	1134:12,16,19	1379:12	entire 1101:7
1182:4,5	1247:22	1134:25	Energy's	1150:11
1310:14,15	employees	1135:4,12,25	1146:20	1157:3
1330:23	1180:20	1136:6 1140:6	engage 1219:13	1165:25
1339:25	1194:15	1140:12	1296:11	1344:22,24
1340:10	employer	1146:21	1340:10	1345:4,5,20
1341:7 1354:8	978:22,25	1147:18	engaged	entirely 1066:1
1354:19	979:1 1007:19	1148:1,15	1041:19	entirety 1018:14
1380:5	1134:11	1153:10	1045:1	1097:8
electricity 987:2	employers	1154:1	1309:14,16	1303:17
1056:8,10	1240:23	1157:23	engaging	entities 1009:11
1121:22,23	1247:23	1160:6,12	1041:20	1131:2,7
1122:1,2	enable 1161:15	1161:16	1282:20	1145:21
1135:16	1163:6	1162:8,19	engineer	1195:10
1145:1,9	end-all 1360:12	1163:8 1165:2	1236:23	1218:7 1219:7
1153:22	energize 985:6	1167:13,14,17	engineering	1243:1
1160:16	energy 977:1	1167:19,22,24	1326:10	entitled 1148:15
1171:9 1330:6	983:21 984:17	1173:3 1177:7	1328:21	1226:19
1331:2	992:18 993:6,8	1184:9	1332:5	entity 1218:24
1355:11	993:9 994:8	1193:18	engineers	1219:2 1243:9
element 1232:15	999:9 1000:2	1194:9 1195:5	1199:4	1314:14
elements	1001:12	1195:5,6,14	enhance	1330:4
1168:12	1009:11,18,22	1198:7	1130:25	1340:16
1239:3	1011:6	1221:16	1132:22	1341:3,7
elicitation	1015:20,25	1231:8,13	enhanced	entry 1010:12
1352:20	1016:3	1232:8	1132:24	environmental
embedded	1043:14	1274:23	1317:6	1112:7
1068:3	1062:4 1067:1	1280:9	1370:13,15	1118:24
eminent	1067:7	1315:19	enhancement	equal 1060:7
1179:11,23	1068:14	1317:5,11,23	1370:17	1154:1
1183:5	1069:2,7,21	1318:12,14	ensure 1338:8	1195:20
emission 1112:5	1070:21	1319:20	enter 981:13	1278:1
1166:19	1076:11	1320:3,11	1006:6	equaling 1075:7
emissions	1078:15,24,25	1321:14,22	1097:11	equation
1166:22	1079:13,23	1331:8	1192:10	1264:15

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1267:8,10	1141:20	evaluated	987:11	1104:1 1141:2
equations	1148:8	1066:18	1097:13	1239:22
1245:22	1181:18	evaluating	1149:14	1240:7
1251:12	1241:25	981:19	1246:8 1257:7	1248:22
equipment	1242:9,10,17	evening 1292:4	1258:7	1252:4 1255:8
1217:1 1241:7	1247:22	1313:4,5	1265:19	1261:6,17
1328:13,20	1259:9 1262:7	1315:6	examination	1262:8,21
1330:5	1272:20	1342:17,18	978:15 1004:1	1263:9 1264:9
equitable	1287:2,12,15	1350:23,25	1007:14	1264:9,10
1164:1	1288:8	1351:5	1100:12	1287:15
equity 1208:20	1313:17	1359:14	1114:14	1311:1
1337:18	estimated	event 992:19	1120:9 1171:1	1347:17
equivalent	1052:6,20	1153:16	1174:3	1352:5
1000:12	1053:19	1197:24	1183:14	1364:13
1121:22	1054:2	1312:4	1185:10	exceed 1157:7
1122:1	1105:20	1322:23	1217:15	exceeding
errata 1122:4,7	1128:5	1358:8	1221:8	1135:12
1123:11,21,24	1147:25	events 1317:12	1233:14	1143:22
1175:11	1148:22	eventually	1282:8	exceeds 1143:19
1381:6,8	1149:3	1049:8 1057:4	1292:10	1149:25
erroneously	estimates	1184:12	1297:13	exception
1069:4	999:19	everybody	1300:17	1143:18
error 1186:21	1097:17	1242:19	1324:16	1228:8
1301:15	1147:17	1245:13	1326:2	exceptions
escalator	1148:15	1246:12	1331:20	1067:13
1182:25	1195:22	1247:9	1333:5 1347:1	1228:7,10
especially	1242:6	1249:21	1349:1 1350:2	excerpt 1127:21
1245:10	1249:13,14,18	everybody's	1374:5,10,13	1381:16
1264:6	1249:22	1291:4	1374:20,23	excerpted
essence 1362:18	1250:2,2	evidence	1375:3,7,10,13	1128:3
essential 985:19	1258:12	1128:18	1375:16	excerpts
essentially 995:6	1259:19	1141:17	1376:3,11,14	1217:22
1017:10,11	1262:13	1175:19	1376:17,21	excess 1076:11
1126:11	1263:21	1177:25	1377:3,9,12,14	excessive
1169:3	1268:14	1244:14	1377:17,21	1130:13
1190:10	1284:3	1264:25	1378:3	exchanged
1316:9 1329:6	1379:13	1279:23	examine	1306:21
1344:17	estimating	1284:16	1345:11	exclude 1150:5
established	1052:7	1290:8	examined	1154:8 1155:4
1371:17	1140:12	1337:13	1066:8	1156:2
estimate	1261:3	1338:7	1198:17	excluding
1013:16,24	1274:13	1343:25	1341:16	1149:19
1054:9	et 1044:1	evidentiary	examining	1155:1
1057:15	1241:13	974:6 978:4	1336:14	exclusion
1061:11	1332:5	exact 1258:19	example 982:17	1150:7
1096:15,21	evaluate	1358:5	1015:17	excuse 1016:9
1097:15	1163:23	exactly 983:19	1016:14	1016:24

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1067:21	1148:12,13,16	1006:1	1262:9,9	explain 1065:11
1159:22	1166:11	1074:24	1365:3	1070:18
1220:16	1170:7,17,20	1075:13,14,16	expects 1336:6	1072:11
1362:15	1174:12,15,19	1110:21	expenditures	1073:9
excused 1007:5	1175:18,22	1111:4	1242:12	1137:15
1113:16	1178:1,20	1128:25	1254:23,24	1138:2
1119:11,15	1185:25	1188:21	1268:16	1158:19
1173:19	1186:1,16,21	1189:23	1285:12	1164:24
1185:3	1194:1,3	1219:18	1286:11,13	1165:13
1220:20,22	1219:20	1276:19	expense 1190:7	1189:4
1233:9 1289:5	1223:3,10,13	1353:12,13	expenses	1198:14
1289:7,14,17	1223:23	1364:4	1161:17	1219:22
1297:6	1226:12,15,18	exists 1001:18	1168:17	1226:18
1300:12	1226:19	1267:21	1169:18,22	1296:13
1325:20	1227:25	1344:8	1189:17	1315:13
1332:22	1234:6,9,18	expand 1010:13	experience	1321:1 1363:4
1348:11	1293:3,5,8,19	expanded	1017:17	explained
1373:13	1293:22,25	1041:22	1061:24	1156:7,10
execute 1208:17	1297:25	expands 1065:8	1072:22	explaining
executed	1300:24	expect 985:6	1104:7	1077:21
1005:17	1301:13	996:10,24	1117:20,24	explains 1098:3
1328:12	1302:4 1325:4	1000:11,14	1118:9,14,25	1163:5 1164:5
Executive 979:4	1325:7	1012:3 1065:9	1184:6 1236:5	explanation
exercises 992:20	1326:14	1102:19	1236:21	1148:21
exercising	1331:23	1191:18	1237:3 1254:7	1161:4 1336:1
999:25	1333:17	1219:3	1257:9 1301:6	export 1249:19
exert 1130:12	1343:7	1259:19	1349:15	exported
exhibit 979:7,11	1347:25	1360:7	1356:10	1165:14
979:17,21	1349:8 1379:4	expectation	1359:4 1360:1	exporting
1003:23	1379:5,6,12,14	1002:5	1360:14	1166:2
1004:4 1005:5	1379:16,18,19	1072:24	1362:12	1188:12
1005:8,14,15	1379:22	1074:11	expert 983:7	exposure
1006:10	1380:2,7,9,11	1305:19	1135:3	1051:18
1008:1	1380:13,15,20	1355:22,23	1371:19	1062:10
1017:23	1380:21	1356:20	expertise 1278:3	express 974:12
1018:1,13	1381:2,4,6,8	expectations	1278:23,25	975:2 976:16
1055:19	1381:14,16,21	1230:6	1288:10	983:25 999:16
1078:7 1102:7	1381:23	1243:13	experts 1102:5	1001:16
1105:15	exhibits 1003:24	1246:10	1171:15	1002:25
1115:7,13,21	1008:6,10,13	expected 992:13	1245:24	1003:12
1121:1,5	1055:10	1051:7	expiration	1011:15
1122:12,16	1110:13	1059:24	997:21	1015:9 1016:7
1123:23,25	1123:19	1064:5 1173:9	1197:21,23	1043:16
1127:2,7,22	1124:1,3,16,19	1241:22	expire 1000:4	1077:23
1128:1 1136:9	1185:21	1247:15	1048:8,11	1099:25
1136:12	1187:6 1379:1	1248:11,20	expires 997:18	1116:16
1146:4	existing 982:25	1250:13	1048:12	1129:22

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1142:5	1077:18	1157:24	1140:20	1054:14
1150:17	1078:2	1158:3	1141:3,7,14	1058:6,10
1159:13	1312:12	1191:21,22	1143:2,14	1071:23
1168:5 1172:7	expression	1222:22	1148:9	1072:2
1176:3,25	990:24	1238:24	1149:17	1128:24
1188:19	expressly 994:5	1271:23	1150:20	1136:4
1193:4	extent 1001:5	1272:5,6	1151:16	1146:18
1194:16	1064:18	1310:24	1172:5,9,15	1158:2 1239:7
1199:14	1173:2	1356:6	1265:14	1239:9
1208:18	1229:12	1366:19	1318:17	1331:22
1215:5,21	1246:21	factor 1014:12	facts 1105:23	1343:6
1224:3	1268:8 1279:3	1016:20	1279:23	1344:13
1226:20	1280:11	1061:20	fail 1347:22	1354:17
1227:3	1283:23	1062:3,13,19	failed 1339:16	1366:6,9
1229:22	1311:8	1070:14,24	failure 1263:22	families 1254:21
1235:10	1318:10	1071:5,7,16,19	fair 1100:24	family 1254:22
1295:13	1360:20	1072:14,20	1108:18	far 1017:20
1296:18	extra 1310:10	1112:20	1113:6 1151:8	1047:18
1298:20	1366:16	1125:24	1179:3 1197:9	1049:15
1299:20,24	1367:1	1126:3,10,12	1220:5 1229:2	1070:11
1302:16	extrapolating	1139:5	1231:16	1075:8
1305:2,14	1144:20	1140:10,15	1237:6	1114:23
1306:23		1141:24	1244:20	1141:3,6
1311:22,23	F	1142:8	1248:19	1143:10
1312:5,6,11	F-150s 1249:21	1143:19	1249:8 1251:3	1151:11
1318:24	1249:21	1147:4,6,25	1251:11,14,15	1238:17
1322:2	facilitate 1013:5	1148:22	1255:20	1240:20
1323:15	1132:11	1149:3,9,12	1259:17	1277:23
1327:17	1159:3	1150:8,24	1267:5 1281:7	1285:18
1328:5 1329:7	facilities 982:21	1151:11	1291:2	1289:10
1329:23	982:25 983:3,4	1152:7,8	1312:13	1290:5
1330:13	1129:5	1172:8,11,21	1321:17	1294:18
1331:24	1232:11	1173:4,11	1336:12	1314:24
1334:13	1277:9 1278:8	1178:13,21	1353:23	1354:19
1336:21	1311:14	1278:4	1354:15	farm 976:8
1338:4,16	1314:11	1279:19	1361:22	1011:7
1340:4,6	1315:3	1280:19,23	1372:2,2	1061:21
1341:8,13,22	1354:19	1318:2 1362:4	fairly 1046:10	1068:8 1100:4
1346:9 1350:9	facility 982:5	1366:10	1237:23	1116:20
1352:25	1071:2,20	factored	1356:10	1133:3 1151:9
1354:2	1157:13	1272:12,15	fall 1237:18	1176:1
1365:15	fact 989:14	1273:8 1275:9	1316:1 1317:2	1188:14
1368:22	990:1 1062:2	1276:9 1279:8	fallacy 1246:15	1190:9
1369:8,17	1066:18	1280:16	familiar 981:25	1196:25
1370:6,12,22	1068:13	factors 1012:18	983:22 1002:4	1197:14
expressed	1101:14	1063:3	1004:14	1217:4 1230:2
990:15	1118:9,11	1064:23	1009:19	1235:14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1255:9,16	fee 1181:10,13	1285:6	1185:19	1369:22
1278:2 1283:7	1181:15	file 974:14 978:5	1191:13	finish 1080:25
1283:18	feedback 1243:1	1175:11	1344:18	1180:11
1295:12	feel 1001:21	1177:18	finances	1216:16,18,19
1365:1,2	1043:17	1178:12	1337:11	1229:1,4
farmers 1253:16	1220:7 1257:4	1185:24	financial 1058:9	1290:6
farming	1257:8	1304:19	1058:12,21,23	finished 1081:21
1252:17	feels 1257:1	filed 979:7,13	1134:7	1081:23
farms 1061:25	feet 1227:12,12	1007:25	1219:13,14	1107:1 1228:6
1062:9	1227:19,21	1017:23	1297:22	1237:25
1079:14,22	1228:9 1271:1	1078:13	1337:18	fire 1101:15
1140:11,15,20	felt 1220:2	1081:18,23	1338:13	firm 1142:4
1141:3,7,13	FER 1218:14,15	1122:5	1339:20	first 978:7 980:1
1142:7	FERC 1013:4	1123:12	1347:8	988:19 989:4
1188:20	fewer 1220:14	1177:22	financially	992:2 1015:2
1189:9,15	1275:21	1183:21	1338:1	1016:7
1197:10	1276:1 1277:8	1186:21	1344:18	1040:11,21
1231:22	1277:14,18	1221:20	financing	1041:1,7,23
1232:2	1278:7	1233:24	1188:13	1043:1,14
1277:19,24	1317:12	1304:10,16	1208:20	1050:12
1278:4	fiduciary 985:10	filing 1177:20	1216:22,25	1051:25
1366:10	985:14	1178:5,7,17	1299:24	1064:9 1074:4
1372:4	field 1171:16	1304:11,13	1337:12,17	1098:11
fashion 982:10	1173:8	1306:12,18	1338:7	1099:1,3
favorable	fields 1222:21	1357:25	1339:16	1103:7 1116:2
1209:7	fifteen 1363:24	filings 1175:3	1347:5,14,19	1125:3
favors 1353:21	figure 1043:25	fill 1218:13	find 988:10,23	1137:17
fear 1314:17	1053:6	filled 1113:3	1158:17	1142:16
1315:10	1059:16	1222:2	1253:18	1154:25
1316:8,11	1062:7	fills 1372:17	1256:11	1155:12
feasibility	1074:14	final 992:22	1257:9,20	1175:23
1188:6	1103:7	1004:12	1265:24	1187:10
1337:14	1126:22	1078:14	1288:9,10	1193:17
1341:12	1127:17	1104:15	1309:12	1194:6,7
1343:3,17,22	1152:5	1325:1	1339:12,14	1195:16,18,23
1344:6,20	1157:12	1328:20	1340:5,7,12	1196:8 1221:2
feasible 1342:3	1172:2	1372:2	finding 1341:15	1224:2
1344:25	1195:24	finalize 1208:17	findings 1230:9	1234:20
feature 1254:16	1196:2	finalized 996:11	1336:25	1236:6
features 1285:4	1241:16,17,19	1304:7	finds 1370:5	1250:10,13
February	1242:22	finally 1015:12	fine 1176:22	1258:1
989:21	1268:17,18	1045:17	1230:15	1260:10
1047:11,15	1338:12	1135:23	1291:4 1296:4	1295:6
1062:22	figured 1318:13	1164:21	1299:12	1298:14
federal 1195:6	1318:14	1312:13	1331:4 1367:5	1302:10
1218:15	figures 1128:18	1331:4	1367:24	1325:8
1249:2,5	1243:17	finance 996:5	1368:16	1327:11

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1334:7	1121:6	formal 1238:16	1041:13	functions
1340:25	1122:17	1310:2	front 1053:15	1330:1
1348:2	1138:19	formerly	1076:2	fund 1354:1,7
1354:13	1145:17	1043:11	1105:16	1370:23
fits 1320:12	1148:21	forms 1279:15	1107:12	funded 1344:12
1341:21	1308:20	forth 1001:7	1121:3	1345:1
five 1015:21	1310:13	1047:2 1097:7	1171:24	funds 1130:24
1058:2	follows 978:14	1180:14	1187:24	1354:16,17
1189:16	992:16	1221:25	1217:25	further 983:24
1191:10	1007:13	1242:9,14	1251:11	1002:9 1007:1
1260:8	1115:4 1120:5	1248:6 1287:8	1325:1	1011:12
1262:13	1159:12	1287:18	1340:21	1012:15
1264:12,13	1161:13	1330:25	1343:10	1065:14
1279:16	1174:2 1185:9	1336:25	fuel 1353:18,19	1099:24
fixed 1191:9	1221:7	fortunes	1353:22	1113:12
1192:2	1233:13	1264:22	fulfill 1353:6	1119:9 1133:1
fixing 1045:8	1248:20	forward	fulfilled 1006:24	1161:25
fleet 1142:22	1292:8	1097:25	full 996:24	1173:13
flexibility	1297:12	1138:15	1048:19	1183:8
1227:11,20	1300:16	1158:24	1053:9	1184:21
flowing 1361:2	1326:1 1333:4	1172:10	1073:20	1191:17
Floyd 1043:8,9	1348:25	1244:21	1100:15,18,20	1192:14
1044:24	1368:2	1250:14	1101:7,25	1193:23,24
focus 1189:2	food 1242:13	1323:18	1106:13,19,24	1196:24
focused 1050:24	footnote	forward-looki...	1107:24	1222:9,14,25
1345:12,16	1161:12	1239:17	1108:3	1225:8
focusing	1222:7	1244:17	1136:15	1289:13
1043:19	footprint	found 1051:23	1142:16	1296:15
folks 1002:16	1012:24	1127:9	1161:18	1299:17
1077:21	1017:21	1163:14,17	1195:18	1300:3
1082:11	1153:14	1247:10	1326:4	1305:11
1210:3	1164:10	1337:25	1335:21	1312:22
follow 983:10,13	1165:25	four 1015:5	fully 996:25	1321:25
1165:17	1357:10	1133:15	1099:23	1324:13
1179:25	footprint's	1153:21,25	1108:19	1325:17
1261:22	1358:17	fourth 978:4	1112:24	1331:13
1372:1	force 1263:16	1072:19	1126:24	1332:18
follow-up	1367:17	1145:8	1188:14	1335:25
1111:19	foreshadowing	frame 1013:7	1335:22	1336:18,20
1351:11	1351:3	1080:14	function 985:19	1338:25
1353:3 1366:1	forgot 1216:9	1081:25	1268:23	1340:2 1342:9
1369:25	1372:12	1216:14	1362:19	1346:22
followed 1180:2	forgotten	frankly 1047:20	1363:2,3,6	1352:20
1262:5	1228:13	fraud 1265:13	functional	1354:21
1330:13	form 1221:21	1282:16,21,24	1330:1,4	1369:23
1340:18	1286:19	1347:18	functionally	1373:7
following	1309:7 1321:7	free 990:2,2	1269:17	future 997:16

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1012:15	1130:17	generation	geographic	1355:18
1062:14	1227:24	981:22 982:18	1143:2	1364:12
1063:4 1064:2	1228:3 1230:7	1014:17	1236:10	1366:21
1065:8 1102:9	1243:6	1071:21,22	getting 987:23	given 998:7,14
1131:21	1254:23,24	1073:6,10	997:3,4 1011:6	999:18
1160:22	1268:16,17	1109:7	1011:10	1017:24
1173:9	1317:4	1130:11	1043:15,24	1045:14,15
1196:21	1340:23	1138:3 1139:2	1073:18	1051:18
1243:11	1353:24	1141:25	1243:22	1074:19
1258:19	1354:4	1154:8 1155:1	1246:17	1142:20
1275:22	1366:14,18,24	1155:6,23	1255:5 1309:1	1148:22
1345:7	1368:11	1156:4	1321:2	1151:25
1347:16	generally 982:2	1157:12	1367:25	1152:9
	984:24 991:2	1158:4,8	1368:24	1154:25
G	1070:5 1118:8	1160:25	giant 1318:6	1157:13
G-i-z-o-w	1129:1	1161:8,19	GIBONEY	1164:6
1043:8	1138:23	1162:22	976:17 984:1	1182:19
G-o-g-g-i-n	1139:19	1167:25	1003:13	1191:1,2
1120:16	1153:1 1155:3	1170:1	1011:16	1317:8
G-u-p-t-a	1156:1	1231:11,12,18	1100:1	1321:23
1114:21	1157:10	1231:25	1116:17	1323:3
Galli's 1330:2	1158:2	1232:11	1129:23	1355:16
1348:17	1171:10	1273:14	1176:4 1193:5	1360:25
gas 1073:6,10	1222:20	1274:3,8,9,21	1215:22	gives 1076:11
1137:13	1227:1	1278:12,12,18	1229:23	1312:9
1138:24	1251:15	1284:6	1235:11	glad 1107:3
1145:2,13	1288:15	1355:25	1295:14	Glizow 1043:8
1154:7,11,25	1305:4 1336:8	1356:6,7,13,23	1298:21	go 978:2 996:16
1362:1,11	1343:9	1356:25	1302:17	1005:15
GBE 1361:14	1351:24	1358:15	1318:25	1012:15
GBX 1006:18	1352:1	1362:8	1327:18	1015:16
1103:6	1353:21	1371:11	1334:14	1016:6 1018:9
1105:20	1366:6,9	1372:25	1346:10	1018:15
1106:13	generate	generator	1350:10	1042:12
1108:3,19	1240:17	1131:22	1365:16	1046:5
1110:3	1244:2 1264:4	1132:3	Gilzow 1043:9	1047:18
GDP 1247:17	1276:6	1138:14	1044:5,19	1051:21
1248:7,8,11,17	generated	1157:25	give 982:17	1073:22
1248:24,24	1015:20	1317:14	1076:14	1074:17
gears 1311:19	generates	1340:16	1159:16	1082:10
1331:5	1132:3	1341:3 1356:1	1171:21	1101:20
general 982:10	1263:12	1358:2	1215:6	1104:8 1106:8
983:1 1010:16	generating	1360:18	1243:24	1113:20
1052:13	1190:12	generators	1258:12	1114:10
1101:21	1275:21	1131:7 1147:4	1299:13	1124:23
1117:20,24	1276:1,13	1358:2	1301:24	1132:5,6,14
1118:14	1277:9,14	1367:11,14	1313:19	1138:14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1144:20	1097:25	1243:10	1208:7,8	986:16,21
1146:16	1137:14	1244:23	1224:12	987:2,13,17,23
1155:24	1151:12	1246:8,16	1225:19	988:19 989:3,7
1162:25	1246:7	1249:15,18	1229:4 1231:3	990:3,10,16
1173:23	1339:17	1252:1,6,7,17	1231:4	991:1,21 993:4
1179:5	1369:7	1255:23	1244:19	993:17 997:6
1180:21	Goggin 1058:7	1256:15	1257:1	997:13 998:1
1182:1 1183:5	1114:2	1257:2,19	1271:21,22	999:1,16
1184:12,16	1119:22,23,24	1258:16	1275:3	1000:3,6
1191:14,22	1119:25	1260:16	1283:25	1001:16,18
1193:23	1120:2,11,15	1261:12,16,19	1299:11	1002:25
1194:6,10	1121:7	1263:3 1264:4	1303:8 1313:3	1004:23
1195:11,17,23	1122:18	1264:10,20	1313:4	1008:18
1196:5	1123:22,25	1267:14,25	1316:25	1014:3 1015:9
1199:19	1125:1,12	1271:25	1318:16	1016:7,8,25
1209:4 1210:2	1130:3	1272:8	1321:9,14,23	1040:11,25
1216:14,15,20	1133:11	1278:21,25	1335:5	1041:16
1228:17,19	1136:20	1284:14	1342:17,18	1042:7,14,19
1238:2,5	1170:4 1171:3	1286:16	1344:1	1043:16
1241:15	1171:22	1291:19	1350:24	1046:21
1242:3,15	1173:16	1294:7	1355:3	1047:6,8,9,14
1244:4	1375:2 1381:3	1343:21	1361:21	1049:9,13,20
1245:15	1381:5,7,10	1344:25	Google 1339:13	1050:3,14
1252:12	going 982:19	1358:6	Googled	1051:7,16
1253:18	996:4 1014:23	1361:18	1350:24	1052:15
1257:19	1018:9,14,17	1363:11,18,21	Googling	1053:2,20
1260:5 1262:1	1042:22	1367:4,7	1359:14	1054:3,10
1262:2,12,18	1053:13	1368:23	Gotcha 1068:4	1055:15
1265:18	1060:17	good 978:3,17	gotten 1247:7	1057:14
1273:22	1073:25	978:18 984:8	govern 1180:20	1059:21,23
1282:12	1074:24	994:18,19	governance	1060:19
1287:11	1075:11,13	1002:12	1001:6	1061:10
1289:8 1290:1	1082:4	1009:8,9	governed	1062:11
1290:7,9,22	1105:21	1010:23	1190:24	1063:6,18
1291:20,25	1127:20	1011:21,22	government	1064:10,14
1292:2	1136:8	1017:25	1043:12	1066:14,19
1329:18	1138:10	1018:7 1040:9	1194:14	1068:21
1332:23	1151:9,10	1040:10	1218:7	1070:22,22
1337:6 1344:1	1160:19	1100:11	governments	1073:5,11,15
1354:19	1161:9 1171:5	1117:3	1245:25	1074:6 1076:6
1358:11,17	1172:10,21,22	1119:17	grade 1255:24	1076:10
goal 1161:13	1173:8	1130:3,6	graduate 1236:4	1077:8 1078:3
1163:5	1197:14	1133:11,12	grain 974:12	1078:15,23
1232:10	1210:1	1174:5 1177:7	975:2 980:2	1079:8
goals 1224:17	1220:12	1183:23	981:17,18	1081:10
1351:14	1228:2	1193:11,12	984:10 985:5	1097:20
goes 998:24	1230:12	1197:7,8	985:16,18	1098:17

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1107:24	1311:22,23	1244:3	guaranteed	1266:9,14
1116:3	1312:5,6,11	1245:12	1191:9	1268:4,19
1117:11,16	1316:7 1322:2	1254:13,14	Guard 1236:23	1270:13,15
1118:2 1125:4	1322:16	1267:14,23	guess 996:17	1271:15
1126:11	1323:14	grosses 1268:21	997:23	1283:12,22
1135:1,16,20	1325:10	1269:24	1000:17	1286:16
1141:22	1328:5 1329:7	Grotzinger	1131:20	1290:20
1142:5 1147:2	1329:23	983:11 998:20	1137:5 1184:1	1291:2,8
1148:13	1330:13	1004:6 1007:8	1190:13,23	1376:7,12
1150:17	1331:24	1007:10,18,19	1209:25	half 1169:3,4
1157:22	1332:8,15	1009:8	1210:1	1264:14
1159:13	1335:19	1011:21	1237:22	1324:2
1167:13,18,24	1336:10,21	1040:9	1243:25	halfway 1192:20
1168:4,13,19	1337:25	1042:21	1246:22,25	Hall 974:20
1169:6,12,23	1338:4,15	1048:1 1050:8	1252:8 1255:2	975:6 994:15
1171:17	1340:4,6	1055:1	1283:23	994:17 1002:8
1172:7	1341:8,13,21	1081:16	1292:2	1003:21
1176:24	1341:25	1099:18	1345:11	1096:6
1177:13	1342:6	1105:13	1353:13	1098:15
1187:11	1343:15	1107:5	1358:9,18	1099:19
1188:6,19	1345:8	1108:16	1362:10	1208:6
1197:24	1346:21	1113:15	1364:7 1371:9	1209:19,21,25
1199:9,14	1347:21	1189:8	guidelines	1232:23
1208:18	1348:4	1224:19	1180:5	1282:2
1215:4	1352:25	1304:23	1198:17	1296:23
1218:22,23	1354:2 1368:6	1367:21	1199:2	1300:6
1219:18	1368:8,22	1368:17	Gupta 1113:18	1312:25
1223:5 1224:3	1369:8,17	1369:14	1113:25	1313:2
1226:20	1370:6,12,22	1374:12	1114:7,20	1318:18
1234:21	1372:24	1380:10,12	1115:1 1117:3	1324:18
1271:24	1379:8	ground 1239:20	1119:3,10	1331:16
1272:7 1274:9	granted 1338:1	1255:9	1374:22	1342:13,16
1274:21	granting 1354:8	1260:16	1381:15	1343:12
1275:20	graph 1140:19	groundwork		1345:23
1276:1,16	1143:1	1237:1	H	1348:1 1355:2
1277:8,18	Great 1171:5	group 984:11	Haden 976:9	1365:9 1369:3
1278:16	greater 1149:9	995:12	1100:5	1374:8,17
1279:12,19	1314:3	1048:16	1116:21	1375:20
1281:2,5,9	greatly 1162:19	1049:25	1133:5 1176:2	1377:6,20
1283:10	green 1223:4	1055:17	1197:2 1217:6	1378:6
1287:19,24	grid 1065:2	1066:9 1080:6	1230:4,21	Hall's 1100:10
1288:11	1130:11,12,20	1112:10	1235:15,18	1319:11
1296:17	1130:25	1352:2	1244:18	halt 1276:13
1299:19,24	1132:22	group's 1099:2	1245:6	hand 1042:22
1303:25	1184:19	groups 1102:14	1246:22	1065:3 1105:4
1305:2,13	1357:5	1102:15	1247:2	1181:24
1306:23	gross 1138:22	growth 1145:23	1260:10,19	1221:3

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1355:14	happy 1072:11	1105:2,4	1271:2,4	1158:24
handed 1005:5	hard 1012:12	1106:2,12	1304:25	1173:17
1050:8	1240:24	1107:5 1108:9	1368:20	1218:8
handing 989:20	1256:11,11	1108:15	heard 1060:2	1258:13
991:18 1056:1	1335:22	1113:12	1072:3	1325:14
1062:21	1340:5	1116:6 1125:7	1222:18	1369:8
1069:11	1361:12,23	1176:17,19	1278:14	helpful 1313:20
1325:6	1366:20	1177:11	1291:3 1305:3	helps 1261:10
handle 1316:19	Harden 975:3	1183:17	1343:24	1285:6
handled	1372:13	1187:14	1364:8	1325:15
1303:21	harder 1012:14	1209:18,20,23	hearing 974:6	1343:18
1315:16	1145:10	1215:9 1224:6	978:4 979:22	1363:22
handy 1166:12	1361:8	1224:8 1225:8	1005:3,21	Henry 977:10
1307:20	harm 1370:18	1234:24	1008:15	1125:14
hang 1173:17	hauling 1249:20	1295:24	1115:23	hereunto 1382:8
Hannibal 981:6	HBP s 1142:1	1296:2,15	1175:22	Heritage 1311:1
986:12,18,19	HC 1018:9,14	1299:6,8,17	1187:5	Hi 1224:10
991:10,15	1209:18	1303:2,5	1222:17	Higginsville
995:20	1297:24	1305:11	1223:8	1074:25
1005:17	1302:5	1319:10,14	1244:11	high 974:15
1006:13	1333:18	1321:25	1283:22	1013:18
1101:14	1367:25	1328:3	1293:21	1112:20
1380:17	1368:1	1334:24	1294:8 1359:9	1135:6
happen 998:9	heading 1121:6	1335:2	1371:25	1142:10
1017:6 1166:5	1122:17	1336:20	1382:6	1150:4,9
1241:21	1137:7,15	1346:20	hearings 986:11	1159:14
1242:16	1144:1	1350:19,21	986:20	1191:6 1192:1
1243:10	health 1248:5	1352:23	1229:19	1192:2
1246:9,11	Healy 976:3	1366:1,4	heavily 1181:24	1256:22
1252:10	978:9,16	1369:3,12,14	1252:13	1257:1 1309:5
1257:2	979:19,24	1369:22	heavy 1253:9	1310:10
1258:16	991:8,14 992:7	1374:5,10,13	hedge 1058:8	1311:6
1259:20	1003:20	1374:20	hedged 1058:21	1323:23
1290:12	1004:2,25	1375:11	hedging 1058:15	higher 1061:11
1319:18	1005:4,18,22	1376:4,18,22	1059:1	1062:6
1365:7	1007:1,8,15	1377:4,7,18	1219:14	1103:25
happened	1008:12,16	1378:4,7	height 1222:19	1110:2
1166:7,8	1018:8,13	Healy's 1183:23	held 1018:22	1126:12
1364:22	1042:17	hear 1081:17	1082:16	1130:17
happening	1047:25	1114:16	1138:25	1149:22
1242:2	1054:25	1117:5	1139:15	1156:9
happens 997:15	1060:11	1119:23	1199:24	1159:15
998:1 1240:13	1072:8	1125:12	1210:7 1382:6	1161:24
1241:9	1080:21	1133:15	help 987:6	1165:17,19
1258:25	1082:5 1100:9	1136:19	1001:1	1166:3,8
1259:3	1100:13	1169:9 1171:3	1100:22	1172:7,11
1291:22	1101:20,24	1224:21	1118:2	1173:3,3

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1188:23	1124:6,25	hooked 1364:24	hypothetical	1000:4,13
1189:3,6	1129:25	hope 1259:23	1321:21,22	1048:8 1049:1
1196:14	1133:5,7	1351:2	1355:5	1049:6,14
1219:24	1146:5 1170:4	hopeful 1365:7	hypothetically	1050:16,21,25
1220:2,7,8,13	1170:8,12,24	hopper 1265:18	1319:15	1053:21
1222:23	1173:14,18	horizontal		1054:4,6,11,15
1281:20	1175:25	1239:4,5,10	I	1054:19
1329:9,13	1176:2,15	host 1169:21	Iatan 996:13	1055:16
1362:4 1368:9	1183:13	hour 1015:20	idea 1249:20	1073:16
highest 1150:18	1187:14,18	1052:15	1266:2	1074:2
1152:1	1197:2,4	1053:8 1055:7	1268:11	1075:12
highlighted	1199:16	1069:3	1355:9	1152:23
1097:1	1215:9 1216:1	1078:16	1357:15	1158:12,13,22
highly 1018:18	1217:6,8	1079:3	1363:13	1159:3,15
1056:22,25	1220:21	1126:22	1370:18,25	1160:4,5
1071:1 1082:9	1223:12,16,25	1144:15	identical 993:12	1162:7,8,18
1082:12	1225:13,24	1157:23,24	995:7 1102:20	1163:1,14
1122:24	1228:25	1168:9 1190:9	identified 999:7	1216:7
1199:18	1230:22,24	1190:11	1097:9,13	immediately
1209:17	1232:20	1191:2	1121:13	1016:1 1340:4
1248:17	1233:4 1234:8	hourly 1361:10	1122:7	impact 1060:18
1338:12	1234:12,24	1361:11	1219:24	1064:25
highway 1252:6	1235:16	hours 1015:21	1303:23	1105:19
highways	1267:25	1125:22	1311:8	1132:13
1252:5	1270:8,14	1127:11	1349:23	1135:15,20
hire 1240:23	1271:18	1128:7,11,12	identify 1004:4	1149:21,24
historical	1273:20	1128:15	1005:8	1181:1
1017:16,18	1278:21	1157:1	1014:25	1236:12,17
history 1310:24	1279:22	1220:16	1102:1	1237:5
hit 988:11	1280:2	1315:19	1112:21	1238:25
hold 1155:8	1281:24	hrbtsn@aol.c...	1123:22,25	1239:13
1258:23	1282:7	977:11	1124:21	1243:14
1286:17	1284:14	huh 1076:25	1160:21,23	1249:5
holes 1168:20	1289:11,19	1164:21	1338:23	1251:10
home 1192:22	1291:12	hundred	IEC 1330:7,25	1253:11,12,16
honest 1371:24	1294:22	1015:22	IEEE 1330:7,18	1253:21
1372:19	1295:9	1141:13	II 1068:5 1069:3	1254:5,21
honestly	1298:12,17	hundreds	1069:16,22	1256:18
1228:13	1299:4	1238:25	III 978:21	1257:5,10
Honor 984:5	1302:13	1240:10	1068:10,15	1262:7
1003:18	1327:14	1288:20	1069:5,6,8,24	1268:25
1017:22	1334:10,24	Hurst 1290:21	1070:2	1269:4
1082:7	1346:5,8	HVDC 1131:15	1109:18,21	1273:13
1105:21	1350:6	1132:4,6	1326:11	1274:2,20
1106:22	1354:22	1309:7,15,25	Illinois 997:8,15	1275:15
1108:6 1119:3	1365:12	1329:11	997:17,25	1276:11
1123:18	1366:2	1367:17	998:12 999:2	1277:2,13,23

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1278:17	1158:25	1112:9	incomplete	Independence
1280:15	1353:18	1121:10	1343:1	1009:15
1288:8 1307:7	1355:7	1123:2	inconsistent	1011:9
1308:7 1314:3	1370:19	1168:16	1229:7	independent
1315:7	improved	1169:7	incorporated	997:12
1322:19	1062:14	1196:20	1056:21	1134:23
1344:4 1369:6	1063:4	1239:3	increase	1136:3 1199:3
1370:5,8,11	improvements	1268:10	1062:14,18,18	INDEX 1374:2
impacted	1012:20	1336:5	1063:3 1064:6	1379:1
1181:25	1062:17	included 1013:2	1064:14,16,19	Indiana 1162:9
impacts 1235:25	1063:9,13	1017:7 1063:6	1064:23	indicate 990:24
1236:14	1064:24,25	1069:16	1104:5,20,21	1012:10
1254:8 1255:1	1241:6	1074:11	1172:21,22	1068:25
1257:3,7,12	1370:16	1102:25	1231:24	1307:1
1261:3,8,10,24	improves 987:5	1112:6 1140:2	1232:11	1313:24,25
1262:1 1270:7	in-camera	1142:2 1164:3	1301:19	indicated
1279:11	1018:22	1167:23	1307:8 1308:2	1165:3
1280:20,24	1082:16	1168:13	1308:8 1317:5	1219:23
1281:3,8	1199:24	1169:11,14,22	1367:3	1229:8
1287:13	1210:7	1169:23	increased	1329:23,24
1345:19	in-school	1182:24	1103:22	1330:10
implant 1285:16	1238:17	1300:23	1138:25	indicates
implement	in-service	1310:13	1357:12	1044:18
1005:25	1310:9	1338:23	increases 1064:3	1134:1
implicit 1345:15	inadequate	1339:1	1064:10,21	1160:10
implied 1194:16	1184:7,9	1351:18	1128:8	1162:17
important	incentive	includes	increasing	indicating
1042:15	1240:23	1042:23	1064:13	1047:1
1044:9	1264:7,22,23	1067:4	1110:25	1338:13
1096:11	incentives	1141:24	1139:4	indication
1108:14	1262:24	1143:5,11	1141:17,19	1079:4
1140:11	1264:15	1147:17	incremental	indications
1264:5 1285:9	1285:23	1168:11	1145:23	980:22,24
importantly	incentivize	1285:7	incrementally	981:12
987:6	1264:12	1337:17	1110:17	indicative
imported	inches 1102:2	including	increments	1079:15
1278:13	include 994:6	998:16 1006:1	1137:21	indirect 1241:23
importing	1006:17	1054:1 1146:3	incumbent	1241:25
1061:11	1045:7	1149:8 1355:4	1361:24	1242:1,4
1315:4	1051:19	income 1241:12	incur 1132:18	1258:3 1259:5
Imports	1052:10,20	1243:17	1220:11	1261:23
1249:19	1067:6,8,16,24	1247:17,21,25	incurred	1286:25
impossible	1067:25	1250:14	1189:21	1287:2,7
1242:15	1068:1	1262:10	1256:4	indirects 1287:4
1245:1,15	1079:13	1273:5,13,20	incurring	individual
1290:6	1096:25	incomes	1132:9 1192:2	984:22 1042:3
improve	1102:11	1250:13	1220:4	1042:6 1046:5

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1046:6 1099:8	1346:15	infrastructure	1225:6 1368:1	1309:4,6
1195:22	1350:14	1231:14	1368:7	1313:7,8,10,11
induced 1261:24	1365:21	infringe 1194:21	insightful	1314:5,9
indulgence	1379:15	ingredient	1359:19	1316:4,6
1364:13	1381:20	1288:4	installed	1320:4 1322:8
industrial 977:1	influence 1006:5	initial 1010:12	1139:15	1323:4,9
1000:17	inform 1081:6	1113:9	1140:25	1324:19,25
1112:21	information	1237:19	1147:19	1329:12
1224:24	1017:16,18	1250:1,3	1172:16	1342:25
industries	1018:19	1347:19	1173:7	1343:13
1261:8	1045:13,16,24	initially 1008:7	1193:19	1344:7
industry	1046:23	1236:11	instance	interconnectio...
1134:20	1047:1,5,20	1369:4	1189:25	1311:14
1135:2	1061:13	initiate 1347:14	1286:5 1347:9	1372:17
1172:12	1082:13	initiated 989:4	institutions	interconnector
1243:18	1108:13	1041:1	1219:13	1323:14
1340:18	1133:25	1230:18	insurance	interest 980:22
Infinity 976:20	1134:5 1135:3	initiative	1248:6	986:15 990:16
980:10 993:7,9	1141:24	1351:17	integrated	1046:13
997:13	1171:15	injection 1307:6	1154:9 1360:4	1068:25
1001:14	1194:19	1307:25	1361:10	1077:18,23,24
1003:6	1195:6	1308:6	intend 1170:6	1078:3 1283:4
1008:24	1199:22	1370:13	intended 1062:8	1299:14
1014:19	1218:7,8,11	input 1248:15	1324:1	1303:11,12
1050:15	1236:10	1274:14	intends 1314:7	1304:3 1318:3
1051:13	1239:23	1287:3 1288:1	1329:25	1319:19
1080:2,7,20	1243:15,22	input/output	intensive	1320:14,18
1081:8,18	1244:5 1251:5	1243:17	1239:12,12	1321:4,8,15
1099:10	1251:7,12	inputs 1248:13	intent 1006:22	interested
1116:9	1253:2,4,7,19	1248:13	1370:17	1041:16
1129:15	1253:24	1249:24	intentions	1283:7,17
1146:10	1255:18	1250:23	1283:24	1284:9,16
1176:11	1261:25	1251:9 1284:2	Interactions	1318:11
1178:3,14,22	1262:18	1306:10,16	1227:10	interests 981:15
1185:16,18	1266:1,19	inquire 1210:1	interchangeably	interface
1197:9	1267:9,11	1274:19	1321:5	1017:11
1217:10	1272:13,17	inquiries	interconnect	1052:9
1225:14	1273:9	1289:25	1138:6	1314:11
1235:4	1274:18	inquiry 1245:4	1208:17	interfere 1080:8
1295:19	1279:4,6	insert 1062:12	1314:12	interior 1140:2
1299:1	1280:14	1062:16	1370:7,22	1144:11
1302:22	1298:9	inserted	interconnected	intermediary
1319:5	1310:17,21	1097:20	1372:4	1249:9
1327:23	1327:5 1332:8	inserting	interconnection	intermediate
1334:19	1355:19	1355:11	974:16 994:9	1248:13
1341:16	1360:18,20	inside 1103:18	1138:3,8,10,13	1261:23
1342:5	1361:17,18,23	1111:18	1138:14,21	intermittent

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1371:18,21,22	1198:10,11	1198:8,25	1166:19	1242:9,10,16
internally	1240:25	1208:9 1209:8	1291:14	1261:6,16,17
1180:5	1241:3,4	1341:18	Jaskulski's	1261:18
interregional	1338:14	IRP 1041:20	1167:7	1262:20,22,25
1013:4	investments	1155:1	jdlington@rea...	1263:3,4
interrupted	1065:14	IRS 1198:18	975:12	1264:11,14
1107:2	1287:10	1199:3	Jefferson 974:9	1270:10
intervenors	investor	Island 1152:22	JG- 1014:1	1274:7,13
1133:15	1164:25	ISO 1131:4	JG-.55 1005:5	1275:25
1219:9	1272:21	1132:9	JG-11 1062:22	1276:22
introduced	1274:5 1340:9	ISOs 1130:22	JG-3 1014:2	1278:6
979:18	investors	issuance	1017:7	1279:11
1003:25	1337:18	1306:17	1051:22	1284:11
1008:11	1338:14	1337:19	1052:13	1285:10
1018:2 1115:8	invitation	issue 1096:14	1053:6 1058:3	1287:6,7,17
1121:2	1051:5	1158:3	1061:19	John 1004:6
1122:13	invited 980:16	1166:23	1103:4	1007:8,10,18
1124:4 1127:3	invoice 992:22	1180:12,19	1104:15,23	1045:11
1128:2	992:24	1270:25	1305:1	1367:20
1136:13	involve 1371:10	1271:5 1312:5	1368:20	1374:12
1148:17	involved	1312:12	1369:16	1380:10,12
1174:13	1040:16	1317:16	JG-37 1069:19	Johnson 975:18
1185:22	1168:21	issued 989:1,2	JG-5 1016:17	1333:6 1334:5
1223:11	1184:18	1136:17,22	JG-54 1069:12	1343:11
1226:16	1240:21	1199:2 1305:7	1109:17	1346:24
1234:7 1293:6	1265:12	1307:4	JG-6 1016:19,20	1347:2 1348:7
1293:23	1282:16	issues 1045:8	1016:24	1377:17,21
1325:5	1324:5	1118:22	1017:3	join 998:9
introducing	involves 1158:3	1140:4	1066:11	Joint 976:1
1108:7	1268:23	1191:11	1067:5 1068:5	979:1 1007:21
introduction	involving	1218:13	1069:2,17	1380:5
979:20 1005:1	1158:8 1241:5	1348:5	1070:3,10	JOSHUA 975:3
1005:19	Iowa 982:19	items 1227:2	1108:22	joshua.harden...
1008:13	1068:8,11	IX 1137:4,4	JG-7 1072:18	975:7
1194:23	1152:7 1153:9		1073:22	journals
inure 1096:12	1158:9	J	1111:3	1245:24
invariably	1160:11	J 974:22	JG-8 1110:14	Judge 974:19
1184:18	1162:6	J-a-s-k-u-l-s-k-i	1367:20,23	978:2 979:21
invention	1231:18	1166:20	JG.32 1050:13	980:1,4,8,10
1311:9	IPM 1050:5	Jamie 975:17	job 1240:2	980:11,12,14
investigation	1111:9	1226:2	1265:5	983:25 984:1,2
1272:25	Iron 993:9	January 989:3,9	1275:11	984:4 990:7
investment	1001:14	989:10 990:3	1297:19	991:8 994:12
986:22 987:4	1110:3	1103:11,25	1326:9	994:13
987:22 1001:8	1111:21	1107:17	jobs 986:22	1002:23
1065:16	1177:4	1109:21,22	987:4 1239:22	1003:1,2,4,6,8
1161:20,23	1183:17,18	Jaskulski	1240:6 1241:7	1003:10,12,13

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1003:21	1129:15,18,20	1235:14	1324:13,14	992:10
1005:2,20	1129:21,22,23	1244:10,18	1325:3,18,21	1009:12,14,15
1007:2,6	1129:24	1245:3	1327:9,11,15	1009:16
1008:14,18,19	1133:3,6	1246:17,19,24	1327:17,18,19	1010:11
1008:20,22,24	1136:19	1260:7,14	1327:21,23,25	1011:11
1008:25	1146:6,14	1266:8 1268:7	1328:2,4,5,7	1052:17
1009:1,3	1170:6,10,16	1270:11	1331:13,14,18	1057:15,24
1011:14,16,17	1170:20	1271:16,17	1331:19	1059:25
1011:18	1173:15,20	1273:16,17,22	1332:19,23	1061:21,25
1017:25	1175:21	1279:2,14,17	1334:7,11,13	1112:23
1018:7,13,16	1176:1,3,4,5,6	1279:24	1334:15,17,19	1118:10
1040:3,6	1176:7,9,11,14	1280:8,11	1334:21,23	1132:3
1042:17,20	1176:16,17	1281:10,13,25	1336:21	1134:25
1047:25	1177:12,13,15	1282:5	1342:10,11	1135:5,25
1048:5	1183:8,9	1283:14,25	1345:24	1140:1,10,12
1054:25	1184:23	1284:18	1346:1,6,9,10	1140:15
1055:3	1185:4	1286:16,20	1346:11,13,15	1143:11
1060:11,16,20	1186:18	1289:4,8,16,20	1346:17,19,20	1149:4 1150:9
1072:12	1187:1,5,10,12	1289:24	1346:21,22,23	1150:24
1080:21,25	1187:13,15,17	1290:4,20,25	1346:24	1151:5 1152:5
1082:6,10	1192:25	1291:5,9,16	1348:8,9,12,14	1152:9 1158:5
1096:3	1193:2,3,4,5,6	1292:1,9	1348:20	1165:7
1098:16,18,19	1193:7	1293:20	1350:3,7,9,10	1173:12
1098:21	1196:25	1295:1,3,6,10	1350:11,13,16	1189:10
1099:10,12,14	1197:3	1295:12,14,15	1350:18	1190:4
1099:25	1199:19	1295:17,19,20	1352:25	1191:19
1100:1,2,4,5,6	1208:3 1210:3	1295:21,23,24	1354:23	1362:2 1373:1
1100:7,8	1215:3,7,8,10	1296:16,17,20	1365:10,13,15	Kansas's
1101:21	1215:12,14,17	1296:21	1365:16,17,19	1121:21,25
1105:2,3	1215:19,20,21	1297:1,4,7	1365:21,23,25	KARL 975:4
1106:2,9,25	1215:22,23	1298:14,18,20	1369:1,10,22	karl.zobrist@...
1108:9,13	1217:4,7,9,13	1298:21,22,24	1373:7,8,10	975:8
1113:14,17,23	1220:19,23	1299:1,3,5,6	judgment	KCPL 983:21
1114:5,10,13	1221:1	1299:18,19	987:25 988:8	KCPL's 983:22
1114:22	1223:15,20	1300:3,4,8,9	997:18 1184:2	keep 1011:24
1115:5,20,22	1224:2,4,5,6	1300:10	June 1079:10	1046:1 1358:3
1116:2,4,5,6,7	1225:9,12,14	1302:10,14,16	1365:2	keeping 1256:7
1116:9,11,13	1225:16,25	1302:17,18,20	justify 1045:6	1359:5
1116:16,17,18	1226:1 1229:3	1302:22,23,24	1359:7	Kelly 1308:10
1116:20,21,22	1229:22,23,24	1303:1,3	Justis 1291:24	Kelly's 1307:16
1116:23,24	1230:2,23	1305:12,13,15		KENNEY
1119:4,8,10,16	1232:21	1312:22,23	K	974:21
1119:20,25	1233:2,5	1318:19,22,24	K-l-i-e-t-h-e-r...	kept 1132:12
1120:6 1124:5	1234:11,15,20	1318:25	1300:21	Kevin 975:15
1124:13,18	1234:22,23,25	1319:1,3,5,7,9	K.T 975:3	1292:15
1125:3,5,6,7,8	1235:2,4,6,8,9	1319:10	Kansas 983:16	kevin.thomps...
1125:9	1235:10,11,12	1322:1,2	983:18,19	975:19

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

key 1146:1	990:19,20	1135:5,6	1267:2,4,17	1252:14
1164:5	991:5,16,20	1141:17,21	1268:2	1254:8 1268:8
Kielisch	995:20	1144:20,21	1269:13,15	1270:23
1291:15	1005:11	1149:13,15	1277:10	1271:8,11,12
kilovolt 1198:24	1006:14	1150:2,5,11,16	1278:20	1279:4,5
kilowatt 1168:9	1380:17	1151:7,14,15	1280:13	1288:10
1193:20	kite 1161:18	1151:22	1288:14,18,19	1293:14
1196:2	Kliethermes	1152:9,10,19	1290:4,17,23	1294:19
Kincheloe	1300:13,20	1156:25	1294:18	1298:10
978:10,11,21	1303:6 1322:6	1162:5	1304:17	1305:23,25
978:23 984:8	1325:19	1165:16,17,24	1306:14	1306:8 1327:7
989:20 991:17	1336:18	1166:5,6	1308:17	1333:25
994:12 1004:3	1341:24	1168:16	1311:1	1339:8
1005:4 1007:2	1348:17	1169:25	1314:16	1343:10
1040:20	1359:10	1173:8	1316:1,2	known 1007:20
1043:8 1044:6	1362:24	1178:10	1317:15	1371:17
1044:20	1377:2	1188:3	1318:1,6,8,11	knows 1055:1
1076:19	Kliethermes's	1191:12	1318:12,15	KOTTLER
1374:4 1380:8	1319:12	1192:19	1324:24	975:5
kind 1076:21	knew 1042:19	1197:13	1347:17	KWP1 992:8,9
1117:14	1372:11	1209:5 1220:3	1348:18	992:13,19,22
1118:5	knock 1245:1,10	1220:14	1351:24	993:14 994:5
1152:19	know 982:7	1229:16	1352:13	KWPI 992:3,5
1159:3	983:14,17,20	1230:14,19	1355:19	
1161:10	985:25 996:12	1237:9,11,11	1356:9 1357:2	L
1179:25	996:13 997:20	1238:4,12,16	1357:24	L 976:3
1180:25	998:3,7,13	1239:13	1358:6,19	L-a-n-g-e
1182:24	1000:12,20,22	1240:1	1360:3,11,13	1326:7
1190:13,15	1009:10,17,21	1242:21,24	1360:16,17,19	Lab 1218:13
1229:14,15	1010:1,9,20	1243:2,3,21	1360:23	label 1127:22
1241:8 1248:1	1011:5,9	1245:8 1246:8	1361:7,9,19,20	labeled 1069:5,6
1272:24	1040:14	1247:4,11	1363:9 1364:2	1111:4
1279:10	1042:18	1251:6,8	1364:3,10	labor 1239:12
1288:8	1044:13	1252:2,22	1365:6	Laboratory
1310:21	1059:23	1253:6,18	1366:24	1146:21
1319:22	1063:18	1254:3,10	1367:13,14	1195:4
1343:20	1072:15,17	1255:10,16	1372:12	lack 1188:11
1345:3 1354:7	1106:12	1256:9,12,13	knowing	1277:23
1370:17	1107:10	1257:5,7	1319:23	1344:7
1371:25	1109:23	1258:2,3,7,17	knowledge	Lake 1068:5,10
kinda 1110:22	1111:20	1259:1,4	988:22	1068:15
1225:20	1118:10	1260:11,12	1061:24	1069:2,5,6,8
1257:22	1126:5,6,8,8	1261:22	1117:20,24	1069:16,22,23
1323:6	1126:10	1262:16	1118:9,14	1070:2
1339:17	1131:3,18,19	1263:7,11,21	1175:16,17	1109:18,21
kinds 1341:11	1132:11	1265:10,21	1218:2	land 1149:8,25
Kirkwood 981:2	1133:24	1266:9 1267:1	1230:15	1150:4

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1151:23	1365:11,13	1126:25	Leidos 1056:19	1051:6 1124:8
1180:9,20,21	1379:11,21	1290:8	1101:19,25	1183:5
1181:14,21	landscape	1291:20	1102:12,23	1223:17
1199:12	1236:4,19,24	latest 1137:1	1103:2	1234:13
1236:7,7	Lange 1317:3	1143:7	lender 1191:14	life 1002:18
1241:6	1325:23	latitude 1106:7	1191:15	Light 981:12
landowner	1326:4,6,8	LAW 974:19	lesser 1314:3	996:2
1180:1,7,13	1327:10	Lawlor 1053:18	let's 978:2	lights 1357:3
1182:18	1328:10	1053:25	982:18	1358:3,11,17
1227:9,20	1331:22	1054:24	1042:12	1359:5
1229:14,15	1332:17	1055:1	1074:17	likelihood
1250:10	1377:11	1250:16,17,18	1114:10	1339:15
landowner's	Langley	Lawlor's 1054:7	1168:7 1172:1	1358:11
1228:20	1173:23	Lawrence	1188:2,10	limit 985:2
1229:10,13	1185:5,6,14	1195:3	1193:16	988:12
landowners	1187:9,22	1218:12	1194:5	1017:10
975:10,21	1193:11	Lawson 1250:8	1195:17	1153:17
984:2,4	1196:23	1250:16	1208:25	limitations
1003:14,16	1217:12	lawyer 1335:21	1257:18	1011:1
1011:17	1220:19	LBNL 1218:12	1262:1,7	1314:20
1040:5 1081:6	1375:15	LCOE 1371:3	1268:20	limited 988:16
1100:2,6	1381:22,24	lead 1013:8	1292:3	1112:13
1111:22	Langley's	1060:14	1332:23	1150:4
1116:18,22	1146:11	1064:21	1348:12	limiting 1142:1
1117:4 1124:7	1186:14	1065:9	1357:6	Linden's 1250:5
1124:11	language 1227:6	1130:22	1366:22,24	line 974:12,15
1129:24	large 1110:17,19	1159:15	letting 1364:14	974:17 975:2
1130:5 1133:6	1110:22	1273:5 1345:6	level 1055:6	983:13 985:2,6
1133:14	1161:22	1353:8	1075:22	986:16,21
1175:11,23	1162:10	1370:23	1132:12	987:2,13
1181:6 1182:5	1170:1	leading 1080:23	1195:22	988:20 989:5
1183:4,11	largely 1139:15	1108:8	1256:14,20	989:22 990:11
1193:6 1197:3	larger 996:15	1286:18	1265:10	991:1,21
1215:24	1013:15,19,23	leads 1267:12	1338:13	993:17 997:7
1217:7	1110:20	1356:20	levelize 1360:9	1001:16
1229:25	1144:22	leak 1249:19	levelized 1062:4	1006:22
1230:23	1161:23	learn 1178:3	1140:16	1012:5,11
1235:12	1172:25	leave 1045:9	1317:22	1040:13,22
1271:17	1173:7	1218:24	1318:11	1041:17
1295:7,10	1257:11	leeway 1229:14	1359:11	1043:14
1298:15,18	1259:5	1271:1	1360:2,3,23	1044:9,12
1302:11,14	largest 1154:12	left 1014:8	1361:3 1369:5	1045:21
1318:20,22	1219:6	1141:3	LEWIS 977:2	1046:22
1327:12,15	late 1040:15	left-hand 1015:4	lewis.mills@b...	1049:9 1050:4
1334:8,11	1042:12,12	legal 996:5	977:3	1053:24
1346:3,6	1046:20	1194:17	liability 1194:17	1066:7
1350:4,7	1113:21	1320:16	lieu 985:16,18	1073:15

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1077:8,19	1230:8 1250:4	1264:25	1295:11	983:15
1078:3	1250:22	lines 998:22	1298:19	1009:10
1081:10	1251:5,9	1053:1 1054:8	1302:15	1012:1
1098:6	1255:10	1061:18	1318:23	1048:21
1105:22	1268:24	1063:2 1064:1	1327:16	1067:19
1118:11,17,17	1271:2,24	1065:7 1073:4	1334:12	1068:3 1076:3
1130:10	1274:22	1078:11,18	1346:7 1350:8	1076:3 1109:9
1131:15	1276:1,16	1117:10	1365:14	1109:10
1132:4,6,24	1277:8,18	1118:1	1374:15	1111:15,18
1133:22	1278:16	1121:20	1375:5,10,13	1112:20
1134:3,6,15,18	1279:13,20	1138:19	1375:18,21	1156:23,24
1135:1 1139:9	1280:2,4,21,24	1162:2,5	liquidated	1157:19
1139:13	1281:4,9	1164:24	1001:24	1161:22,25
1142:5 1145:8	1286:12	1168:20	list 1186:21	1164:10
1147:16,22	1288:15	1183:4	1290:24	1189:24
1150:16,17	1301:25	1209:12	listed 1067:24	1305:19
1153:8,20	1310:11	1226:6	1074:5	1355:21,23
1154:24	1311:1 1313:6	1275:16	listen 1018:18	1356:10,19,19
1155:11,12,14	1313:25	1276:17,19,24	1082:12	load-serving
1155:16	1314:1,6,7,10	1277:3 1311:7	1199:21	1131:7
1157:22,23	1314:12	1311:9 1351:8	1359:20	1145:20
1159:6,11,16	1315:18,21,24	1355:16	literally 1251:25	1168:25
1160:2,9,19	1326:22	1364:11	1314:15	1219:7
1162:5,16	1331:24	1371:10	1315:19	1340:16
1163:13,25	1338:14	1372:16	1358:3	1341:3,7
1165:12	1343:8	Linton 975:11	little 990:8	loads 998:7
1166:18	1344:24	984:3 1003:15	994:20 996:15	1067:20
1167:12,14,18	1345:4,5,12	1011:18,20	1106:7	1097:18
1167:24	1347:8 1354:9	1017:22	1107:10	1131:2,8
1175:12	1354:12	1018:3,11	1128:10	1361:11
1188:2,8,11,18	1355:3 1356:5	1100:3 1108:6	1191:4,6	local 986:11
1192:6,17	1356:11,16	1116:19	1196:17	1045:22
1193:17,24,25	1361:2,3	1129:25	1246:17	1245:25
1194:2 1199:9	1362:1,15,15	1130:2,4	1259:3 1290:9	1251:18
1208:19	1362:23	1132:25	1309:18	1268:12
1216:8	1363:1,3,13,25	1174:4,14	1358:22	1278:11,17
1217:19	1364:4,9,14,18	1175:18	1359:1,3	located 1126:7
1218:22	1364:23	1177:25	1364:7 1371:2	1161:24
1220:3	1365:4,8	1183:12,15	live 1002:16	1165:6
1222:10,12,17	1366:5 1368:3	1184:21	LLC 974:13	location 1010:18
1223:4	1368:5 1372:3	1193:7,10	975:2 1226:21	1010:20,20
1224:14	1373:1 1379:7	1196:23	LMP 1366:25	1181:25
1226:21	line's 1222:18	1215:25	1367:2,5,6	1229:17
1227:5,11,15	1255:11	1216:3 1217:3	1368:1	1363:14
1227:18,19,21	1313:17	1230:1	LMPs 1367:8	locations
1227:23	1320:1	1235:13	1368:7,9	1058:18
1229:17,18	linear 1264:15	1291:23	load 982:20	lock 1198:15

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

locked 1198:9	1321:3 1325:8	1144:14	1256:10	1163:4,7
logical 1277:6	1345:18	1156:24	1258:20	1361:3
long 1113:1,21	1347:25	1290:15	1264:7	LSE 1366:25
1208:23	1351:8	1323:15	1265:13	lunch 1113:22
1270:4 1290:1	1355:10	1356:6	1268:6 1286:3	1114:6
1314:10	1356:22	Loomis 1251:6	1344:2	1119:17,19
1352:10	1357:6	Loomis's 1251:4	1345:18	Lutzville 1311:1
1357:21	1366:24	lose 1074:1	lots 1247:3	
long-winded	1368:14	1131:17	Louis 1274:23	M
1243:19	looked 1102:8	losing 1044:25	love 1044:13	M 974:21
longer 988:12	1150:21	loss 1156:24	low 1117:11	M-i-c-h-a-e-l
1173:1 1220:3	1183:23,25	1252:23	1118:10	1333:9
1240:7	1189:13	1255:16	1137:13	M-J-M-E-U-...
1289:22	1257:23	1265:20	1157:18	984:14
1290:9	1270:19	1267:19	1161:21	M-o-P-E-P
1310:24	1271:5	1272:21	1167:14	984:20
look 981:21	1304:17,18	1273:4	1173:4 1177:9	M-u-r-r-a-y
992:1 997:19	1314:23	1305:19	1191:4	1297:17
999:24 1004:3	1315:1,2,9	1355:21,23	1196:16	machinery
1013:14	1320:13	1356:10,19	1315:7 1320:3	1287:16
1014:1	1339:2 1361:7	losses 1016:3	1320:11	magnitude
1042:25	looking 999:25	1107:17	1353:10	1261:9
1044:17	1014:4	1220:12,14	Lowell 1317:16	MAIDA 974:22
1080:3	1016:24	1275:12	Lowenstein	main 1198:23
1097:17	1042:11	1283:9,19	1291:15	maintain 974:15
1105:5	1043:13	1284:10	lower 986:20	1075:22
1110:25	1044:22,24	lost 1044:9	987:1,10 988:4	maintained
1137:17	1049:5 1050:6	1057:18	1017:9 1118:3	1370:20
1143:10	1059:14	1246:3	1126:9	maintenance
1144:24	1067:3	1251:18	1144:23	1000:22
1150:22	1070:10	1255:12	1145:2	1001:2
1152:7 1168:7	1096:23	1266:3,14,15	1149:12,17,17	major 1141:25
1177:9 1190:3	1141:18	1266:20,22	1150:5 1151:6	1149:21,23
1238:3 1240:2	1142:18	1267:20	1157:8	1168:21
1240:15	1150:2,15,19	1269:4,6,17	1160:14,15	1338:14
1260:24	1163:21	1270:3 1273:1	1161:20	majority 1168:2
1262:3,13	1232:17	1273:24	1165:18	1170:1
1263:2,21	1239:21	1274:8	1275:5,8	making 987:24
1273:10,12,23	1244:7,17,21	1275:25	1353:9,12	1323:8
1274:2,7,17,20	1258:3,3	1278:7	1358:21	1372:15
1275:11,15,19	1264:16	lot 986:7	1359:1	Mamtek
1275:24	1286:9 1310:5	1005:25	1366:17	1263:25
1276:11,15,22	1329:3	1043:17	lowers 1097:18	1264:19
1277:2,11,13	1344:22	1046:14	1359:3	1282:14,15
1277:20,22	1351:9	1112:2	lowest 999:9	1347:18,20
1278:6 1281:2	1356:15,17	1139:19	1128:20	manage 974:14
1281:8 1318:8	looks 1142:10	1219:1 1256:6	1161:16	1371:21

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

manager 1233:22 1236:15 1297:21	1148:12 1174:15,19 1178:1 1292:24	1155:9 math 1060:9,12 1060:22 1061:2,8 1107:15,22 1108:10,11 1152:13,15,16	1263:20 1265:13 1266:21 1269:24 1275:20 1276:16 1286:18 1315:14 1317:15 1347:15 1361:19,22 1363:24 1364:22	meeting 1004:13 1004:15 1129:10 1224:17 1351:13 megawatt 981:13 985:2 988:11 995:24 996:19 1004:24 1012:7,7 1013:11,15 1015:18,20,20 1016:14 1052:14,14 1053:8 1055:7 1060:4,8 1069:3 1074:14 1078:16 1079:3 1103:8 1105:6 1108:1 1110:19 1125:21 1126:22 1127:11 1128:7,11,12 1128:15 1144:15 1157:23,24 1190:1,6,9,11 1220:16 1307:3,6,25 1308:6 1329:11 1373:4 megawatts 981:4,7,11,11 984:10,22 988:16 990:21 995:5,19,20 996:3 1004:24 1016:8 1048:13,22,25 1053:9 1060:24 1061:5,12
mandates 1161:15 1163:7	1293:3 1297:25 1300:24 1302:4 1325:7 1326:14	mathematical 1148:4 Matt 1185:6,14 1375:15 1381:22,24		
manner 1046:8 1310:2 1314:1		matter 974:12 1238:23 1291:19	meaning 1071:16,20 1310:10 1317:7	
manufacturer 1242:7	market 1010:13 1011:2 1057:2 1057:3 1071:14 1130:13 1136:5,11 1138:17 1140:19 1145:11 1159:13 1165:16 1171:23 1190:25 1192:10 1193:18 1217:19 1220:9 1256:8 1284:25 1318:13 1379:20	Maywood-Mo... 974:17 MC 1075:5 mean 992:5 997:11 1000:16 1049:16 1078:22 1103:16 1110:19 1131:19 1141:15 1156:18 1182:9 1197:23 1199:11 1218:10 1237:22 1239:5 1241:10,16 1243:20 1244:6 1245:8 1245:11 1246:13 1251:17,21,24 1252:11 1254:4,13 1255:8 1256:6 1256:23 1257:14,17,24 1258:14 1259:21	means 1049:5,9 1059:1 1151:20,21 1157:12 1317:1 1321:11 meant 1184:6 1337:12 measure 1357:20 measurements 999:5 measures 1357:23 mechanism 1058:15,24 1371:17 median 1107:19 meet 1012:1 1073:19 1121:22 1122:1 1125:20 1126:16 1153:22 1160:15,16 1306:10 1358:21	
manufacturing 1242:8 1287:17				
map 1139:23 1145:17				
March 974:7 978:3 991:24 1069:12 1122:5 1123:12 1382:9				
margin 1044:10 1148:24 1155:7 1156:4 1273:24 1301:20,20 1307:8 1308:2 1308:8				
margins 1273:2				
mark 975:18 981:3 1105:15 1250:18,18 1315:21,23 1323:20 1324:5,8 1363:13,21,23 1363:25 1364:4,9 1365:8 1368:3 1368:4,9	Marketer 1048:8 Marketing 997:9,16,17 998:12 999:3 1000:4,13 1050:17,21,25 markets 1011:3 1191:23 1366:15 Marshall 1075:3 massive 1263:22 1317:13 match 1070:16 1070:16 matching			
marked 979:7 1003:23 1008:1 1017:23 1082:8 1127:7 1136:9				

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1066:9	1054:3 1056:8	1157:5,7,7,9	1225:16	1099:13
1068:17,20,25	1056:10	1157:17,20	1235:6	1116:12
1074:3,5,9,12	1057:22	methodology	1295:15	1129:19
1074:13	1077:6	1164:9	1298:22	1176:8 1193:1
1075:9,25	1099:21	1198:20,21	1302:18	1215:18
1076:7	1100:14,16	1238:4,7	1319:1	1225:18,23
1097:19,22	1133:21	methods	1327:19	1235:7
1098:5,10,11	1134:2,20,21	1157:19	1334:15	1289:24
1099:1,3,5	1294:4	metric 1150:19	1346:11	1295:16
1105:8	1306:15	metrics 1257:14	1350:11	1298:23
1125:23	1309:14,16	1286:3,5,14	1365:17	1302:19
1128:21	1310:23	MG-1 1121:13	migrants	1319:2
1129:3,7,9	1352:16	MG-7 1121:13	1254:20	1327:20
1160:13	membership	mic 990:8	1268:10	1334:16
1199:13	1046:4 1097:9	1217:14	migration	1346:12
1220:15	memory 1104:3	Michael 974:19	1243:18	1350:12
1277:7	1110:1 1269:9	1119:22	Mike 1237:14	1365:18
1319:16	mention 989:22	1120:2,14	miles 1363:24	1376:5
1345:17	990:18 1046:2	1121:7	1363:25	mind 1002:6
1355:5	1076:16	1122:18	million 999:20	1298:5
1357:11	1232:8	1123:22,25	1000:10	1316:22
1364:19,21	mentioned	1125:1 1333:1	1002:15	1352:7
Meisenheimer	990:14 995:24	1333:9 1375:2	1016:9,11	mine 1062:8
1221:4,13	996:18	1377:16	1053:3,7,11,20	1072:6
1224:9	1113:18	1381:3,5,7,10	1054:2,9,22	Mineral
1225:19	1114:2	MICHELE	1059:16,17	1274:23
1226:5	1155:22	975:6	1060:25	1275:13
1227:23	1209:12	microphone	1061:6,10	minimal 1162:4
1229:5,21	1216:6	1116:25	1096:17,22	minimum
1231:3 1233:6	1226:11	middle 992:15	1097:13	1075:22
1270:16	1284:20	1122:22	1098:1,8,9,25	1189:25
1376:2	1286:2,24	1126:15	1105:11	1190:2
1380:20	1320:4 1366:5	1147:22	1106:11	Minnesota
member 982:5	1368:3	1314:15	1107:8	1153:9
985:10 990:25	merchant	midpoint	1125:21	1160:11
993:13 996:8	1118:11	1013:14,21	1126:22	minor 1166:14
1043:11	1132:5 1309:7	midst 990:5	1127:11	1222:3
1046:18	1309:15	1080:1	1128:14	minus 1248:12
1076:22	1340:9	MIEC 977:1	1129:4	minute 1102:8
1077:5,14,17	met 1113:8	980:12 1003:8	1247:16,17	1311:20
1096:12	1151:24	1009:1	1248:24	minutes 1004:12
1131:16	1161:15	1099:12	1249:8	1004:17,20,21
1360:13	1163:7	1116:11	1257:19,21,21	1018:20
members 982:4	1306:15,19	1129:18	1264:12	1082:14
982:14 984:23	method 1011:2	1176:7	Mills 977:2	1220:24
984:25 985:1	1156:8,12,20	1192:25	980:13 1003:9	1260:9 1266:7
985:22 987:12	1156:23,24	1215:17	1009:2	1279:16

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1351:1	1319:16	1135:11,13,17	1315:8,21	1353:22
misheard	1320:4 1322:6	1135:21,25	1316:10,13	MJM-13
1322:13	1322:11,14,23	1140:1,6	1318:7,15,20	1053:14
MISO 982:1,4,9	1323:7 1324:2	1147:9	1320:10,22	1055:5
982:14,14	1344:4 1355:8	1149:16,23,24	1326:11	1056:21
1012:23,24	1357:10	1150:25	1327:12	MJM-15 1056:2
1014:3	1358:16	1151:4,9	1329:11	MJM.13
1017:12	1362:25	1152:17	1331:7	1056:15
1052:8,11	1363:7	1160:11	1333:13	1057:12
1058:15,24	1367:10,14,16	1162:5,7,11	1334:8	MJM.17 1051:2
1067:17,18,18	1368:5,21	1167:15	1336:15	MJM.28 1081:3
1067:20,24	1369:6,17	1175:23	1344:23	MJM.62 1077:1
1079:1	1370:4,21	1179:15	1345:13,19	MJMEUC
1097:20	1371:16,20	1197:3 1217:7	1346:3 1350:3	978:8 981:16
1103:6 1104:8	MISO's 1163:13	1222:12	1351:10,13	984:9,14,21,25
1106:20	1370:9	1226:21	1355:8,10	985:9,11,20
1108:4 1109:2	Missouri 974:1	1230:23	1357:10	987:12 988:4
1109:3,6,10	974:8 975:14	1231:22	1361:3	990:2 991:20
1131:10,15,16	975:21 976:1,8	1232:2,12	1363:15	992:17,19,22
1131:23,23	976:12 977:1	1236:9 1246:1	1364:9,18	993:3,7,13
1132:7,17	979:1 982:20	1248:23,25	1365:11	994:22,25
1146:3 1153:3	983:14 984:4	1249:11,17	1368:2,8	995:1,8,8,13
1153:13,18,25	984:17 987:8	1253:9,11	1370:4 1373:5	995:14,17
1158:5,24	1003:16	1256:15	1379:3,11	996:8 997:7
1159:1,4	1007:20	1262:22	1380:5,19	1003:19
1160:5,20	1009:11	1265:5	1382:5	1004:13
1161:7	1040:5	1271:17	Missouri's	1005:10
1162:17	1042:15	1272:2,9	1361:15	1006:18
1163:2,4,21,22	1043:6,18	1273:4,14	1364:25	1007:20
1163:23	1045:1,3,4,23	1274:8,14	1365:5	1011:24
1164:3,5,10	1057:25	1275:17,25	Missourian	1041:15
1165:14,20,22	1059:25	1276:17,23	1358:16	1042:8 1046:5
1166:3,7	1071:2 1076:7	1277:8,9,15,18	Missourians	1046:13
1177:8	1076:23	1278:7,8,12	1319:19	1048:7 1051:4
1189:10	1077:7,15,19	1279:21	mistake 1167:3	1053:19
1192:8,10,15	1078:4 1081:6	1280:3	1167:4	1054:2,10
1192:18	1100:6	1284:11	mitigate	1056:7,8,10
1219:25	1111:22	1285:24	1343:18	1075:21
1222:13	1116:22	1295:7	1362:7 1370:7	1077:5,6
1231:19	1117:4,12,15	1297:20	mitigated	1079:7,21
1305:1 1309:5	1124:7,11	1298:15	1344:8	1081:8
1309:14	1125:21	1302:11	1370:11	1096:20
1310:1,14,14	1126:9 1129:4	1307:4,7,25	mitigation	1097:6,23
1313:7,10,23	1129:7,9	1308:7	1370:6,24	1098:4 1100:8
1313:25	1130:21	1310:12	mix 1160:24	1100:17,25
1314:15,20	1133:6,14	1311:15	1161:1	1101:6
1316:4	1134:24	1312:8 1315:6	1291:24	1108:20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1116:5 1125:6	1190:19	1243:2,6,11	984:16,17,23	1186:13
1176:16,25	1193:15,21	1264:6 1285:3	985:1 991:15	1189:9,21
1177:4,10	MoBap 981:1	1285:17,22	993:21 994:21	1223:12
1187:13	mobiling 1217:1	1287:1,1	994:25 995:2,7	1227:12,20
1192:11	model 1238:8,8	modest 1142:20	995:11,17,17	1234:9
1197:18	1238:15	modifications	995:19 998:9	1246:21
1198:7 1199:6	1239:13,14	1223:14	999:22,24	1323:18
1215:8	1241:25	MoDOT 1239:9	1000:9	1324:1 1352:4
1218:25	1242:17	moment 1002:7	1004:22	1363:22
1219:7 1224:5	1243:1,3,8	1072:19	1046:4,19	moved 1123:20
1224:18	1244:20	1078:9	1048:16,17,21	1146:9,12
1234:23	1245:2,19,22	1106:21	1049:25	1366:7
1295:23	1246:5,7,8,9	1159:21,22	1055:17	moving 1111:9
1296:6,13	1249:7,13	1215:6	1066:9,20	1188:22
1299:5 1303:1	1254:17	1226:18	1075:21	1189:3
1303:25	1256:13	1270:13	1077:21	1250:14
1304:10,16	1258:2,21,25	1316:20	1096:16	multi 981:25
1305:8 1318:3	1259:1,8,16	1363:6	1097:2,2,9,13	multi-value
1319:9 1320:5	1260:6,24	Monday	1098:8 1099:2	982:16 983:4,6
1328:2	1261:7,13,15	1291:19	1100:19	1158:23
1334:23	1264:3	money 1244:8	1110:16	1161:10
1335:13,16,19	1274:12	1244:23	1112:10,16	multiple 1219:4
1335:25	1281:16	1245:17,18	1224:22	1219:4
1336:1,6	1282:19	1247:6	1352:2	multiply
1340:17	1283:11,20	1248:18	1379:18	1015:19
1341:7,17,21	1284:3,12	1256:7	morning 978:3	municipal 976:1
1341:25	1285:4,5,8,11	1258:20	978:17,18	979:2 980:22
1342:6,6	1285:19	1287:10	984:8 990:15	981:2,14
1346:19	1287:5,25	monitoring	991:9 994:18	984:22 988:8
1350:18	1289:2 1306:2	1309:25	994:19	988:13 990:14
1352:8,11,14	1330:2,4	month 1048:11	1002:12	999:11
1352:19	1340:17	1060:5 1103:8	1009:8,9	1000:18
1365:25	1341:4,9	1106:16	1011:21,22	1001:6
1371:13	1344:12,16	1190:2,7	1040:9,10	1007:21
1379:17	1355:24	1209:2	1096:7,8	1273:2 1274:5
1380:2,13,15	1356:7	1285:13	1117:3	1380:5
MJMEUC's	1361:10	1315:5	1304:22	municipalities
994:7 1001:11	modeled 1011:2	months 988:25	motion 1124:14	987:15 998:8
1100:15	modeling	989:11	motto 1197:11	1005:7 1042:3
ML-2 1194:1,3	1236:12,18	1044:11	move 979:19	1042:7,11
MLA 1080:5	1244:1 1245:9	1080:15	990:8 1004:25	1320:7
1223:22	1257:6	1082:2	1005:18	1336:15
1234:17	1284:24	1192:19,21	1008:12	1351:13
MLA's 1223:18	1287:20	1209:6	1115:20	munis 1045:1
1234:14	1288:22	1216:17,18	1123:19,20,23	1351:18
Mm-hmm	models 1241:11	1372:5	1124:1	Murray 1297:8
1188:9,15	1242:23,25	MoPEP 984:11	1170:13	1297:9,15,17

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1298:13	1174:6	1192:17	1321:9	net 1071:7
1299:9,23	1185:12	1259:16	1349:12	1132:13
1300:11	1221:12,13	1347:15	1352:15	1255:4
1337:25	1233:16	necessary	needed 1066:9	1267:14,23
1376:20	1292:12,15	1132:10,12	1128:21	1268:18
Murray's	1297:15	1189:23	1184:9	nets 1254:10
1337:22	1300:19	1274:14	1188:13	1255:2
1338:17	1326:5,6	1288:3	1287:16,17,17	1268:21
MVP 982:21	1333:7 1349:4	1313:24	1359:16,25	1269:24
1012:23	narrative	1322:25	needs 996:3	netting 1254:15
1162:2,6,17,18	1243:22	1343:1	998:6 1073:13	1268:22
1163:4 1164:3	1300:22	necessity 974:13	1102:19	network 1006:2
1164:4,8,11	1301:2	1328:14	1121:23	1067:21
Myers 975:17	1333:16	1371:6,9,10	1122:2	1068:2
1129:21	narrow 1044:10	need 981:21	1153:22	1131:24
1176:6 1193:3	Natelle 1292:5	990:10 1001:3	1160:16	1184:14
1215:20	1292:13,19	1018:19	1242:7	never 1166:22
1226:1,2,4,17	1376:16	1046:21	1351:12	1243:7 1259:6
1229:20	1379:4	1047:3 1049:4	negative	1261:22
1235:9 1297:7	NATHAN	1073:6,9	1253:21	1288:18
1297:14	975:16	1082:13	1257:7	1289:1 1339:8
1298:12	national	1099:20	1278:17	1354:6 1358:1
1300:9 1326:3	1145:24	1101:20	1279:11	nevertheless
1327:9	1146:1 1195:3	1109:4,8	1280:20,24	1196:17
1331:10,19,21	1218:12	1114:23	1281:3,8	new 986:22,22
1332:17	1236:23	1125:20	1321:7	987:3,4,22
1376:6,21	nationwide	1128:10	1366:23	1011:3
1377:12,14	1145:4	1165:1	1367:6	1105:15,23
	natural 1115:11	1173:20	Negotiated	1108:7,8
	1125:15	1175:4	1216:22	1132:11
N	1137:13	1178:13,18,21	negotiating	1148:15
N-a-t-e-l-l-e	1138:24	1184:3,4,6,11	1216:24	1156:8,12
1292:13	1145:2,13	1184:24	negotiation	1157:4
N-E-R-C 1330:7	1146:20	1189:9 1192:7	995:25	1161:17,19
name 978:19	1362:11	1192:8,9	negotiations	1184:12
1007:16	nature 1018:9	1199:22	1079:22	1261:5,6,16,18
1073:21	1134:9 1258:6	1210:1	1080:1,7,8,20	1276:6,12
1114:18,20	near 1137:5	1216:11	1081:7	1277:24
1117:3	1167:11	1220:5,13	1111:21	1281:14
1120:12,12,14	1231:6	1225:4	1181:12	1288:7,21
1120:15	nearly 1061:10	1248:15	neither 1064:12	1311:13
1125:14	1104:6	1260:20	1101:6	1340:14
1130:3	Nebraska	1278:4	1194:14	1348:4 1356:1
1133:13	1153:9	1290:12	NERC 1329:25	1364:11
1139:11,14	necessarily	1311:13	1330:1,4,7,22	1365:4
1155:5,22	1010:17	1313:9	1332:11	1371:16
1156:3	1165:24	1317:24	1370:24	1372:16,16
1157:13				

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1379:12	1172:4,13	1354:18	1270:6,6	oath 978:13
newer 1104:13	notes 1151:14	number 978:5	1275:24	1007:12
newly 1139:14	1238:3	984:18 992:10	1276:22	1114:24
night 981:5	notice 1194:10	1002:19	1280:6	1115:3 1120:4
1101:15	1194:13	1015:17	1284:21	1174:1 1185:8
1291:20	1336:5	1016:1	1287:15,16	1221:6
nine 1351:1	notified 989:17	1053:14	1302:5	1233:12
nods 1058:1	notify 1175:10	1060:6 1079:2	1303:12	1292:7
non-agricultu...	Noting 1144:16	1079:12,15	1309:9	1297:11
1256:3	November	1082:2	1311:11	1300:15
non-profit	985:6 1042:13	1097:14	1329:3	1325:25
1320:6	1045:18	1103:9,21	1333:18	1333:3
non-proprieta...	1046:20	1104:2,14,14	1356:20	1348:24
1186:16,25	1057:7,9	1105:7,10,16	1358:22	object 991:8
non-solar	1080:12	1106:18,23	1359:1	1047:25
1125:22	1081:14	1107:16,23	numbering	1080:21
1127:10	NP 1008:10,11	1121:5	1186:22,22	1105:22
1128:6,19	1008:15,15	1122:16	numbers	1244:11,15
noon 1113:19,19	1186:19	1123:23	1002:20	1246:16,18,25
normal 1059:24	1187:2	1124:16	1054:15	1260:12
1060:24	1293:22,25	1126:4,15	1104:15,17	1268:1 1270:8
1061:9	1297:24	1148:7	1106:3,7	1278:22
normally	1333:18	1149:15	1107:22	1279:22
1060:19	1379:5 1380:9	1151:16	1142:9 1149:9	1284:15
1072:13	1380:11	1152:23	1150:23	1286:17
1356:25	1381:4,23	1155:11,16	1156:11	1368:23
North 1160:10	NRDC 977:9	1157:17,18	1168:3 1177:9	objecting
1330:22	980:6 1114:11	1159:16	1183:25	1060:13
northern 987:8	1119:8 1176:9	1163:15	1218:17	objection
1011:11	1295:17	1179:19	1219:22	979:22
1043:18	1298:24	1190:4,9	1247:20	1042:17
Notary 1382:4	1302:20	1223:23	1250:1,3,4,23	1054:25
note 1018:21	1319:3	1227:10	1254:14	1063:16
1040:1	1327:21	1232:11	1268:16	1065:13
1082:15	1334:17	1234:17	1285:15	1072:8 1082:5
1096:1	1346:13	1248:16,17	1288:5,11,13	1108:6 1146:8
1124:22	1350:13	1249:2,12	1288:16	1245:5 1260:7
1141:23	1365:19	1252:22	1338:17	1260:15,19
1149:7	1381:13	1254:1	1361:8	1266:6
1153:15	NREL 1146:24	1257:25	1367:25	1270:12
1162:1	1147:3 1148:8	1265:22	Numeral 1137:4	1279:3,14
1163:20	1150:21	1267:13,14,16	1137:4	1280:12
1165:21	1151:14	1267:23,24	numerator	1283:12,23
1199:23	NREL's	1268:2,5,24	1265:9	objections
1208:1 1210:6	1147:17	1269:5,11,14	_____	1005:2,20
1215:1 1339:5	1160:10	1269:15,16,17	O	1008:14
noted 1103:24	nuclear 1138:21	1269:21,24	_____	1115:22
			o'clock 1114:4	

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1124:5,8,10,11	occasions	1180:17	1143:25	1288:3,9
1124:15,19,21	1306:14	officials 986:19	1147:15	1296:11
1146:6	occur 1098:11	offset 1270:10	1153:7	1299:17
1170:10,17,19	1160:22,23	offsets 1283:4	1154:23	1303:18,22,24
1175:21	1229:12	OG&E 1155:4	1155:15	1304:4,9,13,19
1187:5	1283:4	1156:1	1156:15	1304:25
1223:15,17,18	occurred	OG&E's 1156:7	1158:18	1305:7
1223:22,23	1145:14	oh 1017:4	1159:22	1306:22
1234:11,14,17	1198:6	1049:1 1057:2	1160:1,3	1308:13
1293:20	occurrences	1109:25	1164:20,22	1309:1,13
objective	986:2 1367:12	1216:9	1166:17,25	1310:4
1151:25	October 1043:2	okay 979:19	1167:7 1168:6	1318:18
obligated 995:8	1044:5,19	988:15 995:1	1170:5	1321:1,17,25
1001:14	odds 987:5	995:18 996:18	1171:19	1322:23
obligation	off-system	1002:21	1172:3 1175:5	1323:19
985:14	1312:16	1004:7,25	1178:12,24	1327:9 1329:5
1001:17,22	offer 1112:11,14	1008:5 1014:1	1181:17	1329:22
1012:1	1112:17	1014:5,6,16,23	1182:23	1330:10
obligations	1146:4 1170:7	1015:8,16	1192:23	1331:4
1001:11	1175:18	1016:16	1194:5,10,24	1335:13
1145:21	1182:5,10	1017:6	1195:15,23	1337:6 1341:1
observation	1183:4	1051:24	1196:9 1209:6	1342:9
1145:17	1223:18	1052:10	1218:6,20	1344:14
obstacles	1234:14	1056:1	1219:20	1345:23,25
1151:23	1293:18	1060:23	1220:17	1351:6 1352:8
obtain 1188:13	1294:24	1063:23	1224:21	1353:16
1189:18	offered 979:22	1066:4	1229:6,20	1354:3 1357:6
1220:5	999:5 1047:21	1067:11	1230:14	1357:8,16,17
1339:15	1113:2	1073:3,24	1234:8 1237:5	1358:9,12,25
obtaining	1170:17	1074:14,17	1243:20	1359:9 1362:3
981:16,20	1181:16	1081:15	1247:13,21	1362:23
983:15,21	1224:22	1096:20	1249:4,24	1365:9 1366:9
1009:11,18	1296:6 1379:2	1099:9	1255:23	1366:13
1337:11	1380:1	1101:13,18	1257:23	1367:16
1347:14	1381:12	1102:11,14	1259:10	Oklahoma
obviously	offering 1046:25	1103:20	1260:2,22	1011:8 1154:6
1142:3 1166:1	1112:13,17,19	1104:5,11	1262:5 1265:1	1154:7,11,25
1190:7	1113:3,10,11	1105:3,12,18	1267:7,12	old 1157:4
1216:11	offers 1240:8	1106:12,17	1268:9,19	1225:20
1219:2 1220:5	office 1238:22	1107:20	1269:13,20,23	older 1182:11
1242:25	1246:3	1109:7	1270:4	once 1189:17
1244:2 1362:4	1263:11	1111:19	1271:15	1208:19
1366:24	1285:11	1114:8	1273:22	1252:1
occasion	1286:9	1125:18	1276:10	1316:14
1347:23	officer 979:4	1128:17	1282:12,19,23	one's 1255:12
occasionally	983:9 1007:23	1130:19	1283:3 1284:5	one-time
1239:6	1134:15	1142:14	1287:19,23	1182:12,19

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

<p>ones 987:20 988:5 1244:17 1287:14 1307:1 1323:7 online 1365:3 onshore 1154:2 1160:13 open 989:4,15 990:4 1040:1,4 1041:1,7,18,23 1096:1,3 1126:21 1208:1,3 1215:1,4 1370:10 1371:1 opened 1047:9 1047:15 operate 974:14 1184:20 1246:4 1311:15 1314:1,7,9,13 operated 1314:2 1314:6 operating 983:8 1007:23 1197:10,14 operation 1209:1,8 1256:19 1314:20,25,25 1315:3,25 1354:13 1362:14 operations 1043:19 1241:4 1250:11,12 1323:12 operators 1197:12 opine 1299:13 opinion 1104:15 1104:16 1135:3 1258:11</p>	<p>1261:2 1299:14 1305:6 1311:16 1312:12 1320:8,20 1321:19,20,23 1336:13 opportunities 985:21,21 987:25 1111:12 1232:17 1367:12 opportunity 988:9,15 1058:25 1076:14 1111:1 1176:24 1177:3 1182:19 1183:4 1226:8 1231:24 1255:4,7,21 1256:1,2,3,6 1256:12 1267:21 1306:9 1368:19 opposed 1059:25 1249:16 opposing 991:11 1018:6 1078:12 1102:5 1106:4 opposite 1166:7 1367:9 opted 1198:19 1199:14 optimal 1161:1 1163:15 optimistic 997:1 option 992:21 1053:2 1061:10</p>	<p>1066:14 1068:4 1070:11 1076:11,16 1110:3 1198:3 1319:22,22,23 1319:25 1320:2 optional 1077:6 options 992:17 1066:8,15,17 1067:16 1109:4,7 orange 1144:10 order 989:1,2 1013:4 1042:25 1173:21 1220:13 1223:21 1234:16 1237:23 1288:4 1291:17 1306:18 ordinance 1351:23 organization 1146:23 1208:19 organizations 1134:8,10 original 1117:21 1117:25 1118:15 origination 1185:20 Osborn 1364:25 outages 1357:21 1357:21 outcomes 1165:16 1261:12 Outlet 1161:8 outlined 1330:2 output 1142:1 1248:11</p>	<p>1272:8,11 1286:23 outputs 1286:3 1286:14 1287:7 outside 1018:19 1082:13 1163:23 1199:22 1249:23 1254:19 1278:23,25 outstanding 1104:10 1113:7 outstrip 1266:4 overall 1065:1 1098:4 1102:23 1195:21 1369:9 1370:17 overestimate 1285:10 overlap 994:21 overly 1339:18 overnight 1365:6 overrule 1124:15 1223:22 1234:17 1245:5 1279:2 1280:12 Overruled 1060:20 1072:12 1106:9 1108:14 1284:18 1369:10 overseen 1178:24 overstatement 1241:2 oversubscribed 1112:13,25</p>	<p>overtones 1110:23 overweigh 1257:11 owned 1129:5 1164:25 1194:21 1272:22 1274:5 1340:9 owners 1130:11 1131:17 1272:15,25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <hr/> <p>P 974:21 p.m 1373:14 P1 993:15 paad408@aol.... 975:23 page 992:2,12 993:10 994:4 1004:7 1005:15 1012:5,11 1043:1 1044:18 1046:25 1052:23 1053:24 1061:15 1063:1,21 1065:7 1066:3 1073:2 1078:10,11 1102:1,13 1117:7 1118:1 1121:11 1122:22 1123:3 1125:16 1127:6,8 1130:8 1137:4 1137:8,18 1138:16 1139:6,14,22 1140:18 1142:12,25</p>
---	--	--	---	---

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1143:23	1351:7 1374:3	1051:6	1149:23	1366:11
1144:1,25	1375:1 1376:1	1097:24	1227:8 1318:4	paths 1103:5
1145:8,16	1377:1 1378:1	1102:22	1323:3 1336:7	pathways
1147:13	pages 1018:4,23	1111:8	1343:23	1188:12
1153:6,19	1082:17	1124:12,14	1344:23	patterns
1154:21	1101:24	1139:3	1356:5	1248:21
1155:11,12,13	1121:11	1146:10,10,13	1358:10	Paul 975:22
1155:16,23,24	1123:3	1146:15	1359:24	1117:4 1124:6
1159:8,25	1136:10	1163:2 1165:1	1360:14	1133:13
1160:9,19	1148:14	1190:25	1363:14	pay 982:22
1161:13	1199:25	1208:14,15	particularly	1001:15
1162:13	1210:8 1301:2	1224:20	987:7 1000:24	1131:4,8
1163:13,25	1301:5 1302:4	1236:6	1173:1	1189:19
1164:16	1329:21	1241:23,24,25	1361:13	1366:23
1165:9	1331:5	1251:2	1369:6	payer 1131:1
1166:15	1349:11,16,22	1252:14,21	parties 994:5	payer's 1358:10
1167:11	1379:19	1324:10	1059:10	payers 998:18
1172:2	paid 982:23	1330:5	1290:11	1000:17
1175:12	1058:16,16	1344:21	1336:4	1336:15
1188:2,8	1247:10	1351:20	1344:17	1345:17
1193:16,22,24	1273:6 1274:4	1355:17	Partners	paying 983:2
1194:6,6,7,22	Palmyra	1361:9,12	1338:15	999:1,2
1194:25	1326:22,22	1363:10	parts 1146:3	1058:16
1195:1,16,17	papers 1054:1	1368:13,18	1153:18	1280:8
1195:18	1055:22	1369:20	1160:5	payment 992:24
1196:5,8	1107:12	Partially	1262:15	1182:12,14,15
1209:11	1108:12	1335:21	1296:8	1182:18,20,24
1222:7,7,10,17	paragraph	participant	1328:12,19	1209:13
1224:14	992:2,15	1344:12	1332:4	payments
1226:5	1004:8	1345:1	party 1283:7,17	1131:2 1181:5
1227:15	1043:14,23	participants	1284:9,16	1181:5 1182:5
1231:5,7	1142:16	982:14 993:14	1305:24	1182:20
1232:7	1144:24	996:14	1306:6	1250:10
1301:16,18	1145:16	participate	1371:13	pays 1262:19
1303:9,11	1162:25	1000:19	pass 1043:23	Peabody
1307:13,18	1194:25	1367:16	1151:22	1274:22
1309:17	1195:1 1196:7	participating	1293:3	1275:2,12
1310:6 1325:8	1196:8,11	987:3 1119:12	passed 1000:15	peak 1048:21,24
1326:19,20	1301:19	1309:22	1279:20	1048:25
1329:21	paragraphs	participation	1280:5 1320:6	1157:1
1335:7,8	1303:21	1004:23	1351:19	1314:25
1337:6,7	parcel 1181:21	1005:11	passing 986:7	1315:1
1338:12,18	parent 1338:15	particular	1222:21	1322:12,14,19
1342:20,24	Parkinson	1006:11	path 1046:4	1322:22
1343:13	1291:7	1008:1	1108:1	peer 1245:23
1347:4 1348:2	part 983:19	1101:11	1227:17	PEGGY 976:4
1349:22	1043:13	1102:9	1305:2	peggy.whipple...

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

976:6	1128:5,8,18	1191:10	1250:11,12	1170:15
Pemberton	1137:23,24,25	1209:2 1241:8	phases 1249:25	1232:8,10,15
976:21 980:11	1140:15	1322:7,10	1267:18,23	1243:3
1003:7	1141:14,20	periodic	phone 1359:16	1285:22
1008:25	1142:8,11	1182:20,24	phrase 982:6	1344:1 1348:4
1099:11	1143:19,22	periodically	physically	1351:4
1116:10	1145:20	985:15	1290:6	1379:18
1129:17	1149:4,9,16,20	1253:13	picked 1363:15	1381:18
1176:12	1149:25	periods 1156:25	pile 1044:23	planner 1236:7
1185:11,23	1150:3,13,25	1157:1 1173:5	Pipeline 976:16	planning 1074:8
1186:13,20	1151:1,3,7	permanent	PJM 994:8	1130:22
1187:3,8	1152:11	1181:16	1076:7,12,23	1138:6
1217:11,16	1154:2 1155:5	person 1237:13	1077:15,19	1157:15
1220:17	1155:22	1246:3	1078:4	1164:6
1225:15	1156:3,11,16	1250:20	1111:12,18	1178:25
1235:5	1157:12,13,18	1303:18	1146:3	1360:4
1295:20	1160:13	1331:6	1159:13,14	planning's
1299:2	1172:8,16,17	personal	1165:14,19,23	986:7
1302:23	1172:18,19,20	1230:15	1166:2,3,8	plans 984:9
1319:6	1173:11	1242:11	1219:23	1196:19
1327:24	1181:19,20,23	1247:16,21,25	1220:2,7	1332:5
1334:20	1182:2 1198:9	1315:16	1314:12	plant 1272:1,9
1346:16	1257:22	personally	1323:7 1324:3	1288:25
1350:15	1261:21	989:13,19	1344:2	1345:6
1365:22	percentage	1002:3	place 995:4	1356:13
1375:16,22	1137:22	1040:14,15	1208:19	1362:2,12
pen 1105:12	1172:22	1307:14	1219:18	plants 1272:15
people 996:16	1181:15	1354:16	1251:25	1273:1,25
1180:8	1256:24	personnel 996:2	1314:20	1274:3,8,14
1191:16	perfect 1240:6	perspective	1328:19	1275:1,17,21
1199:20	1243:7 1246:7	1047:21	1351:23	1276:2,7,13
1242:4	perform	1049:22	1364:17	1277:15
1249:22	1134:23	1096:10	1368:10	1354:18
1254:18,20	1135:7	1184:1 1357:9	1382:7	1361:16
1268:14,15	1142:19	1358:10	placed 1138:9	plate 1073:21
1358:2 1359:4	1264:24	1363:5	1195:21	1139:11,14
percent 1014:12	performance	pertains 1304:2	1222:23	1155:6,22
1061:20	1184:14,18	pertinent	1223:14	1156:3
1062:3,6,7	1209:14	999:22	placement	1157:14
1064:15,17	1264:23	petition 1351:17	1182:1	play 1316:14
1070:15	performance-...	petroleum	places 1242:17	1317:23
1071:4	1264:8	1242:8	1248:18	1359:12,23
1072:21	performed	Petty 981:3	1252:13	please 978:20
1104:5,6	1071:8 1127:8	Pew 1285:20	1268:13	993:10 1004:9
1110:2	1307:24	phase 1137:21	1323:12	1004:12
1125:24	period 1002:18	1241:3,4,4	plan 1127:15,22	1006:14
1126:17,18,19	1182:3,20	1247:16	1154:9 1165:4	1007:17

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1051:21	point 978:6	1326:21	1355:8	1314:5
1052:23	980:24 985:5	1368:1,7	1357:10	1344:24
1053:25	985:25 989:23	1373:3	1359:3	1362:25
1056:6,14,20	990:10 991:13	pole 1182:12	portions	1363:5
1061:15	992:23 996:25	poles 1182:6	1124:22	possibly 1258:7
1063:21	1010:4 1017:5	police 1254:24	1151:11	1318:8
1065:10	1018:21	policy 1158:25	1177:5 1301:1	post 1197:17
1066:3 1073:2	1042:13	1163:16	1301:12	postmortem
1077:3 1081:6	1049:4,24	1180:1,8,13	1323:4	1240:4
1114:19	1052:4,4,5	1181:1	1326:13	1244:16
1117:7	1072:8	1182:24	portrayal	1257:20
1120:11,13	1079:17	1370:24	1082:3	1259:7
1137:3 1139:7	1082:15	pool 984:17	pose 1272:3	postmortems
1140:18	1108:8 1114:1	1004:23	posed 980:23	1241:16
1143:24	1124:9	1100:15	1004:5	potential
1147:14	1136:25	population	position 979:3	1051:19
1153:6 1159:9	1137:8,18,20	1243:18	1007:22	1063:9
1162:14	1166:14	1254:21	1120:19	1071:21
1164:16	1171:19	1268:15,16	1185:17	1077:25
1165:9,13	1178:20	portfolio 995:15	1209:8 1227:3	1112:10
1166:15	1198:4	1009:25	1227:7	1147:17,23,24
1174:5	1199:23	1049:16	1271:12,13	1148:15
1184:25	1208:24	1050:6	1308:13	1153:21
1185:12	1209:5 1210:6	1100:21	1329:16	1154:1,2
1199:22	1223:17	1101:8 1111:1	positions	1160:12,14
1217:14	1227:14	1161:18	1235:23	1273:12
1221:3,12	1260:16	1162:19	positive 1256:17	1274:2
1222:5 1231:6	1270:10	1163:3 1164:3	1257:8	1275:11
1233:17	1304:7	1164:9,11	1261:12,20	1280:20,24
1260:21	1316:13	1231:21	possession	1281:3,8
1272:4	1326:21	1352:4	1306:24	1283:9
1283:15	1329:9,12	1353:13	possibility	1284:10
1292:12	1339:19	portfolios	1013:3	1336:14
1297:15	1340:3	1010:2	1077:13	1343:1
1300:19	1360:17	1100:14	1275:19	1371:14
1301:25	1362:13	1102:17	1276:15	1379:12
1315:13	1364:10,19	1161:14	1277:17	potentially
1325:22	1366:25	1163:6	possible 985:15	1056:11
1326:4 1333:7	1367:2	portion 1049:2	1065:17	1147:19
1349:3	1370:19	1049:11	1070:20	1222:24
plenty 1280:1	1372:15	1199:10	1081:8 1111:2	power 976:20
plug 1240:17	pointing 1318:2	1297:24	1126:24	980:10,23
plus 1078:23	points 1017:20	1304:3 1312:8	1127:1	981:4,8,20
1098:9	1110:9	1333:16	1130:11	982:19,20,21
1118:22	1137:22	1337:7	1143:17	983:15,18
1167:22	1172:22	1342:19	1278:15	985:20 986:15
1240:15	1196:21	1345:9,20	1291:25	986:21 987:13

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

995:9 997:9,15	1355:16	1180:19,25	1046:9	1058:17
997:17,25	1363:22	1297:23,23	1274:25	1076:12
998:12 999:3	1370:13	1300:22	presumed	1130:13,17
999:11 1000:1	1381:20	1306:2	1067:18	1135:17
1000:2,4,5,8,9	PPA 992:18	1326:12	pretty 1013:11	1137:10,13
1000:11,13	993:6 1050:14	1333:15	1100:11	1144:4,7,11,23
1001:15	1069:16	prepared	1169:20	1145:2,3,3,9
1002:17	1144:14	1070:3,9	1177:7	1145:14
1003:6	1145:3	1121:15	1183:23,25	1159:15
1005:25	practice	1123:6	1244:4,8,25	1165:17,18,19
1006:1,6	1151:16	1174:14,21	1253:24	1166:3 1171:9
1048:8,15	Prairie 996:13	1223:2	1256:22	1353:9
1049:24	preceded	1226:12	1264:15,24	1366:15,17
1050:17,21,25	1161:10	1292:20,20	1343:25	pricing 1047:1
1051:5,7	preceding	1303:15	prevent 1012:2	1049:15
1057:14,16	1144:19	1306:3	1151:17	1050:16
1075:5	predict 1012:12	1326:13	previous	1102:22
1079:18	1012:15	1333:16	1144:22	1103:13
1081:8	1192:3 1244:3	preparing	1189:14	1105:6
1099:10	1258:16,18	1303:24	1234:16	1107:18
1116:9	predicted	1304:1	1364:10	1190:24
1117:16	1254:5	present 985:21	previously	1220:7 1367:6
1130:13	prediction	988:9 1044:14	1017:22	1368:22
1137:9,10	1258:17	1137:13	1223:21	primarily
1138:21	predictive	1284:9	1227:6 1382:7	1000:8 1145:2
1144:3,4,7	1258:10	1289:23	price 997:4	principle 1164:5
1145:4,18,23	1259:17	1304:22	998:25 999:2	principles
1166:2	1260:25	1323:5 1334:2	1009:24	1180:2,14
1176:11	1285:1	1368:16	1014:16,22	print 1102:3
1177:4 1179:1	predicts 1368:5	1369:19	1069:16,17	1335:8
1179:12,25	preface 1313:19	presented 996:6	1070:6,7	prior 1304:1,11
1180:18,25	prefer 1291:25	1244:22	1078:14	1306:12,18,18
1188:20,22	preference	1278:24	1079:13	1313:10
1189:3,9,21	1278:10	1318:2	1103:4	1328:13
1190:11	1295:2	1321:21	1106:13	priority 1012:25
1191:3,5	preferred	presenting	1109:17,20,23	privately
1192:20	1285:18	1221:17	1110:5,9	1194:21
1198:23	prejudge 998:10	presently	1145:4 1191:1	probability
1220:6 1235:4	prematurely	983:16	1191:9	1156:24
1277:7	992:21	presents	1219:22	probable 1055:6
1288:15	premised	1188:12	1220:2,8,13	probably 983:8
1302:22	1353:11	president 979:4	1321:23	999:20
1310:15	preparation	1185:19	1367:3	1000:21
1319:5	1176:23	PRESIDING	1368:21	1001:2 1044:9
1334:19	prepare 1115:9	974:19	prices 1012:6,11	1069:5
1340:15	1120:22	presumably	1014:24	1081:20
1341:2	1179:25	982:15 987:24	1057:3	1113:20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1114:5 1126:9 1209:1 1255:16 1266:12 1291:14 1321:11 1372:13 problem 1141:25 1188:21 1244:17 1260:2 1268:21 1363:18 1367:5 procedures 1309:7 proceed 1044:11 1115:5 1216:5 proceeding 1221:21 1233:25 1339:10 proceedings 974:4 978:1 1179:12 1183:6 process 989:8 993:22 996:4 996:12,16 999:8 1041:21 1079:21 1111:8 1138:8 1138:11 1160:21 1162:3,12 1164:6 1179:5 1189:14,15 1192:15,16 1194:19 1208:20 1216:11 1248:14 1261:11 1309:4,21 1310:1 1311:24	1312:8 1316:4 1320:4 1358:19 1360:4 procure 1151:23 1198:23 procured 1198:23 produce 1180:12 1246:9 1259:18 1261:16 1262:9,10 1263:16 1265:7 1285:6 produced 1336:13,13 product 1165:16 1194:19 1198:9 1249:10 production 1137:20,24 1141:18 1147:18,23 1162:20 1198:12 1272:1 1273:25 1306:2,4,11 1361:11 productive 1290:8 products 1112:11,18 1113:2 1242:8 1242:8,9 1249:10 1340:9 Professional 1382:4 profits 1272:21 1273:1,4 1275:5,8 prognosticate 1259:22	program 1240:7 1262:22 1264:8 programs 1145:22 1146:2 1263:7 1264:7 project 981:5 982:16 983:4 992:10 996:13 996:14 1000:19 1004:23 1005:12,17 1013:4,9 1014:3 1015:9 1043:16 1044:1,11 1046:14 1051:8,16 1056:9 1068:11 1069:8 1070:22 1078:15 1097:25 1112:23 1117:11,16 1118:2 1135:16,20 1138:5,6,22 1140:25 1158:13,22,22 1159:2,13 1161:10 1162:8,17,18 1163:2,14 1164:2,7 1183:18 1184:3,13 1188:6,19 1191:14,17 1193:20 1195:22 1196:16 1198:8,19,25 1199:7,14	1208:9 1209:2 1216:17 1217:2 1223:5 1238:2,23 1240:11,13 1241:12 1251:13,19,23 1252:14,16 1254:6 1255:11 1256:4,16 1257:18 1263:10,25 1264:19 1266:5,17,24 1268:24 1271:24 1274:10 1275:20 1281:21 1287:9 1299:15 1314:21 1316:14 1317:19,24 1318:5 1323:20,21,24 1324:5 1328:11,18 1338:6,9 1340:6 1341:12,18 1343:3,22 1344:18,22 1345:9,20 1347:14,15 1359:25 1360:14,17 1362:25 1363:21 1368:10 1370:14 1379:9 project's 1247:6 1328:20 projected 1056:8,9	1076:3 1140:10,14 1227:17 1265:3,16 projecting 1368:4 projection 1241:18 1263:23 1267:15,22 1368:1 projections 1057:3 1266:18 projects 982:1,8 983:6 1012:25 1112:24 1132:11 1137:22 1138:4,9 1142:2,19 1143:6,12,18 1156:22 1158:5,23 1172:16,17,19 1180:3 1182:8 1199:1,6,8 1218:21 1236:21 1237:3 1238:22 1239:2 1240:3 1240:4,10,15 1240:19,21,24 1241:1,3 1262:6 1263:19 1287:6 1309:7 1310:11 1347:22 1352:6 promoted 1236:15 promulgated 1198:18 proper 1260:12 properties
--	---	---	--	---

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1181:10	proud 1367:22	1159:12	publicly	1158:23
1323:25	provide 1000:12	1332:8	1133:25	1177:25
property	1001:7 1051:2	provision	1361:16	1255:12,17,18
1181:24	1053:25	1006:11,12	publish 1180:7	1256:23
1182:21	1056:6	provisions	published	1261:18
1183:3	1066:13	993:18 994:1	1136:5	1283:10,20
1228:20	1077:4	1006:16	1193:18	1284:2,12
1229:9,10,13	1100:25	1047:23	1245:23	1287:5,11
1276:12	1113:5	proximity	1246:6	1288:2 1356:1
1277:3	1121:22,25	1081:25	pulled 1103:10	1363:15
1280:20	1131:24	proxy 1079:16	pulling 1017:19	1368:5
proportion	1135:3 1184:7	1366:23	1101:15	putting 1122:14
982:13	1184:9 1218:7	PSC 1044:10	purchase 985:1	1242:19
proposal 1354:1	1243:1 1283:8	1045:23	991:20	1255:9,10
1373:2	1283:18	1046:3	1001:12,12	1256:7
proposals	1307:24	public 974:2,8	1059:8 1073:6	1323:11
1050:20,24	1310:9	975:14 984:17	1073:10	1363:17
1051:5	1337:13	986:11	1076:6 1081:9	1364:21
propose 1312:7	1342:2 1348:4	1101:22	1135:11	1365:4
proposed	1355:12,13	1122:25	1183:18	
1077:14	provided 987:16	1134:4	1219:8	Q
1081:10	991:4 1018:5	1158:25	1249:23	qualify 1198:19
1138:3	1045:24	1163:16	1331:7	1199:15
1180:22	1047:19	1180:12,13,21	1340:15	qualitatively
1241:21	1054:9	1181:2	1341:2 1353:7	1136:2
1280:21	1059:20	1226:21	purchases	quality 1135:6
1281:4 1314:1	1079:5 1102:4	1229:19	1241:6 1242:1	1150:5,9,12,18
proposing	1111:23	1240:18	1353:5,16	1151:6
1138:6 1157:5	1125:23	1292:18	purchasing	1239:22
1347:21	1152:20	1297:20	1134:25	1240:6
1363:3	1157:25	1299:14	1177:4	1262:21
proposition	1167:13	1302:5	1216:25	quantified
1354:5,5	1168:4,13	1303:11,12	1219:11	1098:7 1099:5
1366:14	1175:2 1179:9	1304:3 1318:3	purpose 1155:7	1099:7
1368:12	1194:3	1319:19	1315:18	quantify
proprietary	1287:19	1320:9,14,17	1347:11,13	1099:23
1186:15,24	1288:11	1320:23	purposes 983:1	1253:22,23
1187:2	1336:9,9	1321:4,5,6,8	1074:9	quantifying
prospective	provider 1132:6	1321:15	1126:13	1101:10
1239:17	providers	1326:11	1156:5	quantities 994:8
1240:5	1310:13	1333:13	1157:14,15	998:3,6
prospectively	1311:15	1339:9	pursue 997:20	quantity
1245:9	provides 994:6	1345:16	put 982:7	1068:18
prospects	1132:4 1338:6	1379:3 1382:4	1042:24	1100:25
1365:5	providing	1382:6	1079:17	quarrel 1312:17
protocol 1180:1	974:16	publication	1106:17	1312:19
1180:8,13	1100:23	1137:1	1114:23	question 980:21

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1002:13	1319:21	1111:20	1221:9,25	1319:11,14
1004:5 1048:4	1321:18,21,24	1113:12	1224:4,8	1322:1,5
1050:13,17	1323:19	1114:15	1225:8,11,13	1324:17
1051:25	1328:23	1115:18	1225:15,18,24	1325:17
1053:22,23	1342:1,4	1116:4,6,8,10	1226:4	1326:3 1327:2
1056:5 1063:1	1343:20	1116:12,14,17	1229:21,23	1327:13,16,18
1065:6	1345:10,11	1116:19,21	1230:1,4,25	1327:20,22,24
1069:15	1353:11	1117:2 1119:4	1231:2	1328:1,3,7,9
1080:24	1356:18	1119:7,9	1232:20,21,23	1331:14,16,21
1081:1	1359:7,22	1120:10	1232:25	1332:3,10,18
1098:22	1369:13	1121:12	1233:15	1333:6 1334:9
1100:10	1370:3 1372:3	1122:8 1123:4	1234:3,22,24	1334:12,14,16
1108:24	questioning	1123:14	1235:1,3,5,7,9	1334:18,20,22
1136:20	983:13	1125:5,7,11	1235:11,13,15	1335:2
1145:15	1105:22	1129:17,19,21	1235:18	1336:20,23
1164:1 1167:5	1217:20	1129:23	1238:6	1342:11,16
1171:13	1247:1 1347:7	1130:2 1133:1	1243:23	1344:2 1346:2
1180:11	1362:23	1133:3,10	1271:20	1346:4,7,10,12
1183:16,20,23	questions	1166:9	1279:1	1346:14,16,18
1187:14	978:16 979:10	1170:21,22	1281:25	1346:20
1216:4	980:3,7,9,11	1171:2	1282:2,4,9,13	1347:2
1217:23	980:13,18	1173:14	1286:19	1348:16
1224:16	983:24 984:1,3	1174:4,23	1292:11	1349:2 1350:5
1230:20	984:7 990:14	1175:24	1293:12	1350:8,10,12
1232:6	994:12,13,17	1176:2,4,6,8	1294:14	1350:15,17,19
1244:12,21	998:19,20	1176:10,12,15	1295:8,11,14	1350:21
1245:7,8	1002:9,11,24	1176:19	1295:16,18,20	1351:11
1246:20,23	1003:1,3,7,9	1177:11,13,17	1295:22,25	1352:23
1252:9	1003:13,15,17	1177:21	1296:2,13,15	1353:2,4
1253:15,22	1003:20	1179:8 1183:9	1296:17,19,21	1354:1,23
1258:2	1004:2 1007:1	1183:15	1296:23,25	1355:2
1259:15	1007:15	1184:21	1297:14	1365:11,14,16
1260:17	1008:5,19,23	1185:11	1298:6,16,19	1365:18,20,22
1265:1 1268:3	1008:25	1186:11	1298:21,23,25	1365:24
1271:13	1009:2,7	1187:12,16,21	1299:2,4,8,18	1366:2,4
1272:4	1011:12,16,20	1192:24,25	1299:19,22	1368:25
1273:16	1018:5,9,15	1193:1,3,5,8	1300:4,6,18	1369:5,23
1278:22	1040:8 1064:8	1193:10	1302:12,15,17	1370:2
1283:15	1073:23	1196:24	1302:19,21,23	queue 1138:3,9
1286:21	1078:6 1082:8	1197:6	1302:25	queues 1138:22
1288:19	1096:4,6,9	1199:17	1303:3,5,19	quick 1238:2
1307:21,23	1098:17,18,20	1208:6 1215:4	1305:11,13,17	quite 1098:13
1308:18,21	1098:24	1215:7,9,11,13	1309:3	1344:24
1310:8,25	1099:11,13,17	1215:16,18,20	1312:23	1356:12
1311:4	1099:24	1215:22	1313:2	quote 1043:14
1316:25	1100:1,3,9,13	1216:3 1217:4	1318:20,23,25	1044:23
1317:21	1101:21	1217:16	1319:2,4,6,8	1056:5 1058:8

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1058:9 1063:3	1169:22,23	1170:21	1060:21	1147:8
1063:4 1081:6	1170:2	1185:4 1221:2	1061:1	1164:16
quoting 1054:8	1189:20,20	1246:21	1154:25	1165:10
<hr/>	1190:1,17,21	1291:10	1220:6	1178:1,20
R	1191:7 1220:5	1311:5	1282:23	1185:24
R 977:6	1257:14,17	real 1236:20	1283:2	1186:14,23
rail 1275:16	1294:23	1251:24	1288:16	1187:24
raise 1012:3	1336:15	1259:2	1313:12,16	1221:22
1208:20	1345:16	1269:20	1336:7 1356:4	1224:14
1221:3	1358:10	1270:1 1364:5	reasonable	1226:6
raised 1177:21	rates 987:2,10	realities 1230:7	1017:15	1227:15
raising 1209:1	987:21	1365:5	1127:11,13	1231:6
1337:17	1064:13,14,19	reality 1218:16	1152:6,7	1292:20,24
ramped 1241:7	1106:5	1259:24	1173:11	1296:5
ran 1102:12	1167:14	1357:24	1243:12	1297:24
range 999:20	1168:7 1169:5	realize 1259:2	1245:4	1300:23
1012:7	1169:6,12,15	realized 1046:12	1246:10	1304:9,11
1013:10,11,15	1169:17	1049:4	1258:12	1305:9
1013:15,18,19	1190:22	1078:13	1259:19	1326:13
1013:20,23	1274:4 1366:6	really 996:17	1261:3 1284:3	1333:17,23
1017:14,15	1369:17,18	997:14	1343:25	1335:14
1052:20	rating 1157:14	1041:20	1358:14	1336:10
1144:7 1145:4	ratio 1164:10	1045:2	1368:15	1347:5 1349:7
1151:6,7	1264:16	1096:11	reasonably	1352:9,14
1152:9	1328:24	1191:11,16	1171:16	1379:4,5,22
1181:18	1329:7,8,10	1220:1	reasons 1009:24	1380:7,9,20,21
1288:16	read 1004:9,10	1244:19	1012:21	1381:2,6,14,21
rate 987:16,23	1121:24	1248:4 1254:3	1184:12	REC 1159:15
988:4,6,12	1194:12	1256:10,12	rebuttal 979:6	recall 991:1
998:18	1217:22	1285:9	1007:24	1057:7,17
1000:17,21	1291:3 1296:5	1286:17	1012:5	1063:20
1001:8	1308:11,15,17	1287:1	1014:25	1079:20
1014:10,17	1308:23	1291:18	1051:22	1080:5,18
1059:20,24	1309:19	1314:11	1052:24	1127:17,19
1060:1,18,24	1335:13,16	1317:25	1061:16	1140:16
1061:9 1064:2	1352:8,11,13	1321:14	1063:22	1147:1 1154:5
1064:11	readily 1310:17	1344:3	1066:3 1073:2	1171:10,12
1071:6,17,19	1340:12	1345:10	1078:13	1179:13
1071:24	reading 1124:8	1355:24	1080:15	1184:15
1104:8	1223:17	1358:8	1081:19,21	1238:1,2
1105:20	1234:13	1360:17	1115:10	1264:5 1283:5
1106:13,19,24	reads 1051:12	1362:9	1117:8 1121:6	1284:7 1304:7
1107:6,24	ready 978:6	rearrange	1121:19	1304:18
1108:3,19	1007:6 1040:4	1290:14	1122:9	1309:8
1131:1	1096:4	reask 1369:13	1123:21	1311:20
1135:12	1119:21	reason 987:10	1125:17	1312:2 1329:1
1168:8,11	1120:7	997:6 1051:15	1127:5 1130:8	1352:14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1367:22	recollections	1359:17	1369:15	1185:24
1369:21	1179:21	1373:12	1373:8	1186:1
receipt 1170:11	recommendat...	records 988:23	1374:10,20	references
1170:18	1232:16	1263:17	1375:7,13	1055:19
1175:22	recommendat...	recourse	1376:14	referencing
receive 1000:19	1226:8,24,25	1229:15	1377:9,14,21	1067:19
1002:17	1227:24	recover 1132:13	Redirect-Exa...	referred
1006:18,23	recommended	Recross 1002:23	1375:22	1069:18
1009:15	1164:11	1098:16	redo 1107:4	1099:3 1143:3
1124:16	1285:21	1215:3	reduce 1150:8	1146:24
1223:23	1299:25	1318:19	1162:19	1172:2
1234:18	record 978:3	1346:1	1367:12	1198:20
1262:24	979:23 991:6	1365:10	1368:7 1369:9	1268:9 1285:5
1274:18	992:7 1007:16	Recross-Exa...	reduced 1274:3	1348:16
1320:10	1040:3	1216:2	reduction	referring
1336:6	1062:20	1319:13	1162:21	1002:20
1339:20	1063:14	1322:4 1366:3	1273:5	1054:21
received 979:23	1071:3	1370:1	1274:13	1145:13
1005:3,21	1096:11	1375:21	reductions	1155:20
1008:15	1097:4 1098:3	1377:7,8	1166:19	1161:5
1047:7	1105:23	1378:7,8	refer 1006:9	1167:18
1103:24	1114:11,19	RECs 1112:7	1125:16	1194:2
1115:23	1115:24	1125:22	1127:4,20	1307:11
1146:16,17	1119:21	1129:4,8	1129:2	1320:17
1170:16,21	1120:12	1159:14	1167:17	1323:20
1175:23	1123:20	1351:10	1231:7 1312:1	1342:25
1183:16,20	1124:2,8,12,16	1353:5,17	reference	1367:14
1187:6	1137:18	red 1015:12	1053:24	refiled 1301:9
1222:11	1146:10,12,15	redeemed	1054:6,15	reflect 1004:17
1288:20	1146:17	1240:9	1056:21	1004:20,21
1293:21	1174:6	redirect 1003:19	1065:6	1064:2,10
receives 1240:16	1178:17	1004:1 1100:8	1069:10	1103:12
receiving	1185:13	1100:12	1078:18	1109:20
1005:23	1187:7 1210:5	1119:8	1165:12	1110:8 1112:5
1328:13	1217:23	1170:22	1167:3	1301:6
recess 1113:24	1221:2,12	1171:1	1193:25	reflected
1114:9	1223:14,18,24	1183:10,14	1222:8	1109:12
1119:18,19	1233:17	1217:9,15	1338:18	reflecting
1220:24,25	1234:10,13,18	1233:2,4	1372:19	1109:17
recognize	1268:6 1291:6	1282:5,8	referenced	regard 999:23
1050:10	1297:16	1297:1,2	1006:17	1140:9
1056:3 1065:4	1308:24	1300:8,9	1046:25	1164:23
recognizes	1326:5	1324:14,16	1053:18	1167:9 1180:1
1155:5 1156:3	1330:17,20	1331:18,20	1054:22	1181:4
1337:11	1333:8	1346:23	1057:13	1217:23
recollection	1348:14	1347:1	1060:2 1063:8	1218:6,17,21
1363:11	1356:4	1368:20	1063:12	1218:22

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1219:20	1139:20,24	1113:10	1216:25	1319:20
1307:3	1143:2 1146:3	1253:9	1289:12	1320:11
1312:14	1150:20	1259:24	remember	1331:8
1324:22	1261:9 1311:8	1264:17	1178:8	1351:14,17,21
1331:1	1311:10	Relativity	1217:19	1352:16
1341:17	register 1329:25	1190:23	1266:10	1353:4,6,7,9
1345:13	Registered	relayed 1061:13	1330:8 1341:1	renewables
1354:8	1382:3	relevance	1363:12	1045:2 1113:7
regarded	regularly	1060:13	1371:25	1117:11
1157:10	1134:19	relevancy	1372:6,20	1185:16
regarding	1238:22	1244:15	remembering	1224:22,23
980:21	regulated	relevant 1018:4	1344:14	1225:5
1111:12	1320:22	1060:14	REMI 1238:10	1351:15
1171:8 1182:6	regulations	reliability	1238:12,15,20	repeat 1053:22
1183:17,21	1331:1	1074:8	1238:21	1283:14
1222:19	regulatory	1118:24	1239:16	1307:21
1223:5	974:19	1157:14	1243:5	1349:12
1224:22	1006:23	1158:25	1254:17	rephrase
1283:8	1195:7	1163:16	1261:13	1067:12
1284:10	1297:21	1317:6,18	1268:10,22	1179:18
1305:8	1333:14	1330:1,4,23	1284:21	1286:20
1307:15	relate 1314:2	1355:7,10,13	1285:3,18,22	1366:15
1332:4 1347:5	1360:1	1355:15,20	1286:2,14,23	1369:12
1369:15	related 1079:22	1356:21,22,24	1287:25	replace 1049:14
1379:8	1080:7,20	1357:1,2,4,12	remind 1063:9	1050:5,6,20
regardless	1118:23	1357:20	reminding	replacement
997:25 1323:6	1167:25	1358:7 1364:4	1372:10	1049:11
regards 1226:5	1315:21	1369:4	reminiscent	replacing
regeneration	1343:16	1370:12,20	1347:21	1049:5,9
1014:13	1355:21	reliable 1141:20	remove 1048:3	1050:16,24
region 1062:9	1371:4	1157:8	1287:23	1074:4
1103:19	relates 1167:5	1323:10,13	render 992:22	1099:22
1126:8 1140:2	1227:11	reliably 1184:20	renewable	1110:21
1143:11	relations	relied 1103:7	980:22	report 1056:19
1144:11	1043:12	1339:8	1112:11,18,22	1057:2 1127:5
1159:1	relationship	relief 1000:21	1117:17	1128:4 1136:5
1163:24	1342:5	1001:8 1011:3	1125:20,22	1136:11
1307:9 1308:3	relative 1013:2	relies 1256:11	1126:17	1137:4,14
1308:9 1317:8	1134:24	relieve 1158:24	1128:6,25	1138:17
1317:12	1135:4 1137:8	rely 1018:11	1129:5,10	1139:7,18,23
1324:2 1355:8	1140:5 1144:2	1171:16	1135:12	1140:19
1355:11	1157:19	1245:21,24	1146:21	1142:13,25
regional 1057:2	1158:4	relying 1079:6	1161:19	1143:23
1161:8 1238:7	1165:18	1168:3 1189:5	1165:1	1144:25
regions 1012:21	1190:22	remain 993:12	1278:11,11,12	1145:7,15,17
1013:2	relatively	1128:9	1278:18	1146:9,13
1130:21	1110:18	remainder	1318:14	1162:17

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1163:5 1164:4	1082:15	1309:3	1129:11	resolution
1171:23	1096:1	1311:11	1164:2	1208:12,16
1193:18	1199:23	1329:3,18,20	requirements	1209:7
1194:1,7,8,22	1208:1 1210:6	1338:22	995:9 1048:19	resolved
1195:2,12,16	1215:1	1340:19,20	1049:2	1216:12
1196:19,22	reporting	1348:15	1073:19,20	resolving
1217:19,24,25	1262:23	1379:14,16	1100:18,20	1163:15
1218:4,8,18	reports 1165:4	1380:3	1127:10	resource
1239:22,24	1239:21	requested	1159:1 1163:3	1010:23
1240:14,17,18	1294:23	1005:6 1316:7	1163:17	1046:7
1248:2 1250:5	represent	1322:17,20	1301:20	1102:17
1254:14	1117:4 1130:4	requesting	1307:9 1308:2	1110:22
1255:17	1156:17	1324:6	1308:9	1121:21
1262:25	represented	requests 1042:9	1351:13,22	1126:6,7,10,14
1263:13	1102:15	1050:9,10	1353:6	1141:21
1292:24,25	representing	1055:23	requires	1154:9
1293:25	980:5	1103:23	1240:14	1160:24
1294:1,11,15	represents	1175:2	1357:19	1253:25
1294:20	1194:20	1296:12	RES 1127:10,15	1353:22
1297:24	request 1004:6	1306:23	1128:5 1165:2	1360:4,7
1299:13	1005:5,6	1328:25	1170:14	1361:10
1300:1,23	1042:22	1335:25	1318:16	1371:4,5,14,22
1301:1	1043:15	1336:3	research	1373:3
1303:10,15	1050:12,20,24	1340:24	1117:21,25	1379:18
1306:17	1051:4	1352:18,19	1118:15	resources
1326:13	1053:14	1364:16,20	1120:21	995:13,16
1331:5	1054:12,20	1380:14	1233:22	1000:12
1333:17,24	1055:5,25	requests-cont...	1236:16	1011:25
1335:7,11	1056:2 1057:8	1380:16	1253:24	1012:19
1337:7	1057:13,19	require 1059:7	1285:20	1016:25
1338:13	1062:22	1253:23	1339:23	1017:19
1342:20	1065:4	1277:25	reserve 1012:1	1050:6 1059:9
1347:5 1349:7	1069:11,18	1313:13	1073:19	1108:25
1349:11	1076:25	1348:3	1301:20	1109:2
1351:8	1077:1	required	1307:8 1308:2	1110:16
1357:19	1079:18	1075:21	1308:8	1111:4,5
1379:5,20	1080:6,19	1197:17	reserves	1112:15,22
REPORTED	1081:3,5,18	1262:23	1075:22	1115:11
974:24	1109:16	1290:16	reserving	1121:25
reporter 984:13	1131:25	1316:3	1226:7	1125:15
1017:24	1132:17	1322:24	residence	1128:25
1120:13	1179:14	1323:16	1228:18	1135:5,6
1293:4 1333:8	1181:17	1354:7 1370:6	residences	1142:4 1148:1
1382:1,4	1189:12	requirement	1227:18	1150:10,18,24
REPORTER'S	1222:11	1100:15	residential	1151:5,6,18,20
1018:21	1305:8	1127:18	1000:16	1153:2,10
1040:1	1307:23	1128:5,6,19,22	1168:8	1159:4 1160:6

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1161:2 1162:4	1178:17	1170:2	1226:24	1068:1,7,21
1162:22	1179:8,15	1242:13	1245:23	1070:11
1163:22,23	1181:18	1261:17,18	1246:14	1075:8,13
1191:20	1306:23	1274:4	1303:25	1076:2,5,13
1231:8,13	1307:16	1279:21	1304:9,15	1078:9,19
1253:18	1380:13,15	1280:4,5	1335:19	1079:3,14,24
1371:11,18,21	responsibility	1287:17	1367:19	1080:16
respect 992:18	1045:9	retailers	reviewed	1082:10
993:2 999:6	1100:16	1261:19	1171:15	1097:24
1222:17	1194:17	retain 987:8	1245:23	1102:10
1227:8 1293:7	responsible	1305:24	1304:5 1336:3	1111:16
1293:24	1100:17,19	1306:6	revoke 1001:21	1116:25
1294:10,15	1130:19	retired 1012:20	1002:2,5	1119:16
respectively	1219:11	1174:10,11	RFP 999:8	1125:25
1186:17	1306:24	retroactive	RGOS 1160:21	1127:20
respond 1223:3	1323:1,8,11	1244:13	1160:24	1129:2,13
responded	restate 1260:20	1259:2	1161:5,14	1131:22
1273:16	restoration	retroactively	1163:5	1137:14
responding	1168:17	1244:19	right 984:23,24	1141:6 1142:9
1132:17	1328:13,20	1260:24	987:23 989:5	1143:11
response 990:3	result 992:21	retrospective	993:24 994:10	1147:7
1004:8	1150:1 1157:8	1244:16	995:18 997:5	1152:13
1008:21	1173:3	return 1197:23	1002:4	1155:17,23
1042:23	1266:24	1220:5	1014:18	1159:6
1050:19	1273:13	returned 1198:5	1015:10,22	1163:11
1051:11	1276:23	revenue 1128:6	1016:1,13	1166:3,5
1055:22,24	1277:14	1131:16,20	1017:2	1167:9,15
1056:15,20	1278:7	1132:5,12,14	1018:16	1169:1
1060:16	1279:12	1241:13	1040:17,20	1173:15,20
1062:23	1281:4,9	1262:11	1041:25	1177:24
1063:7,15	1356:19	1263:12	1044:4,6	1178:19
1065:4	1357:12	1264:17	1046:22	1179:1
1069:21	1366:16	1265:6,7,16	1048:5 1049:6	1189:18,18
1077:10	resulted	1268:17	1049:25	1194:3
1081:17	1162:11	1286:6,10	1051:14	1195:10
1177:20	1308:1	1342:2	1052:1 1053:4	1197:15
1273:18	results 1041:21	revenues	1053:10	1199:19
1279:25	1102:25	1272:14	1054:18	1209:10
1307:2,5	1276:1	1276:12	1055:11,11	1216:9,11,21
1308:4,23	1307:24	1277:3	1056:16,17	1216:24
1310:16	1317:6	1279:12	1057:16	1221:3
1311:16	1322:25	1286:13	1059:21	1230:12
1329:20	1364:6	reverse 1042:25	1060:6,8,25	1241:18
1336:8 1369:2	retail 998:18	review 985:15	1061:8,25	1244:9,9,12
1380:2	1000:16	1105:24	1062:7,8	1247:13
responses	1112:11,18	1176:24	1065:24	1250:19
1050:9	1169:4,17	1177:3 1226:8	1066:15,16	1251:20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1255:21,25	1098:20	1346:9 1350:9	1357:18	1377:2
1257:23,24	1113:17,20	1365:15	ruled 1124:14	satisfy 1163:3
1258:8,14,18	1114:12,13,15	role 1145:22	1223:21	1343:16
1259:3,25	1115:6,9,20,25	1235:24	rules 1190:25	save 1053:2,19
1263:9,12,17	1119:9 1125:9	1317:22	1332:11	1059:5
1265:19,25	1125:11,14	1359:11,23	run 1287:24	1118:16
1275:6	1127:4 1128:3	Roman 1137:3,4	1288:4,22	1331:13
1282:21	1129:13	room 1222:18	1337:3,5	saving 1016:12
1284:25	1170:13	1228:11,14	running	savings 998:17
1286:6 1291:9	1176:10	1242:19	1075:18	998:25 999:5
1292:1 1294:8	1187:16	1359:9	1284:21	999:12,13,18
1307:22	1215:11	rose 1144:14	Rupp 974:22	1000:7,15,20
1312:13	1225:11	rotor 1173:1	1345:24,25	1002:16
1316:21,22	1235:1	rotors 1173:7		1054:3,9,16,21
1323:17	1295:18	rough 1126:4	S	1055:15
1331:12	1298:25	roughly 989:1	S 976:9	1057:21,22,23
1340:20	1302:21	1104:5	S-a-r-a-h	1059:16,17
1363:14	1319:4	1105:11	1300:20	1065:17
1373:3	1327:22	1110:2	S-h-a-w-n	1066:21
right-hand	1334:18	1111:20	1326:6	1096:12,16,21
1121:5	1346:14	1128:12	S-t-a-h-l-m-a-n	1097:5,12
1122:16	1365:20	1145:20	1333:10	1098:4 1099:1
1148:24	1374:23	round 1047:10	safe 1323:10,12	1099:5,8
Right-of-way	1375:4	1047:15	1331:1	1101:11
1227:10	robust 1111:2	1075:9 1247:9	safety 1332:11	1104:20,21
right-of-ways	1360:8	rounded	1343:14	1105:20
1180:3	1361:10	1103:10	SAIDI 1357:14	1106:11,19
rights 994:7,7	robustly	routes 1162:7	SAIFI 1357:14	1108:2 1112:4
1058:9,13,22	1316:15	routing 1227:16	sake 984:13	1112:5
1058:23	Rock 1152:22	row 1059:15	sale 1111:12	1162:20
1194:21	Rockies 976:16	rows 1015:3	sales 1126:17	1276:5 1320:6
rise 1072:25	983:25	RPR 974:25	1127:10	saw 1046:21
risk 990:2	1003:12	1382:13	1128:9,13	1047:3 1223:8
1041:13	1011:14	RPS 1145:21,22	1274:13	1288:24
1359:3	1099:25	1146:2	1275:7	saying 985:6
river 1158:13	1116:16	1161:15	1312:16	1065:21,23
1162:18	1129:22	1163:3,7,17	sample 1103:11	1242:20
1163:2,14	1176:3 1193:4	RTO 1179:5	1103:17	1244:23
1222:23,23	1215:21	1192:13	1138:21	1246:14
Rivers 1158:22	1229:22	1311:2	1142:2	1247:3
1162:7	1235:10	1342:25	1144:18	1258:15,24
road 1270:4	1295:13	1366:15	1196:15	1263:15
roadwork	1298:20	RTOs 1362:17	Sarah 976:17	1265:17
1239:5	1302:16	1366:19	1300:13,20	1314:12
Robertson	1318:24	rule 993:21	1336:17	1315:24
977:10 980:4,6	1327:17	1260:13	1341:24	1324:9
1003:3	1334:13	1317:4	1348:17	1347:20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1355:25	1058:20	searching	1056:14,20	1113:1
1372:15	1059:14	988:23	1072:13	1197:12
says 992:25	1061:19	second 1004:8	1130:14	send 1055:13,21
993:1,11 994:4	1064:2,9	1005:13	1141:16	1335:24
1043:13,23	1066:11	1014:11	1142:15,23,24	1352:18
1044:8	1067:1,3	1044:4	1148:25	sending 1296:12
1045:21	1068:5 1069:2	1047:10,10,15	1155:20,21	senior 974:19
1051:2	1069:17	1064:18	1162:16	1120:21
1056:20	1070:3,10	1104:23	1172:1,5,10,20	sense 1009:24
1062:13	1072:18	1114:22	1188:2	1268:23
1081:12	1073:22	1155:9	1193:16,22	sent 1042:22
1137:20	1074:15	1158:17,18	1208:25	1043:1,7
1139:1	1106:6,18	1171:21	1244:8 1245:6	1044:5,19
1142:18	1107:10,14	1194:12	1247:5 1262:6	1062:23,23
1144:2,25	1110:14	1220:6	1262:19	1069:12
1145:7	1111:3 1290:3	1250:14	1289:9	1336:3
1193:22	1290:14	1283:22	1291:18	1340:19
1195:11	1305:1	1340:22	1292:2	1352:19
1251:17	1348:19	1365:1	1320:12	sentence 992:16
1264:10,11	1367:20	1368:13	1337:15	1062:12
1314:9	1368:20	secondary	1338:19	1063:11
1315:21	1369:16	1253:22	1356:10,12	1137:19
1335:8	scheduled	1315:1	1357:13	1142:15
1342:24	1289:25	1322:22	1358:7	1194:7,12
SBC 1061:5	schedules	secret 1252:12	seeing 1151:2	1195:16,18,24
sbrady@wind...	1121:12	section 992:12	1172:25	1196:10
977:7	1122:6	992:23 993:11	1173:7	separate 994:23
scenario 1132:1	1123:20	994:4 1051:14	1289:13	998:13 1068:2
1132:2	1185:25	1227:9	seek 1338:25	1097:22
1244:22	1330:2	1303:14	1340:2	1182:13,14
1353:14	1381:25	1307:22	seen 991:11	September
1355:18	scheduling	1335:10	1070:7	988:21
1363:20	1291:11	sections 1130:12	1133:25	series 990:13
1372:22	schooling	1333:23	1141:18	1042:24
scenarios	1254:23,25	secure 1058:14	1191:23	1051:25
1015:5,9,14	Schwake 974:25	1209:13	1236:25	1310:12
1058:2	1382:3,12	secured 1338:7	1289:1	seriously 1049:5
1102:11	scope 1368:24	securities	1360:16	serve 983:15
1345:2	SCOTT 974:22	1282:21,24	segment 1192:5	994:24 995:14
1363:20	screening	security 1197:17	1238:5	996:3 1068:3
schedule 1014:2	1360:10	1209:13	selected 1049:8	1097:18
1014:4	seam 1166:6	1248:2	selection	1111:15,17
1016:16	1192:10	see 990:9,22	1103:23	served 1067:19
1017:7	Sean 977:6	992:3 998:24	self 1100:23	1081:13
1051:21	1187:22	1004:12	sell 984:22	serves 1110:1
1052:13	search 1288:14	1045:13,19	1059:11	1231:15
1053:6 1058:3	1339:13	1051:9	1076:11	service 974:2,8

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

975:14 982:23	1221:25	1129:10	1295:10	980:5,6 1003:2
999:7,22	1262:22	1220:25	1298:18	1008:20
1000:3,8,13	1263:8 1309:3	1237:23	1302:14	1098:19
1001:17,17	1310:5	1238:10	1307:19	1125:8,15
1059:24	1326:20	1328:23	1315:11	1187:15
1067:21,22	1328:25	1329:7,8,10	1317:10,13	1215:10
1068:2 1076:7	1330:25	shorter 1156:25	1318:22	1225:9
1076:23	1336:25	1243:24	1327:15	1234:25
1077:7,15,19	1340:25	shorthand	1334:11	sign 993:16
1078:4	1343:7 1382:8	1237:6	1341:12	1001:20
1131:14,24,25	sets 994:23	shortly 1081:21	1346:6 1350:7	1042:3,15
1132:1,4	1144:22	1111:25	1361:1	signature
1168:13	1230:6 1251:2	1237:22	1365:13	1382:8
1176:25	settlement	shoulder 1315:5	1379:21	signed 981:7
1184:8	1104:12	1322:7,10,12	showed 1144:23	990:20
1189:12,18	setup 1240:21	1322:14,19	1329:10	1001:13
1219:8	seven 1066:15	show 975:10	1361:8	1045:10
1226:22	1121:12	984:2 1003:14	showing 1005:7	1049:13
1292:18	sgiboney@sm...	1011:17	1369:8	1050:13
1297:20	976:18	1053:13	shown 986:15	1066:19
1303:25	shaded 1144:6	1055:4	1058:20	1068:14
1326:11	share 1045:4	1060:17	1066:11	1079:8
1333:13	1071:1	1064:12	1069:1 1075:8	1101:14
1339:9 1341:6	1164:10	1066:14,25	1109:16	significance
1341:22	1244:5	1067:1 1068:4	1110:12	1004:19
1368:5 1379:3	shared 1360:21	1070:11	1143:14	significant
1379:14,16	sharp 1145:1,9	1074:15	1144:13	1010:22
1382:6	Shaw 1167:4	1100:2 1106:7	1148:23	1013:8
services 1254:24	1173:21,22,24	1106:10	1149:5	1100:25
servicing 999:10	1174:7	1111:23	1164:11	1110:11
1009:10	1176:20	1116:18	shows 1139:10	1189:17
1218:25	1177:18,24	1127:5	1140:19	1190:7 1191:3
session 1018:17	1178:24	1129:24	1141:19	1191:5
1018:22	1184:22,23	1130:4	1143:1	1227:22
1040:2,4	1375:9	1141:12	1144:10,17	1362:5
1082:11,16	1379:23	1142:7	1149:3	significantly
1096:2,4	Shaw's 1167:5	1174:16	1150:23	1017:9
1199:20,24	Shawn 1325:23	1175:10	1193:19	1188:23,24
1208:2,4	1326:6	1183:10	sic 1043:8	1189:3,6
1210:7 1215:2	1377:11	1193:6	1146:20	signing 986:15
1215:4	sheet 1123:21,24	1215:23	1161:18	990:16 996:22
set 1048:8	1381:6,8	1217:18,24	side 1015:4	1138:13
1071:3 1097:7	Shifting 1340:14	1229:24	1109:13	similar 1051:5
1113:24	shock 1288:6	1235:12	1196:16	1059:1,3,5
1149:7,18	short 1046:10	1271:25	1236:20	1063:5 1118:7
1150:6	1113:10,24	1281:16,19	1271:1 1321:6	1127:8
1180:13	1114:9	1291:24	Sierra 977:9	1164:12

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1241:11	sister 1199:1	1278:7 1352:3	1112:15	southwest
1306:3	site 1016:22	1352:6	1190:2	983:15
1322:15	1217:1 1236:8	sold 1275:4	1238:16	1009:12,14
1337:3,5	siting 1151:14	solely 1050:24	1244:1 1316:3	1010:11
1365:7	1151:22	1345:16	1356:6	1061:21
similarly	1236:21	solicitation	1370:18	Southwestern
1142:19	1237:3	989:4,15 990:4	1372:21	1310:15
1165:23	sitting 1225:20	1041:1,7,18,24	sorta 1257:1	span 1311:9
simple 1148:4	1225:21	solution 1163:15	sorts 1197:18	spare 1328:12
1357:24	1359:13	solutions	1262:12	1328:19
simplest	situation 984:9	1163:18	1263:16	1332:4
1260:22	1126:5 1135:8	somebody	sound 1060:5,8	sparse 1144:21
simply 1097:17	1184:16	988:23	1060:25	speak 1167:8
1097:24	1192:18	1262:19	1127:11,13	1250:22
1146:24	1247:5	1291:3	1149:6	speaking
1156:9 1165:3	1313:21	somewhat	sounded 1152:5	1051:13
1165:15	1345:7 1358:1	1126:15	sounds 1060:6	1250:21
1355:25	six 1015:21	1145:10	1076:2	special 1265:12
1363:6	1082:2 1372:5	1156:21	1080:17	Specialist
simulation	size 1139:10	soon 1081:7	1246:14	1326:10
1242:18	1144:18	1106:25	1247:18	specific 1097:11
1243:8 1258:5	1209:2	sorry 992:9	1251:15	1117:21
simulation's	1216:17	1016:19	1301:4,7	1118:15,25
1258:9	sizeable 1196:16	1049:1	source 981:20	1124:22
single 1049:17	sizes 1139:4	1051:23	981:23 982:19	1171:7,8
1050:7	Skelly 1134:14	1057:18	1010:7,10,21	1179:21
1144:21	skewed 1196:15	1070:18	1049:17	1303:20
1229:13	skips 1045:3	1107:2	1050:7 1052:8	1310:22
1247:4 1259:8	slight 1372:18	1152:14	1074:4	1340:6
sink 1220:12	slightly 1155:19	1155:24	1103:18	1341:25
sir 1002:14	1220:13	1169:9 1187:3	1220:12	1343:10
1003:5 1007:3	slower 996:15	1188:10	1355:13	1345:19
1016:18	small 1144:18	1195:13	1362:8,9	1352:5
1052:25	1149:24	1196:7 1216:9	sourced 1096:25	1355:16
1053:16	1169:20	1236:8 1243:8	sources 1049:23	1360:18
1080:18	1194:6 1254:1	1243:19	1050:3	specifically
1115:11	smaller 987:7	1248:7	1056:11	1112:22
1119:11	1144:18	1250:17,18	1066:25	1198:22
1151:8	smallest	1252:3 1272:3	1117:18	1243:25
1180:11	1000:25	1292:15	1135:1,2	1363:22
1187:3 1197:7	smear 1240:1	1307:10	1140:5	1364:1
1209:20,23,24	Social 1248:2	1308:20	1195:12,19	specifics
1233:17,24	software	1309:18	South 1009:15	1247:14
1280:12	1284:25	1322:9,13,21	1153:9	1351:25
1283:5 1284:7	solar 1075:5	1322:22	1160:11	specify 1360:3
1337:15,16	1138:24	1368:15	Southern	speculation
1338:20	1277:8,14	sort 999:4	1009:16	1042:18

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1055:2	1058:24	stack 1208:21	1332:7,15,24	1125:21
1283:13	1059:2 1061:5	Staff 975:14	1333:17,17	1126:17
speculative	1061:12	980:14	1335:6,10	1258:23
1065:18	1064:3,19,24	1003:10,21	1336:17	1278:14
speed 1126:25	1065:8,14	1009:3	1337:7,10,21	1320:17
1173:5	1067:16,25	1099:14	1338:25	1341:9
speeds 1149:17	1071:14	1116:13	1339:8 1341:2	1351:18
1152:2	1073:19	1127:8 1129:3	1343:2,8,15	1353:6
spell 1120:12	1074:13,18,22	1129:20	1346:23	1358:20
1232:2	1074:25	1176:5 1193:2	1347:4,25	standards
1233:10,18,19	1075:3,22	1215:19	1351:8	1278:11
1271:21	1096:25	1223:5	1353:21	1330:7,14
1282:10	1103:6,12,19	1225:25	1360:13	1331:2
1289:5	1103:19	1226:2,21	1362:6 1379:3	standpoint
1300:19	1104:7,19	1227:5	1379:9	1050:16
1333:8 1349:3	1105:7,8	1228:21	Staff's 1127:5	stands 1161:8
1376:10	1106:18,19	1235:8	1226:8,24,25	1330:25
1380:21	1107:16	1270:17	1227:4,7,24	Star 993:9
spelled 1114:21	1108:4,25	1271:6 1292:3	1289:9	1001:14
spelling 1120:15	1109:7,13,14	1292:17	1292:24	1110:3
spend 1242:13	1131:12,15,16	1294:4,23	1293:18	1111:22
1242:13	1131:23,23	1297:1,7	1297:24	1177:4
spending 1242:1	1132:6,17	1298:12	1308:13	1183:17,18
1242:11	1155:5 1156:2	1299:13,23,25	1310:16	1198:8,25
1248:12,20	1156:9 1157:5	1300:8,23	1311:15	1208:9 1209:8
1258:4	1189:10,15,16	1303:10,14	1325:14,15	1341:18
1287:10,11	1189:21	1305:18,23	1326:13	starred 1236:12
1288:7	1190:5,25,25	1306:1,4,15	1329:13,16	start 1011:5
spent 1236:5,6	1192:8,15,18	1307:5,24	1333:23	1043:24
1248:18	1305:1	1308:4,5,18	1338:5	1049:5 1070:8
spite 1010:23	1310:14,14,15	1309:14,15,21	1343:16,19	1100:10
spoke 1136:2	1314:8,11	1309:25	1344:6 1349:7	1155:25
1331:6	1323:7 1344:2	1310:8,18,20	1362:8 1379:5	1188:11
spoken 1314:14	1368:21	1310:23	Stahlman	1198:21
sponsoring	1369:16	1311:12,25	1317:3 1333:1	1209:5,8
1292:23	SPP's 1156:20	1312:4,12,17	1333:9 1335:3	1216:16
1294:1	spread 982:3	1312:19	1336:24	1289:9
SPP 999:15	1164:7,12	1315:16	1347:3	1350:25
1012:25	spreadsheet	1317:16	1348:10	started 1009:17
1014:3,10	1107:11,15	1324:14,19,21	1377:16	1107:3 1228:4
1015:6 1016:5	1109:13	1324:24	stakeholders	1235:22,23
1016:23	Springfield	1325:11,22	1160:20	1236:11
1017:3,5,11,19	983:18	1327:9	stand 978:10	1339:14
1017:21	1009:14	1328:10,17	1007:9	starting 1014:8
1052:8,8,17,19	1011:5	1330:11	1119:18	1137:22
1054:17	squeezed 1145:3	1331:5,18,23	1166:25	1144:25
1057:23	St 1274:23	1331:24	standard	1159:11

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1160:2	1261:6	1118:13	998:14	1055:14
1162:16	1262:10,11	states 992:16	1003:22	1243:21
1193:16,24	1264:11	1121:4	1316:6	string 1307:15
1196:6,10	1265:17	1122:24	stay 985:20	strong 1172:14
1260:15	1268:17,25	1137:8	1104:23	1316:11
starts 1138:8	1273:5,13,20	1139:13	stayed 1249:10	struck 1301:21
1149:20	1277:19	1145:19	steadily 1141:16	structure
1151:3 1351:5	1278:11	1148:24	1141:19	1182:5,14,18
state 974:1	1285:11	1150:8 1153:3	steady 1138:25	1182:21
978:19 991:6	1286:6	1153:11,13,18	1139:15	structures
996:14	1288:25	1153:22,25	steel 1242:8	1181:22,25
1007:16	1292:12	1158:5 1160:7	step 1007:3	struggled
1063:2 1064:1	1297:15	1160:14,15	1018:19	1318:1
1066:7	1300:19	1191:21	1082:13	struggling
1114:18	1318:7 1326:4	1194:14	1113:15	1000:25
1117:10	1333:7	1231:19	1184:25	1345:8 1355:9
1118:2	1337:10	1246:1	1190:14	stuck 1314:15
1120:11	1347:13	1278:13	1199:22	studied 1316:15
1121:21	1349:3	1285:20,21,24	1233:6	studies 1054:1
1122:16,23	1351:10	1326:21	1325:19	1054:13
1130:10	1382:5	states' 1163:3	1332:20	1056:6 1077:4
1145:22	state's 1231:8	station 974:16	1348:10	1138:12
1147:4,4,16,18	1267:24	1046:9 1307:4	1366:22	1236:14
1147:23	1269:1	1307:7 1308:1	STEPHEN	1238:25
1148:1,23	stated 1111:6	1308:7	974:21	1239:15,16
1149:4,23	1148:7	1316:13	steps 1198:14	1240:4,5
1150:11	1181:18	1324:4	Steven 1120:14	1244:13
1151:11,15	1307:5 1308:5	1329:12	stick 1367:4	1253:11
1153:8,20	1308:5,19	1342:2	stimulate	1271:25
1154:12	1309:15	1343:22,23	1268:11	1272:8
1159:2	1312:6	1344:4,23	stock 1256:8	1315:20,24
1160:10,20	1338:24	1345:2,4,14	Stoll 974:21	1322:7
1162:4,17	statement	1355:4,6	1002:11,21	1323:15
1163:17	993:11	1357:12	1119:6	1329:7,10
1165:1 1174:5	1054:13	1362:19	1232:25	1342:24,25
1185:12	1063:5 1064:9	1363:1,2	1282:4	1343:14
1221:12	1118:6,18	1364:16	1296:25	1348:5 1370:5
1222:5 1225:2	1138:20	1370:4 1373:4	1374:9	study 990:5
1231:15	1167:1 1181:1	stations 1323:9	stop 1252:18	1053:18
1232:8,12	1227:3 1228:3	1372:8	storm 1168:17	1076:21
1233:16	1228:4	Statistic	straight 1344:1	1101:19,25
1239:2,19	1254:25	1338:19,24	strategies	1102:15,23
1245:25	1301:19	1339:8,23	1102:16	1103:2
1246:1	1312:18,20	statistics	strict 1184:15	1117:14
1249:11,16,21	1347:4,12	1357:20,20	strictly 999:6	1118:5,19
1249:23	1354:20	1358:5	1184:17	1134:23
1253:10,13	statements	status 981:9	strike 1016:9,19	1135:7 1138:8

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1138:11	1107:14,21	successfully	1308:5	1199:3
1161:7,8	1108:10,17,18	1265:4	supplier 983:23	supporting
1190:5	1151:13	suffer 1273:1	1074:2	1227:7
1227:16	1152:18	sufficient	suppliers	1337:13
1230:6,11,16	1154:5	1150:12	1274:22	supportive
1237:6,10,12	1157:21	1188:12	1275:2,12	1232:14
1237:17,21	1164:15	1338:8 1342:2	supplies 988:1	supports 1118:6
1240:22	1234:16	suggest 1063:9	995:16	suppose 986:9
1243:10	1278:24	1232:5	1046:13	1104:24
1247:8,14	submit 990:2	1256:13	1048:15	1197:22
1249:4 1250:7	1041:7,17	1290:13	1049:2	supposed
1251:2,4	1283:11,21	suggested	supply 981:2	1167:3
1252:22	1284:12	1063:10	985:20 988:9	1288:18
1269:16,25	submitted	1362:24	993:8 995:9	supposedly
1272:10	979:15 1051:4	suggestion	1005:25	1079:2
1279:18	1057:4 1081:3	1063:6,19	1006:1,6	sure 983:7 989:7
1280:19,23	1121:7	1126:21	1011:25	991:11 997:23
1281:6	1122:18	suggests	1012:4	1043:18
1305:19	1218:18	1275:20	1049:24	1046:20
1307:24	submitting	Sullivan 1077:7	1050:7	1047:18
1312:15	990:1 1041:10	summarize	1054:18	1049:21
1313:7,8,10,13	subscribed	1230:9	1066:8,25	1053:23
1313:23,25	996:25	1270:22	1073:12	1054:5
1314:5,16	1112:24	summarizing	1135:1	1060:11,13
1315:8,11	subscribing	1078:21	1159:12	1071:11,18
1316:3,6,8	1177:10	summary	1191:4,5	1072:10
1317:17	subsequent	1129:3	1199:6,13	1075:10
1318:7	1178:5	summer 1168:8	1242:1,5	1078:19
1322:11,14,19	subsequently	superhuman	1280:3	1080:4
1322:20,24	1011:6 1145:8	1258:23	support 1042:7	1120:14
1324:19	subset 994:25	superior	1042:11	1133:2 1138:5
1336:9,25	995:1	1163:18	1044:12,25	1139:8
1337:3,5	substantially	supplement	1045:22	1162:15
1355:23	1103:25	1073:10	1046:3	1163:25
1356:11	substantiate	1105:23	1054:13	1165:4 1166:1
1362:25	1283:19	1248:5	1158:21,25	1169:13
1364:5	substation	supplemental	1159:5	1174:17
studying 1309:6	1077:7	1004:8 1175:2	1184:25	1177:22
stuff 1237:1	substitute	supplemented	1189:24	1189:7
1239:5	1104:13	991:9	1226:24	1199:11
1249:23	subtle 1372:9	supplements	1227:3,24	1215:7
subject 986:10	subtract 1016:8	1247:23	1228:4	1218:12
988:17 1048:7	1016:10	supplied	1337:18	1226:19
1060:9	success 1339:21	1054:17	1339:20	1231:23
1065:12	1347:16	1070:23	supported	1239:15
1066:2 1073:1	successful	1103:23	1118:18	1250:20
1076:5	1138:12	1195:2,8,9,13	1171:17	1251:8

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1255:25	1266:8	1357:22	1269:6 1290:9	1241:24
1262:4 1285:9	1279:17	1370:19	1291:16	1250:20
1285:17	1281:13	systems 984:23	1312:15	1265:20
1286:10,11,22	swaps 1219:15	985:10 988:13	1315:22,24	1269:23
1307:2	switch 1311:19	990:14 1001:9	1317:16	1288:20
1313:22	1364:16	1188:21	1318:4 1325:8	1320:5
1316:21	1372:8	1236:10	1325:21	1355:15
1319:22	switching	1273:2 1274:5	1332:24	1358:19
1320:21	1331:5		1344:19	1361:23
1322:18	sworn 978:12	T	1347:25	1371:2
1342:21	1007:11	T 974:22	1366:22,22	talks 1058:7
1372:19	1115:2 1120:3	table 1107:13	1371:14	taller 1173:2
surprise	1173:25	1121:11	taken 998:14	tallied 1257:22
1076:25	1185:7 1221:5	1123:3 1128:4	1324:21	tap 1046:7
1291:22	1233:11	1144:17	1330:13	1326:22
surprised	1292:6	1151:3	takes 1239:23	Tara 974:25
1368:13	1297:10	1170:14	1285:13	1382:3,12
surprising	1300:14	1248:14	talk 1012:23	tariff 1106:19
1163:1	1325:24	1344:20	1043:16	1107:6,24
Surprisingly	1333:2	take 978:6	1166:18	1108:3,4
1282:14	1348:23	982:19 987:25	1180:21	1131:9
surrebuttal	system 1045:10	988:3 990:22	1189:5	1192:16
1007:25	1046:11	990:25	1219:21	1322:25
1078:7	1052:17,19	1001:15,17	1226:12	1369:17
1122:18	1057:16	1009:21	1228:2 1238:7	tariffed 1108:19
1177:19	1061:5,5,12	1010:10	1247:13	tariffs 999:15
1178:9,13	1064:20	1013:8 1014:1	1270:15	1370:10
1183:22	1065:8,10,14	1015:17	1364:14	tartan 1320:19
1186:19	1065:15	1068:14	talked 1112:2	task 1309:6,15
1296:6	1075:18	1097:17	1190:20	1309:16,25
1304:15,20	1076:12	1101:18	1238:23	1367:17
1305:9	1118:3 1131:6	1113:1,23	1270:17,21,25	tax 1137:20,24
1312:14	1131:8	1114:6 1127:6	1273:20	1198:10,11,12
1335:16	1132:10,19,23	1130:22	1322:10	1198:17
1348:18	1132:23	1132:1,2	1364:9 1369:4	1208:20
1352:11	1136:1 1138:7	1173:21	1372:3	1241:12
1367:20	1162:23	1189:16	talking 1010:15	1262:10,11,24
1380:11	1168:21	1190:13	1010:25	1263:11
1381:4,9,23	1184:7,9	1196:11	1013:7	1264:7,17
survey 1338:24	1189:16,22,23	1208:23	1054:24	1265:6
surveys 1218:13	1191:2	1220:23,24	1057:17,19	1276:12
suspect 1044:12	1240:21	1245:12	1067:5	1277:3
1372:11	1315:8	1251:17	1131:20	1279:12
sustain 1270:12	1322:19	1252:21,25	1138:17	taxes 1248:1
Sustained	1323:5	1260:14	1222:20	1262:17,19
1042:20	1324:11	1261:5	1231:10	1273:6,13,20
1055:3 1082:6	1330:6	1267:19,20	1238:13	team 1309:6,15

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1309:16	1175:19	1263:22	1186:3,7	1167:6,8,12
1310:1	1187:8 1224:1	1270:17	testimony 979:6	1173:16
technical	1234:19	1273:1	979:11,13	1175:7
1184:18	1295:4 1302:8	1314:13	980:20,23	1176:24
Technologies	1334:5 1350:1	1321:4	1007:3,25	1177:19
1136:5	tenders 1298:12	1335:22	1008:8 1012:6	1178:1,9,13,20
1171:23	1327:10	TERRI 976:21	1014:25	1183:22
1193:17	tends 1150:8	terri@caferla...	1051:22	1184:24
1217:18	1220:7	976:22	1052:24	1185:24
technology	tentative	test 1285:13	1053:25	1186:14,15
1062:15,17	1047:13,23	testified 978:13	1054:7 1057:5	1187:24
1063:4	tenth 1255:24	986:20	1058:6,10	1188:5
1136:10	TEP 1368:6	1007:12	1062:13	1193:14
1146:9	term 992:3	1040:21	1063:2,22	1218:3
1220:11	1014:8	1061:23	1065:7 1066:3	1220:20
1379:19	1071:23	1115:3 1120:4	1076:17	1221:17,21,22
telephone	1072:2,6,10,13	1146:11	1078:7,13	1222:20
1113:24	1146:1	1158:7,13	1081:19,23	1224:21
1114:11	1255:14	1159:11	1096:14	1225:2
1120:1	1256:5	1160:4	1097:4 1108:7	1227:15
1306:21	1322:21	1163:13	1108:8	1228:15
tell 1065:21,24	1344:11	1174:1	1113:15	1230:5 1231:6
1065:25	terminal 1311:2	1179:10,15,20	1115:10,15	1232:7 1233:7
1179:19	1311:3	1185:8 1221:6	1117:8 1118:8	1233:25
1244:7,19	terminate	1224:19	1118:18	1234:3
1247:19	1198:4	1233:12	1119:11	1245:16
1260:5,6,23	terminated	1280:6 1292:7	1120:22	1247:15
1261:15	992:24	1297:11	1121:6,19	1251:17
1314:4 1361:5	1081:11	1300:15	1122:4,6,9,9	1268:5
1361:6	terminates	1325:25	1122:18	1270:22
1367:24	992:21	1333:3	1123:10,12,15	1271:3 1280:2
telling 1047:4	termination	1348:24	1123:22,24	1289:5 1291:1
1244:25	992:17,20	testify 1061:18	1124:22	1292:21
1260:3	1006:16	1113:25	1130:8 1136:3	1293:2,8,9,15
1267:18	1138:12	1161:13	1146:11,13	1296:6,13
ten 1013:7	1198:1	1173:22	1147:8,14	1297:5 1298:3
1123:3 1266:7	terminology	1294:25	1149:11	1300:22
1285:24	1255:20,25	testifying	1152:22	1301:2,8,13
1358:20	1261:23	1133:18	1153:1,6,20	1302:6
1363:24	terms 998:4,5	1147:1 1154:6	1154:15,22	1304:10,12,16
tend 1157:8	999:10	1159:5	1157:6	1305:9
1165:17	1047:14,23	1179:23	1158:15	1307:16
1345:8	1055:6	1228:12	1159:9,20,25	1312:15
tended 1345:18	1178:21	1294:8	1162:14	1320:25
tender 979:24	1235:24	1304:23	1164:17	1326:17
1008:16	1236:5 1240:1	1368:17	1165:10	1333:16,21
1115:25	1240:3	testimonies	1166:10	1334:3,3

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1335:14,17	1170:4,5,9,24	theoretically	1118:8	1314:4,8
1336:2,13	1171:5,19	982:13	1132:16	1315:20,23
1338:3 1339:6	1173:13,17,18	theory 1372:24	1144:19	1317:10
1343:24	1176:12,22	thereof 1194:15	1146:16	1319:21
1348:19	1177:15	thereto 1063:5	1150:15	1320:2 1321:3
1349:18,23	1184:22,24	thermal 1314:24	1152:4,11	1321:9 1324:6
1352:9,12,15	1185:1,2	thick 1102:2	1155:21,23	1328:24
1364:8	1187:18	thing 1130:16	1156:20	1336:17
1367:20	1192:24	1252:9	1161:9	1337:11,12
1368:18	1193:7	1258:15	1166:11	1339:7 1340:3
1372:21	1195:15	1259:8 1264:6	1177:21	1340:5
1379:4,22	1196:23	1287:2 1321:9	1178:16	1342:13
1380:7,9,11	1197:4	1364:7	1190:4 1196:3	1343:18
1381:2,4,7,9	1199:16	things 979:14	1217:11	1344:11
1381:14,21,24	1217:3	998:9 1001:3	1219:1	1353:11
tests 1360:15	1220:18,21	1006:1	1222:21	1356:25
thank 980:15	1223:9,25	1042:24	1224:20	1357:1,13
984:5,21 990:8	1229:21	1112:8 1184:5	1225:3,4	1360:11,12,13
994:3,12	1230:21,24	1184:10	1227:3,12	1360:19
1002:8,21	1232:23	1195:4	1228:6,12,21	1361:6,6,8
1003:5,11	1233:1,5,8	1239:13	1228:25	1362:10
1007:4 1009:4	1235:16	1243:3 1256:6	1229:2,3,11	1363:9,9,19,19
1011:13,18	1271:18	1257:5 1258:7	1230:18,19	1363:21
1013:10	1282:2 1289:3	1359:15	1231:14	1364:2,19
1040:6	1289:4,6,21	1362:21	1232:13,17	1365:2
1046:17	1292:9 1295:3	1365:7	1237:18	1368:24
1047:9	1296:4,23	1366:20	1245:3,16	1369:3,7
1051:13	1297:3 1300:6	think 981:3	1246:19,21,23	1370:17,25
1055:13	1300:10	987:5 988:7,22	1251:11,16	1372:20,23
1056:1	1302:2	991:2 997:12	1252:12	1373:11
1063:14	1305:15	998:5,21	1253:15	thinking 1055:2
1067:11	1312:21	1005:14	1254:2	1290:7
1069:1	1318:18	1040:15	1256:17	1340:25
1075:10	1324:12,15	1042:9,10	1258:1,14	thinks 1108:11
1098:15	1325:18	1046:2,11	1260:8,15	third 992:1
1099:9,15	1331:16	1055:1,8,24	1262:2	1004:7
1113:13,14	1332:17,19,21	1070:8 1071:2	1265:21	1219:12
1114:13	1335:5	1071:12,12	1267:13	1220:10
1116:14,23	1345:23	1077:20	1268:1,4,5	1301:18
1119:3,12,13	1346:24	1078:21	1269:8,9	1305:24
1120:6,8	1348:7,9,20	1080:10	1270:9	1306:6
1124:24	1352:24	1081:20,24,24	1273:19	1326:20,21
1129:14	1365:9	1098:13	1278:22,24	1342:23
1132:25	1372:10	1101:22	1290:2,9	Thompson
1133:7	1373:9,10	1103:22	1291:20	975:15 1292:9
1138:16	thanks 1044:8	1104:3 1106:6	1307:22	1292:11,15
1156:14	1303:8	1108:14	1313:19	1293:2,7,18,24

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1294:22	1040:25	1101:14	tonight 1290:2	trans 1109:14
1295:3 1297:2	1046:24	1250:9	1291:20	transact 1219:2
1376:17	1050:13	title 1194:6	1348:13	TRANSCRIPT
thoroughly	1057:11	1297:19	tool 1285:1	974:4
1296:10	1070:9 1079:7	1326:9	1360:5,10	transfers 1162:8
thought 990:20	1079:25	titled 992:13	1371:3,21,23	transformers
1042:14,19	1080:14	1136:5	top 1116:25	1198:24
1291:2	1081:25	1303:10	1144:1	transmission
1322:11	1104:8	today 978:3	1150:10	974:15,17
three 986:1,3	1110:20	979:12 980:5	1155:16	981:17,22
988:25 991:14	1113:10	981:4 1008:7	1195:17	982:5,23 999:6
1040:12	1115:15	1045:24	1231:6	999:12,16,21
1128:17	1118:16	1075:15,16	1285:24	1000:8 1006:2
1138:19	1119:17	1112:2,13	topic 1209:17	1010:25
1142:21	1132:9 1156:8	1114:3	1340:14	1011:1
1148:14	1181:7 1182:3	1115:18	1352:21	1012:19,22
1164:25	1182:20	1122:9	1371:16	1013:4
1219:6 1270:9	1190:6	1123:15	total 991:14	1014:10
1291:13	1198:18,19	1173:8,17,22	1075:7 1079:2	1015:5,25
1329:21	1216:14,19	1174:24	1097:5	1045:5,8,10
1330:14	1218:2,5	1184:24	1107:17	1053:3
1338:14	1227:4 1229:8	1185:2 1186:9	1138:20	1054:16
1351:8	1230:18	1197:11,16	1148:1 1154:2	1057:23
threshold	1237:24,24	1221:17	1157:2	1058:9,12,15
1149:22	1241:8 1247:4	1222:1,11	1160:13	1058:21,23
1152:11,19	1252:10	1224:11	1169:4,16	1061:9
through-and-...	1253:17	1234:4	1248:11	1064:20
1189:19,20	1283:22	1238:23	1355:11	1065:8,14
1190:1,17,21	1288:24	1290:7	1367:9	1067:2,9,16,21
1191:7	1293:19	1293:12	totally 1060:18	1067:24,25
throw 1265:14	1295:4 1301:9	1298:6	1344:19	1068:2
1291:23	1309:24	1301:13	totals 995:22	1096:13,17,21
thrown 1372:13	1317:10	1302:6 1327:3	tower 1173:2	1096:24
tie 1046:10	1349:21	1334:3	towers 1222:19	1097:6 1103:5
1259:24	1352:10	1349:19,24	1222:23	1104:19
1363:23	1360:25	1368:17	town 1291:13,17	1105:8
tied 1259:16,18	1363:18	1373:11	1291:18	1108:25
1356:5	1371:24	today's 1290:6	track 1057:18	1109:1,4,8
ties 1363:25	1382:7	told 988:17	1240:20	1112:4
time 979:15	times 1015:20	1079:25	1259:7	1130:23
988:19 989:18	1121:24	1339:7	tradeoffs	1131:14,17,25
990:6,12	1153:23	tomorrow	1161:20	1132:2,5
996:25 997:19	1160:17	1001:20	traditional	1135:20
998:6 999:19	1225:20	1185:2 1290:1	1103:6 1108:4	1138:7 1142:4
1000:5 1010:4	1256:10	1290:12,12,16	trained 1238:19	1150:16
1013:6,8	1270:9	1290:23	training	1151:13,21
1014:17	timing 1080:4	1291:20,25	1238:17	1153:16

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1158:4,22	1339:3	1261:7 1292:3	1145:16	1160:17
1161:1,14,18	transporting	1356:7	1147:13	1172:23
1161:20,23	1361:25	trying 1010:19	1159:8,24	1184:5 1187:6
1162:2,11,21	1362:1	1043:25	1162:13	1191:11
1163:6 1164:2	travel 1290:18	1045:8,22	1164:16	1192:7 1246:2
1164:7	treated 1362:20	1241:17,19,25	1165:9	1247:20
1167:20,22	trend 1141:17	1251:13	1166:15	1250:12
1168:1 1170:1	1141:19	1258:22	1187:23	1251:25
1176:25	1172:14,18,24	1259:21,23	1194:5 1231:5	1262:15
1178:25	1173:6,10	1339:14	1351:7	1290:10
1179:4 1180:3	1196:18	TSA 992:18	1367:11	1310:16
1182:6,7	trends 1195:21	993:3 994:8	turned 1106:3	1314:2
1183:3 1184:7	Trenton 1043:6	1001:11,21	turning 1163:12	1363:20
1184:8	1046:4,18,18	1016:8	1163:25	1364:20,23
1189:12,18	triangulate	1050:14	1188:8	1372:4
1192:6 1219:8	1218:14	1107:24	1194:22	type 1126:6,10
1220:11	trick 1372:25	1176:25	1195:15	1141:21
1276:17,24	true 986:9	1218:23	1209:11	1169:9
1277:3	1064:9,20	1335:20	Twain 1315:21	1218:16
1303:25	1066:17,24	1341:25	1315:23	1219:2 1232:1
1305:2	1081:16,20	1342:7	1323:20	1241:5 1242:5
1310:11,13	1132:8 1165:8	TSA s 1219:18	1324:5,8	1255:5,11,21
1311:9,13,14	1165:24	TSR 1191:7,11	1363:13,21,23	1256:1
1323:5	1168:11,15	1191:24	1363:25	1344:16,19
1324:11	1169:25	1192:4,18,19	1364:4,9	1355:20
1328:11,18	1175:15	TSR s 1192:4	1365:8 1368:3	1361:10,22
1339:25	1186:10	Tuesday 981:5	1368:5,9	types 1126:14
1340:8,11	1256:21	turbines 1139:4	twenty-five	1182:6 1219:4
1341:6,8,22	1260:3,5	1139:11,15	1015:21	1250:13
1343:1 1354:9	1293:15	1173:1,1,2,8	twenty-two	1257:15
1354:11	1294:20	turn 992:11	1109:25	typical 1071:9
1356:5,11,16	1298:10	993:10	twice 1306:19	1071:12
1357:4 1361:2	1299:23	1006:14	two 988:25	1218:23
1364:23	1327:6	1016:16	991:12 994:22	1222:21
1368:21	1328:10,17	1052:23	997:10,11	1241:9
1371:10	1333:24	1061:15	999:4 1015:8	1340:17
1372:16,17	1353:8,17	1063:21	1040:12	1341:4
1379:14,16	1354:4,11,20	1066:3	1050:9	1356:15
transmitted	1367:10	1072:18	1058:17	typically
1081:9	1368:12	1073:2 1103:3	1064:8	1112:20
1117:16	1370:12,21	1108:22	1067:25	1151:19
1134:25	1371:12	1117:7 1137:3	1080:15	1156:22
Transource	try 1002:1	1138:16	1102:2	1161:22,24
1364:14	1042:7 1046:2	1139:6,22	1109:25	1169:2,20
1366:5 1372:3	1067:15	1140:18	1121:24	1189:15
transportation	1111:1	1142:12,25	1122:15	1241:7 1360:6
1236:13,14	1243:23	1143:23	1153:23	1360:9

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

typographical 1301:15	1250:10 1251:10 1252:8,15,24 1253:16,21 1255:19 1256:20 1258:22 1259:14 1261:7,11 1265:11,11 1268:20,22 1285:22 1320:21 1321:20 1324:9 1335:22,24 1344:16 1356:14,16	1356:10 unit 1070:12,15 1071:10 1072:20,23 1073:21 1297:22 unit's 1071:13 United 1145:18 1153:11 1160:6,14 1191:20 1194:14 units 1012:20 1070:25 1074:25 1075:13 1364:24 unknown 1343:2 unreasonable 1288:12,14 1313:18 unusual 1071:13 update 980:19 991:11 updated 979:15 1106:18 1198:18 1218:3 1243:15 updates 981:14 1243:5 upgrade 1131:24 1132:18 1184:13,16,20 1322:25 1323:1 upgraded 1276:20,25 1277:4 upgrades 1131:5 1132:10 1189:23 1313:14,17,24 1319:17	1323:16 1343:2 1370:23 upper 1121:4 1122:16 1337:7 upward 1172:14 urged 1337:2 usage 1105:6 use 984:9 994:7 1053:2 1067:20 1070:14 1071:20 1072:13,20 1075:11 1079:16 1107:7,16 1131:6,8 1157:17 1162:22 1181:15,19 1194:20 1198:11,12 1243:1 1245:22 1246:3,6 1247:3 1249:24 1261:7 1285:3 1285:17,21 1337:2 1347:5 usefulness 1194:18 user 1238:20 1245:21 uses 1140:14 1247:25 1371:21 usual 1070:24 usually 1059:8,9 1241:1,2,5 1366:14,16 1367:1,3 utilities 981:4 983:14,18 985:22 990:25	999:11 1000:18,23,24 1001:4,6 1076:23 1077:5,17 1117:15 1134:24 1164:25 1165:14 1168:25 1184:1 1239:6 1272:22 1279:20 1280:3 1318:3 1320:22 1331:7 1339:3 1340:9 1353:21 1357:19 utility 976:1 979:2 981:3 988:8 1007:21 1042:15 1043:5 1077:14 1154:12 1237:3 1255:10 1297:21 1326:10 1353:5,16 1360:6 1361:24 1380:6 utility's 1353:18 utilization 1071:6,17,19 1071:24 1072:14 utilized 1051:6 utilizing 1077:14
<hr/> U <hr/> Uh-huh 1194:11 ultimate 1338:15 ultimately 1220:15 1259:22 1361:21 um 1143:21 1167:2 1171:14,14,15 1171:15 1230:9 1232:17 unable 1343:2 unbundled 1129:8 underestimate 1126:23 underground 1168:20 underlies 1150:22 underlined 1055:8 underlying 1045:10 1107:17 1142:21 understand 984:9 985:24 997:23 998:21 1049:22 1054:5,23 1069:9 1096:15,20 1099:21 1108:10 1228:19 1239:25 1240:2 1244:1 1245:7 1246:13 1247:3 1250:9	understanding 996:1 1001:10 1006:21 1041:9,12 1042:5 1122:4 1190:14 1243:12 1310:9 1313:20 1314:24 1315:2 1316:5 1325:12 1352:20 1370:9 1371:15 1372:23 understands 1072:10 understate 1156:21 unfair 1361:14 unfortunate 1098:12 unfortunately 986:5 1042:25 1316:24 Union 982:18 unique 1282:16 1340:4			
				<hr/> V <hr/> vague 1268:2 vaguely 1268:3 valid 1244:20

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1245:9	versa 1192:22	1310:10,10	1290:18	1263:6,8,14,16
validity 1244:21	version 1137:1	1311:6	1291:10	1265:24
1245:4,19	1155:20	1323:23	1299:12	1271:9 1314:6
1246:20	1186:16	Volume 974:10	1314:10	1314:10
valuable 1360:5	1218:4	1018:23	1345:11	1321:16
1371:3	1284:12	1082:17	1355:7	1342:23
value 981:25	1302:5	1199:25	1358:21	1361:13
1045:2,3,4	versus 999:16	1210:8	1363:10	1362:10,17
1059:10	1001:8 1014:3	voluntarily	1371:14	ways 1106:8
1076:22	1052:16	1080:6,19	wanted 1041:20	we'll 1082:10
1077:6	1053:20	vote 1044:10,25	1043:23	1110:25
1156:21	1056:9	VP 1043:11	1051:19	1114:6
1157:2,9	1057:15		1114:4	1123:22,25
1181:10	1069:23	W	1227:14	1173:23
1245:2 1258:9	1106:19	wage 1243:19	1250:19	1199:19
1258:10	1108:3 1109:1	1247:23	1255:24	1240:12
1259:3,15	1109:14	1248:3	1291:3	1290:2,11
1260:25	1135:1 1305:1	wages 1247:22	wants 981:12	1292:2
1261:2	1319:22	1248:2,4,5	1072:9 1268:4	1294:23
1360:11	1343:22	1263:5 1287:7	1370:7	we're 978:6
values 1181:13	1368:8,21	wait 1192:21	warranty	984:19 999:25
1280:20	1369:17	1216:12	1194:16	1018:16
variability	vertical 1239:3	1294:23	wasn't 1041:15	1057:19
1192:1	vest 1046:1	waiting 1138:10	1126:5,13	1067:5 1077:3
varied 1181:14	vetted 1218:9	1208:12	1238:1	1096:3
varies 1071:12	viable 1046:4	1216:5	1278:23	1100:22
1076:4	1345:5	waived 1290:25	1336:9	1112:12,19
variety 1012:21	vice 1185:19	waiving 1063:15	1372:14,19	1119:20,21
1017:20	1192:22	1289:12	watching	1136:8 1151:2
1168:12	view 997:20	walk 1107:9	1369:19	1170:21
various 996:4	1152:19	Walmart	Water 981:12	1172:25
1015:14	1184:5 1229:6	1219:10	996:2	1173:6 1185:4
1049:23	1359:24	want 983:10	watts 1128:7	1190:12
1143:2	viewed 1157:7	996:3 1045:25	way 982:7	1208:3 1210:1
1267:18	vintage 1142:19	1101:18,22	1071:25	1215:4 1221:1
1294:4	virtually 1272:1	1114:1 1127:4	1078:1	1238:12
1329:25	1272:9	1189:2	1112:16	1241:19
1357:19	virtues 1153:2	1190:13	1161:4	1244:12,23
verification	vis-a-vis 987:22	1209:25	1188:23	1255:5
1106:1	988:5 1054:4	1219:21	1192:22	1258:14
verified 1239:23	1054:11	1238:5	1218:21	1259:23
1240:15	1055:16	1240:20	1231:13,20	1264:16
1262:25	1060:18	1244:10	1242:3	1282:20
1301:8	voltage 974:15	1260:18	1244:19	1285:16
verify 1244:4	1184:6	1270:15,22	1245:20	1290:1 1291:9
1286:8	1198:24	1278:3 1286:1	1260:4,22,23	1320:5
verifying 1245:3	1309:5	1286:17,20	1262:23	1344:22

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1351:1	whatsoever	1000:1,2,2,11	1138:20	1225:12,14
1356:15,17	1181:22	1003:4,6	1139:2,11,15	1231:11,12,18
1358:18	WHIPPLE	1008:22,24	1140:11,15,20	1231:22,24
1373:11	976:4	1009:11,15,18	1140:25	1232:2,11
we've 981:1	White 1290:15	1009:22	1141:3,7,13,21	1235:2,4
997:18,21,22	wholesale	1010:2,6,10,15	1142:1,3,7	1277:19,24
998:15 999:5	1112:17	1010:23	1144:3,14	1278:2,4,8
1056:15	1135:16	1011:6,7,10	1145:3,10,18	1295:19,21
1097:9 1106:3	1137:10	1014:17,19	1145:23	1299:1,3
1112:2 1124:9	1144:4,7,11	1016:25	1146:8,19	1302:22,24
1138:17	1145:1,4,9	1045:1 1052:8	1147:4,18,19	1315:4,6,19,20
1139:18	1161:16	1052:17	1147:23,24	1319:5,7
1191:23	1163:8 1171:8	1057:24	1148:1,15	1324:1
1260:8	1353:9	1061:21,24	1149:17	1327:23,25
1311:20	wide 1168:12	1062:9 1068:8	1150:6,10,23	1334:19,21
1343:24	widgets 1249:15	1068:10	1151:4,9,17,20	1340:16
weak 1130:10	WILLIAM	1069:18	1152:2 1153:2	1341:3 1342:6
website 1240:18	974:21	1070:23	1153:10,17,21	1346:15,17
1338:19	Williams 975:16	1073:21	1154:1,2,8	1350:14,16
1339:23	980:15,18	1074:18	1155:1,4,6,23	1352:3,7
1347:6	983:24	1075:3	1156:2,4,22	1362:1,13
weigh 1318:17	1003:11	1078:15	1157:2,12,23	1363:7 1364:9
weighted	1009:4,7	1079:14,18,22	1158:5,8	1364:19,21,24
1193:19	1011:12	1081:8,9	1159:4 1160:6	1364:25
1196:14	1099:15,17,24	1098:21	1160:12,22,24	1365:1,1,5,21
went 1042:16	1116:14	1099:10	1161:2,21,21	1365:23
1049:15	1124:18,24	1112:23	1161:23,24	1366:10
1056:18	1300:18	1116:7,9	1162:4,10	1367:11,14
1118:17	1302:1,3,8	1118:10	1163:21	1372:4
1245:17	1324:15,17	1119:21,21	1170:22	1379:12,19
1247:6	1325:2,6,17	1120:18,20,23	1171:23	1381:1,20
1249:11	1348:14	1120:24	1172:11	window 1047:10
1287:20	1349:2 1350:1	1121:7,8,21,25	1173:4,4	1113:11
1364:18,18	1368:23	1122:19,19	1176:11,14	windy 1324:2
weren't 986:11	1373:9 1374:6	1125:23	1178:4,14,22	winter 1062:19
1045:15	1374:14,19	1126:7	1183:18	wires 977:5
1182:10	1377:3,9	1128:21	1187:17,23	980:8 1003:4
1339:24	1378:3	1129:3,7,9,16	1188:14	1008:22
west 1160:5	willing 1045:4,7	1131:21,22	1189:9,15	1098:21
western 1071:2	1283:10,20	1132:3	1190:9	1116:7
1118:10	1284:11	1133:19,19,22	1191:18,20	1119:21
1141:25	1370:23	1133:24	1193:17	1120:23
1159:4	wind 976:20	1134:3,12,15	1195:5,12,14	1121:8
1164:25	977:5,5 980:8	1134:19,20,25	1197:10,14	1122:19
1189:10	980:10 981:20	1135:4,6,25	1208:9	1133:19,22,24
1190:3	992:10,18	1136:5,10	1215:12	1170:23
1191:19	993:6,7 999:7	1137:9 1138:5	1217:18	1176:14

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1181:22	1268:1,7	1321:11	1270:1	1270:2
1187:17,23	1279:3	1337:12	wouldn't	1307:23
1215:12	1286:18	worded 1311:4	1011:24	1312:25
1225:12	1289:6,7	wording 1325:1	1041:6	1340:20,22
1235:2	1290:10	1325:10	1168:19	1342:13
1295:21	1292:6	words 1057:24	1253:20	1352:5 1359:8
1299:3	1296:16	1073:14	1281:17	year 1042:13
1302:24	1297:6,10	1099:4 1255:3	1305:21	1048:9 1060:8
1319:7	1300:12,14	work 1054:1	1319:18	1064:15
1327:25	1302:9	1055:22	1353:19	1069:10,22,23
1334:21	1303:21	1107:12	1355:18	1070:8 1071:3
1346:17	1305:21	1108:11	write 1106:15	1075:20
1350:16	1316:16,18,21	1133:24	write-offs	1096:17,22
1365:23	1316:22	1134:10	1169:8,10	1098:1,8
wish 1298:2	1317:20	1236:23	written 1079:7	1106:11
1326:16	1325:20,22,24	1237:7	1180:4	1128:4
withdraw	1328:4	1238:22	1221:21,25	1136:18,23
1283:23	1332:21,22,24	1239:8	1233:25	1137:22,23
withdrawn	1333:2 1334:5	1242:23	1234:3	1139:16
1291:7	1336:17	1254:19	wrong 1108:11	1140:21,21,24
withdrew	1337:22	1263:25	1155:10	1141:9 1143:6
1080:6,19	1348:11,13,23	1372:24	1159:17,22	1143:7,12,15
witness 978:7,7	1364:10	worked 1160:20	1190:15	1143:19
978:12 979:25	1372:20	1182:4	1237:19	1144:3,13,18
1007:4,5,7,11	1373:13	1235:23	1246:12	1144:21
1008:16	witnesses	1252:4 1262:6	1363:18	1145:19,19
1018:4 1058:1	1078:12	1263:19		1156:25
1072:10	1082:1	workers	<hr/> X <hr/>	1157:1,3
1108:8	1222:19	1242:11	X 1244:3,23	1172:21
1113:16	1280:6 1289:9	1268:12	1255:5	1191:10,17
1114:11	1289:13,18,25	1287:16	1262:10	1196:16
1115:2 1116:1	1290:6,11	Workforce	<hr/> Y <hr/>	1239:1,23
1119:13,15,22	1291:13,17,18	1233:21	Y 974:20	1243:5
1120:3 1133:2	1292:3	1236:16	yeah 988:15	1250:11,13,14
1136:21	1311:22	working	989:12 994:15	1285:11
1167:5 1170:5	1374:2	1118:22	1139:1	1365:2
1173:18,19,25	Wolf 1354:18	works 1131:10	1144:19	years 986:1,3
1175:19	wondering	1131:11	1145:25	1009:20
1185:1,3,7	1316:22	1236:10	1152:11	1013:7
1220:21,22	wood 1248:15	1260:6,24	1183:19	1040:12
1221:3,5	1248:15	1262:22	1195:25	1064:6 1111:7
1224:1,18	word 1081:17	1367:5	1196:3 1209:9	1118:22
1229:1	1127:6 1196:6	world 1191:21	1218:15	1138:23
1230:10,12	1222:12	1236:20	1225:22	1141:4
1233:8,9,11	1258:18	1251:24	1229:3	1144:19,22
1234:19	1301:20	1259:2	1242:20	1145:21
1260:11	1316:11	1269:20		1172:23

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1178:25	1305:15,17	1,690 1193:20	1039 1018:23	1179:15,20
1189:16	1312:21	1196:2	1380:3,3	1188:8,18
1236:15,18	1322:3,5	1.2 1106:10	1040 1374:16	1209:1,6
1240:8	1324:12	1:00 1113:21	1083 1082:17	1236:18
1253:14	1328:6,9	1:15 1119:18	1092 1379:16,16	1309:17
1257:4,15	1331:10,12	10 1002:15	1095 1082:17	12-0560 1152:24
1262:13	1332:4,10	1012:7	1379:18,18	12.0 1168:8
1264:13,13	1336:23	1013:11,20	1096 1374:17	12.7 1053:10
1284:21	1342:9	1014:24	1098 1374:18	1061:6
1285:21	1344:10	1017:14	1099 1374:19	1200 1199:25
1288:21	1346:22	1052:21	11 999:20	1207 1199:25
1352:2	1347:3	1053:3,7,19	1000:10	1379:14,14
1354:13	1348:15	1054:2,8,22	1002:15	1208 1375:20
1358:20	1353:2	1062:6	1081:14	1211 1210:8
1360:14	1354:21	1096:16,22	1226:6	1214 1210:8
yesterday 991:9	1369:24	1097:12	110 1181:19	1216 1375:21
1043:15	1370:2 1373:7	1098:8,9,25	1100 1374:20	1217 1375:22
1114:2	1375:12	1110:2	1114 1374:23	1221 1376:3
1228:12	1376:23	1126:17	1115 1381:15,15	1223 1380:20,20
1372:15	1377:5,8,13,19	1128:5	1117 1374:24	1224 1376:4
	1378:5,8	1162:13	1120 1375:3	1225 1376:5
Z	Zobrist's	1329:4	1124 1381:3,3,5	1226 1376:6
zero 1265:10	1260:11	1349:11	1381:5,7,7,10	1230 1376:7
1269:17,21,25	zone 1166:7,8	100 981:10	1381:10	1231 1376:8
1270:1	zones 1160:21	995:22	1125 1375:4	1233 1376:11
Zobrist 975:4	1165:22,23	1048:13	1130 1375:5	1234 1380:21,21
980:3 1003:1	1166:5,5	1074:3,5	1133 1375:6	1235 1376:12
1008:19		1121:20	1146 1379:20,20	1271 1376:13
1098:18	0	1181:23	115 1257:21	1282 1376:14
1116:4 1125:5		1182:2 1198:9	1170 1379:13,13	1292 1376:17
1177:15,17	1	1257:19	1381:18,18	1293 1379:4,4
1183:8,21	1 984:18 992:10	1261:21	1171 1375:7	1296 1376:18
1187:12	1017:8 1117:7	1263:3,4	1174 1375:10	1297 1376:21
1215:6 1224:4	1118:1	1264:11	1175 1379:23,23	1299 1376:22,23
1234:22	1154:24	1000 1013:5	1176 1375:11	13 1057:19
1244:10	1155:11,14	1002 1374:9	1177 1375:12	1061:18
1260:7 1266:6	1188:11	1004 1374:10	1183 1375:13	1138:16
1266:10,12	1193:25	1005 1380:14,14	1185 1375:16	1190:10
1269:9	1232:7	1380:17,17	1186 1381:22,25	1301:6
1273:15	1343:13	1007 1374:13	1187 1375:17	13,608,000
1279:14	1349:16	1008 1380:10,10	1381:22,25	1107:25
1281:10	1,020,000	1380:12,12	1193 1375:18	13,701,600
1296:19	1016:10	1009 1374:14	1197 1375:19	1107:18
1299:22	1,200 1125:23	1011 1374:15	12 1078:11,20	13.6 1060:25
1300:3	1128:21	1019 1018:23	1125:16	1300 1377:3
1301:24	1,600,000	102 1075:8	1163:13	1303 1377:4
1302:2	1128:11	102.3 1129:3	1164:16	1305 1377:5

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1313 1377:6	1127:8	1006:12,13	1198:19	978:3 991:24
1319 1377:7	1199:25	2.5 1074:21	2014 988:18	1062:23
1322 1377:8	1210:8 1226:7	2.7 1016:11	1141:7,16	1069:12
1324 1377:9	1331:6 1351:9	2:00 1114:3	1142:20	1103:25
1326 1377:12	175 1160:19	20 1064:6	1143:6	1137:23
1328 1377:13	18 1053:24	1104:5,6	1149:11	1382:9
1331 1377:14	1127:21	1117:10	1154:18	2018 1128:4
1333 1377:17	1194:3 1209:2	1137:21	1172:5,12,19	1137:24
1335 1377:18	1209:6	1175:12	1172:21	2019 1137:25
1336 1377:19	1216:17,17	1179:11,20	1196:20	201HC 1293:22
1342 1377:20	1349:11	1319:20	2014-0207	1293:25
1347 1377:21	1381:17	1338:12	1147:11	1379:5
1349 1378:3	184 1167:12	1354:13	2015 988:21	2021 985:7
1350 1378:4	19 1130:8	20.75 1069:8,23	989:3,9,10,21	997:18,21
1353 1378:5	1194:3	200 985:2	990:4 1041:2	998:7 1048:9
1355 1378:6	1198:23	988:11,16	1041:17	1069:10,23,25
1366 1378:7	1998 1141:4	996:24 997:4	1042:13,13	1109:21,24
1370 1378:8	1999 1141:4	1053:9	1043:2 1044:5	1126:20
14 1061:18	1235:22	1060:23	1044:19	1127:10
1156:10,16		1061:4,11	1045:18	1128:10
1157:11,13,18	<u>2</u>	1097:22	1046:20	1198:3 1368:2
1165:9	2 1012:7	1098:5 1105:6	1127:9	206 1223:3
1309:11,12	1013:10,20	1105:8 1108:1	1137:10,13	1226:13,15,18
15 981:7 991:16	1014:24	1293:3,5,8,19	1140:21	1226:19
991:24 995:20	1015:17,18,19	1293:21	1142:18,22	1227:25
1040:15	1017:5,14	1379:4	1143:15,19	1325:4,7
1063:2	1043:1	2000 1145:19	1144:3,13	1331:23
1126:18,19	1052:21	2005 1235:20,25	1145:10,14,19	1343:7
1128:8,18	1055:8,11	1236:11	1193:17,20	1347:25
1188:18	1064:15,16	1240:8	1196:19,20	1379:6
1220:24	1075:4	2009 1144:25	1217:18	21 1117:10
1226:6	1079:10	1196:18	1237:18	1118:1
1257:22	1098:1 1128:4	1357:25	1240:8	211 1222:8
16 974:10	1153:6 1159:8	201 1127:2,7	2016 1004:13,15	215 1147:16
1012:5	1159:25	1297:25	1047:11,16	217 1147:23
1053:24	1194:22	1300:24	1057:9	22 988:21
1063:2	1209:11	1302:5	1069:22	1069:3,22
1078:11,20	2,000 1175:12	1326:14	1079:10	1118:1 1318:7
1193:17	1199:15	1333:18	1080:13	1342:20
1222:17	2,500 1190:6	1349:8	1081:14	23 974:7 978:3
1227:16	2,838,000	2010 1161:9	1103:11	1012:11
1329:19	1160:12	2011 1139:16	1127:14,21	1078:16
1331:6 1351:7	2,880 1103:8	1161:9	1142:18	1079:3
17 1018:23	1104:4	2012 1172:15,21	1196:20	237 1164:24
1082:17	2.0 1329:9,13	1190:1	1218:1	24 1143:12
1122:5	2.1B 1051:14	2013 1172:17	1381:17	1192:19,21
1123:12	2.3 992:12	1196:14	2017 974:7	240 1198:2

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

241 1164:24	30 1071:4	385 1223:19,23	475 979:8,17,20	1076:7 1142:8
246 1247:16	1072:21	386 1234:14,18	979:21 1380:7	1142:11
25 981:4 990:21	1118:22	394 1130:10	476 1008:1,6,13	1143:19,21
991:16 995:19	300 1240:15		1247:17	1160:2
1068:20,23	300,000 1319:19	<u>4</u>	1248:24	1264:14
258 1162:16	1320:9	4 992:12 1053:1	1249:8	500 1097:19
25th 989:21	31 1139:6	1064:1 1065:7	476HC 1008:10	1129:6,8
26 1154:1	1198:3	1078:11	1008:15	1227:12,12,19
1155:24	32 1159:11	1125:21	1380:9	1227:21
26th 1382:8	1172:2 1301:3	1126:22	477 1008:3,6,13	1228:8 1271:1
27 1154:21	327 1148:13	1128:14	1078:7	1277:7 1307:3
1155:13,16	33 1172:16,23	1172:18,20	477HC 1008:10	1307:6,25
1163:25	33.7 1149:15	1209:12	1008:15	1308:6 1316:9
273 1006:22	34 1121:11	1222:10,12,17	1380:11	1319:16
29 1043:2	1160:13	1227:15	478 1003:23,24	1329:10,11
1044:5,19	342 1148:12,16	1310:6	1004:4 1005:1	1345:17
1301:2	1170:7,16	4,700,000	1380:13	1355:5
1360:14	1379:12	1128:12	479 1003:23,24	1357:11
292 1163:13	345 1198:24	40 1137:25	1005:5,8,19	1364:21
294 1165:13	1364:1,1	1144:15	1006:10	1373:4
	345kV 974:17	1149:9,20,25	1380:15	51 1145:20
<u>3</u>	1310:11	1150:3,12	48 1142:25	1227:18
3 1053:1,24	1326:22	1151:1,3,7	1153:8	525 1223:10,13
1058:20	35 981:11 995:2	1152:10	1160:14,15	1223:23
1059:14	995:5,6,24	1195:24		1380:20
1064:1,2,9	996:2 1068:22	1246:1	<u>5</u>	526 1234:6,9,18
1069:12	1068:25	1301:18	5 993:10 994:4	1380:21
1107:14	1069:1	402 1174:12,15	1012:5	53 1193:22
1114:3	35,699 1175:13	1174:17,19	1052:23	1195:16
1139:13	35,99 1175:12	1175:18	1061:15	54 1196:8
1153:19	364 1219:21	1178:1,20	1063:1 1155:5	55 1062:3
1160:9	1379:14	1379:22	1155:22	1140:15
1166:15	367HC 1379:16	406 1018:1	1156:3	1141:14,20
1193:16	368HC 1102:7	406HC 1017:23	1161:12	1150:25
1209:12	1379:18	1380:2	1209:13	1172:8
1222:10	37 1172:17	40s 1142:10	1303:12	1173:10
1349:16	1301:3 1303:9	41 1172:19,23	1311:12	56 1106:15
3,000 1199:13	1337:6	1301:3 1335:7	1364:19	1153:20
1219:3,3	1338:18	42 1140:18	5,600 1106:16	57 1326:20
3,157,757	1347:4	1172:2	5,670 1060:4	572 1048:25
1128:7	374 1136:9,12	1178:25	5,688 1107:3	59 992:23
3,387 1104:4	1146:4,17	1349:11	5.274 1127:10	
3.1 993:11	1379:19	44 1142:12	50 1014:12	<u>6</u>
3.2 1075:6	38 1075:2	45 1068:17	1061:20	6 1013:15,21
3.4 1016:9	1125:24	1149:4	1062:7	1053:8
3.5 994:4	1139:22	1349:11	1070:15	1059:15
3:00 1114:3	384 1124:11,16	467 1364:19	1074:23	1061:3

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

HEARING VOL. XVI 3/23/2017

1062:22	69 1349:12	<u>9</u>		
1063:21		9 999:20		
1065:7	<u>7</u>	1045:18		
1074:13,14	7 1057:7,9	1073:4		
1105:5	1066:3 1073:4	1167:11		
1107:13,14,19	1160:19	1190:10		
1188:2,2	1162:6	1301:5		
1222:7,7	1175:12	1349:11		
1224:14	1188:8 1227:9	9.2 1059:16		
1231:5 1310:6	7.2 1107:8	9.3 1059:16		
1340:20	70 1145:16	978 1374:5		
6:00 1350:25	1181:19	979 1380:8,8		
6:21 1373:14	721 1155:16	980 1374:6		
60 984:9,22	725 1115:7,14	984 1374:7		
991:15 995:5	1115:21,23	99 1121:20		
995:19	1381:14	994 1374:8		
1004:24,24	726 1127:22	9E 1307:12		
1016:7,14	1128:1			
1048:21	1170:14,17,20			
1066:8	1381:16			
1074:12	76 1098:10			
1098:11	1099:4			
1099:1,2,3	77 1075:24			
1137:24	<u>8</u>			
61 1160:10	8 1013:21			
62 1166:18	1065:7 1066:7			
64 1143:23	1073:2			
65 1145:8	1147:13			
67 1349:11	1162:6			
675 1121:1,5	1172:22			
1123:19	1224:14			
1124:1,17,19	1307:18			
1381:2	1349:11			
676 1122:12,17	8.1 1105:11			
1123:19	80 1137:23			
1124:1,17,20	85 1257:21			
1166:11	875 1185:21,25			
676HC 1381:4	1186:17,22			
677 1123:23	1381:21			
1124:1,3,17	876 1185:21			
1381:6	1186:1,17,24			
678 1123:25	1187:1			
1124:2,3,17	876P 1381:23			
1381:8	877 1186:19			
68 998:18	878 1190:1			
68,004 1060:7				
680 1164:1				

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES