

*Exhibit No.:*  
*Issue(s):* Policy  
*Witness:* Natelle Dietrich  
*Sponsoring Party:* MoPSC Staff  
*Type of Exhibit:* Rebuttal Testimony  
*Case No.:* EA-2016-0358  
*Date Testimony Prepared:* January 24, 2017

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**  
**COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**  
**OF**  
**NATELLE DIETRICH**

**GRAIN BELT EXPRESS CLEAN LINE, LLC**  
**CASE NO. EA-2016-0358**

*Jefferson City, Missouri*  
*January 2017*

*PSC Staff Exhibit No. 200*  
*Date 3.23.17 Reporter TS*  
*File No. EA-2016-0358*

1

**TABLE OF CONTENTS OF**

2

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

3

**OF**

4

**NATELLE DIETRICH**

5

**GRAIN BELT EXPRESS CLEAN LINE, LLC**

6

**CASE NO. EA-2016-0358**

7

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....2**

8

1 **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

2 **OF**

3 **NATELLE DIETRICH**

4 **GRAIN BELT EXPRESS CLEAN LINE, LLC**

5 **CASE NO. EA-2016-0358**

6 Q. Please state your name and business address.

7 A. My name is Natelle Dietrich. My business address is 200 Madison Street,  
8 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

9 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

10 A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission")  
11 as Commission Staff Director.

12 Q. Please describe your education and relevant work experience.

13 A. I received a Bachelor's of Arts Degree in English from the University of  
14 Missouri, St. Louis, and a Master's of Business Administration from William Woods  
15 University. During my tenure with the Commission, I have worked in many areas of  
16 telecommunications regulation. In October 2007, I became the Director of Utility Operations.  
17 The division was renamed the Tariff, Safety, Economic and Engineering Analysis Department  
18 in August 2011. In October 2015, I assumed my current position as Commission Staff  
19 Director. In this position, I oversee all aspects of the Commission Staff.

20 My responsibilities include involvement in several activities related to implementing  
21 sound energy policy in Missouri. I was the lead Director for the Commission's rulemakings  
22 on such things as the implementation of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act, the  
23 Chapter 22 rewrite, and the Commission's renewable energy standard regulations. Relevant

1 activities relate to energy efficiency, demand side management, demand response and smart  
2 grid. I was a member of the Missouri Delegation to the Missouri/Moldova Partnership  
3 through NARUC and the US Agency for International Development.

4 I am a member of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners'  
5 Subcommittee on Rate Design and the Staff Subcommittee on Telecommunications. I serve  
6 on the Staff of the Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service, serve as lead Staff for the  
7 Missouri Universal Service Board, and was a member of the Governor's MoBroadbandNow  
8 taskforce.

9 Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission?

10 A. Yes. My Case Summary is attached as Attachment ND-r1.

11 **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

12 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

13 A. The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor the Staff's Rebuttal Report that is  
14 being filed concurrently with this testimony and provide an overview of Staff's position in  
15 this proceeding.

16 Short forms used in this testimony and Staff's Rebuttal Report include:

17 "Commission" for the Missouri Public Service Commission;

18 "Staff" for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission;

19 "Grain Belt" for Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC;

20 "Application" for Application of Grain Belt Express Clean Line, *LLC*  
21 *for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity*;

22 "CCN" for certificate of convenience and necessity;

23 "Project" for the approximately 780-mile, overhead, multi-terminal  
24  $\pm 600$  kilovolt ("kV") HVDC transmission line ("HVDC Line") and  
25 associated facilities that will collect over 4,000 megawatts<sup>4</sup> ("MW") of  
26 low-cost, wind-generated power in western Kansas, which will deliver  
27

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Natelle Dietrich

1 500 MW into Missouri and 3,500 MW into Illinois, Indiana and  
2 states farther east. More specifically, in Missouri, Grain Belt  
3 proposes to construct the approximately 206-mile portion of the  
4 HVDC Line on a route that crosses the Missouri River south of St.  
5 Joseph and continues across the state in an easterly direction to south of  
6 Hannibal in Ralls County, where the HVDC Line will cross the  
7 Mississippi River into Illinois.  
8

9 Q. Please briefly describe the request of Grain Belt Express Clean Line, LLC  
10 (“Grain Belt”).

11 A. On August 30, 2016, Grain Belt filed the *Application of Grain Belt Express*  
12 *Clean Line, LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity* (“Application”), seeking a  
13 CCN authorizing it to construct, own, operate, control, manage, and maintain electric  
14 transmission facilities within Buchanan, Clinton, Caldwell, Carroll, Chariton, Randolph,  
15 Monroe, and Ralls Counties, Missouri, as well as an associated converter station in Ralls  
16 County. In the Application, Grain Belt also requests a waiver of certain reporting  
17 requirements of 4 CSR 240-3.145, 3.165, 3.175 and 3.190.

18 Q. What is Staff’s recommendation on the Application?

19 A. Based on Staff’s review: 1) Grain Belt does not have the consent of the  
20 Caldwell County Commission for its proposed transmission line to cross the public roads and  
21 highways in that county, the validity of its consent from the Monroe County Commission is  
22 being challenged in court, and, presently, the prefiled evidence does not include any such  
23 consents by the County Commissions of Buchanan, Clinton, Caldwell, Carroll, Chariton,  
24 Randolph, Monroe and Ralls Counties; 2) There is not a clear need for the Project; 3) Grain  
25 Belt is qualified to construct, own, operate, control and manage the facilities and provide the  
26 service, but additional expertise will be needed once engineering and safety issues have been  
27 resolved; 4) Grain Belt has the financial ability to undertake the Project; 5) It is not clear

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Natelle Dietrich

1 whether the Project is economically feasible due to the lack of various regional transmission  
2 operator (“RTO”) studies and the uncertainties surrounding the ATXI Mark Twain  
3 transmission line and its effects on the Missouri converter station and corresponding  
4 congestion; 5) A determination cannot be made at this time as to whether the Project is in the  
5 public interest since there is still uncertainty related to the economic feasibility and the safety  
6 of the Project.

7         It is Staff Counsel’s position that the Commission cannot grant a CCN absent  
8 Grain Belt receiving all county consents. Due to the lack of county consents and uncertainties  
9 related to: the modeling and a demonstration of the need for the Project, outstanding RTO  
10 studies, the potential effect of the pending ATXI Mark Twain transmission line project appeal  
11 by Neighbors United and the litigation on county consents on Grain Belt’s proposed Missouri  
12 converter station and corresponding congestion issues, and the lack of details on Grain Belt’s  
13 Emergency Response Plans, Staff cannot definitively state that the Application satisfies the  
14 requirements of Commission Rule, 4 CSR 240-3.105 and the Tartan Factors of Need,  
15 Economic Feasibility and Public Interest.

16         There are two potential outcomes as a result of these deficiencies: 1) The Commission  
17 can find the Application does not meet the criteria as outlined above and deny the CCN; or,  
18 2) The Commission could grant the CCN conditioned upon Grain Belt obtaining county  
19 consents, providing completed RTO Interconnection Agreements and any associated studies,  
20 submitting a modified plan to address congestion should the ATXI project not proceed as  
21 planned, provide a completed emergency response and contingency plans, and require  
22 compliance with all conditions Staff recommends in Section VI of Staff’s Rebuttal Report.  
23 Unless otherwise noted, Staff recommends the Commission order that Grain Belt must

Rebuttal Testimony of  
Natelle Dietrich

1 comply with the conditions prior to acquiring involuntary easements or starting construction  
2 of the transmission line. Staff further recommends the conditions be subject to a  
3 demonstration to the Commission that the outstanding studies do not raise any new issues,  
4 and if they do, that the Commission is satisfied with Grain Belt's solution to address those  
5 issues.

6 Q. How is Staff's Rebuttal Report organized?

7 A. It is organized by topic as follows:

8 I. Executive Summary

9 II. Does the Application Meet the Requirements of Commission  
10 Rule 4 CSR-240-3.105?

11 III. Tartan Criteria

12 a. Whether there is a need for the facilities and service

13 b. Whether the applicant is qualified to own, operate, control  
14 and manage the facilities

15 c. Whether the applicant has the financial ability for the  
16 undertaking

17 d. Whether the proposal is economically feasible

18 e. Whether the facilities and service promote the public  
19 interest

20 IV. Safety Issues

21 V. Summary of Public Comments

22 VI. Recommended conditions

23 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

24 A. Yes.

**Natelle Dietrich  
Case Summary**

Presented testimony or analysis through affidavits on the following cases and proceedings:

- Case No. TA-99-405, an analysis of the appropriateness of a “payday loan” company providing prepaid telecommunications service.
- Case No. TX-2001-73, In the Matter of Proposed New Rules on Prepaid Calling Cards.
- Case No. TO-2001-455, the AT&T/Southwestern Bell Telephone Company arbitration, which included issues associated with unbundled network elements.
- Case No. TX-2001-512, In the Matter of Proposed Amendments to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-33.010, 33.020, 33.030, 33.040, 33.060, 33.070, 33.080, 33.110, and 33.150 (telecommunications billing practices).
- Case No. TO-2002-222, the MCI/SWBT arbitration.
- Case No. TR-2002-251, In the Matter of the Tariffs Filed by Sprint Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Sprint to Reduce the Basic Rates by the Change in the CPI-TS as Required by 392.245(4), Updating its Maximum Allowable Prices for Non-Basic Services and Adjusting Certain Rates as Allowed by 392.245(11) and Reducing Certain Switched Access Rates and Rebalancing to Local Rates as Allowed by 392.245(9).
- Case No. TX-2002-1026, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to Implement the Missouri Universal Service Fund End-User Surcharge.
- Case No. TX-2003-0379, In the Matter of Proposed Amendments to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-3.545, formerly 4 CSR 240-30.010 (tariff filing requirements).
- Case No. TX-2003-0380, In the Matter of Proposed Amendments to Commission Rules 4 CSR 240-2.060, 4 CSR 240-3.020, 4 CSR 240-3.510, 4 CSR 240-3.520, and 4 CSR 240-3.525 (competitive local exchange carrier filing requirements and merger-type transactions).
- Case No. TX-2003-0389, In the Matter of Proposed Amendment to Commission Rules 4 CSR 240-3.530 and 4 CSR 240-3.535, and New Rules 4 CSR 240-3.560 and 4 CSR 240-3.565 (telecommunications bankruptcies and cessation of operation).
- Case No. TX-2003-0445, In the Matter of a Proposed New Rule 4 CSR 240-33.160 Regarding Customer Proprietary Network Information.
- Case No. TX-2003-0487, In the Matter of Proposed Commission Rules 4 CSR 240-36.010, 36.020, 36.030, 36.040, 36.050, 36.060, 36.070, and 36.080 (arbitration and mediation rules).
- Case No. TX-2003-0565, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to Codify Procedures for Telecommunications Carriers to Seek Approval, Amendment and Adoption of Interconnection and Resale Agreements.
- Case Nos. TX-2004-0153 and 0154, in the Matter of Proposed Rule for 211 Service (emergency and permanent rules).



- Case Nos. TO-2004-0370, IO-2004-0467, TO-2004-0505 et al, In the Matter of the Petition of various small LECs for Suspension of the Federal Communications Commission Requirement to Implement Number Portability.
- Case No. TX-2005-0258, In the Matter of a New Proposed Rule 4 CSR 240-33.045 (placement and identification of charges on customer bills).
- Case No. TX-2005-0460, In the Matter of the Proposed Amendments to the Missouri Universal Service Fund Rules.
- Case No. TO-2006-0093, In the Matter of the Request of Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. d/b/a SBC Missouri, for Competitive Classification Pursuant to Section 392.245.6, RSMo (2205) – 30-day Petition.
- Case Nos. TC-2005-0357, IR-2006-0374, TM-2006-0306, the complaint case, earnings investigation and transfer of assets case to resolve issues related to Cass County Telephone Company, LP, LEC Long Distance, FairPoint Communications, Inc., FairPoint Communications Missouri Inc. d/b/a FairPoint Communications and ST Long Distance Inc. db/a FairPoint Communications Long Distance.
- Case No. TC-2006-0068, FullTel, Inc., v. CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC.
- Case No. TX-2006-0169, In the Matter of Proposed New Rule 4 CSR 240-3.570 Regarding Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Designations for Receipt of Federal Universal Service Fund Support.
- Case No. TX-2006-0429, In the Matter of a Proposed Amendment to 4 CSR 240-3.545 (one day tariff filings).
- Case No. TX-2007-0086, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to Create Chapter 37 – Number Pooling and Number Conservation Efforts
- Case No. TA-2009-0327, In the Matter of the Petition of TracFone Wireless, Inc. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Missouri for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline and Link Up Service to Qualified Households.
- Case No. RA-2009-0375, In the Matter of the application of Nexus Communications, Inc. dba TSI for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Missouri for the Limited Purpose of Offering Wireless Lifeline and Link Up Service to Qualifying Households.
- Case No. AX-2010-0061, Office of Public Counsel’s Petition for Promulgation of Rules Relating to Billing and Payment Standards for Residential Customers.
- Case No. GT-2009-0056, In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company’s Tariff Revision Designed to Clarify its Liability for Damages Occurring on Customer Piping and Equipment Beyond the Company’s Meter.
- Case No. ER-2012-0166, In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri’s Tariffs to Increase Its Revenues for Electric Service. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).
- Case No. ER-2012-0174, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company’s Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).

- Case No. ER-2012-0175, In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).
- Case No. ER-2012-0345, In the Matter of Empire District Electric Company of Joplin, Missouri Tariff's Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Missouri Service Area of the Company. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).
- File Nos. EO-2013-0396 and EO-2013-0431, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc., Mid South TransCo, LLC, Transmission Company Arkansas, LLC and ITC Midsouth LLC for Approval of Transfer of Assets and Certificate of Convenience and Necessity, and Merger and, in connection therewith, Certain Other Related Transactions; and In the Matter of Entergy Arkansas, Inc.'s Notification of Intent to Change Functional Control of Its Missouri Electric Transmission Facilities to the Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator Inc. Regional Transmission System Organization or Alternative Request to Change Functional Control and Motions for Waiver and Expedited Treatment, respectively.
- Case No. MX-2013-0432, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to Revise Manufactured Housing Rules Regarding Installation and Monthly Reporting Requirements.
- Case No. TX-2013-0324, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to the Missouri Universal Service Fund.
- Case No. EO-2014-0095, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Filing for Approval of Demand-Side Programs and for Authority to Establish Demand-Side Programs Investment Mechanism.
- Case No. EA-2014-0207, In the Matter of the Application of Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing It to Construct, Own, Operate, Control, Manage, and Maintain a High Voltage, Direct Current Transmission Line and an Associated Converter Station Providing an Interconnection on the Maywood - Montgomery 345 kV Transmission Line.
- Case No. ER-2014-0370, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Electric Service.
- Case No. WR-2015-0301, In the Matter of Missouri-American Water Company's Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Water and Sewer Service Provided in Missouri Service Areas.
- Case No. ER-2016-0156, In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Electric Service.
- Case No. ET-2016-0246, In the Matter of the Application of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri for Approval of a Tariff Setting a Rate for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations.
- Case No. ER-2016-0285, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase for Electric Service.
- Case No. ER-2016-0179, In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Increase its Revenues for Electric Service.

- Case No. EE-2017-0113, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Great Plains Energy Incorporated, Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company for a Variance from the Commission's Affiliate Transactions Rule, 4 CSR 240-20.015
- Actively participated in or prepared comments on numerous issues on behalf of the Commission to be filed at the Federal Communications Commission.
- Prepared congressional testimony on behalf of the Commission on number conservation efforts in Missouri.
- A principal author on Missouri Public Service Commission Comments on the Reduction of Carbon Emissions in Missouri under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.
- A principal author on Missouri Public Service Commission Comments on the Environmental Protection Agency's "Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Unity".

Commission Arbitration Advisory Lead Staff for the following cases:

- Case No. TO-2005-0336, Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P., d/b/a SBC Missouri's Petition for Compulsory Arbitration of Unresolved Issues For a Successor Interconnection Agreement to the Missouri 271 Agreement ("M2A").
- Case No. IO-2005-0468, In the Matter of the Petition of Alma Telephone Company for Arbitration of Unresolved Issues Pertaining to a Section 251(b)(5) Agreement with T-Mobile USA, Inc.
- Case No. TO-2006-0147 et al, In the Matter of the Petition for Arbitration of Unresolved Issues in a Section 251(b)(5) Agreement with T-Mobile USA, Inc and Cingular Wireless.
- Case No. TO-2006-0299, Petition of Socket Telecom, LLC for Compulsory Arbitration of Interconnection Agreements with CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC and Spectra Communications, LLC, pursuant to Section 251(b)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
- Case No. TO-2006-0463, In the Matter of the Petition for Arbitration of Unresolved Issues in a Section 251(b)(5) Agreement with ALLTEL Wireless and Western Wireless.
- Case No. TO-2009-0037, In the Matter of the Petition of Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC for Arbitration of an Interconnection Agreement Between CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC and Charter Fiberlink-Missouri, LLC.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

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

Case No. EA-2016-0358

**AFFIDAVIT OF NATELLE DIETRICH**

STATE OF MISSOURI     )  
                                  )     ss.  
COUNTY OF COLE     )

**COMES NOW NATELLE DIETRICH** and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.


Further the Affiant sayeth not.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**NATELLE DIETRICH**

**JURAT**

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this 24<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017.

D. SUZIE MANKIN  
Notary Public - Notary Seal  
State of Missouri  
Commissioned for Cole County  
My Commission Expires: December 12, 2020  
Commission Number: 12412070

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public