4 Evidentiary Hearing 5 VOLUME IX

6 Tuesday, June 6, 2023 8:30 a.m. - 4:51 p.m.

7

Missouri Public Service Commission 8 200 Madison Street Governor Office Building Room 310 Jefferson City, MO 65101 9 and WebEx

10

11

12

13 In the Matter of the Application of Grain Belt Express LLC for an

Amendment to its Certificate of 14 Convenience and Necessity 15

Authorizing it to Construct, Own,) File No. EA-2023-0017 Operate, Control, Manage, and 16 Maintain a High Voltage, Direct Current Transmission Line and

17 Associated Converter Station

18

NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding 19 CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

2.0 SCOTT T. RUPP, Chairman MAIDA J. COLEMAN 21 JASON R. HOLSMAN

GLEN KOLKMEYER 2.2 DR. KAYLA HAHN,

23 COMMISSIONERS

24 Stenographically Reported By: Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640



```
Page 331
 1
     APPEARANCES:
     On behalf of Grain Belt Express, LLC:
 2
          Polsinelli
 3
          900 West 48th Place, Suite 900
          Kansas City, MO 64112-1895
 4
          BY:
               ANNE E. CALLENBACH, ESQ.
 5
               ANDREW O. SCHULTE, ESQ.
               SEAN PLUTA, ESQ.
 6
               JARED JEVONS, ESQ.
               acallenbach@polsinelli.com
               aschulte@polsinelli.com
 7
               spluta@polsinelli.com
 8
               jjevons@polsinelli.com
 9
     On behalf of the Staff of the
     Public Service Commission:
10
          Public Service Commission
11
          200 Madison Street
          P.O. Box 360
12
          Jefferson City, MO
                               65101
13
          BY:
               TRAVIS PRINGLE, ESQ.
               travis.pringle@psc.mo.gov
14
     On behalf of Clean Grid Alliance:
15
          Clean Grid Alliance
16
          PO Box 4072
          Wheaton, IL 60189-4072
17
               SEAN BRADY, ESQ.
          BY:
18
               sbrady@cleangridalliance.org
     and
19
          BY:
               JUDITH A. WILLIS, ESQ. (Local counsel)
2.0
               jaw@anniewillislaw.com
21
     On behalf of Dustin Hudson, Gary and Carol Riedel,
     Missouri Landowners Alliance, Eastern Missouri
2.2
     Landowners Alliance, and Norman Fishel:
23
          485 Oak Field Court
          Washington, MO
                           63090
24
          BY:
               PAUL AGATHEN, ESO.
25
               paa0408@aol.com
```



```
Page 332
 1
     APPEARANCES:
                    (Continued)
 2
     On behalf of the Missouri Electric Commission:
 3
          Healy Law Offices
          3010 East Battlefield, Suite A
 4
          Springfield, MO
                            65804
 5
          BY:
               PEGGY A. WHIPPLE, ESQ.
               ALEX RILEY, ESQ.
 6
               peggy@healylawoffices.com
               alex@healylawoffices.com
 7
     On behalf of Renew Missouri:
 8
          Renew Missouri
 9
          PO Box 413071
          Kansas City, MO
                            64141
10
          BY:
               ALISSA GREENWALD, ESQ. (WebEx)
11
               alissa@renewmo.org
     On behalf of the Sierra Club:
12
13
          Great Rivers Environmental Law Center
          319 N. 4th Street, Suite 800
14
          St. Louis, MO
                          63102
15
               SARAH W. RUBENSTEIN, ESO. (WebEx)
          BY:
               srubenstein@greatriverslaw.org
16
     On behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel:
17
          200 Madison Street, Suite 650
18
          PO Box 2230
          Jefferson City, MO
                               65102
19
          BY:
               NATHAN WILLIAMS, ESQ.
20
               Nathan.Williams@opc.mo.gov
     On behalf of Missouri Cattlemen's Association, Missouri
2.1
     Corn Growers Association, Missouri Farm Bureau, Missouri
22
     Pork Association, Missouri Soybean Association:
23
          827 East Broadway
          Suite B
          Columbia, MO
2.4
                         65201
25
               BRENT E. HADEN
          BY:
               brent@showmelaw.com
25
               brent@showmelaw.com
```



Page 333 (Continued) 1 APPEARANCES: 2 On behalf of Associated Industries of Missouri: 3 ELLINGER & ASSOCIATES, LLC 308 East High Street, Suite 300 Jefferson City, MO 65101 4 5 MARC H. ELLINGER, ESQ. mellinger@ellingerlaw.com 6 Also Present: 7 WILLIAM W. HOLLANDER 8 114 South Laclede Station Road St. Louis, MO 63119 9 ahollander@wionhollander.com 10 PATRICIA STEMME 12601 E. Remie Road 11 Centralia, MO 65240 pstemme56@gmail.com 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 2.0 21 2.2 23 24 25



Evidentiary Hearing

1	The following proceedings began at 8:30 a.m.:
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go ahead then and go
3	back on the record. Good morning. This is Tuesday,
4	June 6, and we are here to resume our Grain Belt Express
5	hearing. We will ask Mr. Repsher to go ahead and come
6	back up to the stand.
7	And today's schedule we will try to take a
8	break around 10:00 and then we will take our lunch break
9	a little early just a little before 11:30. And we also
10	have one Staff witness, Mr. Cunigan, who can only appear
11	today. So we will be taking him out of order this
12	afternoon, make sure that we get him in.
13	Are there any other preliminary matters that
14	came up overnight? All right. Are you ready to resume
15	cross-examination?
16	MR. AGATHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Go right ahead.
18	MR. AGATHEN: Mr. Repsher, good morning.
19	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
20	MARK REPSHER,
21	having previously been sworn, was examined and testified
22	as follows:
23	CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. AGATHEN:
25	Q. I think we left off yesterday with you saying

- 1 you weren't familiar with the testimony of Mr. Petti? 2 After having a second to think on it, Yeah. 3 the reason I was confused is because of the adoption by the new witness. So I haven't read through that report, 4 5 but I am loosely familiar with some of it. So I can try 6 to answer some questions if you have any. 7 Mr. Repsher, will you make JUDGE DIPPELL: 8 sure that you're toward the mike. 9 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm sorry. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. 11 For the clarity of the record, MR. SCHULTE: 12 Mr. Repsher is not the witness who adopted Anthony 13 Petti's testimony. That would be Rob Baker. Just want 14 to make that note for the record. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Mr. Agathen. 16 BY MR. AGATHEN: 17 In any event, Mr. Petti in his analysis used a 18 30-year life span for the Grain Belt Project, did he 19 not? 20 I do not recall reading that, but I'll accept Α. 21 your premise. 2.2 0. In your study, you assumed a life span of 40 23
 - years for the Grain Belt Project, correct?
 - Yes, sir, that's correct. Α.

25 And the way your analysis works, the longer Q.



- the life span you assume for the Project the greater will be the supposed savings; is that correct?
- A. Generally speaking, yes, the longer life span that you assume the more benefits that will accrue to consumers.
- Q. And if you had measured the savings in your study over a 30-year period instead of 40-year period, the supposed energy and capacity savings would be reduced from your figures of 17.6 billion to about 11.6 billion; is that correct? And you might -- Let me ask you, do you have a copy of your answers to our data requests?
- A. I do. If you could point me to the data request that you're talking about, I'd be happy to turn to it.
 - Q. MR5.

- A. Yeah, one second. Yes, sir, I see that.
- Q. And the supposed energy and capacity savings, as you say there, would be reduced from your figure of 17.6 billion to about 11.6 billion, correct?
- A. Yes. My recollection is we did that kind of as a top-down analysis and it's really kind of a prorata figure of, you know, about 75 percent of the, you know, projected savings.
 - Q. If you had used the 30-year life of the



- Project, the supposed emission savings would be reduced from your figure of 7.6 billion to about 5.5 billion; is that correct?
- A. Did I note that in one of my responses? Your math sounds correct. I'm not sure if I actually said that anywhere.
 - Q. Same Data Request MR5.
 - A. Yeah, I accept that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. And neither of those 30-year savings figures are reduced to their present values, are they?
- A. Yeah, and to clarify that point, because I know that was a question yesterday, my understanding is the Commission has not ever put forth a procedural item with regard to whether or not numbers should be presented a net present value point of view or from an undiscounted point of view. So we presented it undiscounted point of view.
- Q. If you had used present values for those figures, your numbers would have been reduced substantially, would they not?
- A. They would be lower depending on the discount rate that one assumes.
- Q. A reasonable discount rate would have reduced your savings figures substantially, would they not?
 - A. I'm not sure what you mean by substantially.

But yes, they would be lower.

1

2

3

4

5

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Something else not included in your modeling is the billions of dollars which retail customers will ultimately pay for the Grain Belt Project; is that correct?
- 6 I disagree with that. I mean, the numbers we Α. 7 presented, you're correct, are gross meaning that they are the gross total benefits without the cost of the 8 9 But I believe within my testimony I also note line. 10 that the all-in cost for the transmission line is 11 something on the order of I believe it was \$5.7 billion 12 including expected network upgrade costs, and I compared 13 the gross benefits of 17.6 billion I believe it was to 14 the 5.7 billion in costs for the line.
 - Q. But as you note at page 6, footnote 2 of your direct testimony, your savings values noted here exclude the costs of the Project; is that correct?
 - A. Give me one second to turn to that page. You said it was page 6?
 - Q. Page 6, footnote 2.
 - A. Yeah. So as I was just saying, the total savings of the line for Missouri residents, and to be clear because I know this was a commentary yesterday, these savings include the entirety of Missouri. So the MISO portion of Missouri, the AECI portion of Missouri



2.2

and the SPP portion of Missouri. Those are the total
savings. I would also say that there are additional
savings that accrue to ratepayers in states like
Illinois, Indiana, et cetera, but those are excluded
from this analysis. So those gross savings are 17.6
billion again for just the residents here in Missouri
and then you compare those to the cost for the entire
line. So that would be not just Phase I for Missouri
but Phase I and Phase II, which again gets you all the
way to Indiana, is \$5.6 billion. So just looking at
those savings for Missouri, which again exclude those
other benefits and including the entire cost of the
line, you still have twelve-ish billion in net benefits
for ratepayers even if Missouri residents had to pay for
100 percent of the line, which I do not believe is the
intention of Invenergy.

- Q. Let me ask you this. Don't you say in footnote 2 there at page 6 savings values noted here exclude the cost of the Project. As noted subsequently in my testimony, the Project is still likely to induce material ratepayer savings even if one were to include the associated costs?
- A. Yes, which I don't think is different than what I just said. I believe further in my testimony, I'm not sure what page it was, is where I do point out



2.2

- that the 17.6 are the gross benefits for Missouri residents and then you compare that to the 5.6 I believe billion in cost for the line.
- Q. On a different subject. Are you aware that in the last Grain Belt case here at the Commission Grain Belt witness David Berry compared the Project's delivered cost of wind energy to Missouri to the cost of other energy alternatives, including Missouri wind energy, Missouri Utilities scale solar energy and combined cycle gas generation?
 - A. While I was not part of that proceeding, I am

 -- I was briefed on that testimony and I believe I

 reviewed it a few weeks ago. So I am familiar at a high

 level with that testimony.
 - Q. Are you aware that the Commission found that a levelized cost of energy analysis is the best financial technique to compare different energy generation sources?
 - A. I do recall Staff saying that in that proceeding.
 - Q. Did you compare the delivered cost to Missouri of energy for the Grain Belt Project to the delivered cost to Missouri wind generation?
- A. Not directly. What I did compare though were the capacity factors of wind and solar resources in

Missouri versus Kansas, and I'll explain that a little bit. I believe in my report which was filed as Exhibit MR-1 -- no, 2, excuse me. On page -- Well, it's the start of Section 3, page 12, Figure 3-1, I compare the capacity factor of what's called GBX wind, which is Kansas wind, GBX solar, which is Kansas solar, and then compared that to in-state wind and solar, which are from Missouri resources. And what you can see in that figure is that the capacity factors of wind and solar in Kansas are quite a bit higher than what you expect within the state.

So stepping back, when you think about a levelized cost of energy analysis, there are really two components to the analysis. The first would be the all-in what I'll call capital costs. So that would include the construction costs, the land acquisition costs, the cost of, you know, employees, et cetera, to build the facility. And when you look at the states of Missouri and Kansas, in the work that I've done, you know, over the past two decades, there really aren't significant differences with regard to construction costs for generation facilities between the two states. So if we're talking about gross figures, there's not a lot of difference in terms of those total capital costs.

Now, the second part of a levelized cost of



2.2

energy analysis is effectively the denominator that you		
use. You can do that in different ways, but what we're		
talking about here, and I believe what Staff and the		
Commission spoke about in the previous proceeding, was a		
levelized cost of energy figure on what's called a		
dollar per MW hour basis. So the denominator		
effectively being how much generation is a facility		
producina		

If you take -- If we go back to our arithmetic classes and say that the numerator is the same between the two resources, between a resource whether it's in Kansas or Missouri, the numerator is the same. Where you get to a lower levelized cost of energy analysis between the two is the fact that you have a larger denominator, so more generation from resources coming in Kansas than you do in Missouri which is what produces the lower levelized cost for resources in Kansas versus Missouri. So in that respect we did look at it because we're looking at the difference in capacity factors between the two resources.

Q. I think -- Well, if you'd go to Section 3.1 of your Schedule MR-2 at page 12. I think this is what you were getting at. You compare the capacity factors of several Grain Belt scenarios with the capacity factors of Missouri wind and Missouri solar generation, correct?

1 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. But those comparisons don't factor in the cost for the transmission, do they?
- A. No. These figures do not account for the cost of the transmission line itself.
- Q. So it's not an all-in cost for the two different scenarios?
- A. No, sir. It doesn't include the cost for the transmission line.
- Q. Did you anywhere in your analysis compare the delivered cost of energy from the Grain Belt Project to the delivered cost of MISO wind to Missouri?
- A. Only indirectly in so much that we, as we were talking about yesterday, we used the Aurora production cost model to analyze the impact on different sorts of resources as they impact things like power prices and ultimately their impact on ratepayers. So with regard to that, what you're looking at without the line, so a scenario where Grain Belt Express does not exist, then effectively the state of Missouri is relying on in-state resources and based on that analysis what it shows is that the overall net -- the overall benefit to ratepayers is greater in terms of savings by having the line than without.
 - Q. Do anywhere in your analysis actually show the

Page 344 1 costs of delivered energy from the Grain Belt Project 2 compared to the delivered cost of MISO wind to Missouri? 3 Α. No, sir, I don't. Did you anywhere in your analysis compare the 4 Ο. 5 delivered cost of energy from the Grain Belt Project to 6 the delivered cost of Missouri utility scale solar 7 energy? 8 Α. No, I did not. 9 A direct cost comparison of the delivered cost Ο. 10 of energy from the Grain Belt Project to the delivered 11 cost of Missouri utility scale solar energy, and the 12 answer is no? 13 Correct, the answer is no. Α. 14 Did you compare the delivered cost Ο. Thank you. 15 of energy from the Grain Belt Project to the cost of 16 combined cycle generation? 17 Α. I did not. 18 That's all I have, Judge. MR. AGATHEN: 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there 20 cross-examination from Mr. Hollander? No, Your Honor, thank you. 21 MR. HOLLANDER: 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme.

24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries. 25 Just a couple, Judge, please. MR. ELLINGER:

No.

MS. STEMME:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MR. ELLINGER:
- Q. Morning, Mr. Repsher. My name is Marc
- 4 | Ellinger.

- 5 A. Morning.
- Q. Do you have your surrebuttal in front of you?
 That's Exhibit 4.
- 8 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- Q. Could you turn to page 13, starting with line
 10 10 there's a question that's been propounded to you and
 11 some explanations about some of the costs and benefits.
- 12 I think Mr. Agathen was walking you through some of that
 13 was in your direct testimony also.
- 14 A. You said page 13?
- 15 Q. Page 13, yes, sir.
- 16 A. Yes, I'm here.
- Q. And I guess I'm a little -- In the course of that cross-examination in reading your testimony, I got a little confused here. So if you don't mind me. You
- 20 talk about 17.6 billion in ratepayer benefits and
- 21 associated costs of 5.7 billion. Do you see where I'm
- 22 | at on line 19 and 20?
- A. Yeah, I do.
- Q. Could you explain how you came up with that
- 25 | number of 17.6 billion in savings?



A. Sure, happy to. So again as we discussed
yesterday, we use a series of models. Again, these are
the same models we use across the industry for any sort
of analysis related to financial projections. There
really are two main components here that we're focused
on that consumers need to pay for. The first would be
what are called energy costs. So those would be the
costs when you turn on your lights in your house or
stove or whatnot and what you're charged for your actual
consumption of energy on an hourly or minute-by-minute
basis. And so for that portion of the analysis, which
encompasses really most of the benefit, is we took a
look at the change in energy prices between an analysis
with the line included and without the line included.
Basically did math where we basically looked at the
difference between power prices and then importantly
looked at the actual load profile for residents and
businesses in Missouri for each of the service
territories within the state and then did basically
mathematic or multiplication where you look at the
difference between the power prices and the load and
that comes up with the total dollar figure that again we
looked at over a 40-year period.

The second piece, which is a much more small piece but it's important because for any analysis to be



- rigorous it needs to include it, would be what are called capacity costs. So capacity costs are effectively what consumers pay for for I'll say reliability. So making sure that you have enough capacity on the system for hot days or winter storms or what-have-you. And so we also looked at the change in capacity prices between the two runs, or the two analyses, excuse me, and then similarly did math where you look at the difference in prices times what would be called the peak demand of consumers in each of the service territories similarly to come up with those figures and then we just added together the energy and capacity savings to come up with the \$17.6 billion.
- Q. Do you know how much, I mean, you mentioned that energy costs were the largest amount and capacity costs were a much smaller number, do you happen to know what percentage or what numbers those would amount to?
- A. Based off memory, probably -- Based off memory, I believe it was something like 95 percent of the benefit is from energy. 5 percent is from capacity. So it's really by and large an energy argument, not a capacity one.
- Q. And then you also talk about in that same couple lines of your testimony associated costs. Could you explain how you went about offsetting costs of the



Project and associated generation costs?

- A. Yes. So the associated costs that I'm talking about here are the direct capital expenditures related to the Grain Belt Express transmission line. So those numbers ultimately came from the Company Invenergy, but my recollection is that they include, again these are kind of rough numbers but in wanting to provide an answer here, I believe it was something like 4.7 or 4.8 billion is the direct capital costs and there's another whatever the remainder is for expected network upgrade costs. So those would be the costs that the ISOs would charge Invenergy to upgrade other parts of the system to ensure reliability.
- Q. And then you just -- Would you net those together to come up with savings or how would you prepare for what the ultimate savings is if you account for the costs?
- A. Yeah, ultimately that in a very high level way that would be what you would do to get a net savings.

 You would just take the 17.6 billion minus the 5.7 billion. I would like to point out though, and I think one thing I'm pretty clear if you go up two rows to line 18 of that same page, these are all direct benefits to Missouri ratepayers and ones that I think are, you know, they'll directly show up on consumers' electricity bills

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- in terms of savings. In addition to that, I point out that we also looked at what we'll call environmental savings or societal savings, and those are an additional \$7.6 billion. So the reason we didn't include that in the 17.6 billion is because I think there are debates on certainly what is the value of reducing carbon emissions or reducing SO2, sulfur dioxide emissions, et cetera. But if you kind of used generally accepted principles with regard to the value of reducing those emissions which are put forth by the U.S. EPA, you know, a reasonable number would be an additional \$7.6 billion in savings that could be assumed as well. And I think as Dr. Poudel, I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly, as he says I think one key point is how do you distribute that economic welfare for those emission savings, which is not something we tried to quantify or explain within this testimony.
 - Q. And lastly, your original direct testimony was filed in August of 2022, based upon the study you had done presumably before then, right?
 - A. Yes, sir, that's correct.
 - Q. Does that study need to be updated or do you think it's currently accurate?
 - A. I think within a reasonable degree of like a reasonable degree of uncertainty, it directionally would



1 I think the major things that have really not change. 2 changed since this analysis, I'm trying to go back to 3 remember, so the major things would be really the 4 passage of the Inflation Reduction Act at the end of 5 If anything, that has just made renewables last year. 6 more economic with increasing tax savings that can be 7 utilized.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would say also that one of the benefits of the Inflation Reduction Act is, without getting into the minutia, is it allows the transferability of tax credits. The reason that I bring that up is that for potential offtakers that have been discussed but even just investor-owned utilities within the state here like Ameren, one of the benefits is because of the transferability of tax credits now they have an easier time leveraging those benefits whereas previously because it's a regulated entity, and I'm not a tax expert, but it's easier now for them to leverage those tax credits and pass those benefits on to ratepayers. So I would say it potentially makes them more likely to want to enter into contracts for energy over the line.

- Q. So is it correct then that if you were to update the study those changes would actually generate more savings?
 - A. Yeah, and I think the other thing that would

1	generate more savings is what you have really seen over
2	the past really six to twelve months is, and I think you
3	just saw this NERC came out with an assessment where
4	they were noting reliability challenges that may be
5	coming up on the grid, and a lot of that is because of
6	increasing forecasted demand from electrification. So
7	whether we're talking about electric vehicles or new
8	data centers being sited, et cetera, all of that is
9	increasing load. Generally speaking, the more load
10	that's on the system the more benefit you would
11	experience by putting in a transmission line and
12	associated renewable energy like the one discussed here.
13	MR. ELLINGER: No further questions. Thank
14	you, Mr. Repsher.
15	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Mr. Haden, I think
16	I skipped you again, didn't I. I apologize. Did the Ag
17	Associations have any cross-examination?
18	MR. HADEN: Just a few questions. Excuse me.
19	I'm a little froggy this morning.
20	THE WITNESS: Allergy season.
21	MR. HADEN: Yeah.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. HADEN:
24	Q. So I want to go back just quickly. I know you

worked it over pretty hard yesterday. The assumption

about carbon tax, you had an assumption built in that there would be carbon taxes from 2027 going forward, correct?

- A. That was the assumption we made, correct.
- Q. I guess why did you make that assumption?
- A. Yeah, I think as I noted yesterday but I probably didn't explain very well. So apologies. When you look at resource planning for utilities across the U.S. but I just want to focus on the Midwest here, so we're talking about folks like Ameren or Evergy or AEP or Duke or any of them, they do a series of analyses when they look on a go-forward basis with regard to what will be in the best interest of ratepayers, what will be the most prudent risk adjusted decisions they can make when deciding what sort of resources that they're going to put on the system that, you know, ratepayers will have to pay for for the next 30, 40 plus years.

So when they do those analyses, the vast majority of utilities in the region assume a carbon price, or what they call a carbon shadow price, when they're doing these analyses. Now, does that mean that they assume that the federal government is going to come out with a carbon tax or a federal cap and trade program in the future, not necessarily. What they're trying to do is say we believe that we're living in a carbon



Page 353

- constrained future and in the future there will be restrictions on the amount of carbon that we can emit.
- Q. I'm sorry. I don't want to interrupt you.

 Let me stop you there because I've got a question about how you're tying it together. For those utilities, they're buyers --
- MR. SCHULTE: I think the question was very open ended.
 - MR. HADEN: I'm going to amend my question then. I'm not asking for a long narrative generally and especially as it relates to something that's not -- we're not asking about --

THE STENOGRAPHER: I'm sorry?

2.2

JUDGE DIPPELL: One at a time, please.

MR. HADEN: Just a second, Mr. Schulte. I'm asking about this is a company that's going to generate power and it's built into the assumption. We've now heard about three minutes of testimony about buyers of energy which I understand why they would build that into a conservative estimate, but here that number has benefited the Company because the assumption includes more profitability. So that's really what's relevant to the testimony we're asking here. I don't really care what Duke does. I care about the seller. So I don't think it's a responsive answer at this point even to the

- question I asked relative to the analysis he's done for you. That's my response.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: I will allow. The question can be -- or the answer can be clarified on direct and I'll let Mr. Haden amend his question and ask the witness again.
 - MR. HADEN: Mr. Repsher, I'm really not trying to be rude. We all want to get through this and I know you do too.

10 BY MR. HADEN:

- Q. I understand why modeling for a buyer might include a conservative estimate that says hey, in the future we think we're going to have a carbon tax, that's going to hurt our profitability or we're going to have to find alternate sources. Here though as a seller why would you build that assumption in because, correct me if I'm wrong, but by your analysis that actually increases the profitability of this project because it's going to push buyers to have to buy renewables, correct?
 - A. No, I disagree with that.
 - Q. Okay. Tell me why.
- A. Okay. Let me rewind. The point of our analysis is to -- it's not to take a view from the seller's point of view or the buyer's point of view.

 What we're trying to do here is effectively look at it



- as any prudent person would do, as any, from a prudency basis, how should someone think about the future in a carbon constrained world. As I was saying, and I'll take ten seconds to finish this, when utilities look at their choices, which we're trying to put it in the shoes of how they're going to think about whether they want to purchase from the line or not, we're trying to adopt assumptions that they would assume within their internal analysis. So I'll stop there.
 - Q. Okay. But the converse of that would be, though?
 - A. Yeah, which I was going to get to.
- Q. Okay.

2.2

A. Now, does including a carbon assumption, does that create a, quote, unquote, better environment for the seller, which again using your words, not mine, the answer is no, because what we're doing again as I explained yesterday, we're doing what we call a with and without analysis, sometimes people call it a factual, counter factual analysis or a one-factor analysis. So what that means is we're including a world that has all of the assumptions we talked about, including carbon, so that's the world. The only difference that we make between world one that doesn't have the transmission line and world two that has a transmission line is

- putting the transmission line there. So that world that doesn't have the transmission line has carbon. There's carbon in the world with the line. We're just subtracting the two. So we're not creating a world where all of a sudden this line goes into service and now there's magically a carbon price and that increases the savings that utilities can have. That carbon constrained future in the way that we model it is both worlds. So when you're doing the math and you're subtracting those, you basically are subtracting the same carbon impact from both cases.
 - Q. Is it neutral to your analysis then whether you include that assumption or not?
 - A. It's not neutral but it's not binary.
 - Q. Then which way does it cut? Here's the reason I'm asking. If it doesn't matter if it truly just zeroes out in the math, then it doesn't really matter if you include the assumption, right, but I think you just said that it does matter if you include the assumption. So why is it there?
 - A. It's a complicated question. And I know you want me to be quick. So I'll try to be quick here. One of the impacts by including a carbon assumption, again in both worlds, is that it makes it more challenging for fossil generators to operate and induces more renewables

to enter the system. Again, we're not even talking about the lines. It makes renewables more economic. So what does that do. Renewables in and of themselves, which again I think was consistent from one of the Staff witnesses, is that as you include more renewables in the supply stack, all else equal you're reducing power prices. So we're actually creating in some ways a more conservative power price outcome by including more renewables in our analysis than would otherwise be there without that carbon assumption.

So again, to answer your question, I can't say definitively which way it would move because yes, from a single -- if we remove carbon, all else equal would power prices be lower, yes, they'd be lower in both cases, but the counter to that is we also would build a lot loss renewables. So because of that power prices would go up. So where is it? It's somewhere in the middle. I don't know where it is because I haven't done the analysis. It's not an easy 101 one-for-one analysis to do.

- Q. I want to talk about the basis of the assumptions starting in 2027. That would lie in the next presidential cycle, correct?
 - A. Sure, I'll accept that.
 - Q. Assuming that elections fall in a normal



schedule.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. Assuming we still have democracy.
- Q. So that being the case, essentially -- you would agree with me that that would, first of all, presuppose, it almost presupposes politically you'd have to have a Democrat win the next election, correct?

7 MR. SCHULTE: Objection. This is assuming 8 facts not in evidence.

MR. HADEN: He has made assumptions in his analysis. I'm asking about his assumptions.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Wait a second.

JUDGE DIPPELL: One at a time, please.

MR. HADEN: If I may. If somebody is going to come in here and say I built assumptions into my analysis and then I'm going to ask about these assumptions and say well, that assumes facts not in evidence, it's the very nature of what he's here to testify about.

MR. SCHULTE: No, I'm sorry.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Haden.

MR. HADEN: Let me finish mine and I'll let you finish yours. It necessarily assumes facts that cannot be in evidence because it's about the future. So it's a fair question. It's not a fair objection to that sort of discussion with an expert about future



2.2

assumptions. They necessarily assume facts not in
evidence. We've assumed a fact not in evidence from his
testimony in the other way that in 2027 we'll have
carbon tax. Obviously the fact has been stated
yesterday by all of us that nobody knows the future.
That's the nature of modeling. So it's a fair question.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Schulte.

MR. SCHULTE: Yes. My objection is based on the specific question that Mr. Haden asked which said you are assuming that you know the result of the election, and what Mr. Repsher has testified to is that the carbon tax assumption is not based on an actual carbon tax regime passed by the federal government. What he has testified to is that there is a carbon constrained future assumed regardless of whether the federal government passes a specific carbon tax. And so by building into his question a statement that Mr. Repsher is assuming he knows the result of an election assumes a fact not in evidence.

MR. HADEN: Okay. First of all, I'm building my foundation on my questions, not necessarily on questions that were asked before, although I know those statements are on the record. And I think that it is fair to ask under what scenario the federal government would possibly pass a carbon tax by 2027. I know



Page 360 there's some testimony about that yesterday, but that
was from some other lawyer sitting next to me asking
those questions. This is my time to have an examination
of the witness and it's a fair question. If he
disagrees with me, he's free to answer however he wants
and thinks that my assumption that I've asked him about
is wrong, he can explain to me why that's wrong. It's
not a fair objection though.
JUDGE DIPPELL: I think that the question was
that the witness or that there had to be a Democrat
in office. That was the question.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

What I asked -- What I think what MR. HADEN: I'm asking is you would have to assume that a Democrat would be the next president to even have a chance to have a carbon tax passed; is that correct? If he thinks that's not correct, he can tell me what he thinks I'm not right.

I'll let him answer that JUDGE DIPPELL: question. I don't believe that was exactly the question.

MR. HADEN: I'm sorry. That would be my rephrase I guess to at least try to move this along relative to the objection.

24 JUDGE DIPPELL: You may rephrase your 25 question.



BY MR. HADEN:

2.2

- Q. So my rephrase is -- Let's just back up since this is apparently an objectionable area we're going to ask about. I'm trying to do this quick, but we might have to do it slow.
 - A. Sure.
- Q. The 2027 carbon tax and all the carbon tax going forward that you have built into your assumptions, are you assuming that would be a federally imposed regime, a globally imposed regime, a state level regime? What is the assumption there generally built around?
- A. Yeah, and again I want to move this forward as well. It's not based on, I'm making really no assumption there. I think what -- So there are many ways that it could happen. I'll explain that briefly.

Certainly one way as you point out would be from a Congressional initiative with the president signing that into law. I would agree, and this has been my view for a long time, that it's next to impossible to get anything done in Congress these days, so the likelihood of having a federal carbon program move through Congress is limited. However, there are other avenues by which it can happen. The most reasonable one that one would think through is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is also continuing to move through

- 1 different avenues to control carbon prices -- or carbon emissions, excuse me. 2 I think as we all know, there have been fits and starts to that probably starting with 3 4 the Obama administration. But again, the Environmental 5 Protection Agency has moved forward with preliminary 6 plans for ways to limit carbon emissions. In 7 addition to that, you could certainly have state level 8 or regional programs, but again I'm not taking a 9 specific view on the likelihood of those happening.
 - Q. Do you know of any such proposed plan in Missouri to have a Missouri level carbon tax?
 - A. I am not aware of any.
 - Q. Do you know of any such proposed program in Kansas?
 - A. I'm not aware, no.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Do you have any reason to believe that the passage of such a program is likely in either of those states between now and 2027?
- A. As I said yesterday, the future is unknown, but I'm unaware of anything currently moving through the legislatures in those states that would be moving in that direction.
- Q. Do you know of any such proposed program in Indiana or Illinois at this point?
- A. Yeah. Illinois, last year they passed the



Climate and Equitable Jobs Act, I always get the acronym, CEJA, C-E-J-A. And that was passed by their legislature and signed into law by Governor Pritzker, whereas that is severely limiting carbon emissions starting in -- well, the first -- it's already started but the major regulation goes into effect starting in 2030, which will require the shutdown of most of the natural gas-fired fleet within the state at that time frame.

- Q. Okay. That's 2030, not 2027, correct?
- A. Well, not exactly. All of the natural gas-fired facilities within the state as of the beginning of this year have to limit their operations based off of historical operations and then those get further limited in 2030.
 - Q. Do you know of any such program in Illinois?
 - A. I was just talking about Illinois.
- Q. I'm sorry. Indiana. Sorry. Next state over.
- A. I am not aware of anything in Indiana.
- Q. Okay. Your assumptions -- You talked about the Illinois program. Is the assumption you've built in, is it just for the Illinois program or would it be for a broader cap and trade regime?
- A. It would be for a carbon regime that covers all generators within the U.S.



1	Q. Okay. And so this is what I'm asking, because
2	obviously a model is built on the strength of its
3	assumptions in part, correct; you would agree with that?
4	A. Yeah, it is built on assumptions, correct.
5	Q. Okay. If we build a model on me making my old
6	high school wrestling weight, it's not going to happen.
7	That would not be a good assumption I can tell you.
8	That's what I'm trying to get to the bottom of. 2027
9	frankly seems aggressive as an assumption for us to have
LO	a cap and trade program in place nationally. Even if
L1	EPA did it, that would be litigated almost certainly,
L2	correct?
L3	A. More than likely.
L4	Q. It probably wouldn't be litigated to fruition
L5	by or to completion by 2027, would it?
L6	A. I'm not a lawyer, but yeah, it's unlikely it
L7	would.
L8	Q. Have you followed at all the developments in
L9	terms of what's going on with like the Chevron Doctrine
20	of what the Waters of the U.S. case that the EPA just
21	lost?
22	A. I've been meaning to read that article, but I
23	haven't got around to it yet, but I am aware of the
24	ruling but I don't know exactly what it entailed.

It is riveting let

I read it twice in a week.

25

Q.

me assure you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- A. I'll take a look at that.
- Q. That's the kind of thing though where the courts have turned them back even on their discretion, correct?
 - A. My general recollection is that, yeah, something, again I haven't read the article, has limited their ability in some way, yes.
 - Q. But you would stand today on the assumption in the model that there would be a cap and trade system that would dynamically affect your overall conclusion by 2027?
 - MR. SCHULTE: Objection. It misstates the previous testimony as we've been over many times. The testimony does not -- the model does not assume specific federal action in order to assume a carbon constrained future.
 - MR. HADEN: I didn't say I assumed federal action. I said it assumes a cap and trade carbon program, I believe, but that's what I'm asking about.
 - MR. SCHULTE: Again, it still misstates the evidence because the testimony which we've been over many times is that it does not assume specific government action federal or state.
- MR. HADEN: Okay. But it does assume, I think

1	he said multiple times, a carbon tax program being in
2	place from 2027 forward and he said that does make a
3	difference in the model. He may not know exactly where
4	the number is, but that's what I'm trying to get to the
5	bottom of. I don't understand why there's such a push.
6	You're going to present an expert and then try to
7	constrain his testimony only to what you want to hear.
8	It's a fair question as to how that affects the model.
9	If we're to believe the model, he should be able to
10	explain the model. I'm not saying Witness Repsher is
11	not. But I don't understand the objection, and I don't
12	think it misstates his testimony, but more importantly I
13	think I'm asking as it relates to his conclusion in a
14	way that's fair to the overall inquiry for the expert
15	witness. That's what he's here for.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Bentch, could you read
17	back the last question.
18	(The last question was read back by the
19	stenographer.)
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. I'll let you get
21	caught back up. Are you ready to Okay. Objection
22	sustained. I believe the question asks for facts that
23	the witness has testified don't exist. He has not
24	testified that he assumed a carbon tax.

MR. HADEN:

25

Judge, I respectfully disagree.

1	If I could ask to clarify then his testimony on that
2	matter to see if we can come back to this. We may get
3	an asked and answered objection. My understanding what
4	he testified to earlier is well, and I can ask him
5	again but I don't think that's what he said in his
6	earlier testimony about the way that assumption
7	because it's not that the assumption is neutral, have it
8	in and have it out. It's not that it's completely
9	transparent to the rest of the conclusion. He said that
10	himself earlier that you subtract it out but there is
11	movement, he doesn't know the exact number, but there is
12	a difference between having it in and having it out.
13	MR. SCHULTE: Judge, if I may.
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: One last.
15	MR. SCHULTE: Mr. Haden is testifying about
16	what this witness testified about.
17	MR. HADEN: Then we can go back and read the
18	record. I'm fine with that, but I don't want to slow it
19	down that much.
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Haden.
21	MR. HADEN: I don't think I am.
22	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Haden
23	MR. HADEN: Yes, Judge.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: let Mr. Schulte finish.
25	MR. HADEN: Yes.



1	MR. SCHULTE: This is a good example, Judge
2	Dippell, of why we have prefiled testimony in
3	complicated technically intense areas and we could
4	simply go back and read footnote 4 on page 7 of Mr.
5	Repsher's testimony where he explains this very clearly.
6	And I don't know if Mr. Haden did not read that or if he
7	has questions specific to that statement in his
8	testimony, but I think that would help us and the
9	Commission clarify exactly what Mr. Repsher's testimony
10	is.
11	MR. HADEN: Judge, active cross-examination is
12	here in part because a witness might have an
13	inconsistent answer, they may roll back on an answer.
14	In all sorts of judicial proceedings, people say X in
15	direct testimony and then come back and say well, Y, in
16	cross-examination or they qualify their answer.
17	MR. SCHULTE: A study is a fixed final study.
18	MR. HADEN: It's about procedure.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Stop. I've
20	already ruled on the objection. Move on with your next
21	question.
22	MR. HADEN: Judge, I will move on.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: Do not argue with me.
24	MR. HADEN: I have a question then on
25	clarification then. I'm not to go back to ask about



- anything he's talked about earlier then in terms of the analysis? I'm not going to ask the same question again. I'm unclear now as to what his testimony is about how it applies.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: We talked for a long time yesterday about a carbon tax. The witness testified, the witness has prefiled testimony. I don't know how much more we need to testify about whether there's going to be, whether there was or whether there's assumptions about an official carbon tax.
- MR. HADEN: And Judge, not argumentatively then, you know I have to do my job just making a record then, I just put a place in the record. I mean, I am objecting on an ongoing basis in not being able to adequately cross-examine this witness based on the ruling. I'll put that on the record. I'm not arguing. You understand where I'm at on that. I'll move on.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead.

MR. HADEN: Thank you. I have. I just wanted to make a statement there so I've got that.

BY MR. HADEN:

2.2

Q. Okay. Let's talk about underlying assumptions, the dynamics within the model as it relates to economic activity that may have been foregone by the building of the line. Did your model as it lays these



- numbers out, does it look at -- I know you talked about ongoing social goods, et cetera. Did you account for any lost ongoing social goods in the other direction?
- A. I think if I understand your question, and I'm trying to answer your question, I believe is your question, you know, does the line result in less economic generation development within the state of Missouri, am I understanding your question?
- Q. I guess when I look at it you talk about a large number of ongoing social benefits that may come from this.
- A. Uh-huh.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. With a line in place there's some things that will not be able to be done just necessarily. Would you agree with that?
- A. Yes. There's a finite amount of capital theoretically in this world, as long as the government doesn't print too much money, that limits economic decision making, correct.
- Q. And so there's opportunity costs in the strict economic sense but then there's also a physical world -- I mean, there are literally things that you can't do wherever they build the line, correct?
- A. Yes. I mean, if a line, a tower is put in place, then theoretically whatever the footprint is of

that tower, then you can't do something with that land than you otherwise do.

- Q. Did you make any accounting for lost agricultural activity where the line is going to be built?
- A. That was a bit outside the purview of my analysis. I think that might be a better question for, I'm bad with names, but with the economic analysis that I think is coming from a future witness from Invenergy on the economic impact analysis. But yeah, I mean, I agree that my analysis does not directly account for lost agricultural use and, you know, if that creates a negative impact. I didn't look at that.
 - Q. So you have no -- As you see sit here today, you have no number either way on what would that would do?
 - A. No, it was outside the scope of what I did.
 - Q. Do you have any -- Did you make any analysis as to lost like habitat opportunities for wildlife?
 - A. I did not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Did you make any analysis as to lost local aviation opportunities?
- A. Again, that was outside of the analysis that I did.
 - Q. Did you make any analysis as to the effect on



local communications that the line would have?

2 A. I did not.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. So you have no number one way or the other as to how that would affect your overall analysis?
- A. Yeah. I was focused primarily on the impact with regard to power prices and capacity prices and the impact on ratepayers with those direct impacts.
- Q. Did you make any analysis as to what the effects that falling SO2 rates would have relative to the solar?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand that question.
- Q. If you've got falling SO2 rates in the atmosphere, does that have any effect on the efficiency of solar operations over a 40-year window?
- A. That's a very interesting question. I am not a climate scientist. So I don't know. I'm going to probably Google that later.
 - Q. That's not built into your model at all?
 - A. No, I didn't make an assumption on that.
- Q. SO2 rates in the atmosphere do have, I mean, the effect of diffusing the sun or do you know?
- A. I feel like I've heard that at some point. So I'll accept that as true.
- Q. One second here. Did you look at any modeling as to the way that future climate change may change wind



patterns in the Midwest?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- A. I did not look at that.
- Q. So in your model, I mean, it does assume a fairly constant rate of wind going forward for the high plains; is that fair?
 - A. Yeah, which I believe is based off of a, I'm going to get the numbers wrong, but a 10 or 20-year kind of record of wind.
 - Q. But you didn't look at any dynamic climate modeling as to how that may change with or without global warming or something like that?
 - A. I did not try to incorporate that.
- Q. Do you know if anybody has published methodology that would make that a possibility?
 - A. My understanding is that the IPCC, I believe, or maybe someone else, has started to try to quantify how wind patterns and solar irradiance may change based off of climate change. I haven't personally tried to dig into that or know how certain or uncertain those projections are. So I haven't tried to incorporate that.
 - Q. Do you have any post-mortems on the analysis that you do for the clients?
- A. Could you explain what you mean by post-mortems?



- Q. Well, I was looking at your CV. You got out of UVA I think in 2001, correct? I'm sorry. Is that a yes for the record?
 - A. I'm sorry. Yes, I got out of UVA in 2001.
- Q. Sorry. So we make a clean record. So I think you said in all 21 years of your professional career after college have been involved in energy consulting, correct?
 - A. That is correct.

- Q. So in 21 years, I assume you've done, I'm not being facetious, but you've done more projects than this project, I assume?
- A. Yeah. They've covered all sorts of generating facilities across the U.S. and world.
- Q. Have you ever gone back and analyzed post hoc whether or not your analysis was correct or how correct. I understand no analysis can be 100 percent correct when you're projecting the future. Do you ever go back and figure out how accurate your analysis was? Have you ever done that on any of your past analyses?
- A. Yeah, I mean, I don't know if clients have ever asked us directly to do that. Certainly we're always kind of going back and, you know, at least on an ad hoc basis or from a high level kind of just looking at how things look versus what we were saying at the

time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- Q. Have you ever gotten it really wrong?
- A. I'm thinking. Sure. I mean, I would hazard a guess that there have been times where we have made assumptions that end up not happening.

MR. HADEN: That's all I have, Judge.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Are there questions from the Commission? Chairman Rupp.

CHAIRMAN RUPP: Morning.

THE WITNESS: Morning. How are you?

CHAIRMAN RUPP: I'm well.

12 QUESTIONS

BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

- Q. At the risk of poking the hornet's nest, I need to revisit the carbon tax conversation, because I too was confused at your responses which at times seemed contradictory. So I wanted to try to clarify. You had stated there was \$17 billion of ratepayer benefits in savings. Later you said there were \$7.6 billion of environmental savings that was not included in that 17 billion; is that correct?
 - A. Yeah, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. The carbon tax assumptions, if a carbon tax does not materialize, which bucket of money would be most effective, the \$17 billion figure or the



environmental savings of 7.6?

2.2

- A. Yeah, that's a good question and I can understand the confusion because I often get those confused as well. If we're talking about a carbon tax or what's called a carbon shadow price at times, the impact would be, again not knowing exactly where the exact number of the impact would be on the \$17.6 billion, the 7.6 billion, this separate bucket is what's sometimes called the societal cost or societal benefit of carbon. That is -- You may be familiar with the term called the social cost of carbon. That's what's used there which is a different concept.
- Q. Okay. You answered my question. That's the social cost. Thank you. Will a carbon tax hurt the sale of renewable energy?
- A. I would say a carbon tax would only help the sale of renewable energy, but I don't think the absence of a carbon tax hurts it as you can see today with the renewable developments.
- Q. There was some questions between you and the counsel from the Agricultural Association that appeared that you were saying that a carbon tax would not impact, would not hurt nor help the attractiveness of renewable energy on the market?
 - A. Yeah, and I apologize if I was unclear. I



- think, yes, from a very, if that's the direct question, certainly. Putting a carbon tax all else equal would make renewables more attractive.
- Q. Okay. Thank you for clarifying. I thought you also stated in your back and forth that if a carbon tax was passed less renewables would be built. Did I mishear you or could you explain?
- A. I hope I didn't say that, because that's not correct. I don't think I said that. I'm trying to remember what I was saying. So all else equal, carbon, or I'm sorry, all else equal, the assumption of a carbon tax or a carbon program all else equal should lead to more renewable development. It will make them more economic.
- Q. Okay. In your footnote 4 that your counsel redirected us to, you identified Ameren is using a carbon tax in their IRP, correct, process?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. Does Ameren have their carbon tax assumptions beginning in 2027, or do you know?
- A. I am -- I actually don't know. I'm happy to follow up there. I believe it's around the same time frame but I don't remember off the top of my head.

 Apologies.
- Q. So my next question I was going to ask about

2.2

- MISO, M-I-S-O, that you have in your footnote. Is there a common timeline that utilities and RTOs and ISOs use in their modeling of carbon tax or is it arbitrary to whichever utility is plugging it into their own IRP?
- A. Is your question related to the timing or the price or both?
- Q. When are they making -- Is there a general assumption on IRP planning that when you model in a carbon tax or carbon shadow that it will begin roughly at the same time or one utility say it's going to begin in 2035 and one be arbitrary and say no, it will be 2050?
- A. Yeah, it's a good question. I don't think there's any one year that utilities use across the U.S., but what I have seen is it's anywhere from 2025 to 2030 is sort of the time frame within which they're used. I would say when you think about resource planning for utilities, certainly they do care about what's going to happen the next year and the year after. But really they're trying to figure out if I'm going to put a new power plant in service and it's going to be there for, you know, 20 or 30 years, I really want to make sure that the arc of my future kind of follows what I think is going to happen. So I'm not sure that they're as concerned about the specific start date but just whether

or not there is a carbon, you know, shadow price within their analysis.

- Q. Thank you. I believe it was yesterday in the conversation about the IRA where you stated that the new legislation can make projects more economic and I believe you referenced a battery production tax credit?
 - A. I did, yes.

2.2

- Q. Are any of those assumptions on those additional tax credits for things like battery included in any of your assumptions?
- A. I'm thinking. I don't believe this analysis assumes a tax credit for batteries. I believe shortly after we completed this analysis my firm and myself we started making -- we started hypothesizing about what may come out of an IRA type bill and I think we started making an assumption of an investment tax credit for batteries kind of shortly after this analysis was complete. My recollection, which is a bit fuzzy, is that we did not include that tax credit within this analysis.
- Q. Currently a tax credit for -- a production tax credit for batteries did not exist prior to the IRA?
- A. No, it did not. So just to clarify, again I don't want to drag us into the minutia, but I believe batteries are only eligible for what's called the



- investment tax credit, not the production tax credit, which the only difference is that with the ITC as it's called, you deduct that 30 percent off of your capital costs straightaway as opposed to getting it over time. I think that's all they're eligible for, but again I could be wrong there. But prior to the IRA, the only way that batteries could get a tax credit was if they were paired directly with a solar or a wind facility. But one of the changes with the IRA is that you can now have a standalone storage facility and it can get a tax credit on its own.
- Q. Thank you for that clarification. You mentioned earlier this morning that one of the changes in the IRA is the transferability of tax credits?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. I'm going to make -- Can any of those tax credits be sold for capital costs? If it's a production tax credit, it would be after the fact; but if the batteries are investment tax credits, could that be sold?
- A. So the transferability market as you might imagine is still developing given how new the IRA is, but yeah, my understanding is that if you came up with an arrangement with, you know, whoever the counterparty would be, that you could -- I think it would probably be

- 1 challenging to transfer them at the same time you would
- 2 | need to be putting out the explicit dollars for the
- 3 | capital. I'm guessing you could have it happen shortly
- 4 | thereafter. Again, I'm not a tax expert, so I don't
- 5 know exactly, but I would assume people could get
- 6 creative with the financial instruments to make that
- 7 happen.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUPP: And Judge, that completes my
- 9 questions. Thank you.
- 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there other Commissioner
- 11 questions? Commissioner Holsman.
- 12 COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Just real briefly.
- 13 | Thank you.

14 QUESTIONS

familiar with his comments?

- 15 BY COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN:
- 16 Earlier in the testimony about the carbon tax, Ο. 17 I heard a question, and I wasn't certain if it was 18 objected to and walked back about partisanship in carbon 19 I think the question went something like Democrats tax. 20 would have to win for the carbon tax to be a viable 21 option and I just was curious if you had seen Mitt 2.2 Romney's comments that the quickest way to address 23 climate change would be through a carbon tax. Are you
- A. Yeah, I have. And I think, you know, it's

- 1 interesting. Again, I don't want to get into partisan
- 2 | politics here, but one of arguably the most economically
- 3 | efficient ways to address, you know, carbon emissions is
- 4 | via just a carbon tax and I believe that's what
- 5 Mr. Romney has testified about. So yeah, there have
- 6 been bipartisan discussions on different ways to
- 7 | implement it. I think things have just gotten -- things
- 8 get political after a while.

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. So carbon taxes are not exclusive to one political party?
- 11 A. They are not. And I believe if you go back,
 12 you know, 20 years, the carbon tax was originally
 13 introduced by Republicans, if I recall.
 - Q. Okay. And I also was interested in the follow up. To be clear, it's not in the assumption of the 17.6 billion that a carbon tax will be in place by 2027; that was not your assumption in that number?
 - A. Correct. I mean, it assumes that there is a shadow price starting in 2026, but it's not saying that it has to be, you know, from Congress or the EPA or anything. It's recognizing the fact that today when someone like Ameren is looking at their future, they are assuming there will be some carbon constrained future they have to deal with.
 - Q. My last question is, we talk about Phase I and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Phase II. Phase I we heard yesterday is, you know, 200
miles in Missouri, Phase II is 50 miles in Missouri then
continues on to the substations through Illinois into
Indiana. You mentioned earlier in your testimony that
Illinois has already passed some form of carbon
regulation. You said that it would start at the end of
or I guess the measuring or idling down of the natural
gas would happen in the next by 2024 but that by 2030
it really is going to impact. Have you factored in or
considered what that would do to Phase I or Phase II
given that we do have a regulatory framework that would
potentially impact Phase II?

Α. Yeah. So it's a great question and something we've looked at. So the state of Illinois by 2030 is going to be facing issues where they need to find new generation resources whether those are located in the state, whether they are coming into the state, et cetera. And so if Phase II does not happen, then the state would be forced to look at other resources whether those are in state or out of state. Even if you go to the legislation that the state passed, I think one of the explicit references in the legislation is the idea that you can use transmission that interconnects at the border of the state to help count for meeting the requirements of the legislation. So I think all else

1	equal, to answer your question directly, if Phase II
2	doesn't exist, it would hurt the state of Illinois'
3	ability to meet their goals.
4	Q. So would an inverse position of that statement
5	there suggest that the regulatory environment in
б	Illinois would put an impetus on constructing Phase II?
7	A. Yes. I think that all else equal they would
8	prefer to have Phase II completed.
9	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you. Thank you,
10	Judge.
11	JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there other Commission
12	questions? All right. I have just a few.
13	QUESTIONS
14	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:
15	Q. Going back to your Schedule MR-2 of your
16	direct testimony.
17	A. Yes, I'm there.
18	Q. You outline the ratepayer impacts and the
19	additional benefits of the extended Grain Belt case.
20	How do these impacts differ from the initial project as
21	approved under the previous case, the 2016 case?
22	A. That's a great question. And I very much wish
23	I could answer that. We weren't part of that
24	proceeding. So I don't recall what they were and I

But I think if we

haven't done that specific analysis.

- want to kind of do a very 80/20 math just to put in the record, I would imagine that you could kind of do a pro rata kind of analysis where you said if the original was proposed was I think 500 MW was authorized, you could kind of take that on a pro rata basis versus now the 2500 and I think take 20 percent of this I guess that would be and that would be roughly the savings you would have had previously. Again, that's 80/20, maybe 60/40 math.
 - Q. Can you say what the ratepayer impacts over additional benefits to Missouri is for Phase I alone?
 - A. The vast majority of the benefits that
 Missouri get will be from Phase I just because that's
 when the power is getting dumped directly into the
 state. So I would -- again, I haven't done that
 explicit breakout, but I would hazard to say that
 probably, you know, of that 17.6, probably somewhere
 north of 10 billion at least is just related to Phase I,
 probably 10 to 15 billion, but again that's me doing
 some math in my head very quickly.
 - Q. And is that the same in your estimation if Phase II is never built?
 - A. Yeah, yeah, exactly. So basically what I was trying to do with that math is say okay, if you just had Phase II by itself it would be sort of what's called in



- that \$10 to \$15 billion and then if Phase II happens
 that's when you get that incremental 2 to 5 billion
 benefit.
 - Q. Okay. You started with Phase II there, but did you mean Phase I?
 - A. I'm sorry, yeah, Phase I.
 - Q. Also in that schedule on page 7 you mention you showed delivering so much to Ameren's service territory, Ameren Missouri?
 - A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. I'm going to skip that one. I think that was answered. What happens to the additional MW that are going to be delivered to the substation for Associated Electric Cooperatives that isn't already spoken for? Do you know?
 - A. Yeah, I think again without -- I don't want to -- I know we're in whatever acronym we were using yesterday for confidential, so I won't get into that directly, but you know, I think the idea would be that that power could be utilized by any number of offtakers that are directly interconnected with the AECI service territory. You know, as I said yesterday, our analysis is agnostic to who the specific offtaker is given we're looking at the power price impacts. I think to answer your question directly there are any number of folks



- either in the AECI territory or directly adjacent to them that could take that power.
- Q. And you mentioned using the model called Aurora. Do you know if MISO uses that tool, that same model?
- A. Subject to check, I think the answer is yes. They either use that or they use a model called PROMOD. I'm happy to get back to you on that. I used to know the answer to this. I think they do use Aurora, but I can get back to you certainly on that.
 - Q. Do you know about SPP?

2.2

- A. I don't know again. The two main models that ISOs use are either Aurora or kind of a competitor model called PROMOD that sort of does the same thing. There's a third one called PLEXOS. So I'm happy to get back to you on those. Again, they all kind of do the same thing. They kind of have the same objective in life. It really comes down to what sort of legacy system the ISO has used and what they're most comfortable with, but I can get back to you on that.
- Q. Does the model matter? Is it really more the assumptions?
- A. I think it's the assumptions and the operators of the model and what -- but I think if you have a competent person that knows how to run the models, it's



really about the assumptions more-so than anything else than the model that you use.

2.2

- Q. And do you know are you familiar with at all which utility companies in Missouri might use that model in their planning?
- A. I'm not familiar off the top of my head which one they use.
- Q. Your testimony asserts that the renewable resources delivered by the Grain Belt project have considerably higher capacity factors than typical midwestern resources. Can you tell me whether the RTO's accreditation processes will recognize those resources in a similar manner?
- A. Yeah, that's a great question. I think as Mr. Sane was talking about yesterday, and I'll kind of echo some of his thoughts, SPP and MISO are currently going through a stakeholder process to better understand how they should account for the accreditation of renewables on their system. Currently the way that MISO works, for example, is they -- I believe they use just the historical record of operations for the renewable facilities to determine how they were operating during the peak hours on the system. And in some cases that could be a fleet average. To answer your question directly, if the line was in place today, there could be

some challenges with recognizing the accreditation of the line of the superior resources. However, where MISO is moving now and will be within the next six to twelve months is using what is called an effective load carrying capability or ELCC methodology.

What that does is it looks specifically at how individual resources are operating when those peak hours happen. So my professional expectation is that certainly by when this line would be online but probably more likely within the next year they're going to be looking specifically at how these resources operate when that peak hour happens. So they would be able to recognize these higher accreditation factors.

The other thing I'll point out just really quickly, as Mr. Sane said yesterday, one of the benefits, and this is what's captured in that ELCC methodology, is that because these resources are located farther west than the service territories here in Missouri, if you think about load generally picks up around the, you know, 5:00, 6:00, 7:00 p.m. here as people get home from work. The solar resources will still be performing quite well in western Kansas at that time frame and wind also will be performing well. My expectation is you'll get some, I call it a time zone advantage as well because of where those resources are

1	located relative to load that would further strengthen
2	their accreditation on the system.
3	Q. Okay. Let me look here. I think I've got one
4	more. Okay. And the dreaded carbon tax subject. Is
5	the inclusion of a carbon tax the preferred or more
6	broadly accepted proxy value to evaluate the regulatory
7	risk associated with the continued utilization of carbon
8	intensive resources?
9	A. I think the short answer is yes. And when you
10	look at, for example, the MISO long range transmission
11	process that we were I think briefly talking about
12	yesterday or maybe Mr. Sane was, you know, that analysis
13	when MISO itself did it, they're looking at the two
14	different carbon worlds to analyze the value of
15	transmission lines. And as I said, most utilities when
16	they do their long-term resource planning they are
17	looking at a carbon shadow price to determine their
18	preferred resources going forward.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other Commission
20	questions? All right then. We can go ahead then. Are
21	there further cross-examination questions based on
22	questions from the bench from MEC?
23	MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club.
25	MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

Page 391

1 Renew Missouri. JUDGE DIPPELL: 2 No, thank you. MS. GREENWALD: 3 JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance. 4 MR. BRADY: No, thank you. 5 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 6 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 8 MR. PRINGLE: Yes, Judge. Thank you. 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. PRINGLE: 11 And Mr. Repsher, what is the western most 12 state in MISO? 13 Good question. North Dakota I believe would Α. 14 be the furthest west. 15 I guess would it surprise you that MISO does 16 extend a little bit into Montana? 17 Yeah, it gets a little messy up there. I'll Α. 18 agree with you. 19 Thank you, sir. And also would you agree that 0. 20 completion of both phases of this project is 21 economically optimal compared to the possibility of only 2.2 Phase I? 23 I mean, I think if you believe in the Α. Yeah. 24 efficient use of capital and spreading costs over 25 larger, yeah, it's going to be more efficient to build

both phases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

18

21

22

23

24

- For clarification, how would you define economically optimal?
- I think when you look at the benefit, sorry, Α. the benefit to whether it's ratepayers or the company pursuing the line, you know, the monetary benefits versus the cost to build the line.
- And then do you recall when Judge Dippell was questioning you about what assumptions have changed since the original CCN case?
 - Yes, I do. Α.
- And you did not testify in that 2016 case, Ο. correct?
- That is correct. Α.
- 15 Ο. Did you have the economic feasibility study at that time prior to completing the study you submitted 17 with your direct?
 - Α. I did not.
- 19 So do you know what assumptions actually O. 20 changed?
 - Α. I'm not sure that I -- I'm just trying to remember what I said. I don't know if I actually testified about the assumptions that were made, but I think it's fair to say that I don't know all of the assumptions that were made in that analysis.



Page 393 1 Thank you, sir. No further MR. PRINGLE: 2 questions. 3 JUDGE DIPPELL: Anything from MLA? 4 MR. AGATHEN: No questions, Your Honor. Thank 5 you. 6 Agriculture Associations. JUDGE DIPPELL: 7 No, Your Honor. MR. HADEN: 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander. 9 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. HOLLANDER: No. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme. 11 MS. STEMME: No questions. Thank you. 12 Associated Electric. JUDGE DIPPELL: 13 MR. ELLINGER: Associated Industries has no 14 questions. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sorry. I've been saying cooperatives too much. Is there redirect from Grain 16 17 Belt? 18 MR. SCHULTE: Yes, please. Thank you. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: How much redirect do you think 20 you have, Mr. Schulte? 21 MR. SCHULTE: It's not a huge amount. Were we 2.2 planning to break at 10:30? 23 JUDGE DIPPELL: No, I was hoping to take a 24 short break around 10:00 sometime. So I didn't know if 25 this was a good time or if we should wait until after



	Evidentially Healing Surie 66, 20
1	Page 39. the witness.
2	MR. SCHULTE: We can take a short break. I'm
3	sure Mr. Repsher would appreciate it.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go ahead and take a
5	ten-minute break, come back at ten after, ten after
6	10:00. Go off the record.
7	(A recess was taken.)
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I think we can go ahead
9	and go back on the record. So we were going to resume
10	with redirect of Mr. Repsher. Go ahead, Mr. Schulte.
11	MR. SCHULTE: Thank you, Judge.
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
13	BY MR. SCHULTE:
14	Q. Mr. Repsher, can you turn to your direct
15	testimony page 7?
16	A. Yeah, I'm there.
17	Q. At the top of that page do you see the
18	question please explain the project specific analysis
19	framework.
20	A. I do see that.
21	Q. And at line 5 in your answer you state PA
22	Consulting modeled two scenarios: One, a scenario with
23	approximately 2500 MW of injection capacity in Missouri



25

(the Expanded GBX Case) and (ii) a status quo scenario

with 500 MW of injection capacity in Missouri (the

Status Quo Case). Did I read that correctly?

- A. Yeah, that's what it says.
- Q. And then going down to line 11, there's a sentence that begins the two scenarios differed in their respective configurations; specifically, whether or not they delivered into PJM, as well as the capacity of the line and associated renewables. Are you referring to when it says whether or not they delivered into PJM, is that referring to the Grain Belt Express Project?
- 10 A. Yes, that's correct.

- Q. And then it states all other assumptions were held consistent between the two scenarios to isolate the wholesale market impacts of the Expanded GBX Case? Did I read that correctly?
- A. I think you said consistent. I said constant. Yes, that's what it says.
- Q. Were held constant, yes. Thank you. So that means, and just to clarify, all of the assumptions regarding carbon tax or a carbon constrained future, those were the same in the two scenarios that you compared?
- A. That's correct. We held all of the assumptions the same between the two cases.
- Q. And so there was a carbon tax or a carbon constrained future assumed in both futures?



- A. That is correct.
- Q. And then in footnote 4 on that same page, you refer to a national carbon pricing regime being implemented in 2026. Do you see that?
 - A. I do.

2

3

4

5

6

7

14

15

- Q. Could you read the last sentence of that footnote?
- A. Sure. So last sentence says "Carbon pricing can be reflected as a broad shadow cost within fundamental market models to analyze varying regulatory outcomes, and the use as a modeling variable is not necessarily tied to/dependent on a single legislative outcome at the federal or state level."
 - Q. Okay. And is another way of saying that is that the national carbon pricing regime is a useful proxy?
- MR. HADEN: Objection. I don't know what can be more leading to actually put a quote in his mouth.

 19 It's a leading objection.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: I'll sustain. Can you rephrase, Mr. Schulte.
- 22 BY MR. SCHULTE:
- Q. What is the national carbon pricing regime a proxy for?
- 25 A. It's a proxy for how players in the industry



- analyze a carbon constrained future when making resource decisions.
- Q. And it would have been possible to model the two futures, one with the status quo case and one with the Expanded GBX case without an assumption about carbon constraints; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. If you hadn't assumed carbon tax or a carbon constrained future in your study, would you still show savings in excess of cost for the Grain Belt Express Project?
 - A. Yes, I would.
- Q. And you testified that your study did not assume explicitly the provisions within the IRA; is that correct?
- A. Yeah, with the IRA being the Inflation Reduction Act that was passed last year by Congress.
- Q. Okay. So another way that you could have modeled it, assuming you had the time, would have been to remove the carbon tax or the carbon constrained future proxy and replaced it with provisions of the IRA?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And under that scenario would the results of the study still show savings in excess of cost for the Grain Belt Express project?



A. Yes, they would.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Q. And just briefly, and I think we've covered this, but I just want to tie the line, you decided to include a carbon constrained future assumption. Why?

Evidentiary Hearing

- A. Again, as I discussed I think earlier this morning, we wanted to replicate a world that was consistent with how industry players are making their resource decisions on a go-forward basis. So trying to ensure that we were putting ourselves in the shoes of who would be the prospective buyers for energy and capacity off of this line.
- Q. In addition to the modeling that utilities and RTOs do, have utilities also make public commitments to shareholders and customers to decarbonize over time?
 - A. Yes, they have.
- Q. Would that be another reason for including a carbon constrained proxy in your study?
- A. Yes, it would. For example, and I think it's somewhere in my testimony, I believe Ameren specifically has committed to carbon reductions, as well as I believe the City of Springfield and at least one other city within the state of Missouri.
- Q. Are the takeaways of your study dependent on the specific identity of offtakers for the project?
 - A. Yeah. Consistent with what I said I believe

- yesterday afternoon, our study is agnostic to who the offtakers are and the takeaways would be the same regardless of who those specific offtakers are.
- Q. In cross-examination by counsel for MLA, you were asked and you testified that your study did not directly compare the delivered cost of energy from Grain Belt to the delivered cost of energy from various in-state resources. Do you recall that line of questioning?
 - A. Yes, I do.

- Q. And why is the production cost modeling that you did, in your opinion, why did you do that rather than the direct comparison of the delivered cost of energy, which I believe is sometimes referred to as a levelized cost of energy analysis?
- A. Sure. While a levelized cost of energy analysis can be a useful starting point, it is a fairly simplistic metric in so much that it's directly looking at what is the cost of one option versus the other. So sometimes I think about it you're going into a grocery store and looking at what is the cost of this type of apple versus another type of apple. What that price doesn't tell you though really is the, or that cost I should say doesn't really tell you what is the -- what's the benefit that you're getting out of that purchase

- like how good is the apple going to taste. So what our analysis really shows is by putting this line in service what are all of the impacts on the system that one would see with the line in service, predominantly what are the changes in energy prices, what are the changes in capacity prices, what are the changes in emissions, things that directly, you know, impact consumers with regard to the benefits that they're deriving from the line.
- Q. I believe that counsel for MLA referred to Staff's position in the 2016 case as stating that the levelized cost of energy analysis is the best form of analysis. Do you agree with that statement?
- A. Again, while I wasn't part of the 2016 proceeding, I would respectfully disagree with that statement.
- Q. Do you recall on cross-examination from Staff counsel you were asked about a hypothetical where there was 10 MW of generation at 50 percent capacity factor and 10 MW of generation at a 30 percent capacity factor?
- A. Yeah, and walking off the stand I realized I was an idiot because that's very easy math. It should have been 40 percent capacity factor as opposed to whatever I said. So apologies to counsel there.
 - Q. Okay. And that's just a simple average of the

two capacity factors?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Correct.
- Q. For the net capacity factor assumed in the PA consulting study, did you take a simple average of the assumed generation?
 - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Did you -- Did you consider in order to arrive at the 74 percent capacity factor assumed in the study, did you consider the hours at which the various generators would be producing?
- Yeah, and I think that's a key difference from the single kind of simple average analysis that was hypothesized yesterday. I think the best way to think about it is if you have a hypothetical solar resource and a second hypothetical wind resource, I think we would all agree that solar does not produce during the middle of the night so its capacity -- the capacity factor that it's realizing is happening during the middle of the day. Conversely, while you do get wind generation in all hours of the day, within the Midwestern U.S. you get what is sometimes called a diurnal wind pattern which effectively means that as the sun sets the wind typically generates more and so you get what we would call a complementary effect whereas when you put those resources together it's not directly

- additive. I don't want to make that -- people have that be the takeaway, but it can create a capacity factor that is greater than the simple average.
- Q. And do you recall how many MW of generation you assumed would be interconnected to the Grain Belt line in order to come up with that net capacity factor?
- A. Yeah. Consistent with the discussions that the Company has been having with developers, we assumed 9,300 MW would be interconnecting at the western terminus in Kansas.
- Q. And what's the overall capacity of the Grain Belt line?
- A. Once Phase I and Phase II are completed, again, it is 5000 total MW.
- Q. But you assumed 90 -- you assumed 9.3 gigawatts would be interconnect -- I'll use the same measure, unit measurement. You assumed 9300 MW for a 5000 MW line; is that correct?
 - A. That is correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. How does that, I'll call it oversizing of the generation, how does that impact the net capacity factor in addition to the hours at which it generates?
- A. Yeah. I anticipated this question I guess last night because actually I had a dream about it. So the way I would think about it is think about a garden



2.2

- hose where it's finite size of the hole, your tube, you are as you're packing more electrons within to that finite space you're basically filling up more volume of the line in more hours of the day which effectively creates that higher call it utilization factor of the line or capacity factor if we want to call it that. So not only are you getting the two different patterns of solar and wind that I just talked about earlier, but also because in most hours, for example, solar even during the middle of the day is not operating at 100 percent capacity factor. If you had two solar resources operating at 50 percent capacity factor, both of those could feed into the line and that becomes then an additive number for that utilization factor of the line.
- Q. Okay. Thank you for that explanation. I believe you talked about the Aurora modeling in response to questions from Judge Dippell. And that's one of top two or top three models used in the industry?
 - A. Based on my opinion, yes.
- Q. And then you also used GPCM for your modeling as well. Can you explain what that is?
- A. Sure. GPCM is a model that's used by the natural gas industry to project future natural gas prices. So without getting into the details of how it works, you can effectively think of it as a production



1	cost model but for the natural gas sector. What we
2	utilized that model for is to come up with a forecast
3	for natural gas prices across North America again using
4	assumptions some of them the same that we use in our
5	power price forecasting but the model also will take
6	other assumptions such as the cost of a drilling rig,
7	decline curves for wells, et cetera, ultimately to come
8	up with those natural gas price assumptions which then
9	we input into our Aurora model.
10	Q. Is GPCM also a standard modeling tool used
11	across the industry?
12	A. Yeah. I believe MISO specifically uses the
13	GPCM model to forecast gas prices.
14	MR. SCHULTE: I don't have any further
15	questions.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Mr. Repsher, I
17	believe that concludes your testimony then.
18	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: You may step down. I think we
20	can go ahead then with Grain Belt's next witness.
21	MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you, Judge. Grain Belt
22	calls Rolanda Shine, please. And Judge, just as a
23	preliminary. While she's getting settled, I had handed
24	out to every counsel table a red-lined one pager of some

changes to Ms. Shine's direct testimony at page 7, and

- 1 that was really in deference to our court reporter so 2 she did not have to take down every single strikeout. 3 We do intend, as we mentioned yesterday in prelims, to 4 file a new version of Ms. Shine's testimony at the 5 conclusion of this hearing that has those changes, the 6 several minor changes she'll make on the stand this 7 morning, the November errata sheet as well just so 8 there's one clean copy for the record, if that's 9 acceptable.
 - JUDGE DIPPELL: That is preferable so that the exhibit that we mark will be the clean corrected copy; and if for some reason counsel finds that there's an error after that is filed, please bring that to the attention of the Commission, myself, and we will get it corrected.

MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you, Judge.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Shine, would you please raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give at this hearing will be the truth?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Could you spell your name for the court reporter?

THE WITNESS: Rolanda Shine, R-o-l-a-n-d-a S-h-i-n-e.



24 And do you have any corrections to your Q. 25 testimony or schedules at this time?

1	A. I do. I have a few. The first one is in my
2	direct testimony, page 5, the Q&A on exhibits and
3	schedules. I would like to add Schedule RS-3 and let's
4	see the title of that, RS-3 is the Chart of Accounts
5	adopted in accordance with FERC's Uniform System of
6	Accounts at 18 CFR Part 101.
7	The next corrections are in my surrebuttal
8	testimony, the first one being page 3, line 8. The
9	exhibits and schedules identified as Schedules RS-1
LO	through RS-4 sorry, RS-3; is that right?
L1	Q. Yes, thank you.
L2	A. RS-3. And then the final changes are on page
L3	8, line 3 should reference highly confidential Schedule
L4	RS-4 and footnote 6 should also refer to RS-4.
L5	Q. Thank you. If I were to ask you the same
L6	questions as contained in both your direct and
L7	surrebuttal testimony, would your answers remain the
L8	same today?
L9	A. Yes, they would.
20	MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you. Judge, at this
21	time I would move for the admission of Exhibits 5 and 6
22	and Schedules RS-1 through 4, please.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: And am I correct Exhibit 6, is
24	that HC, contains HC information?

I believe, yes, the schedule

MS. CALLENBACH:

Page 408

1 does, yes, Schedule RS-4. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Then are there any 3 objections to Exhibits 5 and 6? Seeing none, I will 4 admit Exhibits 5 and 6, including the 6 highly 5 confidential version. 6 (COMPANY EXHIBITS 5 AND 6 WERE RECEIVED INTO 7 EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.) 8 MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you. And I would 9 tender the witness for cross. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there any 11 cross-examination by MEC? 12 No, Your Honor. Thank you. MS. WHIPPLE: 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club. 14 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri. 16 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. 17 Clean Grid Alliance. JUDGE DIPPELL: 18 MR. BRADY: No, thanks. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 20 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 2.2 MR. PRINGLE: Yes, Judge. Thank you. Good 23 morning, Ms. Shine. 24 Good morning. THE WITNESS: 25 CROSS-EXAMINATION



BY MR. PRINGLE:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. I want to start off by just getting a few definitions from you. How do you define economic feasibility?
- A. From my perspective, economic feasibility is having an executable plan on how we intend to construct and finance the Project in an economic viable and financial matter.
- Q. Do you see any difference in the definition between economic feasibility and economic viability?
- A. I think that those can be used interchangeably.
 - Q. How would you define economic viability?
 - A. I would define it as a project that is able to support its own cost through its revenue stream.
 - Q. And then how would you define financial feasibility?
 - A. I think that would be very similar to economic feasibility.
 - Q. How about financial capability?
- A. Financial capability would be the ability to support your operations potentially through your own sources of funding.
- Q. And then how would you define revenue certainty?



- A. Revenue certainty would be the Project's ability to forecast out on a long-term basis the types of long-term revenue contracts that it will be able to look to for its source of revenue.
- Q. Were you present yesterday when Mr. Sane was on the stand?
 - A. I was.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Did you hear his testimony regarding what the Project's subscription level needs to be for revenue certainty?
- A. I believe he said it was around 70 or 75 percent.
 - Q. Do you have any reason to disagree with that?
 - A. I don't have any reason to disagree with that.

 I don't think that it's a hard and fast answer, but I

 don't disagree with that percentage.
 - Q. And then presently does Grain Belt have any long-term transmission capacity contracts signed or finalized at this time?
 - A. It has one contract signed at this time.
- Q. And then you also in your surrebuttal you reference a Staff witness Michael Stahlman's definitions for material change; is that correct?
- A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. And do you believe that a change in cost of



- half a billion dollars would not result in material change to the design and engineering of the Project?
- A. I think for a Project of this size \$500 million would not necessarily constitute a material change.
- Q. Do you also agree that half a billion dollars is roughly the cost of a converter station?
 - A. That is what I've heard.

2.2

- Q. And then one moment. I need to confer with your counsel see if we need to go in camera for this question. All right. I don't think we need to go in camera for this. It does have to do with what has now been corrected to be RS-4 with your surrebuttal. It's not going to be anything specific about any certain numbers, Ms. Shine. Just more in the revenues there, are those numbers there hard coded?
 - A. They are hard coded, yes.
- Q. And can you describe to us why they're hard coded, what was the reasoning for that?
- A. I believe as we've just talked about, and Mr. Sane explained yesterday, the customer contracts are still in negotiation. So the terms have not yet been finalized. The model that we are using takes different customer terms into account. So the financial model that was submitted uses hard codes because the



- assumptions are not yet agreed.
- Q. Okay. So it is fair to say those hard coding,
- 3 | that's because it's resulting with the current
- 4 | negotiations with the potential customers that Mr. Sane
- 5 | discussed yesterday?

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. Correct.
- Q. And the physical number itself, were there any other assumptions built into it beyond the current contract negotiations?
- 10 A. No. Those are the customer contract numbers.
- 12 | Q. Were the, let's say, the assumed MW, is that also based on the current negotiations?
- 13 A. Yes, it is.
- Q. That number, can you share that number without us going in camera, the assumed MW?
 - A. I believe our assumption is that the capacity would be fully contracted.
 - Q. All right. Ms. Shine, I also asked this question of Mr. Repsher. Would you agree that completion of both phases is economically optimal compared to only Phase I?
 - A. Yes, I would agree with his assessment that completion of both phases is economically beneficial.
- MR. PRINGLE: Thank you, Ms. Shine. No further questions.



Page 413

1	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Anything from MLA?
3	MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Good
4	morning, Ms. Shine.
5	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. AGATHEN:
8	Q. Before I forget, I want to follow up on a
9	question from Staff counsel. I believe you said you had
10	one long-term contract for the purchase of capacity?
11	A. Correct.
12	Q. That would be with MEC?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Don't you have a contract with a merchant firm
15	called R-e-a-l-g-y?
16	A. That is not something that we have
17	incorporated into our financial model.
18	Q. Why is that?
19	A. I don't know. I think that the understanding
20	is that the remainder of the contracted capacity would
21	be subscribed through the other potential customers that
22	Mr. Sane described yesterday.
23	Q. Instead of that, I mispronounce this every
24	time, R-e-a-l-g-y?
25	A. I'm not familiar with the terms of that



contract.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. Thank you. I got a one-page handout with an errata sheet this morning. I haven't been able to digest it completely. But if I ask you questions that are changed because of this errata sheet, would you let me know?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. If your answers are changed by the errata sheet from what I ask you, would you let me know?
 - A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Thank you. Would you turn to page 7 of your 12 direct testimony, please.
 - A. I'm there.
 - Q. At lines 18 to 20, you mention the possible financing of the line through the sale or lease of an individual interest in the Grain Belt Project, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. If I'm correct, over the last nine years, your testimony is the first reference in any of the Grain Belt cases that the Company is considering the sale or lease of an undivided interest in the Project; is that correct?
- A. I was not involved in Grain Belt at that time.

 24 So I'm not aware of how it was described then.
 - Q. You're not aware of any suggestion though on



- those other cases for the sale or lease of the capacity of the line of an undivided interest in it?
- A. Like I said, I'm not familiar with the contractual structures that they were contemplating.
- Q. Okay. To me this is a new proposal from prior Grain Belt cases. So let me just say hypothetically that a utility purchased a 500 MW undivided interest in the line. Exactly what would they be purchasing from Grain Belt? I'm just unclear as to what that undivided interest constitutes or includes.
- A. So an undivided interest would be the sale of a percentage of the line for their exclusive use.
 - Q. Percentage of the whole line?
 - A. For Phase I, if we're talking about Phase I.
- Q. So it would be a percentage of the whole Phase I as opposed to a certain segment of Phase I?
- A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Would the buyer own the segment of the line free and clear from any ownership interest or control by Grain Belt if they bought an undivided interest in Phase I?
- A. Yes, that would be the intent.
- Q. As a practical matter, how would this purchase differ from a purchase of entire capacity of the line?

 I'm trying to figure out what this undivided one-half



- interest constitutes. How would that differ from simply buying the entire capacity on Phase I Project?
- A. Well, I think that the key difference is when the payments are made. So if they were to take an undivided interest, the payment for that interest or percentage would be paid for up front. That would be the purchase portion of the parenthetical. The alternative would be to lease it on a long-term basis and that would be paid over time.
- Q. Assuming someone did buy an undivided half interest in the entire Phase I, who would control the right to sell capacity to others? For example, hypothetically Ameren.
 - A. Uh-huh.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

24

- Q. Who would control the right to sell to Ameren?
- A. That's not really my area of expertise. I think that we, you know, we address things from, you know, from an overall risk perspective from a commercial lender. But in terms of an agreement on who is going to control or operate or maintain, those are not decisions that we make in the financing group.
 - O. So you don't know?
- A. I do not know in this case, no.
 - Q. I assume you were involved in the discussions at Invenergy to possibly sell or lease an undivided



interest in the line; is that correct? 1 2 Α. Can you repeat the question? 3 Q. Sure. I assume you were involved in the 4 discussions at Invenergy to possibly sell or lease an 5 undivided interest in the Grain Belt line, Phase I? 6 I am not typically involved in those discussions. 7 So you were not involved in the discussions in 8 9 this instance? 10 Α. No. Do you know what the primary objective after 11 Ο. nine years or so of offering to sell or lease an 12 13 undivided interest in Phase I of the line? 14 Am I aware of the objective? Α. 15 Ο. Yes. 16 Α. I think the objective is to contract as much 17 of the capacity as possible in order to finance it. So this was another means of financing the 18 Ο. 19 Project as opposed to simply selling the capacity on the line? 20 21 I think that both options are viable for Α. 2.2 financing. 23 Ο. Right. But it's another option? 24 Α. Correct.

Have you spoken with any entities about the

25

Q.

- possible sale or lease to them of an undivided interest in the line?
 - A. I have not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. If you do sell or lease an interest in the line, that transaction would have to be completed before the closing on construction loans; is that correct?
 - A. Not necessarily.
 - Q. Why is that?
- A. So I think that there are certain commercial considerations about when, you know, a transfer of a line would take place or the commitment to purchase an undivided interest would take place. For us to, you know, to raise the capital and to finance the construction, most likely the sale would come after completion of the line, not before.
- Q. You testified in the Illinois Commerce

 Commission proceeding regarding the Grain Belt line, did

 you not?
 - A. I testified in Illinois, yes.
- Q. Do you recall stating, quote, if we were to enter into a lease or partial sale, we would do that prior to financial close and that would be evaluated by the lenders as part of the revenue source for the project, end quote?
- 25 A. That's correct.



1 So that's still correct in this case as well? Q. I think I was taking your question 2 Α. Correct. 3 to mean when would the cash transaction occur. 4 would likely not occur prior to financial close. 5 Perhaps I was unclear. Do you have any 6 estimate of the amount of capacity for which Grain Belt 7 might be selling or leasing an undivided interest in the 8 line? 9 I know discussions are ongoing. I don't know Α. 10 the current discussion. 11 Ongoing with respect to the sale of the 0. 12 undivided interest? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Do you know who that discussion is with? Ο. 15 MS. CALLENBACH: Excuse me, Judge. I think if 16 before we reveal any potential counterparties we need to 17 -- that would be confidential information or HCC. 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think she can say whether 19 she knows but not the specifics. 20 MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. Thank you, Judge. 21 THE WITNESS: I do know. 2.2 BY MR. AGATHEN: 23 You do know. Thank you. On a different 24 subject, did Grain Belt recently apply to the Department 25

of Energy for a construction loan for the project?

A. It did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Is this a request for an outright loan or a loan quarantee?
 - A. It was for a loan guarantee.
 - Q. As opposed to a loan from the DOE?
- A. The DOE provides a loan guarantee to the federal financing bank and they provide the direct loan.
 - Q. Who provides the loan?
 - A. Still the federal government.
 - Q. So the federal government is going to be loaning money?
- A. Correct. I think as I stated however in my
 direct testimony, DOE is only one of the financing
 options that we're considering, but yes, we did submit
 an application.
 - Q. How much of a loan guarantee are you asking for in dollars?
 - A. We are not asking for a specific amount at this time. The loan guarantee program is capped at 80 percent of total project costs.
 - Q. But there's been no decision made as to how much they would guarantee in your case?
 - A. The typical process is to share the budget with a lender and to conduct an underwriting analysis for how much debt the Project can support. And we would



- **Evidentiary Hearing** June 06, 2023 Page 421 1 finalize the actual loan amount when the budget is 2 finalized closer to financial closing. 3 Ο. Do you have an expectation as to how much this 4 I mean, 70 percent, 60, 50? will be? 5 We always like to raise as much as the lender Α. 6 will allow. 7 Right. 0. 8 And DOE is allowing up 80 percent of total 9 Project costs. What have you budgeted for? 10 Ο. 11 We have budgeted for 80 percent of total Α. 12 Project costs. 13 And the other 20 percent would come from Ο. traditional lenders like banks? 14 15 Α. The remaining 20 percent would come from 16 equity either from Invenergy or from third-party 17 investors. So the complete financing is going to 18 Okav. 0. 19
 - be through a loan from the federal government and equity from Invenergy or others?
 - Α. That's correct.

21

2.2

- 0. Did Grain Belt first contact the DOE about this loan or did the DOE contact Grain Belt first?
- 24 I was not involved in the Grain Belt Α. 25 transaction at the time of the initial DOE discussions.



- Q. Do you know what the approximate date was on which the first contact was made between the DOE and Grain Belt on this issue?

 A I don't have the date in front of me. It was
- A. I don't have the date in front of me. It was probably Q2 or Q3 of last year.
 - Q. Probably what?

2.2

- A. Q2 or Q3 of last year.
- Q. Thank you. Do you know what the status of that request for the loan guarantee is? Has DOE made any kind of a decision?
- A. DOE has not made a decision. We still have quite a bit of development on Phase I for any lender to be able to make a final decision. We did submit the part one application, they accepted it and invited us to submit the part two application. We submitted the part two application.
- Q. Do you know when that matter will be finalized with the DOE, when you will find out how much, if any, they're going to guarantee?
- A. Their decision would be made in a similar manner that any commercial bank would go through. As we have said, most lenders require several things to be demonstrated before they will provide their commitment and disburse funds. Examples of that would include obtaining all permits, having all your regulatory



- approvals, demonstrating that you have the remaining equity needed to complete the Project, your customer contracts are in place, your construction schedule is viable.
- Q. So basically the same types of conditions as banks or other lenders would impose?
 - A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q. Under the terms of the proposed loan from DOE, does DOE have the right to terminate the proposed loan before it closes? Can they back off at any time?
- A. Well, to be clear, DOE has not issued a commitment yet. We are still in discussions with them and we have submitted a part two application. I think DOE and any commercial lender can choose not to fund a project up until the time that they have issued their commitment.
 - Q. So DOE could walk away at any point?
 - A. Up until financial closing, that's correct.
- Q. Thank you. Aside from the DOE loan that we've been discussing, has Grain Belt or Invenergy requested any other form of financial assistance from any federal government agency with respect to the Grain Belt Project?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.
- 25 Q. You're familiar with the term memorandum of



- understanding, correct?
- 2 A. Correct.
 - Q. Sometimes simply referred to as MOU, all caps?
- 4 A. Yes.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Could you please describe the general nature of an MOU?
- A. It's an expression of interest to execute a transaction between two parties.
- Q. In your experience with lenders or investors loan the money to finance the Grain Belt Project solely on the basis of a typical MOU for the sale of capacity?
- A. No, MOUs are nonbinding. So lenders would not underwrite against it.
 - Q. They'd want to see actual customer contracts, right?
 - A. That's right.
 - Q. Could you briefly describe the meaning of a debt service coverage ratio?
 - A. Sure. So this is a typical metric that lenders, project finance lenders, will use to ensure that there is sufficient revenue to repay the debt. The numerator consists of cash available for debt service which in this case would primarily be from long-term customer contracts. It would also net out your operating expenses and then the denominator would be

your principal and interest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Typical coverage ratio for a construction loan of a transmission project is roughly 1.25 to 1.5 times, is that correct, based on your testimony starting at the bottom of page 10 of your direct?
- A. I believe my testimony was referring to coverage ratios for project finance transactions generally, not specifically to transaction projects.

 The coverage ratio --
- Q. Not specifically to transmission projects did you mean?
- A. Correct. A transmission project would fall within the range that I provided, but this is a wide range to take into account all different types of project profiles. So a lower risk project, which one would argue a transmission project is lower risk from a lender's perspective, could fall towards the lower range and a higher risk project could be at the upper range.
- Q. What's the debt service coverage ratio for a typical MOU? It would be zero, wouldn't it?
- A. There would be no coverage ratio associated with an MOU.
 - O. Zero?
- A. I'm not sure that I understand the question.
- Q. You've talked about debt coverage ratios and

- how they're calculated. Wouldn't the debt service coverage ratio for an MOU for potential purchase of the line be zero?
- A. Well, the coverage ratio would apply to the operations of a project entirely, not specific to a singular contract or arrangement.
- Q. So are you saying that there would be no debt coverage ratio for a typical MOU?
- A. I'm not really following the question because an MOU is not a -- it's a letter of interest. It's not cash based. There would be no metric associated with that particular piece of paper.
- Q. So there would be no debt service coverage ratio for that project?
- A. A coverage ratio can only be calculated if there are revenues --
- Q. Right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- A. -- and there is debt.
- Q. That's my point. Since there's no revenues and there's no debt service coverage ratio?
- A. I think that the conclusion is not quite appropriate, because as we've said an MOU is a step towards having a signed customer contract that will be legally binding. And once that is in place, then you can use that as an input to your coverage ratio. But if



Т	an MOU is only an expression of interest for parties to
2	move forward to negotiate economic terms and specific
3	prices, then at that point you will have information
4	necessary in order to calculate your coverage ratio.
5	Q. I don't want to prolong this, but there's no
6	revenues associated with the MOU, right?
7	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, I'm going to object.
8	I think the witness has answered this question now
9	multiple times. So I would say asked and answered.
LO	JUDGE DIPPELL: I think she's answered that,
L1	Mr. Agathen.
L2	MR. AGATHEN: Okay, Your Honor. I'll move on.
L3	BY MR. AGATHEN:
L4	Q. As you sit here today, other than the contract
L5	with MEC, you don't know who the customers might be for
L6	the purchase of the capacity on the line, do you?
L7	A. I do not.
L8	Q. On a different subject, could you turn to page
L9	6 of your direct testimony, please.
20	A. Okay.
21	Q. At about line 3 through 7, excuse me, lines 3
22	through 7, you talk about the ability to secure Project
23	financing once the Project reaches an advanced stage of
24	development; is that correct?



That's correct.

25

Α.

1	Q. At what point in this process would you say
2	that the Grain Belt Project will reach an advanced stage
3	of development?
4	A. I would say once we have signed customer
5	contracts for the majority of the capacity, as well as
6	received regulatory approvals, that would be considered
7	enough of a basis to enter into active financing
8	discussions.
9	Q. Thank you. So at this point the Project is
10	still in what's called the developmental phase; is that
11	correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. Changing subjects again. I want to try and
14	nail down your latest projections for the cost of the
15	Revised Grain Belt Project. Do you have a copy there of
16	your responses to our Data Request G37?
17	A. It might take me a while to find it, but you
18	can
19	MS. CALLENBACH: If I could just help the
20	witness, I think it might be tab 9 in your book there.
21	THE WITNESS: I'm not seeing tab 9.
22	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, if we could just have
23	one minute to make sure the witness has the document.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sure. We can go off the

record while they get the witness.

- Page 429 1 MS. CALLENBACH: I think we've got it. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Oh, we can go back on the 3 record. Okay. I have it. Thank you. 4 THE WITNESS:
- 5 BY MR. AGATHEN:
 - 0. Thank you. That's G37?
- 7 Yes. Α.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- 8 And you verified the answers to that response, Ο. 9 did you not?
- 10 I did. Α.
 - You begin the response by saying that based on Ο. your most recent estimates, the total projected cost to the entire Revised Project not including network upgrade costs is 4.95 billion; is that correct?
 - Α. That's correct across Phase I and Phase II.
 - And then regarding the updates to the 0. projected interconnection cost, you defer to the answers to Data Request G39, which was submitted by Mr. Rodriguez; is that correct?
 - Correct. Α.
 - And then you go on in the last paragraph of 0. your response to Data Request G37 to state as follows: Quote, please note that approximately 190 million of the network upgrade cost will be paid during the Phase I operating period through projected revenues and will not



- be paid up front. Therefore, the Amended Project costs are 5.5 billion, paren, 495 billion plus 598 million in upgrades; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, that's what it says.

- Q. I've got two questions about that quote. First, just because a portion of the network upgrades will be paid through project revenues, there's still costs which must be incurred by Grain Belt as part of the total cost of the Project; is that right?
- A. That's correct. Some upgrade costs will be paid up front and some of them will be paid during the operating period.
- Q. At the end of the quoted material you refer to a total of 598 million in upgrades, correct?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Let's assume hypothetically, if you would, that in our response to Data Request G39, which you refer to, Mr. Rodriguez said that the updated estimate for the cost of network upgrades is just over 788 million. Do you know how to reconcile that figure with the number you provide of 598 million?
- MS. CALLENBACH: Excuse me, Judge. This is not an objection. If Mr. Agathen wants her to look at that response, that data request response, I think he should provide a copy.



1	MR. AGATHEN: I'm just assuming the answer
2	hypothetically. He'll be on the stand later.
3	JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm sorry. I didn't catch the
4	original question.
5	MR. AGATHEN: Let me start again.
6	BY MR. AGATHEN:
7	Q. Let's assume hypothetically that in response
8	to our Data Request G39 Mr. Rodriguez stated that the
9	updated estimate for the cost of network upgrades is
10	just over 788 million. Do you know how to reconcile
11	that figure with the number you provided of 598 million?
12	MS. CALLENBACH: Sorry, Judge. Same
13	objection. If he wants her to compare the two numbers
14	and reconcile the two, I believe she should be provided
15	a copy so she can see those numbers in context.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: Do you have a copy of that DR,
17	Mr. Agathen?
18	MR. AGATHEN: Not readily available, Your
19	Honor.
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: If the witness can answer in
21	the context that, I mean, Mr. Agathen is asking about
22	numbers in the context of the DR but he's asking the
23	question outright as if it weren't in the DR. So can
24	you answer the question or do you need?

I would like to see the context

THE WITNESS:

- and the buildup of the number that's being referenced in
- 2 Mr. Rodriguez's testimony.
- MR. AGATHEN: I'll withdraw the question.
- 4 BY MR. AGATHEN:

9

10

- Q. Could you turn, please, to page 7 of your direct testimony.
- 7 A. I'm there.
 - Q. Beginning at line 9, you're talking about the costs of network upgrades as opposed to the base cost of the Project itself; is that correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. Perhaps you could help me out here. Beginning 13 at page 7 --
- MS. CALLENBACH: Excuse me, Judge. I'm sorry
 to interrupt. Are we referring to page 7 that's
 currently in her direct testimony or the red-lined of
 page 7 we distributed this morning?
 - MR. AGATHEN: Original direct testimony.
- MS. CALLENBACH: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. AGATHEN: And you can tell me if that changes your answer.
- 22 BY MR. AGATHEN:
- Q. Beginning at line 11 of page 7, you state that
 the transmission owner will pay for the upgrades up
 front and Grain Belt will repay the transmission over --



transmission owner over a 90-year period; is that correct?

- A. In my direct testimony, I said that the transmission owner will pay for the upgrades up front over a 20-year period.
- Q. In that statement, is the transmission owner the entity which owns the line to which the Grain Belt Project is connecting, for example, its connection with Ameren in Callaway County?
- A. So Grain Belt would repay the transmission owner. I did for clarity update this section in the revised page 7 that was circulated at the beginning.

 And so the revised sentence reads typically upgrade costs are paid up front and included in the project costs, but for this Project, some costs will be paid up front and, for the rest, Grain Belt Express will enter into facilities services agreements to pay for the upgrades over time.
 - Q. Okay. So you're saying Ameren would pay up front part of the costs of connecting hypothetically if Ameren were involved in it?
 - A. Hypothetically if Ameren were involved in it. It depends on the arrangements, but the upgrade costs that we agree to pay could be paid for in one of two ways, up front or over time.



1	Q. Who would make the decision as to which way to
2	do that?
3	A. I believe that would be a joint decision but a
4	question better for Mr. Rodriguez.
5	Q. Well, if Ameren pays it up front, doesn't it
6	become part of Ameren's rate base?
7	A. I believe that's a question for Mr. Rodriguez.
8	Q. But Ameren could potentially have to pay the
9	costs up front?
10	A. They could potentially pay the costs up front.
11	Q. And it's going to want to recover somehow a
12	return on that up front payment, is it not, logically?
13	A. I think that's a question for Mr. Rodriguez.
14	Q. So you don't know?
15	A. I do not know the discussions that we are
16	having on the ways to pay for the upgrades.
17	Q. Would that up front payment by the
18	transmission owner apply to all of the network upgrades
19	needed to connect the Grain Belt line to the
20	transmission systems at all three of Grain Belt's
21	converter stations?
22	A. Can you repeat the question?
23	Q. Would this up front payment we've been talking



about by the transmission owner apply to all of the

network upgrades needed to connect the Grain Belt line

24

Page 435

- to the transmission systems at all three of Grain Belt's
 converter stations?
 - A. No. My corrected response says that the upgrades can either be paid for up front or over time.
 - Q. Right. But that would apply to all three converter stations?
 - A. That's my understanding, yes.
 - Q. On a different subject, does your projected cost figure for the Project of 4.95 billion include the cost of debt, the interest that would be paid on construction loans?
 - A. This includes -- This includes primarily equipment and costs specifically related to construction, not financing costs.
 - Q. Okay. When you borrow money from the DOE or whoever, you will incur a financing cost, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. But that's not included in the 4.95 billion?
- 19 A. Correct.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. Do you have a projection as to how much the financing cost will be approximately?
- 22 A. I do not have that number with me.
- Q. Are we talking billions over the life of the Project?
- 25 A. I'm sorry. I think it's important to clarify



- or distinguish that financing costs as it relates to the \$4.95 billion figure would only include the construction phase, as financing costs incurred during the operating phase would be covered by your operating cash flows.
- Q. Right. They'd be covered by those cash flows, but I'm looking for an amount of what the cost of debt really is, an approximation.
- A. We negotiate financing terms, financing fees when we get into active negotiations. Obviously we try to keep those financing fees as competitive as possible, and we do not have I think a firm estimate at this time.
- Q. Well, there is some amount of financing costs that Grain Belt will incur, right?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And that's not included in the 4.95 billion figure, right?
- 17 A. Correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. And you just don't know at this point how much that cost of debt is going to be; is that what you're saying?
 - A. The cost of debt is dependent on several factors, including the time of construction, the interest incurred during the construction period, and any associated fees related to the cost.
 - Q. I understand that. What I'm looking for is an



Τ	approximate number of what that cost is going to be.
2	MS. CALLENBACH: Objection. Asked and
3	answered. The witness has said that it's unknown at
4	this time.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: I didn't actually hear the
6	witness say that. I heard her say that Well, I heard
7	her say that, you're correct, she doesn't know the exact
8	number, but she hasn't answered whether there's an
9	estimated number and I thought that was Mr. Agathen's
LO	question.
L1	MR. AGATHEN: It was, Your Honor.
L2	BY MR. AGATHEN:
L3	Q. I mean, there has to be a budget at Invenergy
L4	somewhere or Grain Belt somewhere that includes the cost
L5	of debt as an estimated figure. Would that be correct?
L6	A. Yes, we have internal estimates and that
L7	estimate changes depending on other changes to the
L8	Project such as changes in the budget, changes in the
L9	timeline. So that estimate will continue to change.
20	Q. Okay. And what is it at this point?
21	A. I don't have that number in front of me.
22	Q. Do you have an approximate number?
23	A. Yeah, I don't have that number in front of me
24	unfortunately. I would say, however, that financing

costs are included as eligible Project costs within the

- calculation of debt. So the financing costs would be included in total Project costs of which DOE lends up to 80 percent.
 - Q. But they're not included in that 4.9 billion figure that you cite to, is it?
 - A. That's correct, but it would be included in the basis for financing.
 - Q. On another subject, would you turn, please, to page 12 of your direct.
 - A. Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Beginning at the first line of page 12, you state that debt providers would not make such a long-term commitment to finance the Project before key regulatory approvals are in place. Is that essentially correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And it's also true they would not make commitments until after the Project has obtained all of the required interconnection approvals such as those from MISO and PJM; is that correct?
 - A. Was that in my direct testimony?
- 22 Q. I'm just asking.
 - A. Can you repeat the question, please?
- Q. It's also true that the lenders would not make such commitments until after the Project has obtained



Page 439 1 all of the required interconnection approvals such as 2 those from MISO and PJM? 3 Α. Yes, that's generally correct. 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Agathen, I hate to 5 interrupt, but we're going to have to take our lunch 6 break right now. 7 MR. AGATHEN: You're not interrupting at all, 8 Judge. I am finished. 9 Excellent. Well, then this is JUDGE DIPPELL: 10 a good place to take our lunch break. We will take a 11 break until -- let's see. It's 11:30 now. Let's take a 12 break until 12:45, and we can go off the record. 13 (The noon recess was taken.) 14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Back on the record. 15 right. Let's go ahead then and go back on the record. 16 And Mr. Agathen said that he had completed his cross; is 17 that correct, Mr. Agathen? 18 MR. AGATHEN: That is correct. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: So Agriculture Associations. 20 MR. HADEN: Thank you, Judge. I just had a 21 few quick ones, I think. 2.2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. HADEN: 24 So Ms. Shine, I just want to be clear. Ο. Ι

think you said earlier to the extent there's talk about

- selling or leasing the line out to a third party, I

 understand leasing the company would retain ownership of

 the physical assets of the line, correct, if you did

 that?
 - A. If we lease the line?
- 6 0. Yes.

18

19

20

- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. But if you sold the line, you would presumably
 sell it to a third party?
- 10 A. We would sell that portion of the interest to 11 a third party.
- Q. I just want to make sure I understand what
 we're talking about. When we're talking about an
 interest, because I know any one of these things could
 be something you sell, you could sell transmission
 rights, you could sell the actual physical asset. We're
 talking about the physical asset itself.
 - A. If it would be, yes, in some percentage.
 - Q. That could be -- I understand that could be 1 percent, that would be 100 percent you sell to some third party, correct?
- A. Technically that's correct. I don't think
 that's part of the current plan to sell 100 percent.
- Q. Okay. I guess we're tying back into it from landowners. And you may not know, but if you know, if



- Grain Belt does that, is it going to sell the entity to a third party, the Grain Belt entity, or is it just going to sell a share in the real estate and assets?
- A. Yeah, it would not sell an interest in the entity. That would remain with Invenergy or Invenergy as a sponsor.
- Q. Do you know if there's any plan for how the -I mean, would Grain Belt retain the obligation to pay
 the remaining 80 percent on its voluntary easements to
 landowners under the plan?
 - A. Could you repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah, let me back up. You may not know. Let me give you a little background. Your own witness talked about this and I think it's been pretty public record that the deal being offered to landowners has been -- on voluntary easements has been 20 percent payment up front, 80 percent at construction?
 - A. Uh-huh.

Q. If the line sells after construction, then this isn't really relevant because I think they would be paid contractually at construction. But if the line was sold before construction, do you know if Grain Belt has any plan as to what they would do? Would they offload that obligation to a third-party buyer? Would they retain the obligation to pay the landowners? How would

it work, if you know?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

A. Well, the line would not be sold prior to construction, because there wouldn't be anything to sell.

Evidentiary Hearing

- Q. Okay. So you feel confident one way or the other that at construction Grain Belt will own that asset still such that they will be there to pay the landowners?
 - A. Yes, that's right.
- Q. You think they'll be solvent such that they'll be able to pay landowners at that point?
- A. We would have the debt and equity financing necessary to pay out all Project costs which would include land payments.
- Q. Earlier you were talking I think in response to one of Mr. Agathen's questions about Ameren paying upfront costs on upgrades. Do you remember that? It's from your revised testimony we looked at today?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. To be fair, I don't think this testimony specifically references Ameren but I think that was a hypothetical you at least discussed today with --
 - A. I think that was the hypothetical, yes.
- Q. Okay. And whether it's Ameren or anybody
 else, I mean, you don't have a contract in place right



Page 443 1 now that says that's going to happen, correct? 2 Α. That's an interconnection question best left 3 to Mr. Rodriguez. 4 So you don't have knowledge as to whether the Ο. 5 Company has contracts in place regarding that sort of 6 arrangement? 7 I don't have the specifics, no. Α. 8 MR. HADEN: Thank you. That's all I had, 9 Judge. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Mr. Hollander. 11 MR. HOLLANDER: I do not have any questions, 12 Your Honor. Thank you. 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme. Thank you. 14 She's left the room. MR. HOLLANDER: 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries. 16 MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge. 17 Are there questions from the JUDGE DIPPELL: 18 Commissioners? Chairman Rupp, do you have questions? 19 Not for this witness. CHAIRMAN RUPP: Thank 20 you. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: I have just a few, including 2.2 some for the Commissioners who aren't here. 23 **QUESTIONS** 24 BY JUDGE DIPPELL:

So on page 5 of your direct testimony, let me

25

Q.

- pull it up here. Sorry. I'm trying to pull it up myself. At line 23 through line 1 of page 6, you say Grain Belt Express has access to the necessary financial resources to carry out the necessary development work for the Project prior to engaging in project-specific financings for the construction of each Phase of the Project. Can you explain what project-specific financing means?
- A. Project-specific financing from my perspective means creating a financial structure that is nonrecourse or limited recourse in basis which looks at the Project cost specific to that Project, in this case Grain Belt, and then looks at the revenues that that Project will generate over time that will be sufficient to cover its financing needs. So project-specific financing typically means that there is no recourse to the parent or no obligation by the parent to service or repay the debt and that the Project is successfully structured in such a way that the revenues will be sufficient to support its operations including payment of operating expenses, taxes and debt service.
- Q. And in this case the parent company is Invenergy?
 - A. Invenergy Renewables.
 - Q. How does that Project financing differ than

from corporate financing?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

In the financing structure that we're using here, we're assuming that we are going to raise the majority of it from financing through debt and then the remainder of it would be financed through equity. the case or the example that I was using with DOE, we could raise 80 percent in debt and 20 percent would be covered by Invenergy Renewables through the sponsor equity commitments. The project-specific financing would not include any guarantee by the parent to repay the debt because the financing has been appropriately structured to ensure that there is sufficient cash flow being generated by the Project to cover its financial obligations which I went through before and again includes a certain amount of buffer via the agreed debt service coverage ratio.

In the case of a corporate financing, debt would be raised maybe at the corporate level, not at the Project level. The financial obligation would flow through to the Project sponsor, the Project sponsor would be 100 percent responsible for the debt obligations or financial obligations of the Project regardless of the performance of the Project.

Q. And when you were saying "we," you were referring to Grain Belt?



A. Correct.

2.2

- Q. So in order to close on the financing of Phase I using the project financing, will Grain Belt have to show that it has executed sales contracts?
- A. Yes. In the type of Project financing that I am describing, it is very common, if not expected, for the revenue stream to be -- to have a high degree of certainty. That means that we would be looking to sign up long-term customer contracts that would demonstrate the Project will have stable cash flows.
- Q. And will those cash flows have to be sufficient to cover all operating costs and debt service?
- A. Generally speaking, yes. Some Project lenders will give credit to uncontracted cash flows but on a discounted basis. But generally they will look to the contracted revenues to cover the debt service and sometimes they will give credit to a portion of the uncontracted.
- Q. Under project financing, at what phase in the process are offtaker contracts and operations and maintenance contracts executed?
- A. Well, they would be executed during the development phase. So prior to financial close and start of construction.



So would that be typical to have those Q. contracts at the current status of the Project or would it typically be done after certification and before the financing close or what's the timing of that in general? For long-term customer contracts, it's Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- certainly before financial close. When it is signed depends on the level of development of a particular Project. Some customers will be willing to enter into commitments early subject to the Project meeting certain development milestones. So that gives them a certain level of comfort for entering into a commitment early. Others may prefer to wait until Projects have reached more advanced development when key Project risks have been derisked before they enter into a contract. think it really is on a case-by-case basis.
- And in order to use the Project financing to Ο. finance in phases of construction like is being requested here, will the lenders be -- what will the lenders be assessing for each phase? Will that be like sufficient revenue to cover costs and service fees?
- Α. Yes. So the lenders will be looking for each phase to be able to stand on its own and service its financial obligations on its own. So for example, the customer contracts that we negotiate and enter into for Phase II will not be -- will not be used in Phase I to



2.2

cover debt service. The lender for Phase I is going to look at Phase I costs and the expected revenues for Phase I as the basis for providing financing for a Phase I. And Phase I will need to stand on its own, which is why we've always said that Phase I will be and has to be economically viable in order for the financing to be closed.

And that's a similar case for Phase II. The Project finance lender for Phase II will look at the Project costs related to Phase II, will look at the customer contracts that we sign up for Phase II, and will expect that those revenues will be sufficient to cover the debt related to that phase.

- Q. And will lenders also look at the revenues under various stress scenarios?
- A. Absolutely. And they will hire outside consultants, typically a third-party independent engineer, that will help them determine what the appropriate stress scenario should be.
- Q. Why is the Project being considered in phases?

 Do you know? Why has it been broken up into Phase I and

 Phase II?
- A. Well, I think the previous or the past
 witnesses have, you know, given their view. From a
 financing perspective, you know, Phase II is much

- earlier in development than Phase I. And Phase I is getting to a point where it will soon be ready for financing which is we are very close to signing up customer contracts for Phase II -- or sorry, for Phase I, but we're not as advanced as it relates to Phase II. So we do not want to hold up Phase I simply because of where we are on Phase II. So in my opinion, we are breaking it up into phases so we can successfully finance and build the part of the line that is ready to go.
 - Q. And by doing that, are there financing benefits to breaking it up into phases or are there challenges?
- A. I'm not sure there are benefits on an economic basis. There are perhaps benefits from an execution standpoint. By breaking it up into phases, there is a high likelihood that we can replicate a lot of the financing due diligence from Phase I into Phase II.

 Perhaps the documentation will be more straight forward for Phase II because it will look very similar to Phase I. Perhaps we can even use the same lender for Phase II that we will use in Phase I but the interest rates will stay the same. Fees will probably be around the same, maybe a little bit less. In terms of disadvantages, I can't really think of any.



1	JUDGE DIPPELL: In your Schedule RS-3, which
2	is a highly confidential schedule Can I ask the
3	attorneys if it's just the numbers in that schedule that
4	are highly confidential?
5	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, are you referring to
6	RS-4, the financial model? We renumbered it. We had
7	inadvertently had two RS-3s.
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes, I'm referring to the
9	Excel spreadsheet with financial information.
10	MS. CALLENBACH: Was your question is it just
11	the numbers that are considered?
12	JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes, are the items that are
13	listed.
14	MS. CALLENBACH: Can we have just one second
15	to confer about that. Thanks. Thank you, Judge. It is
16	just the numbers that we consider confidential.
17	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. So the reason I asked
18	that was because in the now I want to make sure I'm
19	asking the right question about the right thing. Hang
20	on just a second. Okay. Yeah, in that schedule there's
21	a reference to construction completion dates. Is that
22	construction completion timeline, is that also HC?
23	MS. CALLENBACH: No.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: No. Okay.
25	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:

1	Q. So when is the construction of Phase I
2	expected to be completed?
3	A. I don't have the file in front of me.
4	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, we need to grab a
5	laptop real quick.
6	JUDGE DIPPELL: I apologize. This may have
7	been asked or answered by the other witnesses.
8	THE WITNESS: I have the model. Can you
9	repeat the question?
10	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:
11	Q. I was wondering when the construction phase or
12	construction of Phase I is expected to be completed.
13	A. So we have the commercial operation date in
14	here as March 31, 2028.
15	Q. That's what COD is in that context?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. So how would the schedule for Phase II then
18	align with that? When do you plan to start Phase II
19	relative to the completion of Phase I?
20	A. And you're talking about start of
21	construction?
22	Q. Yes.
23	A. Because I don't think that we have assumptions
24	for Phase II in this model. So I just want to be clear

on whether you're referring to something in the model.

- Q. Okay. Do you know the answer or?
- A. I think it's generally trailing 18 months behind Phase I; but again as I mentioned, Phase II is further behind from Phase I. So that could move around.
- Q. And then in your testimony in your schedules, and I don't know if it's RS-4 or something else, but you also included the pro forma financials for Phase I, correct?
- A. So RS-4 are the pro forma financials for Phase I.
 - Q. Okay. Did you anywhere include a similar proforma for Phase II?
 - A. We did not.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. So we talked about economic feasibility and financial feasibility of Phase II, and do you consider -- Staff kind of asked these questions, but to you is economic feasibility and financial feasibility the same thing?
- A. To me I view them the same. I think that Phase II will be or is economically feasible given the fact that we have a plan for executing on Phase I. It is and it looks very similar to our strategy for Phase II. So the conclusion is that Phase II is economically viable.
 - Q. Okay. How have the increased Project costs

impacted the decision to do a phasing of the Project?

Do you know or has it had an effect?

Evidentiary Hearing

- A. An increase in the Project costs?
- Q. Yeah, has that had any effect in the decision to break it out into two phases?
- A. No, not in my opinion. I think that the rationale for phasing is what I described previously which is we're more advanced on the Phase I part of the Project versus Phase II.
- 10 Ο. Okay. One more from me. Staff in their 11 recommended revisions to the amended financing condition 12 that Grain Belt is asking for, Staff suggested that 13 Grain Belt not start construction on Phase I until you 14 receive the financing for both phases. Am I stating 15 that correct? I'm looking at Staff counsel to make sure 16 I said that correct.
 - MR. PRINGLE: If phasing is approved, then we don't have anything in there about having to get both phases financed at once if phasing is approved. We do think that one phase is all that's needed. But if phasing is approved, we don't have anything about Phase I and Phase 2 being financed together.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you for that clarification. I think I read that wrong.
- 25 BY JUDGE DIPPELL:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

2.2



Q). Are	there any	Are	there	any	fees	that	would
be inc	curred fo	or Phase I	I finan	cing if	E	never	mind	l.
Strike	e that.	I've alre	ady ask	ed the	ques	tion	I thi	.nk or
you've	already	y given me	the an	ıswer I	was	looki	ng fo	r.

Mr. Chairman, you had some follow ups.

CHAIRMAN RUPP: I did. Thank you, Judge.

Your line of questioning kind of brought to memory.

QUESTIONS

BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

2.2

- Q. In your conversations with the Judge and her questions, you were discussing getting financing for the different phases. Was the reason you're breaking the Project into phases so that you can generate revenue sooner?
- A. I don't think that that's a key driver. I think it's factually correct. But for Invenergy if we have all of the necessary components to build a Project, which means we also have secured the financing, then we want to start building it. We want to get MW in the ground. We want to start, you know, having these assets perform and, you know, passing along the benefits as we envision them. So there's really no reason to wait for Phase II if we're ready to go on Phase I.
- Q. In any of your conversations with financing authorities or companies that would provide financing,



1	was it recommended by them that you should break into
2	two phases to prove out the concept and generate
3	revenue?
4	A. I don't recall that being part of the
5	discussion.
6	Q. Do you believe or Invenergy believe that
7	having Phase I generating revenue would provide better
8	financing terms for Phase II?
9	A. No, I would say that the financing terms are
10	largely driven by the technology, which will be the
11	same, and the market conditions at the time, which we
12	don't control.
13	CHAIRMAN RUPP: Thank you, Judge.
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other Commission
15	questions? All right then. Is there further
16	cross-examination based on questions from the bench from
17	MEC?
18	MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club.
20	MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you.
21	JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri.
22	MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance.
24	MR. BRADY: No, thanks.
25	JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel.



Page 456

1	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff.
3	MR. PRINGLE: Yes, Judge.
4	FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. PRINGLE:
6	Q. Ms. Shine, just one question for you.
7	Assuming that phasing is approved, if something were to
8	happen that would prevent the Company from constructing
9	Phase II, would the Company attempt to seek any kind of
10	cost recovery from nonparticipants for Phase I?
11	A. Can you repeat the question?
12	Q. Yes. Assuming that phasing is approved by the
13	Commission, if something were to happen that would
14	prevent the Company from constructing Phase II so all we
15	have is Phase I, would the Company seek to recover any
16	costs from nonparticipants, nonsubscribers to the line?
17	A. No.
18	MR. PRINGLE: Thank you.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA.
20	MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE DIPPELL: Ag Associations.
22	MR. HADEN: No, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander.
24	MR. HOLLANDER: No, Your Honor.
25	JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme.



Page 457

1	MS. STEMME: No questions.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
3	MR. ELLINGER: No, thank you.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there redirect from Grain
5	Belt?
6	MS. CALLENBACH: Just a very small amount,
7	Judge. Thank you.
8	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY MS. CALLENBACH:
10	Q. Ms. Shine, do you recall earlier in your
11	conversation with Staff counsel he was asking you about
12	the definition of material change proposed by Staff. Do
13	you recall that line of questioning?
14	A. Yes, I do.
15	Q. And he asked whether change in a half billion
16	dollars is a material change in design and engineering;
17	is that an accurate restatement of his questions?
18	A. I believe so, yes.
19	Q. Could there be a change in Project costs that
20	is unrelated to design and engineering?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. When you were questioned by Mr. Agathen from
23	MLA, do you recall a series of questions about a 25 MW
24	contract with an entity called Realgy?
25	A. Yes.



1	Q. And I believe you indicated that the Realgy
2	contract is not currently within the financial model; is
3	that correct?
4	A. That's right.
5	Q. And it is not in the model. Why is it not in
6	the model?
7	A. Because my understanding of that contract is
8	that it's just an option agreement. So we are focused
9	on signing up committed capacity, and that does not fit
10	within what we're looking for so we're not including it
11	in our model.
12	MS. CALLENBACH: No further redirect, Judge.
13	Thank you.
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: I believe that concludes your
15	testimony then, Ms. Shine. Thank you.
16	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
17	(Witness excused.)
18	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I want to take Staff's
19	witness out of order since he's only available today. I
20	want to be sure that we get his testimony in. So we're
21	going to switch gears a little bit and go to Staff's
22	witness, Mr. Cunigan.
23	I think that's just there for future
24	reference. It's a copy of the Amended Report and Order.



Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony

- Page 459 1 you're about to give at this hearing will be the truth? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you. If you could spell 3 JUDGE DIPPELL: 4 your name for the court reporter, please. 5 THE WITNESS: Cedric, C-e-d-r-i-c, and Cunigan 6 is C-u-n-i-q-a-n. 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Mr. Pringle. 8 MR. PRINGLE: Thank you, Judge. 9 CEDRIC CUNIGAN, 10 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 11 as follows: 12 DIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. PRINGLE: 14 Mr. Cunigan, by who are you employed and in 15 what capacity? The Missouri Public Service Commission, and 16 Α. 17 I'm a Senior Professional Engineer. And did you contribute to Staff's Report in 18 Ο. 19 this case which has been previously marked as Exhibit 20 109? 21 Α. Yes. 2.2 0. Did you also submit rebuttal testimony in this 23 case that has been previously marked as Staff Exhibit
- 25 Α. Yes.

101?



- Q. At this time, do you have any corrections to the Staff Report or your rebuttal testimony?
 - A. I have a correction to the rebuttal testimony.
- Q. And could you direct us to the page and line number, please?
- A. This would be page 1. It starts at line 22. The sentence starts finally, I recommend that the Commission order the Company to provide documentation that all relevant permits -- right there we are adding and Missouri specific environmental studies -- and then it would continue have been received prior to approval.
- Q. Are there any further corrections or additions to your testimony at this time?
- A. There would be a similar change on page 6, line 20. Staff recommends that the Commission order the Company to provide documentation that all relevant permits -- we would add there and Missouri specific environmental studies -- again have been received prior to approval.
- Q. Thank you, Mr. Cunigan. Are there any other additions or corrections?
- A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. If I asked you the same questions today within your rebuttal testimony, would your answers be the same?
- 25 A. Yes.



1 Are those answers true and correct to the best Q. 2 of your knowledge and belief? 3 Α. Yes. 4 MR. PRINGLE: Thank you, Mr. Cunigan. At this 5 time, I offer exhibit, Staff Exhibit 101 into the 6 record. 7 Would there be any objection JUDGE DIPPELL: to Exhibit 101? Seeing none, I will admit that. 8 9 (STAFF'S EXHIBIT 101 WAS RECEIVED INTO 10 EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.) 11 JUDGE DIPPELL: Would it be possible for Staff 12 to also submit a corrected version of Exhibit 101 with 13 those corrections added? 14 MR. PRINGLE: Yes, we can do that, Judge 15 Dippell. Not a problem. 16 JUDGE DIPPELL: Similar to what we did with 17 the other witness's testimony. That way it will be one 18 document and we won't have to look at the transcript for 19 the wording of the testimony. So that is received. 20 Thank you, Judge. At this time MR. PRINGLE: 21 I tender Mr. Cunigan for cross-examination. 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there cross-examination 23 from MLA? 24 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor. 25 The Ag Associations. JUDGE DIPPELL:

Page	162

Page 462 1 MR. HADEN: No, Judge. 2 Mr. Hollander. JUDGE DIPPELL: 3 MR. HOLLANDER: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme. 5 MS. STEMME: No questions. 6 Public Counsel. JUDGE DIPPELL: 7 Thank you, no. MR. WILLIAMS: 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries. 9 MR. ELLINGER: No questions. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club. 11 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No questions. Thank you. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri. 13 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance. 14 15 MR. BRADY: No cross. 16 JUDGE DIPPELL: MEC. 17 MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there anything from Grain 19 Belt? 20 MS. CALLENBACH: No, thank you, Judge. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: I guess I should have asked 2.2 that question before we began. I have a couple 23 questions for you. Are there other questions from the 24 Commission? Mr. Chairman. 25 Thank you, Judge. CHAIRMAN RUPP:



afternoon.	ernoon.
------------	---------

2.2

2 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.

QUESTIONS

BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

- Q. Grain Belt's witness Stelzleni's surrebuttal testimony on page 4 indicates that Grain Belt responded to Staff's DR No. 50.1. Was that response adequate in your opinion?
- A. The response provided studies that they had already received or completed at that point, but there were some that were set for the future. She did write in that response that they would supplement it as necessary. So I would say it was adequate, but there are still ongoing studies that we would want to see as well.
- Q. Okay. Does Staff have any continuing concerns about the endangered species located along the Grain Belt or Tiger Connector route as a result of the DR responses?
- A. There was some concern with the Indiana bat habitat. But at this point, it wouldn't be up to Staff to make that determination. It would be the other regulatory bodies and we would follow along with whatever permitting they required them to do.
 - Q. Does Staff have any continuing concerns that



Page 464 1 Grain Belt be able to meet all the environmental 2 compliance requirements? 3 Α. With the information we have so far, no, but again there's still studies that are ongoing that we 4 5 haven't seen yet. 6 And witness Andrew Burke in his surrebuttal on Ο. 7 pages 1 and 2 responds to your question related to 8 waiting given to the different guidelines on the routing 9 study. Were your questions addressed and would you 10 respond to his response at all? Do you feel like you 11 need to? 12 I do not have that in front of me. Α. 13 someone give me a copy? 14 MR. PRINGLE: Providing the witness a copy of 15 Mr. Burke's surrebuttal. 16 THE WITNESS: What page was that again, sir? 17 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP: 18 Pages 1 and 2. I think he's responding to 0. 19 your questions related to the weighting given to the 20 different guidelines on the routing study. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: That may be numbered 2.2 differently. My copy is numbered a little differently. 23 I think it's on pages 3 and 4.

24 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Pages 3 and 4.

25 THE WITNESS: Okay. Can you restate your



question?

BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

- Q. Were your questions addressed, number one, and number two, do you feel that you need to respond to anything in here?
- A. They responded to the question. Typically what I'm used to seeing is more of a you get some kind of a spreadsheet typically or ranking that shows like how these factors weighed into their decisions. We didn't receive that in this case. They did provide the report that explained what they did, but the weighting or how important each factor was we weren't able to get that from them. I don't have the DR in front of me. They did respond that it was not weighted, but typically you see something in their decision process that shows how things were ranked or how they came to that decision with a little more detail.
- Q. So the Company statement was not weighted, but in your professional experience weighting factors into these decisions in these cases?
- A. I mean, typically, yes, it does. You have things that matter more to you that have more importance when you're making a decision like this, and we weren't able to see how that was broken out for them.

CHAIRMAN RUPP: That's all I have. Thank you.



- Page 467 1 Rodriguez. 2 Mr. Rodriguez, do you solemnly JUDGE DIPPELL: 3 swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give 4 at this hearing will be the truth and the whole truth? 5 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 6 Thank you. If you could spell JUDGE DIPPELL: 7 your name for the court reporter, please. 8 THE WITNESS: Carlos, C-a-r-l-o-s, Rodriguez, 9 R-o-d-r-i-q-u-e-z. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Counsel. 11 Thank you. Good afternoon. MS. CALLENBACH: 12 THE WITNESS: Hello. 13 CARLOS RODRIGUEZ, 14 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 15 as follows: 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MS. CALLENBACH: 18 You stated your name already. Would you 19 please give your business address for the record, 20 please? 21 It's 1 South Wacker, Suite 1800, Chicago, Α. 2.2 Illinois 60606. 23 And by whom are you employed and what is your Ο.
- 24 title?
- Invenergy LLC. I'm Senior Vice President of 25 Α.



Interconnections and Grid Analysis. 1 2 And are you the same Carlos Rodriguez who 3 filed direct testimony which has been marked as Exhibit 4 7, surrebuttal testimony which has been marked as 5 Exhibit 8 and Schedules CR-1 through CR-3? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Do you have any corrections to your testimony O. 8 at this time? 9 Α. No. 10 Ο. If I were to ask you the same questions again 11 today, would your answers be the same? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Thank you. Judge, at this MS. CALLENBACH: 14 time I'd move for the admission of Exhibit 7 and 8 and 15 Schedules CR-1 through 3. 16 And Exhibit 7, some of those JUDGE DIPPELL: 17 schedules contain confidential information, correct? 18 MS. CALLENBACH: Yes, they do. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: So are there any objections to 20 Exhibit 7 including 7-C and Exhibit 8? Seeing no objections, I will admit those. 21 2.2 (COMPANY EXHIBITS 7, 7-C AND 8 WERE RECEIVED 23 INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.) 24 MS. CALLENBACH: And we would tender the

25

witness for cross.

	Evidentiary Hearing June 06, 202
1	Page 469 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Would there be any
2	cross-examination from MEC?
3	MS. WHIPPLE: Yes, Your Honor. Briefly.
4	Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez.
5	THE WITNESS: Hello.
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MS. WHIPPLE:
8	Q. A point that I'd like to understand a little
9	bit better, please, from your direct testimony along
10	about page 8 you testify I'll wait until you get
11	there.
12	A. I'm there.
13	O. You testify that Grain Belt has made a

You testify that Grain Belt has made a 0. decision to change the technology in its, converter technology, and you're mentioning that this change technology which I'd like to understand better, VSC, somehow will allow for a more robust and reliable connection and also be able to provide emergency energy. Could you explain what you mean by that, particularly how emergency energy will be provided, please?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The first thing that I would like to Α. Sure. say is that with regard to the technology, the previous technology that was used for the Project was called Line-Commutated Converter. It's an HVC technology from the '70s.



1	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Rodriguez, did you say
2	what kind of technology?
3	THE WITNESS: LCC, line-commutated converter.
4	So that's a technology that is from the '70s. What
5	we're proposing now is called voltage source converter
6	or VSC, which is a new HVC technology that it's
7	basically more robust, that it can connect to weak grids
8	as we call them that don't have a lot of thermal
9	generation. It can provide voltage support which LCC
10	was not able to, and it can reverse power faster. So to
11	your point in the case of an emergency, the Grain Belt
12	Project should be able to reverse power very quickly
13	depending on the end of the line that is under an
14	emergency.
15	Q. So for example, would that have been helpful
16	in some of these terrible storms that we've had here in
17	the last couple of years to be able to reverse that
18	power?
19	A. Yes. Specifically Winter Storm Uri. Had
20	Grain Belt been there and power could have come from the
21	regions that were not experiencing the winter storm,
22	that would have helped significantly to address the
23	emergency that was going on. It would have helped

experienced and, of course, it would have avoided loss

mitigate the very high prices that were being

24

1 of load. So definitely. 2 MS. WHIPPLE: Thank you, Your Honor. That's 3 all I had. Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez. 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 5 Is there any cross-examination JUDGE DIPPELL: 6 from Sierra Club? 7 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you, Your Honor. 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri. 9 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. 10 Clean Grid Alliance. JUDGE DIPPELL: 11 MR. BRADY: No cross. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 13 Thank you, no. MR. WILLIAMS: 14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 15 MR. PRINGLE: Yes. Thank you, Judge. Good 16 afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez. 17 THE WITNESS: Hello. 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 BY MR. PRINGLE: 20 And I just want to ask you a few questions 21 about your response to Mr. Stahlman's recommendation of 2.2 a definition of material change. I guess in your 23 opinion you do not believe that a material change 24 definition is required; is that correct? 25 From an interconnection perspective and from a Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- project perspective I believe that a change in the POI, point of interconnection, or an increase in the size of the injection would definitely be a material change and I think that's one of the reasons why we're here. But to that end, I do believe that those would be material changes. But I don't feel that there's a requirement or a definition should be included.
- Q. But for those two you just discussed, do you believe it would be helpful to have that defined in the Commission's Order in case we need any future proceedings?
- Α. For the increase of injection, I do believe that yes, because when you increase injection beyond what you have in your contracts, you need to start the process over. So you start from scratch through the interconnection process, and to me that would be But also if you're increasing the material change. injection, you're changing the design, the engineering of the converter, right, in this case. So if you're going to inject more, then you're going to need a bigger converter which is going to require changes in engineering. So definitely from that perspective I think that would be a material change and I would agree that, you know, when engineering changes are.
 - Q. Okay. Thank you for that, Mr. Rodriguez.



Page 473 1 Also, so at this time are you aware that is there any 2 TCA signed by Grain Belt and any party? 3 Α. By TCA you mean interconnection agreement? 4 Ο. Yes, transmission interconnection agreement, 5 yes, sir. 6 There is one interconnection agreement, a Α. 7 transmission interconnection agreement executed with 8 There is another interconnection agreement 9 executed with AECI. And we expect to execute the TCA 10 with MISO in the July time frame. 11 Could you just for the Commission's 0. 12 clarification, when were the SPP and AECI ones executed? 13 Α. So the SPP was executed in 2016. The AECI 14 executed in, I believe, December 21, if I'm not 15 mistaken. Yeah. 16 Thank you, sir. No further MR. PRINGLE: 17 questions. 18 Thank you. THE WITNESS: 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there cross-examination 20 from MLA? 21 MR. AGATHEN: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. 2.2 Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez. 23 THE WITNESS: Hello. 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION

25

BY MR. AGATHEN:

1 You provided an update to the expected costs Ο. 2 of all of the network upgrades in your answer to our Data Request No. 39, G39; is that correct? 3 4 Α. Yes. 5 MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, at this time I'm 6 going to distribute a copy of our question and answer to 7 Mr. Rodriguez G39 and ask that it be marked for 8 identification as I think Exhibit 302. 9 JUDGE DIPPELL: That is correct. And is there 10 -- This is not any confidential information, correct? 11 MR. AGATHEN: It is not. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: I marked that Exhibit 302. 13 Thank you. MR. BRADY: 14 Did you give one of those to JUDGE DIPPELL: 15 the court reporter, Mr. Agathen? Okay. Thank you. 16 BY MR. AGATHEN: 17 Mr. Rodriguez, have you taken a chance to look at Exhibit 302? 18 19 You mean this? Α. 20 Yes, the document I just handed to you. Q. 21 Α. Yes. 2.2 0. Is that document an accurate copy of your 23 response to our Data Request No. G39? 24 Α. Yes.

And looking at the bottom line of that

25

Q.

1	Page 47 document, does it indicate that the total for all
2	network upgrade costs which you list there is now
3	estimated at just over 788 million?
4	A. Correct.
5	MR. AGATHEN: Your Honor, I ask that Exhibit
6	302 be received in evidence.
7	JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection
8	to Exhibit 302? Seeing no objection, I will admit it.
9	(MLA EXHIBIT 302 WAS RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE
10	AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)
11	MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	BY MR. AGATHEN:
13	Q. Is that total figure of 788 million still
14	accurate or does the total cost need to be updated
15	again?
16	A. It needs to be updated again. Actually in my
17	surrebuttal I included updated values. So it didn't
18	change much. So it's still I believe it's 760
19	something but it went down a little. And in my
20	surrebuttal, it's basically listed on an RTO per RTO
21	basis.
22	Q. Thank you. In addition to the costs that
23	appear on Exhibit 302, you still have two other queue
24	positions in PJM for which no network upgrade costs have

yet been estimated?

1	A. Correct. We do have two positions four
2	positions in PJM that two of the four have
3	interconnection costs identified. But in the previous
4	PJM serial process, so those two requests completed a
5	feasibility study and a system impact study and the
6	other two requests have not started studies. So for
7	those we do have those costs and they are included in my
8	surrebuttal. And they're included here in this exhibit.
9	But those would likely change because of the queue
10	reform process that PJM went through and was approved by
11	FERC I believe in January of this year, so those costs
12	would likely change.
13	Q. So if I understand correctly, there are four
14	PJM interconnections involved?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. And are the costs of all four of those,
17	current costs recognizing they're going to change, are
18	they included in this exhibit that I handed you?
19	A. Two of the four.
20	Q. Okay. So two of them are not included?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Are two of them not included as well in your
23	surrebuttal testimony?
24	A. Correct.

So we've got two sitting out there

Okay.

Q.

somewhere where no cost has been identified?

- A. Yeah, because the costs are unknown, there's been no studies.
 - Q. Understand. Do you know what the total current expected costs for the upgrades associated with connecting the Grain Belt line to the MISO system is?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. Do you have that figure handy?
- A. May I look into my surrebuttal?
- Q. You certainly may.
- A. So for the MISO system, we have the two requests that went through the MHCP process, and those costs, those phase are completed and the cost for those are 144,248,000. So that's the transmission to transmission or merchant transmission connection process that MISO has. Now, in order to inject into MISO, you need to go through Attachment X, that other process, and those upgrades associated with the injection are \$154,959,241. So those are the costs associated with the MISO interconnections.
- Q. And that would not include the costs associated with interconnecting with Associated Electric?
- A. Correct.
- MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Your Honor.



Page 478

1 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there 2 cross-examination from the Agricultural Associations? 3 MR. HADEN: No, Your Honor. 4 Mr. Hollander. JUDGE DIPPELL: 5 No, Your Honor. MR. HOLLANDER: Thank you. 6 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme. 7 No questions. MS. STEMME: Associated Industries. 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: 9 MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there questions from the 11 Commission? Mr. Chairman. 12 Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez. CHAIRMAN RUPP: 13 THE WITNESS: Hello. 14 OUESTIONS 15 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP: 16 Ο. Attorneys always say you're never supposed to 17 ask a question you don't know the answer to. I am not 18 an attorney and I did stay at a Holiday Inn Express last 19 (Laughter) I'm going to ask you to just walk me niaht. 20 through, because I cannot remember. The SPP interconnection agreement that you guys have from 2016, 21 2.2 if you're breaking this into phases, does that affect 23 that agreement at all? 24 So that agreement would be part of Phase I and Α.



So that agreement includes both phases. So in that

Τ	regard, yean, it's required for the connection of Phase
2	I and Phase II.
3	Q. Does that require you to have to go back to
4	SPP and update the agreement if you split into two
5	phases?
6	A. No.
7	Q. Okay. And how long is that agreement viable
8	for since this is already, what year are we in, already
9	seven years ago. Is there a time limit on that of which
LO	it expires or it has to be renewed?
L1	A. So the agreement is being updated as we speak
L2	to account for cost updates, schedule updates since, you
L3	know, it's been a few years. So we're working with ITC
L4	and going through those updates.
L5	Q. When do you anticipate that to be finalized?
L6	A. It should be completed this year.
L7	CHAIRMAN RUPP: Thank you, Judge.
L8	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Are there other
L9	Commission questions? Commissioner Holsman.
20	QUESTIONS
21	BY COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN:
22	Q. Going back off of what the Chairman was
23	talking about with SPP, you in your testimony talked
24	about meeting with the SPP transmission working group.
25	Would you characterize those interactions as regulatory

impediment that would cause unforeseen delays or communications productive and largely process orientated?

2.2

- A. Can you repeat the question, please.
- Q. Yeah, the communications you've had with the transmission working group, would you consider those to be a regulatory impediment or would you consider them to be productive and largely process orientated?
- A. Yes. So they are productive, process oriented, and we're working with the transmission working group to update the size of the project from 4 to 5 gigawatts, also to update the technology to voltage source converter, and these studies are just going to look at the behavior or the impact of the 5 gigawatt project into the SPP system. So the study was previously done for 4 gigawatts and the LCC technology. So this one is basically addressing the 5 gigawatts and the new technology.
- Q. Did any of the TWG or the utilities that were participating in that working group express an interest or an opportunity to inject or withdraw capacity into the line upgrade?
- A. From an interconnection perspective, the study is being done with zero interchange with SPP. So it would be just a connection. So this study, what this



- study is addressing is the connection to SPP but not injection or withdrawal from SPP. So those studies would be done in the future if any customer, you know, would be interested in withdrawing or injecting into SPP or under emergency conditions, you know, if there's an agreement to inject into SPP or withdraw from SPP to help, for example, MISO or PJM in an emergency.
- Q. Talking about MISO, AECI and PJM, are there any additional anticipated project study costs associated with the RTO interconnection process that will have an impact on the project in Missouri that you haven't mentioned in your testimony?
- A. No. Those are the costs for MISO and AECI. There's one study, a facility study that is pending that we're going to get it from MISO this month. And that would be basically the final costs for MISO for the project, for the connection to MISO, because AECI has already finalized the cost some time ago.
- Q. One of the significant project modifications is to move the converter station. Changing the location allows for two point of interconnection to both Ameren and AECI's territory. Can you describe the impact on reliability and resilience this modification would cause?
 - A. So from a system perspective, a connection to

2.2

- this point is appropriate based on the amount of the injection. So the McCredie substation has four 345 KV outlets, so it's a strong point of interconnection. The Burns substation has two additional outlets. So from a reliability perspective, I think that having an injection of power in that area of the system with a system that is well meshed I think would help to improve the reliability of the system.
- Q. Then what about the number of Missourians that would benefit from the Project as compared to the initial Project in terms of a magnitude in value? Do you see an opportunity to increase the number of Missourians because of this change?
- A. Correct. And the connection to MISO and AECI to both separate balancing authorities is key because then you can access the AECI footprint and the MISO footprint with no additional transmission charges or pancake rates. So you basically connect directly to AECI and you're there, connect directly to MISO you're there, to any MISO customer. So from that perspective it's, of course, going to impact more people in Missouri and it's going to be beneficial.
- Q. I happen to be the SEAMS liaison for our Commission to MISO and OMS. And so we talk a little bit about this from time to time. My question to you would



2.2

be what kind of communication have you seen when it comes to the SEAMS? You mentioned -- let me put it specifically as an example. You mentioned that the transmission line could reverse flow in times of winter storms or summer outages. What kind of communication would you see as necessary for the RTOs to cooperate with that reverse flow? Do you see that as being something that would be already in place as a practice or a standard operating procedure or is that something that you're going to have to negotiate at the time when you need the power to reverse flow with the SEAMS as it travels across so we avoid pancaking?

- A. Yeah. So Grain Belt being an interregional HVDC project, it's going to be sort of like a new type of project that in my view it's going to require new agreements, new types of communications in order to coordinate this piece of equipment that is very different than the normal AC transmission lines that connect the RTOs and the SEAMS. So in this case it's going to be in my view new agreements required for emergency conditions so as to have the power be reversed timely.
- Q. So you would think that those would be a perpetual document, a preexisting standard operating procedure between the RTOs that could be called upon in



1	Page 484 times of emergency and that would not need to be real
2	time negotiated or discussed at the point when we needed
3	the power?
4	A. I think so. It could be an agreement with
5	Grain Belt and the RTOs to see how Grain Belt is going

to assist in an emergency, either RTO, because in the case of SPP with a Winter Storm URI could have been PJM or MISO that could have provided assistance and with Elliott could have been the other way around.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- My last question, we talked earlier with Ο. another witness about the cap and trade and carbon taxing as being sort of a prospective hypothetical, you know, cost factor. To your knowledge, has anybody looked at what those savings would have been had Grain Belt existed during URI, because I know that we did a pretty large securitization order for the utilities that had exorbitant costs during that storm. Has anybody reviewed what those costs would have been had Grain Belt been in existence?
 - And witness Mr. Baker, I think he's Α. Yes. going to provide some information on those values.
- 2.2 COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Okay. All right. 23 Thank you. Thank you, Judge.
- 24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioner Kolkmeyer. 25 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Thank you, Judge.



Good afternoon, Mr. Rodriguez.

2.2

THE WITNESS: Hello.

QUESTIONS

BY COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER:

- Q. Help me in my mind think of this reverse flow, and am I seeing this correctly that there's at Dodge City, Kansas is where the injection point is, or that's where it starts, and then the first connection is going to be the Monroe converter station. Is that correct or are there going to be more converter stations between Dodge City and Monroe?
- A. No. Monroe would be the first HVDC connection, yes.
- Q. Okay. Here again I'm trying to figure out I asked the attorney yesterday, Grain Belt Express attorney yesterday, how is this going to help SPP when there's no connections there. Monroe is as far to the southwest Missouri as Dodge City, Kansas is. You know, help me there. If there's only going to be three places, you know, the beginning, Monroe City and then almost the Ohio line or eastern Illinois, how are you going to reverse flow and/or how is that going to help SPP? That's my question.
- A. Okay. Yeah, so there's going to be a converter station near Dodge City right there. And



- there's going to be a connection to SPP that initially is going to have zero flow. But it's going to be there. The connection is going to be there. Then you're going to have the converter in Monroe and then the converter in the east in Illinois. So in the case of Uri and with appropriate agreements in place, either MISO or PJM, I mean, the flow of the line would generally go west to east but in this situation the operators would talk and based on that agreement they would be likely to reverse the flow from the operators and then power will be pulled from the PJM system and then shipped over the line all the way west. Once it gets to SPP to the converter station, then there's a connection, an AC connection there to SPP and there the power can be injected into SPP.
 - Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

A. And of course, the appropriate agreements need to be in place. And the other situation where Elliott and PJM is in trouble, then either MISO can pull power from MISO and send to PJM or the generation that is descending in Kansas and Grain Belt can also help. But let's say that there's not enough, at that moment there's not enough wind nor not enough solar and then power can be pulled from SPP at that point and sent on the line. So you can see there how this for these

1 winter storms and these emergency situations having this 2 interregional line is really useful. 3 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Thank you. Thank 4 you, Judge. 5 JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other questions 6 from the Commission? All right. Is there any further 7 cross-examination from MEC based on questions from the 8 bench? 9 No, Your Honor. Thank you. MS. WHIPPLE: 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club. 11 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you. 12 Renew Missouri. JUDGE DIPPELL: 13 No, thank you. MS. GREENWALD: 14 Clean Grid Alliance. JUDGE DIPPELL: 15 MR. BRADY: No cross. JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 16 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 19 MR. PRINGLE: No further cross. Thank you, 20 Judge. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Missouri Landowners Alliance. 2.2 MR. AGATHEN: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. 23 Just a couple quick questions based on your responses 24 primarily to Commissioner Holsman. 25 FURTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. AGATHEN:

1

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. You have an interconnection agreement in place with SPP; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Does that existing interconnection agreement allow for the use of a 5000 MW line as opposed to the original 4000 MW line?
- A. The original interconnection agreement is for 4000 MW. It's being amended to increase to five.
 - Q. So you do not at this point have an interconnection agreement which includes the 5000 MW line?
 - A. So we're negotiating and discussing with ITC, the utility, but at this point the amendment hasn't been executed, correct.
- MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, sir.
- 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ag Associations.
- 18 MR. HADEN: No questions, Your Honor.
- 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander.
- 20 MR. HOLLANDER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme.
- 22 MS. STEMME: No questions.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
- MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there redirect from Grain

1	Bel	t	?

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

24

25

- MS. CALLENBACH: Yes, Judge. Just very
- 3 | briefly. Thank you.

4 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY MS. CALLENBACH:

- Q. Mr. Rodriguez, do you recall a series of questions with the Staff counsel regarding the definition of material change?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Thank you. Could I get you to turn to page 14 of your surrebuttal, please.
- 12 A. I'm there.
 - Q. And I believe that in your discussion with Mr. Pringle you testified that an increase in injection rights would be a material change. Is that an accurate representation?
- 17 A. Yes.
- Q. One of Staff's -- Staff's definition or
 proposed definition of material change rather is a
 change to injection and withdrawal rights. So we've
 covered the injection. Would you please explain Grain
 Belt's position with regard to whether a change in
 withdrawal rights constitutes a material change?
 - A. Yeah. So yeah, I don't think -- I believe that would not be a material change. Actually in order



to request withdrawal from MISO, for example, you have to go through Module B, which is basically the transmission service tariff. So you won't be -- let's see.

So the withdrawal would not be a material change because as long as it's within the size of the converter station or within the engineering parameters of the converter station, if you have a 1500 MW converter station and you put in a transmission service request or a customer puts in a transmission service request for 500 MW, it's well within the engineering design of the converter station and therefore it would not be a material change which as opposed to the injection where you would basically have to inject more than what the converter can do so it would be an engineering change. Withdrawal wouldn't be in my view.

- Q. Just to make sure that I understand. So there would not be any modifications to the facilities required to add withdrawal as long as it was within the current parameters of engineering; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.

- MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you. That's all we have, Judge.
 - JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you,
 Mr. Rodriguez. I believe that concludes your testimony



```
1
     and you may step down.
 2
               THE WITNESS:
                             Thank you.
 3
               (Witness excused.)
 4
               JUDGE DIPPELL: I think we will take advantage
 5
     of this spot to take a short break. I have that it is
 6
     2:11. Let's come back at 2:25. We can go off the
 7
     record.
 8
               (A recess was taken.)
 9
               JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. We are back on the
10
     record after our break and we are up to Grain Belt's
11
    next witness.
12
               MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you, Judge. Grain Belt
13
     calls Aaron White.
14
               JUDGE DIPPELL: Do you solemnly swear or
15
     affirm that the testimony you're about to give at this
16
     hearing is the truth?
17
               THE WITNESS:
                             Yes, Judge.
               JUDGE DIPPELL:
18
                               Thank you. Can you spell your
19
     name for the court reporter?
20
               THE WITNESS: Aaron, A-a-r-o-n, White,
21
     W-h-i-t-e.
2.2
               JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead.
23
                                Thank you, Judge.
               MS. CALLENBACH:
24
                           AARON WHITE,
25
    having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified
```



	Evidentiary Hearing	June 06, 202
1	as follows:	Page 492
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
3	BY MS. CALLENBACH:	
4	Q. Mr. White, by whom are you employed ar	ıd what
5	is your title?	
6	A. Invenergy LLC, Director of Transmissi	.on
7	Engineering.	
8	Q. And I believe your title has changed	somewhat
9	since your original testimony; is that correct?	•
10	A. Correct. The testimony, direct testi	mony
11	filed my title there was Senior Manager Transmi	ssion
12	Engineering.	
13	Q. Okay. Thank you. And are you the sa	me Aaron
14	White who filed direct testimony which has been	marked
15	as Exhibit 9, surrebuttal testimony which has b	een
16	marked as Exhibit 10 and Schedules AW-1 through	AW-5,
17	and I believe AW-5 is confidential, Judge.	
18	A. Yes.	
19	Q. Thank you. Do you have any correction	ns to
20	your testimony or schedules at this time?	
21	A. I do not.	
22	Q. Thank you. If I were to ask you the	same
23	questions in your direct and surrebuttal testim	nony,



would your answers remain the same?

24

25

Α.

Yes.



CROSS-EXAMINATION

_			
)	RV	Mς	WHIDDI.F
	-	1.10 •	MITTEETIN

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. Now we can see each other. I recall, I believe, from your prefiled testimony that you testified that DC lines do not cause GPS interference. Is my recollection correct?
 - A. That's correct along those lines.
- Q. So here's my question. Can you tell us whether or not a DC line causes interference with cell phones?
- A. That's a great question. Similar to GPS, cell phones operate at a much higher frequency than a DC line which has a zero frequency. Cell phones operate in the range of gigahertz. So again, much higher frequency than a DC line has zero frequency. Same with GPS. Higher frequencies, so very unlikely that there would be interference.
- MS. WHIPPLE: That was the conclusion I was looking for. Thank you. That does make it clearer. Thank you. That was it, Your Honor. Thank you.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Any cross-examination from Sierra Club. Renew Missouri.
- MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you.
- MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you.
- 25 JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance.



1 MR. BRADY: No cross. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 3 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 5 MR. PRINGLE: Yes, Judge. Thank you. Good 6 afternoon, Mr. White. 7 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. PRINGLE: 10 Do you have a copy of your surrebuttal 11 testimony with you? 12 Α. I certainly do. 13 Would you turn to page 11 for me, please? Ο. 14 Α. Page 11? 15 Yes. Thank you, sir. And looking at lines 5 Ο. 16 through 8, these are your total acreage impact? 17 Yes, sir. Α. 18 Could you just -- So what we have here for 0. 19 Phase I you anticipate no more than 9 acres impacted? 20 Α. So that was what was provided in the 21 surrebuttal. I do have submitted the supplemental 2.2 response to AW6. 23 If you can -- I'm happy if you can read that 24 aloud for me.

So I recently had took a look at this and did

25

Α.

- 1 update these numbers. So for Phase I, total acres, I 2 Based on Grain Belt Express continuing can read it. 3 obligation to provide supplemental response pursuant of 4 20 CSR 4240-2.090(2)(F), Grain Belt Express provides a 5 supplemental response to MLA Data Request AW6 to update 6 the agricultural acreage impacted by the Project: 7 Missouri HVDC line, Phase I, 11.5 acres; Missouri HVDC 8 line, Phase II, 7 acres; and the Tiger Connector, 0.2 9 acres.
- Q. And just for clarification, could you explain to us the Tiger Connector is approximately 40 miles, correct?
 - A. 36.

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. 36. Thank you. And for Phase I, that's approximately 200 miles give or take?
 - A. For in Missouri?
- 17 Q. Yes.
 - A. For Phase I, the HVDC line in Missouri is approximately 150-mile range, I believe.
 - Q. Could you just kind of describe your math on how we went from 9 acres for Phase I to .2 acres for Tiger Connector. How does that work?
 - A. Sure. The Tiger Connector is 345 kV double circuit transmission. What that means and why I say that is because 345 kV, they're smaller structures than



- 1 the 600 kV. So therefore smaller structural loading. 2 There are structures that we can put on monopoles or a 3 single pier foundation. That pier foundation is what 4 was used to measure the agricultural impact. So the 5 diameter of a -- I don't recall exactly but, for 6 example, diameter of a four or six foot pier, that's 7 what would have been used for all of the structures. 8 Whereas the HVDC line, the 600 kV has a significantly 9 larger structural loading, more wires, larger spans, 10 more structural loading. It is for that reason that 11 we've selected the lattice towers. The lattice towers, 12 although they also can use piers, micropiles, helical 13 piles, a number of foundation solutions. The acreage 14 was estimated by the entire base of the tower, not just 15 the foundations. So what was used for these estimates 16 was a 40 by 40 foot footprint, not just the pier.
 - Q. Thank you, Mr. White. Just for laymen's terms or for my understanding, the basic difference in the acreage is due to the size of the structures for each line; is that a good way of summarizing it?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. It's not how I would, but yeah, if that works for you. Yeah, it's different types of structures, the size of structures, different type of foundations, the footprint.
 - Q. When you talked about with the lattice



- structures, in the prior Report and Order that pretty much Grain Belt had put forward that only monopole structures would be used, correct?
- A. I would disagree with that. Let me pull up that response in my surrebuttal. So advise and to my knowledge of the Commission Report and Order remand is that there were a number of structure types provided that could be used but there was no Order to use any specific structure. And that makes sense in that early stage more design flexibility would have been ideal.
- Q. But in the Report and Order the Commission did find that Grain Belt would be using monopoles, correct?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.

2.2

- Q. And also in your surrebuttal testimony you do put forward that you believe that any change in the structure, that would not be a material change in design and engineering, as you say, using monopoles or lattice structures? Page 9 of your testimony?
- A. I don't believe it is. It's not a material change.
- Q. And with that being said, is there any kind of guarantee that Grain Belt would not use lattice structures for the AC line?
- A. I wouldn't say there's no guarantee, but lattice structures are used because they handle



- structural loading very well, they're very efficient in the frame. You know, so if there was a major river crossing, there's not, but there could be other major constraints that need to be spanned. There's a possibility that a different type of structure may need to be used. But for the majority and as the Tiger has been described to date, no, no necessity to use lattice towers. Did that answer your question?
- Q. Yes. So I mean, from what you're seeing right now in this current design of the Tiger Connector, there is no need for lattice structures on that?
- A. Yes, from what we're seeing right now. I would preface that by just saying we're at a preliminary design with the Tiger Connector, much earlier stage than the main line.
- Q. Thank you, Mr. White. Actually going more towards the beginning of your surrebuttal testimony, looking at page 4 it has to do with the as-built drawings. I know we've had a little confusion about what exactly Staff is requesting there. From your perspective you said design is still pretty preliminary on the Tiger Connector?
 - A. Yes.

2.2

Q. Then when it comes to those design drawings, does the Company have any objection to supplying Staff



1 those design drawings as they are completed and before 2 construction? 3 Α. So we do not object to the as-built drawings. As-built drawings are just that, as it was built. 4 So 5 that is what the Order requires and that's what we would 6 provide. 7 Thank you very much for your MR. PRINGLE: 8 time, Mr. White. That's all the questions I have. 9 Thank you. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there cross-examination 11 from MLA? 12 MR. AGATHEN: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead. 14 Good afternoon, Mr. White. MR. AGATHEN: 15 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. AGATHEN: 18 Could you please turn to page 10 of your 19 direct testimony? 20 Α. Yes. Beginning at line 21 you state that worker 21 22 safety and the safety of the public is Grain Belt's 23 number one priority through design, construction and 24 operations, correct?

Correct.

Α.

1	Q. But is it fair to say that no matter how much
2	attention is paid to safety, it's likely that
3	work-related accidents will occur in the construction of
4	a large transmission project?
5	A. I would disagree. I think every safety goal
6	that I've been, you know, various contractors been
7	around, the goal is no incidents. So that is what is
8	strived for. In certain project we have achieved that.
9	Q. Do you have a copy of the data requests that
10	we sent to you and your answers?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Could you find or have you located Data
13	Request No. AW3?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Does that not list a chart of OSHA recordable
16	incidences from Grain Belt construction or Invenergy
17	construction, excuse me, and Invenergy's contractors?
18	A. So what was requested is for all Invenergy
19	affiliated transmission and generation projects over the
20	past five years, OSHA incidents. What was provided in
21	that table is Invenergy generation projects North
22	America, both projects owned by Invenergy and those

24

25

owner.

which Invenergy has contracted to provide O&M, operation

And then I do state in here that -- Let me find

and maintenance, and/or the balance of plant for the

- 1 | it verbatim.
- 2 | Skipped right over it. I apologize. For all
- 3 | Invenergy high-voltage transmission work in North
- 4 America, there have been no OSHA recordable cases.
- Q. But the chart lists for the years 2018, '19,
- 6 | '20 and '21, Invenergy OSHA recordable cases, does it
- 7 | not?
- 8 A. Correct.
- 9 Q. And it lists OSHA recordable cases for 10 contractors working for Invenergy?
- 11 A. Correct.
- Q. So no matter what the goal is, accidents do happen, right?
- 14 A. Accidents do happen.
- Q. Thank you. On a different subject, would you turn, please, to page 19 of your direct testimony.
- 17 A. Okay.

- Q. Beginning at line 11, you state that a part of the construction of the Kansas converter station might not be built in Phase I but might be delayed until Phase
- 21 | II. Is that essentially correct?
- A. As stated here, a portion of the Kansas

 converter station may be built out with Phase II in

 which case the proportional amount would change.
 - Q. So Phase I could be fully operational without



- this portion of the Kansas converter station; is that correct?
- 3 Α. What I'm referring to here is, it is for Phase II it's our objective to minimize any disruption, 4 5 interference in the services of Phase I. So there would 6 be a portion of Kansas that we would likely build out to 7 accomplish that, build out for Phase II, Kansas Phase 8 The reason why we do that during Phase I is because 9 we want to minimize any outages or disruption of service 10 of Phase I.
 - Q. Right. But my question is Phase I could be fully operational without this converter station being fully built out?
 - A. Without the Phase II portion?
- 15 Q. Yes.

2

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

- A. Correct.
 - Q. What amount roughly are you talking about saving by not building it out completely in Phase I?
- 19 A. I don't know. I haven't looked at that.
 - Q. Are we talking millions or ten millions?
- 21 A. I don't know.
- Q. So if Grain Belt for whatever reason, for some reason does not build Phase II, it would save money in that portion of the converter station in Kansas which was not completed?



1	A. If Phase II was not built out, yes, there
2	would be that portion of the Kansas converter that would
3	not be required or built out.
4	Q. And you would save some unknown amount?
5	A. You wouldn't have the cost of that portion of
6	the Kansas converter.
7	MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there anything
9	from Agriculture Associations.
LO	MR. HADEN: No, Your Honor.
L1	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander.
L2	MR. HOLLANDER: No, Your Honor.
L3	JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme.
L4	MS. STEMME: No questions.
L5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
L6	MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge.
L7	JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there questions from the
L8	Commission?
L9	CHAIRMAN RUPP: None from me.
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: I just have one clarifying
21	question.
22	QUESTIONS
23	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:
24	Q. When you were talking with Staff about your
25	updated DR?



1 A. Yes.

- Q. What was the date of that update?
- 3 A. That was I believe June 1. Let me check for 4 you. June 1.
 - Q. Of this year?
- 6 A. Yeah, of '23, yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 A. Last week.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Is it safe to assume there's
 no follow-up questions based on my question? Okay. I'm
 not seeing any. Is there any redirect?
- MS. CALLENBACH: No, Judge, no redirect.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. I believe that
 concludes your testimony, Mr. White. You may step down.
- 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Judge.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Grain Belt can go ahead with its next witness.
- 18 MR. SCHULTE: For its next witness, Grain Belt
 19 calls Robert Baker.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Can I get you to raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give at this hearing will be the truth?
- 24 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: If you could state your name

Page 506

- 1 | and spell it for the court reporter, please.
- THE WITNESS: Sure thing. Robert,
- 3 R-o-b-e-r-t, Baker, B-a-k-e-r.
- 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm going to need you to get a
- 5 | little closer to the mike.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Sure. How is this?
- 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: That's better. Thank you.
- 8 | You can proceed, Counsel.
- 9 MR. SCHULTE: Thank you.
- 10 ROBERT BAKER,
- 11 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified
- 12 | as follows:
- 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. SCHULTE:
- Q. Could you please state your place of
- 16 | employment and title?
- 17 A. Guidehouse and I'm Director.
- Q. I think I forgot to ask you for the address.
- 19 | Can you please provide the address as well?
- 20 A. Sure thing. 100 King Street, Toronto,
- 21 | Ontario, Suite 4950 M5X 1B1.
- Q. And are you in this case adopting the direct
- 23 | testimony of Anthony Petti?
- 24 A. I am.
- Q. And his accompanying Schedules AP-1 and AP-2?



A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

23

24

- Q. And did you also -- Are you the same Robert Baker who filed surrebuttal testimony in this case and accompanying Schedule RB-1?
 - A. I am.
- Q. And do you have any corrections to that testimony, either the direct testimony of Anthony Petti or your own surrebuttal testimony or any of the schedules?
- A. I do. One minor change. On page 15 of the Guidehouse report.
- Q. Could you identify the Guidehouse report by the schedule number. I believe it's AP-2?
 - A. AP-2, correct.
- 15 MR. SCHULTE: Thank you.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Is that part of the direct or the --
- 18 MR. SCHULTE: That is part of the direct.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm sorry. Would you restate the page number?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Sure. Page 15, Table 5.
- 22 BY MR. SCHULTE:
 - Q. There appears to be two -- sorry. There appears to be two sets of page numbers. There's the page number in the document itself and then there's a



red page number at the bottom. Could you identify which one of those you're using?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

- A. Yes, I'll go with the red numbers on the bottom, page 16 of 41, and within Table 5 on the last of the West-East row it says AECI SPP. SPP should be PJM. It doesn't change the results in the report.
- Q. Thank you for that correction. With that correction, if I were to ask you the same questions that appear in the direct testimony of Anthony Petti and your surrebuttal testimony, would your answers remain substantially the same?
 - A. They would remain substantially the same.

MR. SCHULTE: Thank you. I move for the admission of Exhibit 11, which is the direct testimony of Anthony Petti, and Exhibit 12, which is the surrebuttal testimony of Robert Baker, and the accompanying schedules.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection to Exhibits 11 or 12? Seeing none, I will admit those exhibits.

(COMPANY EXHIBITS 11 AND 12 WERE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)

MR. SCHULTE: Thank you. And the witness is available for cross-examination.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any cross-examination

1	from MEC.
2	MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
3	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club.
4	MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew.
6	MS. GREENWALD: Just very briefly. And let me
7	turn on my camera. Good afternoon, Mr. Baker.
8	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	BY MS. GREENWALD:
11	Q. In your surrebuttal you testified that the PRA
12	benefits described in the Guidehouse report are durable
13	regardless of the LRTP Tranche 1 portfolio; is that
14	correct?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. Could you elaborate a little bit further about
17	whether the benefits associated with Grain Belt are
18	duplicative or complementary to the benefits of the LRTP
19	Tranche 1 portfolio, please?
20	A. Sure. In the development of the Grain Belt
21	project, I'm not sure if it took into account any other
22	planning processes that were going on. I'm pretty sure
23	it did. But in terms of the work that was done with
24	LRTP, the Grain Belt injection point which resides
25	within one of the stations within MISO, it does

1 complement nicely the work that's being done within 2 In terms of the LRTP Tranche 1 work, it works on 3 -- or it looks at putting together reliable operation 4 with inside MISO. Grain Belt provides a complementary 5 benefit by bringing in power and putting it into 6 stations which are within the MISO environment and 7 during times of system upset, during normal operation 8 within the operation of the power system and within 9 other environments it provides injections of power which 10 are beneficial. 11 So for example, in terms of having power 12 coming in from let's say Kansas where the prospective 13 power will be built within Grain Belt, within the Grain 14 Belt environment, it takes this power and it distributes it in a way that is beneficial within not only SPP but 15 16 within MISO and within PJM. 17 MS. GREENWALD: Thank you. I have no further 18 questions. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Anything from Clean Grid 20 Alliance. 21 MR. BRADY: No cross. 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 23 Thank you, no. MR. WILLIAMS: 24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 25 MR. PRINGLE: One moment, Judge. No

Page 511 1 questions, Judge. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 3 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 afternoon, Mr. Baker. 5 Good afternoon. THE WITNESS: 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MR. AGATHEN: 8 I hope you're not a rabid fan of the Toronto 9 Maple Leafs. (Laughter) 10 Α. I am not. 11 Fortunate for you. 0. 12 I sleep well. Α. 13 You said you work for a company named Ο. 14 Guidehouse, correct? 15 Α. That's correct. And Mr. Petti also worked for Guidehouse when 16 Q. 17 he submitted his direct testimony, correct? He did. 18 Α. 19 Looking at page 5 of your direct testimony, 0. 20 and when I say page 5 of your direct testimony we know 21 we're talking about Mr. Petti's, right? 2.2 Α. That's correct. 23 Okay. Looking at page 5 of that direct 0. 24 testimony beginning at line 14, you state that Grain

Belt engaged Guidehouse to quantify the reliability and

- resiliency values of the Grain Belt Project for the

 state of Missouri; is that correct?

 A. Correct.
 - Q. And then in the middle of page 7 of your testimony in the bullet points, you list seven specific areas where the project would provide improvements and benefits; is that correct? Page 7, lines 4 to 5?
 - A. Correct.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. And in subsequent pages you quantify the dollar amount of the benefits which would be derived from some of the items listed in the bullet points; is that correct?
 - A. Some of the items, correct.
- Q. Looking at page 7 of your direct testimony at lines 21 to 23, you address the supposed savings which could have been realized by customers in SPP from the Winter Storm Uri; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- 19 Q. That storm occurred in the year 2023; is that 20 correct?
- JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm sorry, Mr. Agathen. Did
 you say 2023?
- THE WITNESS: I see February of 2021.
- MR. AGATHEN: I stand corrected.
- 25 BY MR. AGATHEN:



Page 513 1 Obviously the Grain Belt project was not in Q. 2 operation at that point, right? 3 Α. That's correct. 4 So the savings you attribute to the line are Ο. 5 hypothetical in that they assume the Grain Belt line 6 was, in fact, operational, correct? 7 Α. Correct. 8 Is it fair to say that your analysis did not Ο. 9 even purport to quantify the amount of the hypothetical 10 savings during Uri which would have accrued to the 11 customers in Missouri? 12 Can you please repeat. Α. 13 Is it fair to say that your analysis Ο. Sure. 14 did not even purport to quantify the amount of the 15 hypothetical savings during Uri, that's U-r-i, which 16 would have accrued to customers in Missouri? 17 So my background is as a planning engineer, Α. transmission planning engineer. 18 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm going to need you to get a 20 little closer. 21 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: That's all right. 23 THE WITNESS: I don't want to bump this



transmission planner. And as a transmission planner,

computer box here. So my background is as a

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	one of the very solid ways that one of the very solid
2	steps that's taken in terms of providing mitigation for
3	known effects on the system, the development of the
4	system, the development of the system and to mitigate
5	downstream effects of making changes to the system,
6	these types of ideas are all drawn out in terms of the
7	planning of the system. And in some cases as an example
8	a person might want to stand 10 years in the future,
9	look back and say what decisions would I have made to
0	make the system reliable and resilient. In a way we can
1	do this. By looking back 10 years from now
2	BY MR. AGATHEN:

- Ο. Sir, the question though was, did you quantify the benefits that would have accrued to the state of Missouri?
- I'm setting up a bit of foundation for my Α. response.
 - 0. That's a yes or no question.
- So it quantifies benefits, yes, for all the Α. folks that would be connected to the Grain Belt line.
 - But not for state of Missouri specifically? 0.
- State of Missouri would be included in those Α. benefits, yes.
- But you did not single out the benefits which Q. would accrue to Missouri; is that correct?



- A. That is correct.
- Q. Thank you. Is it fair to say that your analysis likewise did not purport to quantify the amount of the hypothetical savings which would have accrued to Missouri from the three other storms you mentioned at the top of page 8 of your direct testimony?
- A. Can you be more specific about the top of page 8, please.
- Q. If I've got my cite correct, you talked about three other storms which would have benefited from the Grain Belt line had it been in existence.
- A. If I understand what you're speaking by looking at lines 1 and 2 on page 8 of 14, is that correct?
- O. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- A. The answer is yes.
- Q. Does that mean that you did not quantify the benefits from those storms for the state of Missouri?
 - A. Missouri is quantified within those results and we didn't break down any of the results to a state by state or other jurisdictional level.
- Q. So you don't have an amount for Missouri specifically?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. Thank you. On a different subject, the



- objective of your analysis in this case was to identify the benefits of the Amended Project as it's being proposed in this case, correct?
 - A. This is correct.
 - Q. Did you conduct a separate analysis to quantify any of the supposed benefits which would have been realized from the Grain Belt Project as already approved in the last case?
 - A. Could you please repeat.
 - Q. Did you conduct a separate analysis to quantify any of the supposed benefits which would have been realized from the Grain Belt Project as it was approved in the last case?
 - A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q. So your analysis did not look at the incremental monetary benefits of approving the Amended Project vis-a-vis staying with the Project approved in the last case?
- A. The Project was based on the amended parameters.
- 21 Q. So your answer would be no --
- 22 A. No.
- Q. -- to my question?
- 24 A. No.
- Q. To your knowledge, has MISO or any other FERC

- approved RTOs determined that the Revised Grain Belt Project is necessary for reliability or stability of the electric grid in Missouri?
 - A. I'm not aware.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. Has MISO or any other RTO determined that the Revised Grain Belt Project is needed to relieve congestion on the grid?
 - A. I'm not aware.
- Q. Are you aware of any documentation which demonstrates that the Amended Grain Belt Project is the least cost method of improving the reliability of the bulk power system in Missouri?
 - A. Can you please repeat?
- Q. Are you aware of any documentation which demonstrates that the Amended Grain Belt Project is the least cost method of improving the reliability of the bulk power system in Missouri?
- A. Not aware.
- Q. Has Guidehouse performed any analysis or studies which would show that the Amended Grain Belt Project is the least cost method of achieving any of the supposed benefits which you list in the bullet points at page 7?
- A. Please repeat.
- Q. Has Guidehouse performed any studies or



- 1 analyses which would show that the Amended Grain Belt
- 2 | Project is the least cost method of achieving any of the
- 3 | seven supposed benefits which you list in the bullet
- 4 | points at page 7 of your testimony?
- 5 A. No.
- Q. One of the bullet points you list at page 7 of your testimony is value of system restoration capabilities; is that correct?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- Q. Did your analysis look at the current costs of system restoration for utilities in Missouri?
- 12 A. No.
- Q. Can you turn to page 9 of your direct testimony, please.
- 15 A. Got it.
- Q. Beginning at line 12, you state that the Grain
 Belt Project will mitigate additional reliability driven
 generation capacity investments by 526 million per year;
 is that correct?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- Q. And looking at lines 17 through 19, you
 attribute 145 million of those savings to customers in
 Missouri of Associated Electric Co-op and 145 million to
 customers in the MISO zone which includes Missouri; is
 that correct?



- A. That's what it says, yes.
- Q. Do these figures represent your approximation of the dollar amount of generating facilities which would not be built in Missouri by reason of the Revised Grain Belt Project?
 - A. The analysis you point to is not an avoided cost valuation. I'm sorry. I misread. This is the cost of new entry avoidance, yes, correct.
 - Q. So generation that would not be built?
 - A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. Did you quantify a comparable figure for the 12 Grain Belt Project as it was approved in the last case?
- 13 A. In the last case, you mean the unamended 14 Project?
- 15 Q. Correct.
- 16 A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. Finally, could you turn, please, to page 10 of your surrebuttal testimony.
- 19 A. Did you say page 10?
- Q. Yes, of your surrebuttal.
- 21 A. I'm here.
- Q. At lines 10 to 11, you mention studies
 conducted by Invenergy and its consultants ICF, correct?
- A. Correct.
- 25 Q. And the full name of ICF is ICF International?

Page 520 1 I don't see International. Α. 2 So you don't know whether that's a part Ο. 3 of the name? 4 I don't. Α. 5 Is the ICF study referred to there the same 0. 6 study which was submitted by Invenergy in support of its 7 complaint case at the FERC against MISO? 8 Α. I'm not aware. 9 That's all I have. MR. AGATHEN: Thank you. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there anything 11 from the Agricultural Associations. 12 No questions for this witness, MR. HADEN: 13 Your Honor. 14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander. 15 MR. HOLLANDER: No, Your Honor. 16 Ms. Stemme. JUDGE DIPPELL: 17 MS. STEMME: No questions. Associated Industries. 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: 19 MR. ELLINGER: No questions. 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there questions from the 21 bench? Mr. Chairman. 2.2 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Yes. 23 **QUESTIONS** 24 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

Winter Storm Uri severely affected ERCOT in

- that area with residual effects. Is the figures that

 Mr. Petti came up with, the \$300 million cost savings,

 was that just for the SPP footprint? Did that take into

 consideration, you know, anything in ERCOT or how did

 that -- did you geofence the savings to just -- can you

 just walk me through that?
 - A. Sure. As much as I can. As we stated on page 17 of 41 of the Guidehouse report, we show Winter Storm Uri as having potential savings from GBX of about \$322 million or thereabouts. It's been sidelined noted as being PJM to SPP south. So it includes the areas that would be directly related to Grain Belt. I don't believe that these effects were calculated for ERCOT. ERCOT appeared to be a separate calculation.
 - JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Baker, again, can you -you're very soft spoken. So I need you just to lean
 forward a little if you can.
 - THE WITNESS: My kids would disagree. Yes, I understand.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
- 21 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. So just to follow up, the 300 and some million in the report, that was the potential cost savings to PJM and MISO and SPP or?
- 25 A. It would be inclusive of those three, and it

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- also was based on an injection of 2-1/2 gigawatts through that particular area. So the idea would be used that would be the amount of power that Grain Belt could deliver to mitigate the effects of the storm. So it's shown as a storm mitigation technique or method.
- Q. Did that \$300 million savings that you have put forward in your report, was that just loss of load, the value of the loss of load or did that take into consideration any of the securitization of costs that utilities had sought and some were approved moving forward?
- It would be the avoidance of all the effects Α. of having that load not be there during the storm. So it would include operational difficulties. I don't know if it went as far as let's say sparing of equipment. So during a storm like that there might be a transfer of I don't believe it got to quite that depth. equipment. That's a very fundamental detail that would only be found after the fact. This would include all of the losses that customers would suffer, you and I plus commercial enterprises plus industry plus lost opportunity during that period.
- Q. Would it include any cost to ratepayers for the amortization of those costs over time?
 - A. That's a good question. I don't know like for

2.2

the loss of let's say home effects, that might be something that could be relatively easily taken care of within a month or two. For example, spoiled food or potentially damage to a home. In a commercial or an industrial enterprise, that might drag forward, but I don't know if those costs would be identified in this type of study but that's definitely an effect. Is there something I can expand on?

- Q. I think we're talking about two different things.
 - A. Could you repeat the question maybe?
- Q. I'm working it through in my head. I'm trying to ascertain, I understand the value of loss of load, that value and how your -- my question just is any of the financing, any of the rate of return or anything on securitization, you know, of the increased cost of fuel that ratepayers are going to be paying for 20 years and any of those costs inside of this 300 million or is it more just this is what the storm caused for loss of food and increased cost of power. Is it more of a snapshot or is it a full looking back at the entire effects of Winter Storm Uri?
- A. I don't know. I don't know how that was calculated through the report that we relied on for those numbers.



1 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Thank you.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Mr. Chairman, can you tell

3 | me ERCOT, is that an acronym?

4 CHAIRMAN RUPP: It is an acronym. It's

 $5 \mid E-R-C-O-T$.

7

8

9

11

6 THE STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN RUPP: It's the Texas grid.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioner Holsman.

COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you.

10 QUESTIONS

BY COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN:

12 Q. Thank you for your representation of Mr.

13 | Petti's testimony. I've got a series of questions here.

14 | I want to start with on page 6 of the Grain Belt Express

15 resiliency and reliability values that was filed as

16 AP-2. It says that Guidehouse assumed that power

17 | generated facilities such as wind and solar most likely

18 | paired with some form of firm energy storage resource

19 | will be interconnected to the project and are capable of

20 delivering capacity through the HVDC converter stations

21 | located in Kansas, Missouri and Indiana. I personally

22 am very interested in storage and firming renewable

23 resources. It seems like it's been one of the missing

24 links to unlocking the capacity of clean power. I

25 | didn't recall seeing any details in the application

describing anything pertaining to energy storage. If they exist, can you elaborate on what storage might be included in this project?

A. This would be I would say maybe a hypothetical outcome where for the purposes of doing a transmission study such as this, we would take into account the full phasing of the project, for example, full bidirectionality. In the same vein if we had an amount of generation which was nonpersistent to interruptible at the terminal that we're looking at in Kansas, it would make sense to park energy at times when it made sense.

The firm commitments that Invenergy and Grain Belt are looking for to be able to deliver along the line, those would come first, but at times when let's say it would be unusually calm or wintertime with an overcast day, there would be less ability to get that energy ready to go and be delivered on the line. Large amounts of capacity probably on maybe an iterative basis, like after the project is done how much would we need, and it might be a one in three or one in five or one in ten year event where the development and the expansion of facilities at the terminal would allow for a certain flexibility, having storage available, for example. And the ability to park that energy and

Page 526

potentially use it on the line as part of the firm commitment or release it wholesale perhaps would be another connection that this energy could be evacuated through.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- Q. Would you need to locate any of those storage assets near the injection points?
- It would depend largely on where exactly these Α. generation sites are. And as an example. If we had dual use stations. For example, it turned out that in one area maybe 20 miles away from the terminal it was really good sun and a really good wind regime historically through met data. What might happen is that overnight you would have the wind do its thing. You would be providing energy. In the morning, the wind might historically be at a low and the sun would be coming out. So you play off both of those sources' energy in the same station or they might peak at the same time. And this would be one of those cases where using met data and the practicalities of one or two or three years of experience you'd be able to start to build facilities that would complement those historical advantages, natural advantages.
- Q. At this juncture, these are all hypothetical discussions. You don't have any providers, utilities, that have expressed interest into, you know, actually



creating these assets at this juncture?

- A. Not that I'm aware of. Not from the supply side.
- Q. Mr. Petti describes his experience with energy storage projects with PG&E and Puget Sound Energy. I understand you're adopting his testimony. But I was hoping maybe you'd be familiar with some of those storage related projects or possibly others that are in existence that are not hypothetical, and could you speak to the details about those projects, the scale of them, what materials, what technology was used, the progress of how it's going, have they firmed up the power, are you aware of an existing storage in your experience?
- A. Sure. I don't have experience directly with the PG&E reference that Mr. Petti made. Myself I've helped with the planning of about three or 4000 MW of renewable energy and have developed expansion for storage devices. A couple of those have made them to production but they're brand new. I don't have any practical experience. But we did set up in the same way I mentioned a moment ago using met data and with the facilities available being able to size storage and evacuation levels to complement what the met data was telling us and the idea was that we would tune it and calibrate it after the fact.

- Q. This Commission has a history of supporting blockstacking is the term that I might remember as a storage possibility. I just wanted to point that out. It looks like on page 6 of Mr. Petti's direct testimony it says Guidehouse determined that the Project with amended configuration could reasonably provide measurable improvements to the reliability and resiliency of the regional electric transmission system with which the project interconnects. Are you aware of whether the measurable improvements have been affirmed by any external entities?
- A. I'm sorry. I was catching up there. I was looking for page 6.
- Q. The term measurable improvements, have they been affirmed by any external entities?
 - A. Not to my knowledge.

2.2

Q. Okay. We've talked a little bit about the 300 million in potential cost savings from previous storms that would require for reversal of power. In earlier testimony we understood that there would be an injection point at Dodge City, one in Monroe and then one at the end of the line in Indiana. So the idea that SPP would benefit would come from the Dodge City, that MISO would be -- PJM would be in Indiana. I also asked earlier if there were any standard operating procedures or existing



communications on when, how, who would initiate an emergency like that that would require this reversal of power. Are you aware of any conversations that have occurred that would pre-establish the rules of operation for this reverse flow to occur?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- No, not in this specific case. The line is Α. still under development. I have been part though of development of operational protocol for when new facilities come in as an operations analyst and a project engineer for when new projects are actually coming on the system and a parallel there would be the development of the physical construction and then the development of I would say concurrent requirements. So if the project was maybe two months behind, it would actually require a little bit different than if it was a different application and two months ahead. And so when sort of the two met, the actual development of the project and its connection to the system, then by that point the project details would be worked out for if it would supply let's say ancillary services, for example, whether it would be a black start candidate, those types of things.
- Q. So let's talk about hypothetical for a second.

 Let's say that the Project is constructed and I think

 for the purpose of this we would need both phases to



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

potentially be in place for this to work. We see an ice storm is imminent. What would you see the flow of communication being that would initiate? Would it need to be a declaration of the state of emergency by the governors of the state that would then flow backwards? Would we require the RTOs to be the first ones to say okay, in order for us to get this power here, we need to engage the generators. What would you envision that operating procedure looking like in a normative environment?

So beyond a hypothetical, I have been involved when projects have connected to the system. And as the projects were connecting and the working groups would be set up and the working groups would then start to integrate what the aspects or the attributes of that project are and where they would slot into I would say the operational, the procedural, protocol-based effects. Within MISO, I'm not familiar with the details of what that would look like, but I have seen that happen before. Once the project has received approval, in some cases it's licensed to operate, permit for license, then those invitations would be made and those working groups would be set and then a number of different aspects would be put in place.

I remember some work I did with GMD,



geomagnetic disturbances, and the information that would flow from space weather satellites, how it would be accepted by a system control center and how that information would be provided to all relevant parties. These are the types of things that I'm familiar with in terms of how other folks, how other projects are engaged.

- Q. In a former life, I chaired the Committee on Disaster Preparation for the Missouri State Senate and I'm interested in your discussion of black starts and how this project may help do that. Let's suggest that a variety of disasters could have occurred and everything from a manmade EMP, to solar flare, to New Madrid, a whole host of potential risks that the grid resiliency and reliability phase. In the event that a black start were required, how does this project help compared to not having this project?
- A. Probably in a couple of different ways. And so whenever I come to anything like a black start, I always imagine an orderly shutdown even though it might be a terrible thing that's happened, a horrible storm as you see, an EMP, some sort of man effect going in and causing damage. However, the systems are normally safe, safely built to orderly shut down, and so in that particular case if Grain Belt was in service, there's a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- couple of things that we would rely on that presently aren't accessible and I think back to the want and need of FERC Order 1000 over the last ten years wanting competitive interregional projects to be built. this does is it allows at least two things to take place automatically that don't exactly exist at the moment is a change in time zone, which I think was mentioned a little bit earlier. I think Mr. Rodriguez pointed to that, if I recall correctly, and also location. And so if let's say it was a storm that was causing shutdown, chances are the storm isn't large enough to effect multiple RTOs at the same time. So Grain Belt could draw on resources either on the PJM side, in the middle or on the Kansas side. And the ability to dispatch power into areas that are in the process of black starting, as I think Mr. Rodriguez went through that a little bit earlier, you could find cranking paths by which we could look for ignition opportunities on the system again. That would be very much dependent on the characteristics of the outage.
 - O. Okay. Thank you.
- A. And also on the time-based side one of the other comments mentioned earlier, I can't remember by who, the time zone difference also has a benefit because you might have dispatchable power in one area that may



- not exist in another during this particular kind of event.
- Q. I want to talk a little bit about the planning resource auction. I understand that it uses a one in ten scale or one day in ten years loss of load expectation or LOLE?
 - A. Correct.

2.2

- Q. Given the volatility of weather and the increasing extreme weather events that we've seen, is the one in ten LOLE standard appropriate and adequate?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Are there any alternatives where possibly more appropriate planning standards that should be utilized?
- A. That's a really interesting question, and the reason I mention that is the world that we are exiting right now, which tends to be carbon heavy with synchronous machines, there's synchronous hydro machines, there's nuclear machines which are synchronous, but a large amount of synchronous machines that exist right now are natural gas or coal. And those units are going away. And so the world that we're exiting is comfortable in terms of the auctions, in terms of the operation, all of the aspects.

The world that we're moving into is based on interruptible and nonpersistent. And so in terms of how



- we might view loss of load expectation, it would take into account the natural vagarities of an interruptible environment, but to begin with you could mask or assume going forward using storage devices, using a large amount of diversity within the system that we could use and continue to use a one in ten year LOLE.
- Q. Okay. My last question is, you know, in this auction process we have seen large swings within the MISO auction process specifically, and particularly last year from this year. Can you address how significant of a benefit this would be for utility companies going forward?
- A. Yeah. I kind of outlined that in the report where right now, for example, the lower cost auctions within the south of MISO, zones 8 to 10, are decoupled from the north zone. Projects such as this help to alleviate those particular auction disparities by having capacity available and leveling the field. I'm not sure, did I get your --
- Q. Would you agree that one of the principal benefits of a multi-regional multi-RTO transmission line would be to get a negative price point power to a place that would better use it? Is that a simplified --
 - A. Yes.

Q. -- easy way of saying this is one of the major

value	of	this	project?
value	ΟI	tnis	project

A. Absolutely, yes.

COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other

5 | Commissioner questions? We have Commissioner Kolkmeyer 6 | online. So I'll just assume that he'll jump in if he

7 has questions.

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

QUESTIONS

BY JUDGE DIPPELL:

- Q. I just had one further follow up and that is so the testimony discusses the reliability and resilience benefits of the Project and especially with regard to extreme weather events. Are there any fees that Missouri customers directly or indirectly through the utilities and the RTOs would have to pay to receive those benefits redirecting power?
- A. Are you speaking, for example, by having Grain Belt in service, would there be any additional sort of user fees or that type of thing?
 - Q. Like the pancaking fees?
- A. It's a possibility. But the overall benefits of having, and we've heard benefits from a number of different witnesses over the last two days, including the reliability and resilient benefits, those benefits dwarf potentially the pancaking fees. These would be



Page 536 1 the types of things that would occur as a natural going 2 forward but they wouldn't be tied directly to, for example, electricity prices except for, for example, 3 4 bringing in negative price point electricity at times to 5 relieve higher auction prices inside the zones that 6 we're looking at here. 7 Okay. Would there be any JUDGE DIPPELL: 8 cross-examination based on the bench questions from MEC? 9 No, Your Honor. Thank you. MS. WHIPPLE: 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club. 11 No, thank you. MS. RUBENSTEIN: 12 Renew Missouri. JUDGE DIPPELL: 13 No, thank you. MS. GREENWALD: 14 Clean Grid. JUDGE DIPPELL: 15 MR. BRADY: No cross. 16 Public Counsel. JUDGE DIPPELL: 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 18 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 19 No cross, Judge. MR. PRINGLE: Thank you. 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 21 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor. 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Agriculture Associations. 23 MR. HADEN: No questions, Your Honor. 24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander. Maybe he left. 25 Ms. Stemme.

Evidentiary Hearing

1	MS. STEMME: No questions.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
3	MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any redirect?
5	MR. SCHULTE: Yes, just briefly.
6	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. SCHULTE:
8	Q. Mr. Baker, do you recall during the
9	cross-examination from MLA's counsel you were asked
10	whether MISO had evaluated any of the benefits discussed
11	in the Guidehouse report?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. As Grain Belt Express is a merchant Project
14	which was planned outside of the MISO transmission
15	planning process, would you expect MISO to serve any
16	role in evaluating those benefits in the manner that you
17	have?
18	A. Not necessarily. But there would definitely
19	be interest to find out how new projects might,
20	especially novel projects FERC 1000 adhered to projects
21	would be accepted in the system, how they might operate,
22	how they might have to find coherent operating
23	procedures, for example.
24	Q. Okay. And additionally you had started to
25	discuss how future reliability benefits are analyzed by

reviewing past reliability incidents such as the winter storms that we've been discussing?

A. Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Could you just complete that explanation, please?
- Sure thing. Maybe just take one step back Α. from that particular narrative. As we are entering kind of a new world, the operation of the power system will change I would say incrementally but at times it may change somewhat dramatically. Our historical planning practices of which I'm familiar with over the past number of decades speaks to an ability to see sort of a system that's unfolding in a way that is pedestrian. It's not super fast but it is something that requires care and attention. And some of the planning techniques that I'm familiar with is the ability to stand, for example, in this point in history and look back ten And during that lookback you might say okay, so we've experienced let's say storms, or perhaps we've experienced a technological change which is demonstrable and has affected the system. COVID has occurred, a bit of an outlier and we've taken it into account, but how would we digest that particular event in the future. And by looking at our historical approaches to planning and operating the system, we've been very successful in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking forward and figuring out how to wire in generators, how to wire in big transmission lines because they're very expensive, they take a long time to put into place. As has been discussed here, a case of what does disaster recovery look like. All of these things are part of an ongoing synchronized approach to the system.

With the changes that are occurring now, they're relatively slow and it gives us a chance to pause in terms of the amount of wind and solar coming in, for example, and the amount of carbon heavy generation being released from the system as we move And the positioning of these items on the forward. system is also very important because we've got carbon heavy coal plants leaving at a spot which potentially strands facilities on the system and the ability to find something to replace those particular items while still maintaining value and the operational advantages that we have in the system, the wiring, we don't want to give up transmission paths, they're very, very difficult to back. These types of planning techniques have served the industry well. And the modification of these techniques going forward is going to be advantageous to lines like Grain Belt because FERC has been looking and asking for these type of interregional projects going

- Page 540 1 forward and this is an example of how we might do it. 2 It will be a little messy at times, but it's going to be 3 a good example of how we're going to potentially move 4 forward. 5 MR. SCHULTE: Thank you. I don't have any 6 further questions. Thank you. 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, 8 Mr. Baker. Your testimony is finished and you may step 9 down. Appreciate you stepping in. 10 THE WITNESS: Happy to do so. 11 (Witness excused.) 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think this is a good place 13 to take another break. I don't plan to go late this 14 evening. We've made up a little bit of time, not as 15 much as we need to, but I think we'll be okay. If we 16 need to stay late tomorrow or Thursday to get some 17 things finished up, we might try that. So for now let's take a break and come back at 3:55. We'll go off the 18 19 record. 20 (A recess was taken.) 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Brian, you can go ahead. 2.2 can go ahead and go back on the record. All right. We 23 are ready for Grain Belt's next witness.
 - MR. SCHULTE: Thank you. Before we call the next witness, could we get confirmation that witnesses



1 Shashank Sane and Rolanda Shine -- well, I guess I might 2 as well ask if all of the witnesses who have testified 3 on behalf of Grain Belt thus far can be excused --4 JUDGE DIPPELL: They may. 5 MR. SCHULTE: -- so that they can catch 6 flights. Thank you. 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes. Including Staff's 8 witness who I told earlier was excused. Yes, they may 9 be excused. 10 MR. SCHULTE: I appreciate that. Okay. With 11 that, Grain Belt Express calls Jonathan Monken. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sorry. We have a little 13 maintenance work going on back here. Would you please 14 raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm 15 that the testimony you're about to give at this hearing 16 will be the truth? 17 THE WITNESS: I do. 18 Thank you. If you could spell JUDGE DIPPELL: 19 your name for the court reporter, please. 20 THE WITNESS: Sure. It's Jonathan Monken, 21 J-o-n-a-t-h-a-n M-o-n-k-e-n. 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: You can go ahead. 23 MR. SCHULTE: Good afternoon, Mr. Monken. 24 JONATHAN MONKEN, 25 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified

1	as follows:
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. SCHULTE:
4	Q. Mr. Monken, could you please provide your
5	address for the record, business address?
6	A. Yes. 1301 K Street, NW, Washington, D.C.
7	20005.
8	Q. And by whom are you employed and what is your
9	title?
10	A. I'm a principal at Converge Strategies, LLC.
11	Q. And are you the same Jonathan Monken who filed
12	or caused to be filed direct testimony and accompanying
13	Schedules JM-1 and JM-2?
14	A. I am.
15	Q. Are you also the same Jonathan Monken who
16	filed or caused to be filed surrebuttal testimony?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And for the record the direct testimony has
19	been marked as Exhibit 13 along with the schedules and
20	the surrebuttal testimony has been marked as Exhibit 14.
21	If I were to ask you the same questions that appear in
22	those sets of testimony today, would your answers be
23	substantially the same?
24	A. They would.
25	Q. Do you have any corrections to make?



1	A. I do not.
2	MR. SCHULTE: With that, I would move for the
3	admission of Exhibits 13 and 14 into the record and all
4	of that is public.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection
6	to Exhibit 13 or 14? Seeing and hearing none, I will
7	admit those into the record.
8	MR. SCHULTE: Thank you.
9	(COMPANY EXHIBITS 13 AND 14 WERE RECEIVED INTO
10	EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)
11	MR. SCHULTE: The witness is available for
12	cross.
13	JUDGE DIPPELL: And I'll just throw it out
14	there generally again. Is there going to be
15	cross-examination for this witness? All right. Okay.
16	I'll just go down the line again. Anything from MEC?
17	MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
18	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club.
19	MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you.
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew.
21	MS. GREENWALD: Yes, just quickly. Good
22	afternoon, Mr. Monken.
23	THE WITNESS: Good afternoon.
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION
25	BY MS. GREENWALD:



1	Page 54 Q. In your direct and surrebuttal testimony you
2	mention that there are more than a hundred military
3	installations across the 23 states connected by Grain
4	Belt Express; is that right?
5	A. It is.
6	Q. Who is in charge of procuring energy and
7	interfacing with local utilities on these installations?
8	A. Installations within the Department of Defense
9	have a unique contracting authority that doesn't exist
10	with any other federal agency. So the individual
11	installations each have a designated installation energy
12	manager who has contracting authority to negotiate rates
13	and programs directly with utilities.
14	Q. And are the installation energy managers
15	responsible for implementing the DOD energy policies on
16	the installations?
17	A. They are, in coordination with the
18	installation commander who is their direct line of
19	authority.
20	Q. And in your current consulting role, do you
21	provide guidance on the implementation of these
22	policies?
23	A. We do.
24	Q. Do you believe that the Commission's approval
25	of the Amended CCN would create more certainty around

Page 545 1 the Project? 2 Α. I do, yes. And with more certainty around the Project, do 3 Ο. 4 you believe that there would be more vocal support from 5 these installation energy managers? 6 Yes, I do. Α. 7 MS. GREENWALD: I have nothing further. Thank 8 you. 9 Thank you. THE WITNESS: 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there anything from Clean 11 Grid Alliance? 12 MR. BRADY: No cross. 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 16 No questions, Judge. Thank you. MR. PRINGLE: 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 18 MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Good 19 afternoon, sir. 20 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2.2 BY MR. AGATHEN: 23 Will you turn to page 4 of your direct 24 testimony, please? 25 Α. Yes.

- **Evidentiary Hearing** June 06, 2023 Page 546 1 At line 1 you were asked what the purpose is Q. 2 of your testimony; is that correct? 3 Α. Yes, that's correct. 4 And you essentially respond that your purpose Ο. 5 is to provide an assessment of the national security 6 value of the Grain Belt Project; is that essentially 7 correct? Yes, it is. 8 Α. 9 Could you please describe in general terms the 0. 10 multi-value transmission projects which were included in 11 MISO's recent MTEP 22 analysis, MTEP being M-T-E-P? 12 Α. No, I cannot. 13 Do you know what the amount of the investment Ο. in those projects is? 15 Α. No, sir, I do not.
- 14
- - You didn't examine the specific impact on Ο. national security of any of the potential MISO projects, did you?
- 19 That is correct. Α.
 - Did you examine the specific impact on O. national security of any Project being considered for approval by SPP or PJM?
- 23 Α. I did not.

17

18

20

21

2.2

24 And in the sense that you used the term any Q. 25 additional transmission line which adds to system



- reliability will also promote national security, will it not?
 - A. Yes, it will.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Did you make any attempt to quantify the dollar amount of the national security value of the Grain Belt Project?
- A. National security value does not have a dollar amount value. So it's essentially driven based on the ability of the Department of Defense to execute national defense missions.
 - Q. And that's unquantifiable?
- A. In the mind of the Department of Defense, it's an all or nothing proposition. They can either execute those national defense missions or they cannot.
- Q. To your knowledge, has the Department of Defense ever seen the need to intervene or participate in a state regulatory proceeding to support the construction of a specific transmission or generation facility?
- 20 A. Yes, yes, they have.
- Q. They have not done so here, right?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- MR. AGATHEN: That's all I have, Judge.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Anything from the
- 25 Ag Associations.



- Would your prior testimony talking about the installation energy manager would apply to those installations also?
- Α. Yes, that's correct.

21

2.2

23

24 And they could perceive real value in Q. 25 strengthening the infrastructure, energy infrastructure



1	Page 549 in Missouri?
2	A. Absolutely, yes.
3	MR. ELLINGER: No further questions. Thank
4	you.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Are there
6	questions from the Commission? Chairman.
7	CHAIRMAN RUPP: Were all the questions you
8	were asked easier than what you anticipated being asked?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
10	COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Commissioner
11	Kolkmeyer here with no questions.
12	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Commissioner, thank
13	you. Commissioner Holsman.
14	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you.
15	QUESTIONS
16	BY COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN:
17	Q. I apologize if any of this is duplicative. I
18	walked in just a little bit late on Renew Missouri's
19	questioning. We've established that we have a number of
20	facilities here, including Fort Leonard Wood, Whiteman
21	Air Force Base, and I know that each of them has been
22	working to diversify and decarbonize their energy

and resiliency. Looking at the Project more

portfolios, as well as address their power reliability

holistically, are both Phase I and Phase II necessary to

23

24

- achieve the DOD and national security benefits you identified in your testimony?
 - A. Yes, they are.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- Q. Do all of those benefits remain if only Phase I is completed?
 - A. No, they do not.
- Q. Can you say whether you have been involved in creating or reviewing the IEP plan for the installations in Missouri?
- A. Not in the state of Missouri. The closest one is Scott Air Force Base, which is just across the river in Illinois.
- Q. Can you identify some common vulnerabilities that could be addressed by a Project like this?
- 15 Α. Yes. So in particular the installation energy 16 plans are targeted at looking at vulnerabilities or 17 potential disruptions to either capacity availability, so just having enough energy available to meet the 18 19 fundamental critical loads that are identified by those 20 mission critical facilities, or access to 21 infrastructure. So in the form of redundancy or 2.2 hardening of those assets. So Grain Belt Express has 23 the ability to address both of those challenges adding 24 additional transmission infrastructure redundancy to 25 support those installations and adding interregional



2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21

22

23 24

25

transfer capacity that would help meet those critical loads to support national defense missions.

Q. We talked a little bit in earlier testimony about black start capabilities and from that not only natural disasters but from a defense standpoint we do have intelligence that our adversaries are in possession of hypersonic weapons that could deliver EMP, nuclear devices at an atmospheric level that would potentially cause great harm to our energy infrastructure. aware of primarily this Project having any prioritization or significance in terms of addressing threats that we could potentially face that would be like an EMP?

Yes, absolutely. So in terms of the potential Α. technical capabilities of an interregional HVDC line, the enhanced controllability, frequency stability and bidirectional capability are each in direct support of being able to mitigate against all sorts of natural and manmade hazards. So the targeted attacks on physical infrastructure that we've seen certainly in an international scale and the Russia-Ukranian War and then certainly all of the intelligence that indicates a desire on the part of nation state adversaries to deliberately target grid infrastructure as a means of degrading mission capability of United States forces

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- that are based in the continental United States, essentially adding these technical capabilities to each of the three regions that we're discussing right now being SPP, MISO and PJM have the ability to provide significant mitigation of those potential risks.
- Q. Are you aware of any communications from DOD directly to the RTOs or the general operators to prepare or to consider these nation state risks?
- So during my time as a senior director of Α. system resilience at PJM Interconnection, I actually spearheaded a program called Path Finder which is designed specifically to integrate the efforts of privately-owned utilities and the Department of Defense to try and address what critical loads exist within the operating territories of the ISOs and RTOs across the nine reliability coordinators of North America with the specific intent of trying to identify how they can ensure both capacity availability and infrastructure performance to support Department of Defense critical loads. So there are efforts underway to address this directly. Also within the DOE Office of Cyber Security, Energy Security and Energy Resilience, which is CSESER, they have a program called DCEI, or Defense Critical Electric Infrastructure, that is specifically designed to identify both generation capacity and physical

- transmission and distribution assets that are in direct support of defense installations and to prioritize them for both investment and improvement to try and mitigate the potential risks for targeted attacks on infrastructure.
- Q. Where did you say you're based out of? Where are you officed out of?
 - A. Washington, D.C.

2.2

- Q. Washington, D.C. Have you communicated at all on this subject matter with NARUC?
- A. Yes. So we are currently supporting NARUC in a contractual arrangement to facilitate their work on the DCEI program specifically. So this year we'll be running a pilot program that's designed with a particular intent of how to translate DCEI infrastructure investments into ways that make it easier for state commissions to assess the just and reasonable cost of investment in that infrastructure, specifically to support those installations and the defense communities that surround them.
 - Q. We heard a little bit about the impact that it would have on bases. Has anybody talked about BRAC with you yet?
- A. Yes, we've spoken about BRAC. So certainly it has significant ramifications just in terms of long-term



1	infrastructure planning and having the relative
2	certainty as to where those defense installations will
3	be and then what missions will be executed from them.
4	So the Department of Defense has the ability, of course,
5	to establish either redundant functionality of defense
6	missions at other installations or move primary mission
7	sets from one installation to another based on those
8	decisions.
9	Q. My last question is, in your expert opinion,
LO	do you think a Project like this improves the national
L1	security of the United States and the citizens of
L2	Missouri?
L3	A. I do.
L4	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you.
L5	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Looks like that is
L6	the last of the bench questions. Is there any further
L7	cross-examination based on the bench questions from MEC?
L8	MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
L9	JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club.
20	MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri.
22	MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance.
24	MR. BRADY: No cross.
25	JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel.



Page 555 1 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 3 MR. PRINGLE: No cross. Thank you. 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 5 Mr. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 6 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ag Associations. 7 None, Your Honor. MR. HADEN: 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Stemme. 9 MS. STEMME: No questions. JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries. 10 11 MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge. 12 Thank you. Is there any JUDGE DIPPELL: 13 redirect? 14 Very briefly. MR. SCHULTE: 15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. SCHULTE: 17 Counsel for MLA asked you whether you had 18 studied the national security benefits of MISO planned 19 projects or SPP planned projects. Do you recall that 20 question? 21 Α. I do recall. 2.2 Ο. Do any of the currently planned projects in 23 MISO or SPP involve multi-regional HVDC components? 24 Α. They do not. In that way, Grain Belt Express 25 is a unique project.

1 MR. SCHULTE: Okay. Thank you. No further 2 questions. JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. 3 Thank you, 4 Mr. Monken. That completes your testimony and you may 5 be excused. 6 Thanks, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: 7 (Witness excused.) 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think we should go ahead 9 then and keep going with Grain Belt's next witness. Do 10 you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're 11 about to give at this hearing will be the truth? 12 THE WITNESS: I do. 13 Thank you. If you could state JUDGE DIPPELL: 14 and spell your name, please. 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. My name is Jennifer 16 Stelzleni, J-e-n-n-i-f-e-r S-t-e-l-z-l-e-n-i. 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Counsel, when you're 18 ready. 19 MR. PLUTA: Sure. As a preliminary matter, 20 Grain Belt Express has agreed to make an adjustment in a 21 condition that is brought up in Ms. Stelzleni's 2.2 testimony. We've conferred with Staff, and I think 23 they're okay with our proposed revision. But we'd like 24 to read it into the record and then get other parties' 25 consent on the proposed amendment.

2.2

So reading it into the record, the condition would state, Grain Belt Express shall not install transmission facilities associated with Phase I of easement property in Missouri until it has submitted documentation to Commission Staff regarding compliance with all applicable federal and Missouri environmental permits and approvals associated with Phase I, including Missouri specific environmental studies.

Further, Grain Belt Express shall not install transmission facilities associated with Phase II on easement property in Missouri until it has submitted documentation to Commission Staff regarding compliance with all applicable federal and Missouri environmental permits and approvals associated with Phase II, including Missouri specific environmental studies.

JUDGE DIPPELL: That was basically the change that Staff's witness made in his testimony earlier; is that correct?

MR. PRINGLE: Yes, Judge. We specifically added the Missouri specific environmental studies after consulting with Grain Belt's consulting with their witness to add a few other language to make sure we're getting all those permits, but apparently some permits are called approvals. So we're just making sure we're covering all our bases.



JUDGE DIPPELL: So that is a change then also to this witness's testimony?

MR. PLUTA: Correct.

2.2

JUDGE DIPPELL: I was going to say explain to me again how that fits into this part of the -- and what it is that you're wanting from counsel to acknowledge.

MR. PLUTA: Sure. So in Ms. Stelzleni's surrebuttal testimony she stated that she would acquiesce with Mr. Cunigan's condition, proposed condition. Since then, Mr. Cunigan said what he said during his cross testimony, and to clarify the record and simplify what Grain Belt's proposed condition is we're submitting this as our amended one. Ms. Stelzleni can answer any questions the Commission has about that proposed revision.

The other reason why we're bringing it up now is that we haven't had a full opportunity to discuss this change with all the intervenors to see if it's something that they would agree to support.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. So we can -- I will let the intervenors question the witness then about that change as we go.

MR. PLUTA: Sounds good. Thank you, Judge Dippell.

JENNIFER STELZLENI,



1	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. PLUTA:
4	Q. Ms. Stelzleni, please state your name and
5	business address.
6	A. Yes. My name is Jennifer Stelzleni. My
7	business address is 1 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1800,
8	Chicago, Illinois 60606.
9	Q. And by whom are you employed and what is your
10	title?
11	A. I'm employed by Invenergy LLC, and I am a
12	Senior Manager of the Environmental Compliance and
13	Strategy Team.
14	Q. Are you the same Jennifer Stelzleni who filed
15	direct and surrebuttal testimony and accompanying
16	Schedule JS-1 on January 18, 2023 and May 15, 2023, and
17	marked as Exhibits 15 and 16 respectively?
18	A. I am.
19	Q. Do you have any additions or corrections to
20	make in your testimony at this time?
21	A. I do not.
22	Q. If I asked you the same questions again today,
23	would your answers remain the same?
24	A. They would.
25	MR. PLUTA: Thank you. I move the Commission



Page 560

1 to enter Exhibits 15 and 16 into the record. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection 3 to Exhibits 15 and 16? Seeing none, then I will admit 4 those exhibits. 5 (COMPANY EXHIBITS 15 AND 16 WERE RECEIVED INTO 6 EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.) 7 Thank you, Ms. Stelzleni. I have MR. PLUTA: 8 no further questions. Your Honor, I tender the witness 9 for cross-examination. 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Is there any 11 cross-examination from MEC? 12 No, Your Honor. Thank you. MS. WHIPPLE: 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: From Sierra Club. 14 No, thank you, Your Honor. MS. RUBENSTEIN: 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew Missouri. 16 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. 17 Clean Grid Alliance. JUDGE DIPPELL: 18 MR. BRADY: No cross. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 20 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 2.2 MR. PRINGLE: No cross. Thank you, Judge. 23 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 24 MR. AGATHEN: No cross. Thank you, Your 25 Honor.



1	JUDGE DIPPELL: Agriculture Associations.
2	MR. HADEN: No questions, Your Honor.
3	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander. Ms. Stemme.
4	MS. STEMME: No questions.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
6	MR. ELLINGER: No questions. Thank you,
7	Judge.
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Are there any
9	Commission questions?
10	CHAIRMAN RUPP: I'm thinking. No, thank you.
11	JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioner Holsman.
12	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Thank you.
13	QUESTIONS
14	BY COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN:
15	Q. Thank you for joining us today. In reviewing
16	the exhibit containing the comments received from the
17	community meetings I noticed a number of landowners
18	mention concerns about the potential route crossing
19	streams or waterways. Based on your environmental and
20	permitting background, I was hoping that you could
21	answer the following two questions concerning this.
22	What considerations were applied and what
23	specific changes were made in response to those concerns

25

and how were responses and/or any changes communicated

with those landowners who expressed the concern and more

generally to the community?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

- A. Okay. I think to answer your first question about what changes were applied, so myself on the environmental team worked with our routing team and others to examine the comments received and all constraints and opportunities associated with routing the line to make any necessary adjustments to avoid and minimize and mitigate the impacts to the environmental resources.
- Q. Let's start with there were changes and there were adjustments done after the community feedback?
- A. I can't say for sure what changes were incorporated, but I know that we had a post public meeting conference, the team did, and we examined the comments received and how we could look to avoid and minimize resources.
 - Q. What about the second part?
 - A. Could you restate your second question.
- Q. How were the responses or any changes communicated with those landowners who expressed the concerns more generally to the public?
- A. I do not have the answer to that question. I think I would want to defer that to Mr. Kevin Chandler.

 Okay. There were also a number of concerns expressed by landowners with regard to structures on their impacted

2.2

- property which were described as historic or significant value legacy to the family. Can you address what criteria was applied to address those concerns and what, if any, changes were made in response to the specific concerns expressed by the impacted landowners?
- A. That would have also been an item that we would have examined in our post public meeting conference. I think I would need to defer the specifics of that to Andrew on our routing team.
- Q. So to summarize your response, you've examined it, you're aware of the comments, you've evaluated the comments, but you made no changes or suggestions on what to do about the concerns?
- A. I wouldn't say we made no changes to evaluate the concerns. I just cannot remember precisely what edits may have been made to the line in response to those public comments.
- Q. And the second part of my question has to deal with some farms are deemed organic or they have specific designation for how their crops are grown. Is that something that you have taken into consideration in terms of how these lines will impact those designations?
- A. So that is a bit out of my purview on the environmental team. That's more an issue that our development team examines. I do know that organic farms



1	Page 564
1	are something that the team has examined to understand
2	if and where they occur. But I think Kevin Chandler
3	would probably be the better person to answer that.
4	Q. So Kevin Chandler will potentially have the
5	answer to the changes other than the valuation of the
6	concerns?
7	A. Can you restate that question.
8	Q. So Kevin Chandler will have the evidence that
9	the Company has addressed these concerns other than
10	evaluating them?
11	A. I think, yes, he should be able to speak to
12	how the concerns were evaluated and addressed.
13	Q. And addressed?
14	A. Yes, I think if they are present.
15	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: All right. Thank you.
16	Thank you, Judge.
17	JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other Commission
18	questions? Okay. I have a few here.
19	QUESTIONS
20	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:
21	Q. Bear with me. I hope these weren't already
22	asked. In your direct testimony on page 8 you reference
23	the current certificated Grain Belt transmission line
24	route saying additional targeted environmental field
25	studies are to be performed in 2022, 2023 and 2024. Can

you explain what those field studies are and why they will continue through 2024?

2.2

A. Yes. So we have been undertaking a series of studies for the Project to include examination of protected species, wetlands and water bodies and cultural resources and also visual, potential visual impacts from the Project. So those studies have continued over multiple years for various reasons, some because some of the studies are seasonally restricted. So we have to carefully time them.

In the case of the cultural resources studies, those I think are particularly the ones that could go into 2024. And the scope of those studies is large. It's expansive because we are examining the entire portion of the Phase I Project and so it takes a lot of time to advance those studies.

- Q. And you also say that surveys will be used to further refine and reduce overall environmental impacts. Can you explain what you mean by refine? How would those be refined?
- A. I'm sorry, Judge, I want to see exactly -- oh, I see where you are.
 - Q. Also on page 8 somewhere.
- A. Refine and reduce. Yeah, that might not have been the best choice of words. What we always try and

- 1 do is avoid first impacts. And if we can't avoid, then 2 And if we can't -- also if we can't we minimize. 3 completely avoid, oftentimes we need to mitigate for 4 those impacts as well. So we are continuously -- As we 5 collect additional information on environmental 6 resources, we are continuously communicating that to the 7 other teams at Invenergy, our engineering, our 8 development team, and we are examining ways that we 9 could refine the Project so that we could meet that
 - Q. Okay. On page 4 of your surrebuttal you state, at lines 9 to 10 you state Grain Belt Express has issued a response to the Staff DR 50.1 and will supplement its response when necessary as required under the discovery rules in this proceeding. Do you recall what DR 50.1 asks?
 - A. I think I have it here.

avoidance and minimization.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Your counsel has it, if you don't. The Commission isn't privileged to have those DRs in front of them.
- A. Understood. Okay. So DR 50.1 was a request to provide copies of the completed reports that were listed in Data Request 50 and the request to update the response as the new reports are completed.
 - Q. What were the reports in Data Request 50?



A. So that included an assessment of whooping
crane habitat, an assessment of lesser prairie chicken
and greater prairie chicken leks, so leks are their
grounds where they mate, eastern spotted skunk habitat
Indiana bat misnetting and telemetry, as well as a bat
species habitat assessment, a lesser prairie chicken
habitat assessment, wetland and water body delineation
and cultural resources surveys.
Q. And just for the court reporter benefit, that
was lek, l-e-k, correct?

A. Yes.

2.2

- Q. So were those studies -- Have those studies been updated or those surveys?
- A. Some have. Not all are complete. So we are still underway with several of them.
- Q. And have any of them been completed since you filed your surrebuttal? I mean, have you given any more updates to Staff since your surrebuttal was filed?
- A. I want to make sure I'm getting the dates correct. So I think my surrebuttal was filed at the beginning of May. No, that was answer to the data request. One moment. Okay. Surrebuttal testimony in May. I think it was at that time that we did provide a copy of the bat misnetting report but since that time we've not provided any additional information.

Q. And do you know which of the other studies are still to be completed?

2.2

- A. Yes. I'm going to reference this so I don't miss any. So we are still working on the bat species habitat assessment, the lesser prairie chicken habitat assessment, the wetland and water body delineation and the cultural resources surveys.
- Q. And if you can say without it being confidential, did the results of any of those studies that aren't complete or in progress even, did that cause any issues with the proposed route of the Tiger Connector part of the Project?
- A. We are still underway with assessing resources for the Tiger Connector portion of the Project. I think, you know, we carefully routed and sited initially so that we could minimize the resources as we knew them on the desktop. One of our next steps will be to do field assessment for some of those resources and at that time then we'll examine if there are further edits that should be made to the design again to avoid and minimize impacts to resources.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Any further questions from the Commission? Seeing nothing. Is there any further cross-examination based on questions from the bench? From MEC.



Page 569 1 MS. WHIPPLE: No, Your Honor, thank you. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sierra Club. 3 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No, thank you. 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew. 5 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. 6 JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance. 7 MR. BRADY: No, thank you. 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel. 9 Thank you, no. MR. WILLIAMS: 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 11 MR. PRINGLE: No further questions, Judge. 12 Thank you. 13 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 14 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Aq Associations. 16 MR. HADEN: No, Your Honor. 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Hollander is out. Ms. 18 Stemme. 19 MS. STEMME: No questions. JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries. 20 21 MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge. Thank 2.2 you. 23 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any redirect? 24 No, Your Honor. MR. PLUTA: 25 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. I believe that



Page 570

1 completes your testimony and you may be excused. 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 (Witness excused.) 4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Is there any reason we 5 can't keep going with Mr. Burke? Seeing none, we'll 6 just continue on. Does counsel need a minute? 7 MS. CALLENBACH: Yes, Judge. Thank you. I 8 think are we talking about the environmental stipulation 9 briefly? 10 Judge, Grain Belt calls Andrew Burke, please. 11 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Mr. Burke, could you 12 raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm 13 that the testimony you're about to give at this hearing 14 will be the truth? 15 THE WITNESS: I do. 16 Thank you. If you could JUDGE DIPPELL: 17 please spell your name. 18 THE WITNESS: It's Andrew, A-n-d-r-e-w, Burke, 19 B-u-r-k-e. 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: You can go ahead, Counsel. 21 MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you. Mr. Burke, good 2.2 afternoon. 23 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. 24 ANDREW BURKE, 25 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified

1	Page 571 as follows:
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MS. CALLENBACH:
4	Q. Would you please state your business address
5	for the record?
6	A. It is 10 Al Paul Lane, Suite 103, Merrimack,
7	New Hampshire 03054.
8	Q. And by whom are you employed and what is your
9	title?
10	A. I'm employed by WSP USA, and my title is
11	Senior Planner/GIS Specialist.
12	Q. Thank you. Are you the same Andrew Burke who
13	filed direct testimony which has been marked as Exhibit
14	17, surrebuttal testimony which has been marked as
15	Exhibit 18 and Schedules AB-1 through AB-2? And those
16	are both public, Judge.
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Do you have any corrections to your testimony
19	at this time?
20	A. I do not.
21	Q. If I were to ask you the same questions again
22	today, would your answers remain the same?
23	A. Yes.
24	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, at this time I'd move

for the admission of Exhibit 17 and 18 and Schedules

1 AB-1 and AB-2. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection 3 to Exhibits 17 and 18? Seeing no objections, I admit 4 those into the record. 5 (COMPANY EXHIBITS 17 AND 18 WERE RECEIVED INTO 6 EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.) 7 Thank you. And the witness MS. CALLENBACH: 8 is available for cross. 9 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any cross-examination 10 from MEC? 11 Thank you, Your Honor, no. MS. WHIPPLE: 12 Sierra Club. JUDGE DIPPELL: 13 MS. RUBENSTEIN: No cross from Sierra Club. 14 Thank you. 15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Renew. 16 MS. GREENWALD: No, thank you. 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Clean Grid Alliance. 18 MR. BRADY: No cross, thank you. 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Staff. 20 MR. PRINGLE: No cross, Judge. Thank you. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. 2.2 MR. AGATHEN: No, Your Honor. 23 JUDGE DIPPELL: Aq Associations. 24 No questions, Your Honor. MR. HADEN: 25 Ms. Stemme. JUDGE DIPPELL:



Page 573

1	MS. STEMME: No questions.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Associated Industries.
3	MR. ELLINGER: No questions, Judge.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Are there any
5	questions for Mr. Burke from the Commissioners?
6	CHAIRMAN RUPP: None from me. Thank you.
7	JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm not seeing any. Well, I
8	have questions, I think. Let me make sure they haven't
9	been taken care of.
10	QUESTIONS
11	BY JUDGE DIPPELL:
12	Q. Are you familiar with Mr. Chandler's
13	testimony?
14	A. Not particularly, no.
15	Q. Okay. He discusses micrositing. Are you
16	familiar with micrositing?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Can you explain what that is?
19	A. It would be generally looking at structure
20	placement within a property and adjustments to the line
21	for a project, whereas I focus more on the overall
22	siting of the project, trying to get from point A to
23	point B, selecting a preferred route. Micrositing I
24	would consider as making those small adjustments based
25	on landowner negotiations and detailed surveys that are

1 not available at the time that my siting work is done. And so will Grain Belt use micrositing 2 Okay. 3 techniques with the Tiger Connector portion of the 4 Project? 5 That is my understanding they will, yes. Α. 6 Okay. JUDGE DIPPELL: That's the only 7 question I had. Were there any follow-up questions 8 based on my questions? I'll just throw it out there. 9 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, for the record Public 10 Counsel has no cross either of in response to your 11 question nor otherwise. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you, 13 Mr. Williams. All right. I hear nothing. Is there any 14 redirect based on my questions? 15 MS. CALLENBACH: No, Judge. No redirect. 16 Thank you. Well, that was pretty 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: 18 painless, Mr. Burke, I hope. 19 Thank you. THE WITNESS: 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: You may be excused. 21 (Witness excused.) 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is Mr. Chandler ready? We can 23 at least get his exhibits entered and get some 24 preliminaries done. I do think the bench may have some

questions for Mr. Chandler. Would you please raise your

- 1 | right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the
- 2 | testimony you're about to give at this hearing will be
- 3 | the truth?
- 4 THE WITNESS: I do.
- 5 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Can you state your
- 6 | name and spell it, please?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Kevin Chandler, K-e-v-i-n
- $8 \mid C-h-a-n-d-1-e-r$.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Counsel, you may go ahead.
- 10 KEVIN CHANDLER,
- 11 having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified
- 12 | as follows:
- 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MR. SCHULTE:
- Q. Could you please provide your business address
- 16 | for the record?
- 17 A. It's 1 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1800,
- 18 | Chicago, Illinois 60606.
- 19 O. And by whom are you employed and what is your
- 20 | title?
- 21 A. I'm employed by Invenergy LLC. My title is
- 22 | Director of Transmission Business Development.
- 23 O. Are you the same Kevin Chandler who filed or
- 24 | caused to be filed direct testimony on August 24, 2022,
- 25 | including Schedules KC-1 through KC-5?



1 A. I am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- Q. And just for the record I'll note that
 Schedule KC-2 was filed in five parts on EFIS due to the
 size of the files. So just want to note that for the
 record and for the compilation of the official exhibits.
 Are you also the same Kevin Chandler who filed or caused
 to be filed surrebuttal testimony on May 15, 2023,
 including Schedules KC-6 and KC-7?
 - A. I am.
 - Q. And do you have any corrections to those testimonies or schedules?
 - A. I do not.
 - Q. And I will note that the direct testimony, including Schedules KC-1 through KC-5 is marked as Exhibit 19 and the surrebuttal testimony of Kevin Chandler, including Schedules KC-6 and KC-7, is marked as Exhibit 20, and I would move for those to be entered into -- well, actually let me ask one more question. If I were to ask you the same questions as appearing in your direct and surrebuttal testimonies today, would your answers be substantially the same?
 - A. They would.
- 23 MR. SCHULTE: With that, I would move to enter 24 Exhibits 19 and 20 into the record.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: And I understand there is some



1 | Thank you for asking.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PRINGLE:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you have a copy of KC-5 with you?
- A. I believe so. Yes, I do have a copy of KC-5.
- Q. Could you turn to what at the bottom is numbered page 4 of it? It has your red lines regarding payments, easement payment and agricultural impact payment?
- A. Yes. Let me pull out the red-line version.

 Got it.
 - Q. And if the Project -- if the phasing of the Project were to be approved by the Commission, would the Company have any objection to including language in these red lines regarding what payments would go to which phase?
 - A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
 - Q. Just to -- From which to clarify for landowners if phasing is approved, would the Company amend these red lines to specifically say like which payment belongs to Phase I, which payment belongs to Phase II?
 - A. So I believe what we proposed here is essentially breaking out payment structure for both the HVDC portion of the Project, as well as the AC portion



- which is the Tiger Connector, and I think it's our understanding that the HVDC payment structure would remain the same whether Phase I or Phase II.
- Just to clarify for landowners, make Ο. Yes. sure there is no confusion if phasing is approved, would the Company specify Phase II only be receiving -- Phase II would only receive the 110 percent and the structure payments, correct, there would be no 150 under Phase II, correct?
- 10 Α. That is correct, yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

14

15

- 11 All right. And so pretty much if phasing is Ο. approved, would the Company be fine with making sure 13 that is clear in the landowner protocols?
 - That landowners along the Phase II route would Α. receive the standard HVDC payment?
 - Q. Correct, yes.
- 17 Yes, I think we're comfortable with making Α. 18 that suggestion.
- 19 All right. Thank you, MR. PRINGLE:
- 20 Mr. Chandler. I have no further questions.
- 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: MLA. Let me see. Do you have 2.2 substantial questioning, Mr. Agathen? We're like ten 23 until 5:00.
- 24 MR. AGATHEN: I would go past 5:00 I'm quite 25 sure.



1	MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, if I might go on the
2	record. OPC does not have any questions of this witness
3	at this time.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. Williams. I
5	didn't think I skipped you but maybe I did. I think
6	we'll just go ahead maybe and break here for the day and
7	then start with your questions in the morning.
8	MR. AGATHEN: Thank you, Judge.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: That's an opportunity for you
LO	to shorten your questions, not an opportunity for you to
L1	lengthen your questions.
L2	MR. AGATHEN: I kind of understood that.
L3	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Is there anything else
L4	that we need to discuss before going off the record?
L5	MR. BRADY: Yes, Sean Brady with Clean Grid
L6	Alliance. Mr. Goggin might be up for tomorrow based on
L7	the schedule. How do you want When do you want to
L8	talk about a time so I can make sure he's available? I
L9	can tell you right now, I checked with him, and the only
20	time he's not available is going to be after 4:00 p.m.
21	Eastern time. So I mean, if we break at noon tomorrow,
22	that gives him some time. How do you want to coordinate
23	that?
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: I'd say that he should just

give us the times he's not available and if he's okay

1 with being on standby, then if we get to him we'll call 2 him then. If for some reason he comes up when he's not 3 available, then we'll rearrange so that he can appear on 4 Thursday. 5 Okay. All right. MR. BRADY: 6 JUDGE DIPPELL: I do believe we have one 7 witness that's only available tomorrow, Dr. Loomis; is 8 that correct? 9 That should fall in line MR. SCHULTE: Yes. 10 with the existing schedule. He could go right after 11 Mr. Chandler. 12 Who was that? MR. AGATHEN: 13 MS. CALLENBACH: David Loomis. Okay. And I would like to 14 JUDGE DIPPELL: 15 start again at 8:30 in the morning. We'll also be 16 breaking for the Commission's regular agenda meeting at 17 10:15. So at ten o'clock we'll probably break. Just to confirm, I think I asked 18 MR. SCHULTE: 19 for witnesses who had testified prior to Mr. Monken to 20 be excused. Just to confirm, may Jonathan Monken, Jen 21 Stelzleni and Andrew Burke also be excused? 2.2 JUDGE DIPPELL: They may. They are excused. 23 Thank you. MR. SCHULTE: 24 And I quess that is JUDGE DIPPELL: 25 everything.

Page 582

1	MR. PRINGLE: One thing, we could maybe wait
2	until tomorrow, Judge, just we'll be swapping Michael
3	Stahlman and Claire Eubanks in the order of Staff
4	witnesses.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Have you already
6	discussed that with counsel?
7	MR. PRINGLE: Toss it around now.
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I will let everyone
9	know that. Anything else before we go off the record?
10	Okay. Thank you. We can go off the record.
11	(Thereupon, the proceedings concluded for the
12	day at 4:51 p.m. And will begin again tomorrow at 8:30
13	a.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



	Evidentially Healing	Julie 00, 2025
1	INDEX	Page 583
2	COMPANY'S WITNESSES:	Page
3	MARK REPSHER	
4	Cont'd Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen Cross-Examination by Mr. Ellinger	334 345
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Haden	351 375
	Questions by Chairman Rupp Questions by Commissioner Holsman	381
6	Questions by Judge Dippell Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle	384 391
7	Redirect Examination by Mr. Schulte	394
8	ROLANDA SHINE	
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Callenbach Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle	406 409
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen Cross-Examination by Mr. Haden	413 439
	Questions by Judge Dippell	443
11	Questions by Chairman Rupp Further Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle	454 456
12	Redirect Examination by Ms. Callenbach	457
13	STAFF'S WITNESS:	
14	CEDRIC CUNIGAN	450
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Pringle Questions by Chairman Rupp	459 463
16	COMPANY WITNESSES:	
17	CARLOS RODRIGUEZ Direct Examination by Ms. Callenbach	467
18	Cross-Examination by Ms. Whipple	469 471
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	474
20	Questions by Chairman Rupp Questions by Commissioner Holsman	478 479
	Questions by Commissioner Kolkmeyer	485
21	Further Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen Redirect Examination by Ms. Callenbach	488 489
22	AARON WHITE	
23	Direct Examination by Ms. Callenbach	492 494
24	Cross-Examination by Ms. Whipple Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle	495
25	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen Questions by Judge Dippell	500 504
-	~	



Evidentiary Hearing

	Evidentiary Hearing	June 06, 2023
1	INDEX	Page 584
2	(Continued)	Dago
	COMPANY'S WITNESSES:	Page
3	ROBERT BAKER	
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Schulte Cross-Examination by Ms. Greenwald	506 509
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen	511 520
6	Questions by Chairman Rupp Questions by Commissioner Holsman	524
7	Questions by Judge Dippell Redirect Examination by Mr. Schulte	535 537
8	JONATHAN MONKEN Direct Examination by Mr. Schulte	542
9	Cross-Examination by Ms. Greenwald	543
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Agathen Cross-Examination by Mr. Ellinger	545 548
11	Questions by Commissioner Holsman Redirect Examination by Mr. Schulte	549 555
12	JENNIFER STELZLENI	
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Pluta Questions by Commissioner Holsman	559 561
14	Questions by Judge Dippell	564
	ANDREW BURKE	
15	Direct Examination by Ms. Callenbach Questions by Judge Dippell	571 573
16	KEVIN CHANDLER	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Schulte Cross-Examination by Mr. Pringle	575 578
18		
19	Certificate of Reporter	587
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



Evidentiary Hearing

1		Page 585
1	EXHIBIT IND	
2	Company's Exhibits:	Received
3	5 Direct Testimony of Rolanda Shir accompanying Schedules RS-1 thro	
4	RS-3 (Public) 6 Surrebuttal Testimony of Rolanda	408
5	and accompanying Schedules RS-4 (Public and Highly Confidential)	
6	7 Direct Testimony of Carlos Rodri and accompanying Schedules CR-1	
7	through CR-3 (Public and Confide 8 Surrebuttal Testimony of Carlos	ential) 468
8	Rodriguez (Public) 9 Direct Testimony of Aaron White	468 and
9	accompanying Schedules AW-1 thro AW-1 (Public)	
10	10 Surrebuttal Testimony of Aaron W and accompanying Schedule AW-5 (Public
11	and Highly Confidential) 11 Direct Testimony of Anthony Pett	493 .i
12	(adopted by Robert Baker) and accompanying Schedules AP-1 and	AP-2 508
13 14	(Public) 12 Surrebuttal Testimony of Robert and accompanying Schedule RB-2 (Baker
1 4 15	13 Direct Testimony of Jonathan Mon accompanying Schedules JM-1 and	lken and
16	(Public) 14 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jonatha	543
_	Monken (Public) 15 Direct Testimony of Jennifer Ste	543
18	and accompanying Schedule JS-1 (16 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jennife	Public) 560
19	Stelzleni (Public) 17 Direct Testimony of Andrew Burke	560
20	accompanying Schedules AB-1 thro AB-4 (Public)	ough 572
21	18 Surrebuttal Testimony of Andrew Burke (Public)	572
22	19 Direct Testimony of Kevin Chandl Accompanying Schedules KC-1 thro	ough
23	KC-5 (Public and Confidential) 20 Surrebuttal Testimony of Kevin C	577 handler
24	and accompanying Schedules KC-6 through KC-7 (Public)	577
25		



	Evidentiary nearing	June 06, 2023
1	EXHIBIT INDEX (Continued)	Page 586
2		Received
3	Staff's Exhibit:	
4	101 Rebuttal Testimony of Cedric E. Cunigan, PE and attached schedules	461
5	MLA's Exhibit:	
6	302 G39 and Response	475
7	(All exhibits retained by the Public Commission.)	Service
8	Committee Torre	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		



1	Page 587 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF MISSOURI)
	, and the second
3	COUNTY OF COLE)
4	I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640, do
5	hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
6	stenographically report the foregoing Public Service
7	Commission evidentiary hearing; and that the transcript,
8	pages 330 through 585, is a true record of my
9	stenographic notes.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
11	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,
12	nor am I a relative or counsel connected with the
13	action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
14	Dated this 22nd day of June, 2023.
15	Beverly Jean Bertch
16	
17	Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



	Evidentiar	ry Hearing .	June 06, 2023Index: \$1022
\$	19,22 534:15 566:12 571:6 100 339:15 374:17	15 385:19 507:10, 21 559:16,17 560:1,3,5 576:7	441:16 445:7 460:15 496:4 502:6 523:17
\$10 386:1 \$15 386:1	403:10 440:20,23 445:21 506:20	150 579:8	526:10 576:17,24 577:5,7
\$154,959,241 477:19	1000 532:3 537:20	150-mile 496:19 1500 490:8	20-year 373:7 433:5
\$17 375:18,25	101 357:19 407:6 459:24 461:5,8,9, 12	16 508:4 559:17 560:1,3,5	200 383:1 496:15 20005 542:7
\$17.6 347:13 376:7	103 571:6	17 375:20 518:21 521:8 571:14,25	20003 342.7 2001 374:2,4
\$300 521:2 522:6 \$322 521:9	109 459:20 10:00 334:8	572:3,5 17.6 336:9,20	2016 384:21 392:12 400:11,14
\$4.95 436:2	393:24 394:6	338:13 339:5 340:1 345:20,25	473:13 478:21 2018 502:5
\$5.6 339:10 \$5.7 338:11	10:15 581:17 10:30 393:22	348:20 349:5 382:15 385:17	2021 512:23
\$500 411:3	11 395:3 432:23 495:13,14 502:18	18 348:23 407:6 414:14 452:2	2022 349:19 564:25 575:24
\$7.6 349:4,11 375:19	508:14,19,21 519:22	559:16 571:15,25 572:3,5	2023 512:19,22 559:16 564:25
0	11.5 496:7 11.6 336:9,20	1800 406:13 467:21 559:7	576:7 2024 383:8 564:25
0.2 496:8 03054 571:7	110 579:7 11:30 334:9	575:17 19 345:22 502:5, 16 518:21 576:15,	565:2,13 2025 378:15 2026 382:19 396:4
1	439:11 12 341:4 342:22	24 577:1,5,7 19-C 577:5,7	2027 352:2 357:22 359:3,25 361:7
1 406:13 440:19 444:2 460:6	438:9,11 508:15, 19,21 518:16	190 429:23	362:18 363:10 364:8,15 365:12
464:7,18 467:21 505:3,4 509:13,19	12:45 439:12 13 345:9,14,15	1B1 506:21	366:2 377:20 382:16
510:2 515:13 546:1 559:7	466:8 542:19 543:3,6,9	2	2028 451:14
575:17 1.25 425:3	1301 542:6	2 338:15,20 339:18 341:3 386:2 453:22	2030 363:7,10,15 378:15 383:8,14
1.5 425:3	14 489:10 511:24 515:13 542:20 543:3,6,9	464:7,18 496:21 515:13	2035 378:11 2050 378:12
10 345:10 373:7 385:18,19 400:19, 20 425:5 492:16 493:2,8,10 500:18	144,248,000 477:14 145 518:22,23	2-1/2 522:1 20 345:22 378:22 382:12 385:6	21 374:6,10 473:14 500:21 502:6 512:15
514:8,11 519:17,	173 010.22,23	414:14 421:13,15	22 460:6 546:11



.lune	06	2023	Index:	23	60
Julic	vv.	2020	IIIUCA.	~0.	·

23 444:2 505:6		ry Hearing 474 583:19	506 584:4
512:15 544:3	4	478 583:19	509 584:4
24 575:24	4 345:7 368:4	479 583:20	511 584:5
25 457:23	377:15 396:2	485 583:20	520 584:5
2500 385:6 394:23	407:22 463:6 464:23,24 480:11,	488 583:21	524 584:6
2:11 491:6	16 499:18 512:7	489 583:21	526 518:18
2:25 491:6	545:23 566:11 578:7	492 583:23	535 584:6
3	4.7 348:8	494 583:23	537 584:7
	4.8 348:8	495 430:2 583:24	542 584:8
3 341:4 407:8,13	4.9 438:4	4950 506:21	543 584:9
427:21 464:23,24 468:15	4.95 429:14 435:9,	4:00 580:20	545 584:9
3-1 341:4	18 436:15	4:51 582:12	548 584:10
3.1 342:21	40 335:22 352:17		549 584:10
30 352:17 378:22	400:23 496:11 497:16	5	555 584:11
380:3 400:20		5 347:20 386:2	559 584:12
30-year 335:18 336:7,25 337:9	40-year 336:7 346:23 372:14	394:21 406:20 407:2,21 408:3,4,	561 584:13
300 521:22 523:18	4000 488:7,9	6 443:25 480:12,	564 584:13
528:17	527:16	14,17 495:15 507:21 508:4	571 584:15
302 474:8,12,18	406 583:8	511:19,20,23	573 584:15
475:6,8,9,23	409 583:9	512:7	575 584:17
31 451:14	41 508:4 521:8	5.5 337:2 430:2	578 584:17
334 583:3	413 583:9	5.6 340:2	587 584:18
345 482:2 496:23, 25 583:4	4240-2.090(2)(F) 496:4	5.7 338:14 345:21 348:20	598 430:2,14,21 431:11
351 583:4	439 583:10	50 383:2 400:19	5:00 389:20
36 496:13,14	443 583:10	403:12 421:4	579:23,24
375 583:5	454 583:11	566:23,25	6
381 583:5	456 583:11	50.1 463:7 566:13, 16,21	
384 583:6	457 583:12	500 385:4 394:25	6 334:4 338:15,19
39 474:3	459 583:14	415:7 490:11	20 339:18 406:21 407:14,21,23
391 583:6	463 583:15	583:24	408:3,4,6 427:19
394 583:7	467 583:17	5000 402:14,18 488:6,11	444:2 460:14 524:14 528:4,13
3:55 540:18	469 583:18	504 583:25	60 421:4
	471 583:18	304 303.23	00 421.4



60/40 385:8 582:12 337:8 357:24 achieving 517:21 372:23 518:2 **600** 497:1,8 9 acknowledge acceptable 405:9 **60606** 406:14 558:6 467:22 559:8 accepted 349:8 **9** 428:20,21 432:8 575:18 390:6 422:14 acquiesce 558:9 492:15 493:2,8,10 531:3 537:21 **6:00** 389:20 acquisition 495:19 496:21 access 444:3 341:16 498:18 518:13 482:16 550:20 566:12 7 **acreage** 495:16 accessible 532:2 496:6 497:13,19 **9,300** 402:9 **7** 368:4 386:7 accidents 501:3 acres 495:19 **9.3** 402:15 394:15 404:25 502:12,14 496:1,7,8,9,21 **90** 402:15 414:11 427:21,22 acronym 363:2 432:5,13,15,17,23 accompanying **90-year** 433:1 386:17 524:3,4 506:25 507:4 433:12 468:4,14, **9300** 402:17 508:17 542:12 16,20,22 496:8 **Act** 350:4,9 363:1 559:15 512:4,7,14 517:23 **95** 347:19 397:17 518:4,6 accomplish 503:7 action 365:16,19, **7-C** 468:20,22 Α accordance 407:5 24 **7.6** 337:2 376:1,8 account 343:4 active 368:11 **A-A-R-O-N** 491:20 **70** 410:11 421:4 348:16 370:2 428:7 436:9 A-N-D-R-E-W 371:11 388:18 activity 369:24 **70s** 469:25 470:4 570:18 411:24 425:14 371:4 **74** 401:8 479:12 509:21 **a.m.** 334:1 582:13 actual 346:9,17 525:6 534:2 **75** 336:23 410:11 **Aaron** 491:13,20, 359:12 421:1 538:22 24 492:13 583:22 **760** 475:18 424:14 440:16 accounting 371:3 529:17 **AB-1** 571:15 572:1 **788** 430:19 431:10 **Accounts** 407:4,6 475:3,13 **ad** 374:24 **AB-2** 571:15 572:1 accreditation **7:00** 389:20 add 407:3 460:17 ability 365:8 384:3 388:12,18 389:1, 490:19 557:22 409:21 410:2 13 390:2 8 427:22 525:17.25 added 347:12 **accrue** 336:4 532:14 538:12,16 461:13 557:20 339:3 514:25 **8** 407:8,13 468:5, 539:16 547:9 **adding** 460:9 14,20,22 469:10 550:23 552:4 **accrued** 513:10,16 550:23,25 552:2 495:16 515:6,8,13 554:4 514:14 515:4 534:15 564:22 addition 349:1 **absence** 376:17 accurate 349:23 565:23 362:7 398:12 374:19 457:17 absolutely 448:16 402:22 475:22 **80** 420:19 421:8, 474:22 475:14 535:2 549:2 11 438:3 441:9,17 additional 339:2 489:15 551:14 445:7 349:3,11 379:9



384:19 385:11

482:4,17 518:17

386:12 481:9

AC 483:18 486:13

498:23 578:25

accept 335:20

80/20 385:1,8

8:30 334:1 581:15

achieve 550:1

achieved 501:8

535:18 546:25 571:25 affiliated 501:19 560:24 569:14 550:24 564:24 572:22 579:22,24 admit 408:4 461:8 **affirm** 405:18 566:5 567:25 580:8,12 581:12 468:21 475:8 458:25 467:3 583:3,9,19,21,24 additionally 493:9 508:19 491:15 505:21 584:5,9 537:24 543:7 560:3 572:3 541:14 556:10 570:12 575:1 Agathen's 437:9 additions 460:12, admitted 577:6 442:16 21 559:19 **affirmed** 528:10, adopt 355:7 **agency** 361:25 15 additive 402:1 **adopted** 335:12 362:5 423:22 403:14 afternoon 334:12 407:5 544:10 399:1 463:1,2 **address** 381:22 adopting 506:22 467:11 469:4 agenda 581:16 382:3 406:12 527:6 471:16 473:22 416:17 467:19 aggressive 364:9 485:1 493:24,25 adoption 335:3 470:22 506:18,19 agnostic 386:23 495:6,7 500:14,15 512:15 534:10 **advance** 565:16 399:1 509:7,8 511:4,5 542:5 549:23 541:23 543:22,23 advanced 427:23 agree 358:4 550:23 552:14,20 545:19,20 548:6,8 428:2 447:13 361:18 364:3 559:5,7 563:2,3 570:22,23 577:23, 449:5 453:8 370:15 371:11 571:4 575:15 24 391:18,19 400:13 advantage 389:25 addressed 464:9 401:16 411:6 **Ag** 351:16 456:21 491:4 465:3 550:14 412:19,22 433:24 461:25 488:17 564:9,12,13 advantageous 472:23 534:20 547:25 555:6 539:23 addressing 558:19 569:15 572:23 480:17 481:1 advantages agreed 412:1 **Agathen** 334:16, 551:11 526:22 539:18 445:15 556:20 18,24 335:15,16 adds 546:25 adversaries 344:18 345:12 agreement 416:19 551:6,23 393:4 413:3,7 adequate 463:7,13 458:8 473:3,4,6,7, 419:22 427:11,12, 533:10 advise 498:5 8 478:21,23,24,25 13 429:5 430:23 479:4,7,11 481:6 adequately 369:15 **AECI** 338:25 431:1,5,6,17,18, 484:4 486:9 386:21 387:1 **adhered** 537:20 21 432:3,4,18,20, 488:2,5,8,11 473:9,12,13 22 437:11,12 adjacent 387:1 481:8,13,17 agreements 439:4,7,16,17,18 433:17 483:16,20 482:14,16,19 adjusted 352:14 456:20 457:22 486:6,17 508:5 461:24 466:6 adjustment 473:21,25 474:5, agricultural 371:4, **AECI's** 481:22 556:20 11,15,16 475:5. 12 376:21 478:2 **AEP** 352:10 adjustments 11,12 477:25 496:6 497:4 562:7,11 573:20, affect 365:11 487:22 488:1,16 520:11 578:8 24 372:4 478:22 493:19 500:12,14, **Agriculture** 393:6 17 504:7 511:3,7 administration affected 520:25 439:19 504:9 512:21,24,25 362:4 538:21 536:22 561:1 514:12 520:9 admission 407:21 affects 366:8 ahead 334:2,5,17 536:21 545:18,22 468:14 493:2 335:15 369:18 547:23 555:5 508:14 543:3



390:20 394:4,8,10 404:20 406:3 439:15 459:7 467:10 491:22 493:22 500:13 505:16 529:16 540:21,22 541:22 556:8,17 570:20 575:9 580:6
Air 549:21 550:11
align 451:18
all-in 338:10 341:15 343:6
Allergy 351:20
alleviate 534:17
Alliance 391:3 408:17 455:23 462:14 471:10 487:14,21 494:25 510:20 545:11 554:23 560:17 569:6 572:17 577:19 580:16
allowing 421:8
aloud 495:24
alternate 354:15
alternative 416:8
alternatives 340:8 533:12
amend 353:9 354:5 578:20
amended 430:1 453:11 458:24 488:9 516:2,16,19 517:10,15,20 518:1 528:6 544:25 558:13
amendment 488:14 556:25
Ameren 350:14

352:10 377:16,19

```
382:22 386:9
 398:19 416:13,15
 433:9,19,21,22
 434:5,8 442:16,
 21,24 481:21
Ameren's 386:8
 434:6
America 404:3
 501:22 502:4
 552:16
amortization
 522:24
amount 347:15,17
 353:2 370:16
 393:21 419:6
 420:18 421:1
 436:6,12 445:15
 457:6 482:1
 502:24 503:17
 504:4 512:10
 513:9,14 515:3,22
 519:3 522:3 525:8
 533:19 534:5
 539:10,11 546:13
 547:5,8
amounts 525:19
analyses 347:8
 352:11,18,21
 374:20 518:1
analysis 335:17,
 25 336:22 339:5
 340:16 341:13,14
 342:1,13 343:10,
 21,25 344:4
 346:4,11,13,25
 350:2 354:1,17,23
 355:9,19,20
 356:12 357:9,19
 358:10,15 369:2
 371:7,8,10,11,18,
 21,23,25 372:4,8
 373:22 374:16,17,
 19 379:2,11,13,
 17,20 384:25
```

385:3 386:22 390:12 392:25 394:18 399:15,17 400:2,12,13 401:12 420:24 468:1 513:8,13 515:3 516:1,5,10, 15 517:19 518:10 519:6 546:11 analyst 529:9	apologies 352:7 377:24 400:24 apologize 351:16 376:25 451:6 502:2 549:17 apparently 361:3 557:23 appeared 376:21 521:14
analyze 343:15 390:14 396:10 397:1	appearing 576:19 appears 507:23,24
analyzed 374:15 537:25 ancillary 529:20	apple 399:22 400:1 applicable 557:6,
and/or 485:22 501:24 561:24	application 420:15 422:14,15, 16 423:13 524:25
Andrew 464:6 563:9 570:10,18, 24 571:12 581:21 584:14	529:16 applied 561:22 562:3 563:3
answers 336:11 407:17 414:8 429:8,17 460:24 461:1 468:11 492:24 501:10 508:10 542:22 559:23 571:22 576:21	applies 369:4 apply 419:24 426:4 434:18,24 435:5 548:21 approach 539:6 approaches
Anthony 335:12 506:23 507:7 508:9,15	538:24 appropriately 445:11
anticipate 479:15 495:19	approval 460:11, 19 530:20 544:24 546:22
anticipated 402:23 481:9 549:8	approvals 423:1 428:6 438:14,19 439:1 557:7,14,24
AP-1 506:25 AP-2 506:25 507:13,14 524:16	approved 384:21 453:17,19,21 456:7,12 476:10



516:8,13,17 517:1

519:12 522:10 ascertain 523:13 535:6 atmosphere 578:13,19 579:5, 372:13,20 asks 366:22 **assumed** 335:22 12 atmospheric 566:16 349:12 359:2,15 approving 516:16 365:18 366:24 551:8 aspects 530:15,23 395:25 397:8 533:23 approximate Attachment 401:3,5,8 402:5,8, 422:1 437:1,22 477:17 asserts 388:8 15,17 412:11,15 approximately **attacks** 551:19 524:16 assess 553:17 394:23 429:23 553:4 **assumes** 337:22 assessing 447:19 435:21 496:11,15, attempt 456:9 358:16,22 359:19 568:13 19 547:4 365:19 379:12 assessment 351:3 approximation 382:18 attention 405:14 412:22 546:5 436:7 519:2 501:2 538:15 assuming 357:25 567:1,2,6,7 568:5, **arbitrary** 378:3,11 358:2,7 359:10,18 attorney 478:18 6,18 361:9 382:23 arc 378:23 485:15,16 asset 440:16,17 397:19 416:10 442:7 area 361:3 416:16 attorneys 450:3 431:1 445:3 482:6 521:1 522:2 478:16 456:7,12 **assets** 440:3 526:10 532:25 441:3 454:20 attractive 377:3 assumption areas 368:3 512:6 526:6 527:1 351:25 352:1,4,5 attractiveness 521:11 532:15 550:22 553:1 353:17,21 354:16 376:23 355:14 356:13,18, arguably 382:2 **assist** 484:6 attribute 513:4 19,23 357:10 argue 368:23 assistance 423:21 518:22 359:12 360:6 425:16 484:8 attributes 530:15 361:11,14 363:21 **arguing** 369:16 **Association** 364:7,9 365:9 auction 533:4 376:21 367:6,7 372:19 argument 347:21 534:8,9,17 536:5 377:11 378:8 **Associations** argumentatively auctions 533:22 379:16 382:15,17 351:17 393:6 369:11 534:14 397:5 398:4 439:19 456:21 412:16 arithmetic 342:9 **August** 349:19 461:25 478:2 575:24 488:17 504:9 **Armories** 548:18 assumptions 520:11 536:22 355:8,22 357:22 **Aurora** 343:14 arrangement 547:25 555:6 358:9,10,14,16 387:4,9,13 403:16 380:24 426:6 561:1 569:15 359:1 361:8 404:9 443:6 553:12 572:23 363:20 364:3,4 authorities 454:25 arrangements 369:9,23 375:5,23 **assume** 336:1,4 482:15 433:23 377:19 379:8,10 352:19,22 355:8 authority 544:9, 387:22,23 388:1 359:1 360:13 **arrive** 401:7 12,19 392:9,19,23,25 365:15,16,23,25 **article** 364:22 395:11,18,23 373:3 374:10,12 authorized 385:4 365:7 404:4,6,8 412:1,8 381:5 397:14 automatically 451:23 as-built 499:18 416:24 417:3 532:6 500:3,4 430:16 431:7 **assure** 365:1 505:9 513:5 534:3



availability 550:17 552:18 avenues 361:23 362:1 average 388:24 400:25 401:4,12 402:3 aviation 371:22 avoid 483:12 562:7,15 566:1,3 568:20 avoidance 519:8 522:12 566:10 **avoided** 470:25 519:6 **AW-1** 492:16 493:3 **AW-5** 492:16,17 493:3 **AW3** 501:13 **AW6** 495:22 496:5 aware 340:4,15 362:12,15 363:19 364:23 414:24,25 417:14 473:1 517:4,8,9,14,18 520:8 527:2.13 528:9 529:3 551:10 552:6 563:11 В

B-A-K-E-R 506:3 **B-U-R-K-E** 570:19 back 334:3,6 341:12 342:9 350:2 351:24 361:2 365:4 366:17,18,21 367:2,17 368:4, 13,15,25 374:15,

18,23 377:5 381:18 382:11 384:15 387:8,10, 15,20 394:5,9 423:10 429:2 439:14,15 440:24 441:12 466:22,23 479:3,22 491:6,9 514:9,11 523:21 532:2 538:6,17 539:21 540:18,22 541:13

background 441:13 513:17,24 561:20

backwards 530:5

bad 371:8 **Baker** 335:13 484:20 505:19

506:3,10 507:3 508:16 509:7 511:4 521:15 537:8 540:8 584:3

balance 501:24 balancing 482:15

bank 420:7 422:21

banks 421:14 423:6

base 432:9 434:6 497:14 549:21 550:11

based 343:21 347:18 349:19 359:8,12 361:13 363:14 369:15 373:6,17 390:21 403:19 412:12 425:4 426:11 429:11 455:16 466:5,9,11 482:1 486:9 487:7,23 496:2 505:10 516:19 522:1

533:24 536:8 547:8 552:1 553:6 554:7,17 561:19 568:24 573:24 574:8,14 580:16

bases 548:13.14 553:22 557:25

basic 497:18

19 356:10 385:23 403:3 423:5 470:7 475:20 480:17 481:16 482:18 490:2,14 557:16

basically 346:15,

basis 342:6 346:11 352:12 355:2 357:21 369:14 374:24 385:5 398:8 410:2 416:8 424:11 428:7 438:7 444:11 446:16 447:15 448:3 449:15 475:21 525:20

bat 463:20 567:5, 24 568:4

batteries 379:12, 17,22,25 380:7,19

battery 379:6,9

Bear 564:21

began 334:1 462:22

begin 378:9,10 429:11 493:18 534:3 582:12

beginning 363:13 377:20 432:8,12, 23 433:12 438:11 485:20 499:17 500:21 502:18 511:24 518:16

567:21

begins 395:4 **behalf** 541:3

behavior 480:14

belief 461:2

belongs 578:21

Belt 334:4 335:18, 23 338:4 340:5,6, 22 342:24 343:11, 19 344:1,5,10,15 348:4 384:19 388:9 393:17 395:9 397:10,25 399:7 402:5,12 404:21 410:17 414:16,20,23 415:6,9,20 417:5 418:17 419:6,24 421:22,23,24 422:3 423:20,22 424:10 428:2,15 430:8 432:25 433:7,10,16 434:19,25 436:13 437:14 441:1,2,8, 22 442:6 444:3,12 445:25 446:3 453:12,13 457:5 462:19 463:6,18 464:1 466:24,25 469:13 470:11,20 473:2 477:6 483:13 484:5,15, 18 485:15 486:21 489:1 491:12

511:25 512:1 513:1,5 514:20 515:11 516:7,12 517:1,6,10,15,20

496:2,4 498:2,12,

22 501:16 503:22

505:16,18 509:17,

20,24 510:4,13,14

518:1,17 519:5,12 521:12 522:3

524:14 525:14



531:25 532:12 535:18 537:13 539:24 541:3,11 544:4 546:6 547:6 550:22 555:24 556:20 557:2,9 564:23 566:12 570:10 574:2
Belt's 404:20 434:20 435:1 463:5 489:22 491:10 500:22 540:23 556:9 557:21 558:12
bench 390:22 455:16 487:8 520:21 536:8 554:16,17 568:25 574:24
beneficial 412:23 482:22 510:10,15
benefit 343:22 346:12 347:20 351:10 376:9 386:3 392:4,5 399:25 482:10 510:5 528:23 532:24 534:11 567:9
benefited 353:21 515:10
benefits 336:4 338:8,13 339:12, 13 340:1 345:11, 20 348:23 350:8, 14,16,19 370:10 375:18 384:19 385:11,12 389:16 392:6 400:8 449:12,14,15 454:21 509:12,17, 18 512:7,10

514:14,19,23,24 515:18 516:2,6, 11,16 517:22

Evidentia
518:3 534:21 535:12,16,21,22, 24 537:10,16,25 550:1,4 555:18
Bentch 366:16
Berry 340:6
bidirectional 551:17
bidirectionality 525:8
big 539:2
bigger 472:20
bill 379:15
billion 336:9,10,20 337:2 338:11,13, 14 339:6,10,13 340:3 345:20,21, 25 347:13 348:9, 20,21 349:4,5,11 375:18,19,21,25 376:8 382:16 385:18,19 386:1,2 411:1,6 429:14 430:2 435:9,18 436:2,15 438:4 457:15
billions 338:3 435:23
bills 348:25
binary 356:14
binding 426:24
bipartisan 382:6
bit 341:2,10 371:6 379:18 391:16 422:12 449:24 458:21 469:9 482:24 493:20 509:16 514:16 528:17 529:15 532:8,17 533:3 538:21 540:14

549:18 551:3 553:21 563:23
black 529:21 531:10,15,19 532:15 551:4
blockstacking 528:2
bodies 463:23 565:5
body 567:7 568:6
book 428:20
border 383:24
borrow 435:15
bottom 364:8 366:5 425:5 474:25 508:1,4 578:6
bought 415:20
box 513:24
BRAC 553:22,24
Brady 391:4 408:18 455:24 462:15 471:11 474:13 487:15 495:1 510:21 536:15 545:12 554:24 560:18 569:7 572:18 577:20 580:15 581:5
brand 527:19
break 334:8 393:22,24 394:2,5 439:6,10,11,12 453:5 455:1 491:5,10 515:20 540:13,18 580:6, 21 581:17
breaking 449:8, 12,16 454:12

 , = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
581:16
breakout 385:16
Brian 540:21
briefed 340:12
briefly 361:15 381:12 390:11 398:2 424:17 469:3 489:3 493:16 509:6 537:5 548:6 555:14 570:9
bring 350:11 405:13
bringing 510:5 536:4 558:16
broad 396:9
broader 363:23
broadly 390:6
broken 448:21 465:24
brought 454:7 556:21
bucket 375:24 376:8
budget 420:23 421:1 437:13,18
budgeted 421:10, 11
buffer 445:15
build 341:18 353:19 354:16 357:15 364:5 370:23 391:25 392:7 449:9 454:17 503:6,7,23 526:21
building 359:17, 20 369:25 454:19 503:18



buildup 432:1
built 352:1 353:17 358:14 361:8,11 363:21 364:2,4 371:5 372:18 377:6 385:22 412:8 500:4 502:20,23 503:13 504:1,3 510:13 519:4,9 531:24 532:4
bulk 517:12,17
bullet 512:5,11 517:22 518:3,6
bump 513:23
Burke 464:6 570:5,10,11,18, 21,24 571:12 573:5 574:18 581:21 584:14
Burke's 464:15
Burns 482:4
business 406:12 467:19 542:5 559:5,7 571:4 575:15,22
businesses 346:18
buy 354:19 416:10
buyer 354:11 415:18 441:24
buyer's 354:24
buyers 353:6,18 354:19 398:10
buying 416:2
c
C-A-R-L-O-S 467:8

LVIGCITIO		
C-E-D-R-I-C 459:5		
C-E-J-A 363:2		
C-H-A-N-D-L-E-R 575:8		
C-U-N-I-G-A-N 459:6		
calculate 427:4		
calculated 426:1, 15 521:13 523:24		
calculation 438:1 521:14		
calibrate 527:25		
call 341:15 349:2 352:20 355:18,19 389:24 401:24 402:20 403:5,6 466:24 470:8 540:24 581:1		
Callaway 433:9		
called 341:5 342:5 346:7 347:2,10 376:5,9,11 379:25 380:3 385:25 387:3,7,14,15 389:4 401:21 413:15 428:10 457:24 469:23 470:5 483:25 552:11,23 557:24		
Callenbach 404:21 405:16 406:4,10 407:20, 25 408:8 419:15, 20 427:7 428:19, 22 429:1 430:22 431:12 432:14,19 437:2 450:5,10, 14,23 451:4 457:6,9 458:12 462:20 466:25 467:11,17 468:13,		
19 24 490.2 5		

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
492:3 493:1,6,12 505:12 570:7,21 571:3,24 572:7 574:15 581:13 583:8,12,17,21,23 584:15
calls 404:22 466:25 491:13 505:19 541:11 570:10
calm 525:16
camera 411:10,12 412:15 509:7
candidate 529:21
cap 352:23 363:23 364:10 365:10,19 484:11
capabilities 518:8 551:4,15 552:2
capability 389:5 409:20,21 551:17, 25
capable 524:19
capacity 336:8,18 340:25 341:5,9 342:19,23,24 347:2,5,7,13,15, 20,22 372:6 388:10 394:23,25 395:6 398:11 400:6,19,20,23 401:1,3,8,17 402:2,6,11,21 403:6,11,12 410:18 412:16 413:10,20 415:1, 24 416:2,12 417:17,19 419:6 424:11 427:16 428:5 458:9 459:15 480:21 518:18 524:20,24 525:19 534:18

525:19 534:18

550:17 551:1 552:18,25 capital 341:15,24 348:3,9 370:16 380:3,17 381:3 391:24 406:18 418:13 capped 420:19 **caps** 424:3 captured 389:16 **carbon** 349:6 352:1,2,19,20,23, 25 353:2 354:13 355:3,14,22 356:2,3,6,7,11,23 357:10,13 359:4, 12,13,14,16,25 360:15 361:7,21 362:1,6,11 363:4, 24 365:16.19 366:1,24 369:6,10 375:15,23 376:4, 5,10,11,14,16,18, 22 377:2,5,10,11, 12,17,19 378:3,9 379:1 381:16,18, 20,23 382:3,4,9, 12,16,23 383:5 390:4,5,7,14,17 395:19,24 396:3, 8,15,23 397:1,5,8, 20 398:4,17,20 484:11 533:16 539:11,14 care 353:23,24 378:18 523:2 538:15 573:9 career 374:6 carefully 565:10 568:15 **Carlos** 466:25 467:8,13 468:2 583:17



18,24 489:2,5

490:22 491:12,23

carry 444:4	
carrying 389:5	
case 340:5 358:3 364:20 384:19,21 392:10,12 394:24 395:1,13 397:4,5 400:11 416:23 419:1 420:22 424:23 444:12,22 445:6,17 448:8 459:19,23 465:10 470:11 472:10,19 483:19 484:7 486:5 502:24 506:22 507:3 516:1,3,8,13,18 519:12,13 520:7 529:6 531:25 539:4 565:11	
case-by-case 447:15	
cases 356:11 357:15 388:23 395:23 414:20	

415:1,6 465:20 502:4,6,9 514:7 526:18 530:21

cash 419:3 424:22 426:11 436:4,5 445:12 446:10,11, 15

catch 431:3 541:5

catching 528:12

caught 366:21

caused 523:19 542:12,16 575:24 576:6

causing 531:23 532:10

CCN 392:10 544:25

Cedric 459:5.9

583:14

CEJA 363:2

cell 494:9,11,13

center 531:3

centers 351:8

certainty 409:25 410:1,10 446:8 544:25 545:3 554:2

Certificate 584:18

certificated 564:23

certification 447:3

cetera 339:4 341:17 349:7 351:8 370:2 383:18 404:7

CFR 407:6

chaired 531:8

Chairman 375:8,9, 11,13 381:8 443:18,19 454:5. 6,9 455:13 462:24,25 463:4 464:17,24 465:2, 25 466:1,2,5 478:11,12,15 479:17,22 504:19 520:21,22,24 521:21 524:1,2,4, 7 549:6,7,9 561:10 573:6 583:5,11,15,19 584:5

challenges 351:4 389:1 449:13 550:23

challenging 356:24 381:1

chance 360:14 474:17 539:9

Chandler 562:23 564:2,4,8 574:22, 25 575:7,10,23

576:6,16 577:12, 23 579:20 581:11 584:16

Chandler's 573:12

change 346:13 347:6 350:1 372:25 373:10,17, 18 381:23 410:23, 25 411:2,5 437:19 457:12,15,16,19 460:14 469:14,15 471:22,23 472:1, 3,17,23 475:18 476:9,12,17 482:13 489:8,15. 19,20,22,23,25 490:6,13,16 498:15,16,20 502:24 507:10

changed 350:2 392:9,20 414:5,8 492:8

22

changing 428:13 472:18 481:20

characteristics 532:20

characterize 479:25

charge 348:12 544:6

charged 346:9

charges 482:17

chart 407:4 501:15 502:5

classes 342:10

clean 374:5 391:3

405:8,11 408:17

455:23 462:14

471:10 487:14

494:25 510:19 524:24 536:14 545:10 554:23 560:17 569:6 572:17 577:19 580:15
clear 338:23 348:22 382:15 415:19 423:11 439:24 451:24 579:13
clearer 494:19
clients 373:23 374:21
climate 363:1 372:16,25 373:9, 18 381:23
close 418:22 419:4 446:2,24 447:4,6 449:3
closed 448:7
closer 421:2 506:5 513:20
closes 423:10
closest 550:10
closing 418:6 421:2 423:18
Club 390:24 408:13 455:19 462:10 471:6 487:10 494:22 509:3 536:10 543:18 554:19 560:13 569:2 572:12,13 577:15
Co-op 518:23
coal 533:20 539:15
COD 451:15
coded 411:16,17,

	E. de
	Evic codes 411:25
	coding 412:2
	coherent 537:2
	collect 566:5
	college 374:7
	combined 340: 344:16
	comfort 447:11
	comfortable 387:19 533:22 579:17
	commander 544:18
	commentary 338:23
	comments 381:22,24 532: 561:16 562:5,1 563:11,12,17
5	Commerce 418
	commercial 416:18 418:9 422:21 423:14 451:13 522:21 523:4
	Commission 337:13 340:5,1 342:4 368:9 37 384:11 390:19 405:14 418:17 455:14 456:13 459:16 460:8,1 462:24 466:3 478:11 479:19 482:24 487:6 498:6,11 504:1 528:1 549:6 557:5,12 558:1 559:25 561:9 564:17 566:19 568:23 578:13

Hearing June 06, 2	2023Index: clearcompetit
Commission's	communities
472:10 473:11	553:20
544:24 581:16	community
Commissioner 381:10,11,12,15 384:9 479:19,21	561:17 562:1,11 companies 388:4
484:22,24,25	454:25 534:11
485:4 487:3,24 524:8,9,11 535:3, 5 549:10,12,13, 14,16 554:14 561:11,12,14 564:15 583:5,20 584:6,10,13 Commissioners 443:18,22 573:5 commissions 553:17	company 348:5 353:16,21 392:5 402:8 408:6 414:20 440:2 443:5 444:22 456:8,9,14,15 460:8,16 465:18 468:22 493:10 499:25 508:21 511:13 543:9 560:5 564:9 572:5 577:7 578:14,19 579:6,12 583:16 COMPANY'S 583:2 584:2 comparable 519:11 compare 339:7 340:2,17,21,24 341:4 342:23 343:10 344:4,14 399:6 431:13
commitment 418:11 422:23 423:12,16 438:13	
447:11 526:2 commitments 398:13 438:18,25 445:9 447:9 525:13 committed 398:20 458:9	
Committee 531:8 common 378:2	compared 338:12 340:6 341:7 344:2

446:6 550:13

communicated

553:9 561:24

communicating

communication

483:1,5 530:3

communications

372:1 480:2,5

483:16 529:1

562:20

566:6

552:6

npare 339:7 0:2,17,21,24 1:4 342:23 3:10 344:4,14 9:6 431:13 **npared** 338:12 340:6 341:7 344:2 391:21 395:21 412:21 482:10 531:16 comparison 344:9 399:13



357:8

388:10

563:21

521:4 522:9

418:10 561:22

383:10 428:6

compilation 576:5 455:2 complaint 520:7 561:25 complement 510:1 526:21 527:23 complementary 401:24 509:18 510:4 12 complete 379:18 421:18 423:2 538:4 567:14 568:10 505:14 completed 379:13 384:8 402:13 conclusion 418:5 439:16 451:2,12 463:10 367:9 405:5 466:16 476:4 477:13 479:16 494:18 500:1 503:25 550:5 566:22,24 567:16 568:2 556:21 557:1 completely 367:8 558:9,10,12 414:4 503:18 566:3 completes 381:8 483:21 556:4 570:1 completing 516:5,10 392:16 completion 364:15 391:20 **confer** 411:9 412:20,23 418:15 450:15 450:21,22 451:19 conference compliance 464:2 557:5,12 559:12 complicated 356:21 368:3 confidential components 341:14 346:5 408:5 419:17 454:17 555:23

computer 513:24

concept 376:12

concern 463:20 concerned 378:25 **concerns** 463:16, 25 561:18,23 562:21,24 563:3. 5,13,15 564:6,9, concluded 582:11 concludes 404:17 458:14 490:25 365:11 366:13 426:21 452:23 concurrent 529:13 condition 453:11 conditions 423:5 455:11 481:5 **conduct** 420:24 conducted 519:23 562:14 563:8 conferred 556:22 confident 442:5 386:18 407:13 450:2,4,16 468:17 474:10 492:17 493:5 568:9 577:1,2

configuration 528:6 considerably configurations 395:5 consideration confirm 581:18,20 confirmation 540:25 considerations confused 335:3 345:19 375:16 considered 376:4 confusion 376:3 499:19 579:5 congestion 517:7 **Congress** 361:20, 22 382:20 397:17 Congressional 361:17 connect 434:19.25 470:7 482:18,19 483:19 connected 514:20 530:12 544:3 connecting 433:8, 20 477:6 530:13 connection 433:8 469:18 477:15 479:1 480:25 481:1,17,25 482:14 485:8,13 486:1,3,13,14 526:3 529:18 connections 485:17 Connector 463:18 496:8,11,22,23 499:10,14,22 568:12,14 574:3

448:20 450:11 546:21 consistent 357:4 395:12,15 398:7, 25 402:7 consists 424:22 constant 373:4 395:15,17 constitute 411:4 constitutes 415:10 416:1 489:23 constrain 366:7 constrained 353:1 355:3 356:8 359:15 365:16 382:23 395:19.25 397:1,9,20 398:4, 17 **consent** 556:25 353:20 354:12

constraints 397:6 499:4 562:6 construct 409:6 constructed 529:24 constructing 384:6 456:8.14 construction 341:16,21 418:6, 14 419:25 423:3 425:2 435:11,14 436:2,22,23



579:1

conservative

441:17,19,21,22 442:3,6 444:6 446:25 447:17 450:21,22 451:1, 11,12,21 453:13 500:2,23 501:3, 16,17 502:19 529:12 547:18

consultants 448:17 519:23

consulting 374:7 394:22 401:4 544:20 557:21

consumers 336:5 346:6 347:3,10 400:7

consumers' 348:25

consumption 346:10

Cont'd 583:3

contact 421:22,23 422:2

contained 407:16 577:3

contemplating 415:4

context 431:15,21, 22,25 451:15

continental 552:1

continue 437:19 460:11 534:6 565:2 570:6

continued 334:23 390:7 565:8 584:1

continues 383:3

continuing 361:25 463:16,25 496:2

continuously 566:4,6

contract 410:20 412:9,10 413:10, 14 414:1 417:16 426:6,23 427:14 442:25 447:14 457:24 458:2,7

contracted 412:17 413:20 446:17 501:23

contracting 544:9,

contractors 501:6, 17 502:10

contracts 350:21 410:3,18 411:21 423:3 424:14,24 428:5 443:5 446:4,9,21,22 447:2,5,24 448:11 449:4 472:14

contractual 415:4 553:12

contractually 441:21

contradictory 375:17

contribute 459:18

control 362:1 415:19 416:11,15, 20 455:12 531:3

controllability 551:16

Converge 542:10

conversation 375:15 379:4 457:11

conversations 454:10,24 529:3

converse 355:10

Conversely 401:19

converter 411:7
434:21 435:2,6
469:14,24 470:3,5
472:19,21 480:13
481:20 485:9,10,
25 486:4,13
490:7,8,9,12,15
502:19,23 503:1,
12,24 504:2,6
524:20

cooperate 483:6

cooperatives 386:14 393:16

coordinate 483:17 580:22

coordination 544:17

coordinators 552:16

copies 566:22

copy 336:11 405:8,11 428:15 430:25 431:15,16 458:24 464:13,14, 22 474:6,22 495:10 501:9 567:24 578:4,5

corporate 445:1, 17,18

correct 335:23,24 336:2,10,20 337:3,5 338:5,7, 17 342:25 344:13 349:21 350:22 352:3,4 354:16,19 357:23 358:6 360:15,16 363:10 364:3,4,12 365:5 370:19,23 374:2, 8,9,16,17 375:21, 22 377:9,17,18 380:15 382:18 392:13,14 395:10, 22 396:1 397:6,7, 15,22 401:2 402:18,19 407:23 410:23,24 412:6 413:11 414:16,17, 18.22 415:17 417:1,24 418:6,25 419:1,2,13 420:12 421:21 423:7,18 424:1,2 425:4,12 427:24,25 428:11, 12 429:14,15,19, 20 430:3,10,14,15 432:10,11 433:2 435:17,19 436:14. 17 437:7,15 438:6,15,16,20 439:3,17,18 440:3,21,22 443:1 446:1 451:16 452:8 453:15,16 454:16 458:3 461:1 468:17 471:24 474:3,9,10 475:4 476:1,21,24 477:24 482:14 485:9 488:3.4.15 490:20,21 492:9, 10 493:5 494:6,7 496:12 498:3,12 500:24,25 502:8, 11,21 503:2,16 507:1,14 509:14, 15 511:14,15,17, 22 512:2,3,7,8,12, 13,17,18,20 513:3,6,7 514:25 515:1,9,14,24 516:3,4 518:8,9, 19,20,25 519:8, 10,15,23,24 533:7 546:2,3,7,19 547:22 548:15,23 557:18 558:3 567:10,20 577:1 579:8,9,10,16 581:8



corrected 405:11, 15 411:13 435:3 461:12 512:24
correction 460:3 508:7,8
corrections 406:24 407:7 460:1,12,21 461:13 468:7 492:19 507:6 542:25 559:19 571:18 576:10
correctly 349:13 395:1,14 476:13 485:6 532:9
cost 338:8,10 339:7,12,19 340:3,7,16,21,23 341:13,17,25 342:5,13,17 343:2,4,6,8,11,12, 15 344:2,5,6,9,11, 14,15 376:9,11,14 392:7 396:9 397:10,24 399:6, 7,11,13,15,16,19, 21,23 400:12 404:1,6 409:15 410:25 411:7 428:14 429:12,17, 24 430:9,19 431:9 432:9 435:9,10, 16,21 436:6,19, 21,24 437:1,14 444:12 456:10 475:14 477:1,13 479:12 481:18 484:13 504:5 517:11,16,21
518:2 519:7,8 521:2,23 522:23 523:16,20 528:18

534:14 553:18

costs 338:12,14,

17 339:22 341:15,

Evidentia
16,17,22,24 344:1
345:11,21 346:7,8
347:2,15,16,24,25
348:1,2,9,11,17
370:20 380:4,17
391:24 420:20
421:9,12 429:14
430:1,8,10 432:9
433:14,15,20,23
434:9,10 435:13,
14 436:1,3,12
437:25 438:1,2
442:13,17 446:12
447:20 448:2,10
452:25 453:3
456:16 457:19
474:1 475:2,22,24
476:3,7,11,16,17
477:2,5,13,19,21
481:9,13,16
484:17,18 518:10
522:9,24 523:6,18
counsel 376:21
377:15 391:5
399.4 400.10 18

counsel 376:21
377:15 391:5
399:4 400:10,18,
24 404:24 405:12
408:19 411:10
413:9 453:15
455:25 457:11
462:6 467:10
471:12 487:16
489:7 495:2 506:8
510:22 536:16
537:9 545:13
554:25 555:17
556:17 558:6
560:19 566:18
569:8 570:6,20
574:10 575:9
582:6

count 383:24

counter 355:20 357:15

counterparties 419:16

counterparty 380:24 County 433:9 couple 344:25 347:24 462:22

470:17 487:23 527:18 531:18 532:1 548:11 **court** 405:1,23

459:4 467:7 474:15 491:19 506:1 541:19 567:9

courts 365:4

cover 444:14 445:13 446:12,17 447:20 448:1,13

coverage 424:18 425:2,7,9,19,21, 25 426:2,4,8,13, 15,20,25 427:4 445:16

covered 374:13 398:2 436:4,5 445:8 489:21

covering 557:25

covers 363:24

COVID 538:21

CR-1 468:5,15

CR-3 468:5

crane 567:2

cranking 532:17

create 355:15 402:2 544:25

creates 371:12 403:5

creating 356:4 357:7 444:10 527:1 550:8 creative 381:6

credit 379:6,12,16, 19,21,22 380:1,7, 11,18 446:15,18

credits 350:11,15, 19 379:9 380:14, 17,19

criteria 563:3

critical 550:19,20 551:1 552:14,19, 23

crops 563:20

cross 408:9 439:16 462:15 468:25 471:11 487:15,19 493:13 495:1 510:21 536:15,19 543:12 545:12 554:24 555:3 558:11 560:18,22,24 572:8,13,18,20 574:10 577:10

cross-examination 334:15,23 344:20

345:1,18 351:17, 22 368:11,16 390:21 391:9 399:4 400:17 408:11,25 413:6 439:22 455:16 456:4 461:21,22 466:4,9 469:2,6 471:5,18 473:19. 24 478:2 487:7,25 493:15 494:1,21 495:8 500:10,16 508:24,25 509:9 511:6 536:8 537:9 543:15,24 545:21 548:9 554:17 560:9,11 568:24 572:9 577:12 578:2 583:3,4,6,9,



10,11,18,19,21, **cycle** 340:10 442:12 444:18.21 definitions 409:3 23,24 584:4,5,9, 344:16 357:23 445:4,7,11,15,17, 410:22 10,17 21 446:12,17 definitively 357:12 448:1,13 D cross-examine degrading 551:25 369:15 **decades** 341:20 degree 349:24,25 **D.C.** 542:6 553:8,9 538:12 crossing 499:3 446:7 **Dakota** 391:13 561:18 decarbonize delayed 502:20 398:14 549:22 **CSESER** 552:22 damage 523:4 delays 480:1 531:23 December 473:14 **CSR** 496:4 deliberately data 336:11.13 decided 398:3 **cultural** 565:6,11 551:24 337:7 351:8 567:8 568:7 deciding 352:15 428:16 429:18,22 delineation 567:7 **Cunigan** 334:10 decision 370:19 430:17,24 431:8 568:6 458:22 459:5,9,14 420:21 422:10,11, 474:3,23 496:5 deliver 522:4 460:20 461:4,21 13,20 434:1,3 501:9,12 526:12, 525:14 551:7 466:14 558:10 453:1,4 465:15, 19 527:21.23 583:14 16,23 469:14 566:23,25 567:21 delivered 340:7, 21,22 343:11,12 Cunigan's 558:9 decisions 352:14 date 378:25 422:1, 344:1,2,5,6,9,10, 397:2 398:8 4 451:13 499:7 **curious** 381:21 14 386:13 388:9 416:20 465:9,20 505:2 **current** 412:3,8,12 395:6,8 399:6,7, 514:9 554:8 dates 450:21 419:10 440:23 13 525:18 declaration 530:4 567:19 447:2 476:17 delivering 386:8 477:5 490:20 **David** 340:6 decline 404:7 524:20 499:10 518:10 581:13 decoupled 534:15 **demand** 347:10 544:20 564:23 day 401:19,20 **deduct** 380:3 351:6 **curves** 404:7 403:4,10 525:17 **deemed** 563:19 democracy 358:2 533:5 580:6 **customer** 411:21, 582:12 defense 544:8 Democrat 358:6 24 412:10 423:2 547:9,10,12,14,16 360:10,13 424:14,24 426:23 days 347:5 361:20 548:17 551:2,5 428:4 446:9 535:23 Democrats 381:19 552:13,19,23 447:5,24 448:11 **DC** 494:5,9,12,15 demonstrable 553:2,19 554:2,4, 449:4 481:3 538:20 5 **DCEI** 552:23 482:20 490:10 553:13,15 demonstrate **defer** 429:17 customers 338:3 446:9 562:23 563:8 deal 382:24 398:14 412:4 441:15 563:18 413:21 427:15 demonstrated deference 405:1 447:8 512:16 422:23 debates 349:5 **define** 392:2 513:11,16 518:22, demonstrates **debt** 420:25 409:3,13,14,16,24 24 522:20 535:14 517:10,15 424:18,21,22 defined 472:9 **cut** 356:15 425:19,25 426:1, demonstrating definition 409:9 CV 374:1 7,13,18,20 435:10 423:1 457:12 471:22,24 436:6,19,21 **Cyber** 552:21 472:7 489:8,18,19 437:15 438:1,12



denominator 342:1,6,15 424:25
Department 419:24 544:8 547:9,12,15 548:16 552:13,19 554:4
depend 526:7
dependent 398:23 436:21 532:19
depending 337:21 437:17 470:13
depends 433:23 447:7
depth 522:17
derisked 447:14
derived 512:10
deriving 400:8
descending 486:21
describe 411:18 424:5,17 481:22 496:20 546:9
describes 527:4
describing 446:6 525:1
design 411:2 457:16,20 472:18 490:12 498:10,16 499:10,14,21,24 500:1,23 568:20
designated 544:11
designation 563:20
designations

563:22

24 553:14

designed 552:12,

Evidentia
desire 551:23
desktop 568:17
detail 465:17 522:18
detailed 573:25
details 403:24 524:25 527:10 529:19 530:18
determination 463:22
determine 388:22 390:17 448:18
determined 517:1, 5 528:5
developed 527:17
developers 402:8
developing 380:22
development 370:7 377:13 422:12 427:24 428:3 444:4 446:24 447:7,10, 13 449:1 509:20 514:3,4 525:22 529:7,8,12,13,17 563:25 566:8 575:22
developmental 428:10
developments 364:18 376:19
devices 527:18 534:4 551:8
diameter 497:5,6
differ 384:20 415:24 416:1 444:25
differed 395:4

-I:ff 0.44.0.4
difference 341:24 342:19 346:16,21 347:9 355:23 366:3 367:12 380:2 401:11 409:9 416:3 497:18 532:24
differences 341:21
differently 464:22
difficult 539:20
difficulties 522:14
diffusing 372:21
dig 373:19
digest 414:4 538:23
diligence 449:18
dioxide 349:7
Dippell 334:2,17 335:7,10,15 344:19,22,24 351:15 353:14 354:3 358:12,20 359:7 360:9,18,24 366:16,20 367:14, 20,22,24 368:2, 19,23 369:5,18 375:7 381:10 384:11,14 390:19, 24 391:1,3,5,7 392:8 393:3,6,8, 10,12,15,19,23 394:4,8 396:20 403:17 404:16,19 405:10,17,22 406:1 407:23 408:2,10,13,15, 17,19,21 413:2 419:18 427:10 428:24 429:2 431:3,16,20 437:5 439:4,9,14,19 443:10,13,15,17,

21,24 450:1,8,12, 17,24,25 451:6,10 453:23,25 455:14, 19,21,23,25 456:2,19,21,23,25 457:2,4 458:14,18 459:3,7 461:7,11, 15,16,22,25 462:2,4,6,8,10,12, 14,16,18,21 464:21 466:1,7, 13,16,20,22 467:2,6,10 468:16,19 469:1 470:1 471:5,8,10, 12,14 473:19 474:9,12,14 475:7 478:1,4,6,8,10 479:18 484:24 487:5,10,12,14, 16,18,21 488:17, 19,21,23,25 490:24 491:4,9, 14,18,22 493:4,7, 14,22 494:21,25 495:2,4 500:10,13 504:8,11,13,15, 17,20,23 505:9, 13,16,20,25 506:4,7 507:16,19 508:18,25 509:3,5 510:19,22,24 511:2 512:21 513:19,22 520:10, 14,16,18,20 521:15,20 524:8 535:4,9 536:7,10, 12,14,16,18,20, 22,24 537:2,4 540:7,12,21 541:4,7,12,18,22 543:5,13,18,20 545:10,13,15,17 547:24 548:2,5 549:5,12 554:15. 19,21,23,25 555:2,4,6,8,10,12



556:3,8,13,17 557:16 558:1,4, 20,24 560:2,10, 13,15,17,19,21,23 561:1,3,5,8,11 564:17,20 568:22 569:2,4,6,8,10,13, 15,17,20,23,25 570:4,11,16,20 572:2,9,12,15,17, 19,21,23,25 573:2,4,7,11 574:6,12,17,20,22 575:5,9 576:25 577:4,11,15,17, 19,21 579:21
580:4,9,13,24 581:6,14,22,24 582:5,8 583:6,10,
25 584:6,13,15
direct 338:16 344:9 345:13 348:3,9,23 349:18 354:4 368:15 372:7 377:1 384:16 392:17 394:14 399:13 404:25 406:9,20 407:2,16 414:12 420:7,13 425:5
427:19 432:6,16, 18 433:3 438:9,21 443:25 459:12 460:4 467:16 468:3 469:9 492:2,10,14,23

500:19 502:16

16,18 508:9,14

512:14 515:6

518:13 528:4

542:2,12,18

511:17,19,20,23

544:1,18 545:23 551:17 553:1

559:2,15 564:22

571:2,13 575:13.

506:13,22 507:7,

24 576:13,20 583:8,14,17,23 584:4,8,12,15,17
direction 362:22 370:3
directionally 349:25
directly 340:24 348:25 371:11 374:22 380:8 384:1 385:14 386:19,21,25 387:1 388:25 399:6,18 400:7 401:25 482:18,19 521:12 527:14 535:14 536:2 544:13 552:7,21
director 492:6 506:17 552:9 575:22
disadvantages 449:24
disagree 338:6 354:20 366:25 400:15 410:13,14, 16 498:4 501:5 521:18
disagrees 360:5
disaster 531:9 539:5
disasters 531:12 551:5
disburse 422:24
discount 337:21, 23
discounted 446:16
discovery 566:15
discretion 365:4
discuss 537:25

558:17 580:14 discussed 346:1 350:12 351:12 398:5 412:5 442:22 472:8 484:2 537:10 539:4 582:6 discusses 535:11 573:15 discussing 423:20 454:11 488:13 538:2 552:3 discussion 358:25 419:10,14 455:5 489:13 531:10 discussions 382:6 402:7 416:24 417:4,7,8 419:9 421:25 423:12 428:8 434:15 526:24 disparities 534:17 dispatch 532:14 dispatchable 532:25 disruption 503:4,9 disruptions 550:17 distinguish 436:1 distribute 349:14 474:6 distributed 432:17 distributes 510:14 distribution 553:1 disturbances 531:1 diurnal 401:22 diversify 549:22 diversity 534:5

driven 455:10 518:17 547:8 **driver** 454:15 **DRS** 566:19 dual 526:9 due 449:18 497:19 576:3 **Duke** 352:11 353:24 duly 406:7 459:10 467:14 491:25 506:11 541:25 559:1 570:25 575:11 **dumped** 385:14 duplicative 509:18 549:17 **durable** 509:12 dwarf 535:25 dynamic 373:9 dynamically 365:11 dynamics 369:23 Ε **E-R-C-O-T** 524:5 earlier 367:4,6,10 369:1 380:13 381:16 383:4 398:5 403:8

439:25 442:15 449:1 457:10 484:10 499:14 528:19,24 532:8, 17,23 541:8 551:3 557:17 early 334:9 447:9, 11 498:9 easement 557:4,

11 578:8 easements 441:9, 16 easier 350:15,18 549:8 553:16 **easily** 523:2 east 486:5,8 **eastern** 485:21 567:4 580:21 **easy** 357:19 400:22 534:25 echo 388:16 economic 349:15 350:6 357:2 369:24 370:7,18, 21 371:8,10 377:14 379:5 392:15 409:3,5,7, 10,13,18 427:2 449:14 452:14,17 economically 382:2 391:21 392:3 412:20,23 448:6 452:20,23 **edits** 563:16 568:19 **effect** 363:6 371:25 372:13,21 401:24 453:2,4 523:7 531:22 532:11 effective 375:25 389:4 effectively 342:1,7 343:20 347:3 354:25 401:22 403:4,25 **effects** 372:9 514:3,5 521:1,13 522:4,12 523:1,21

efficiency 372:13 efficient 382:3 391:24,25 499:1 **efforts** 552:12,20 **EFIS** 576:3 elaborate 509:16 525:2 **ELCC** 389:5,16 election 358:6 359:11,19 elections 357:25 electric 351:7 386:14 393:12 477:23 517:3 518:23 528:8 552:24 electricity 348:25 536:3.4 electrification 351:6 electrons 403:2 eligible 379:25 380:5 437:25 **Ellinger** 344:25 345:2,4 351:13 393:13 443:16 488:24 504:16 520:19 537:3 548:6,10 549:3 555:11 561:6 569:21 573:3 583:4 584:10 **Elliott** 484:9 486:18 emergency 14,23 481:5,7 483:21 484:1,6

emission 337:1 349:15 emissions 349:6, 7,9 362:2,6 363:4 382:3 400:6 emit 353:2 **EMP** 531:13,22 551:7,13 **employed** 406:15, 17 459:14 467:23 492:4 542:8 559:9,11 571:8,10 575:19,21 employees 341:17 employment 506:16 encompasses 346:12 end 350:4 375:5 383:6 418:24 430:13 470:13 472:5 528:22 endangered 463:17 **ended** 353:8 **energy** 336:8,18 340:7,8,9,16,17, 457:3 462:9 478:9 22 341:13 342:1, 5,13 343:11 344:1,5,7,10,11, 15 346:7,10,13 347:12,15,20,21 350:21 351:12 353:19 374:7 376:15,17,24 398:10 399:6,7, 14,15,16 400:5,12 419:25 469:18,20 469:18,20 470:11, 524:18 525:1,11, 18,25 526:3,14,17 527:4,5,17 544:6, 487:1 529:2 530:4 11,14,15 545:5



548:21,25 549:22

530:17

		, ,	0 0
550:15,18 551:9	entry 519:8	549:19	examination
552:22	environment	estate 441:3	360:3 394:12
engage 530:8	355:15 384:5	estimate 353:20	406:9 457:8 459:12 467:16
engaged 511:25	510:6,14 530:10	354:12 419:6	489:4 492:2
531:7	534:3	430:18 431:9	506:13 537:6
engaging 444:5	environmental	436:11 437:17,19	542:2 555:15
	349:2 361:24	estimated 437:9,	559:2 565:4 571:2
engineer 448:18 459:17 513:17,18	362:4 375:20	15 475:3,25	575:13 583:7,8,
529:10	376:1 460:10,18	497:14	12,14,17,21,23
	464:1 557:6,8,13, 15,20 559:12	estimates 429:12	584:4,7,8,11,12,
engineering 411:2 457:16,20 472:18,	561:19 562:4,8	437:16 497:15	15,17
22,24 490:7,11,	563:24 564:24	estimation 385:21	examine 546:16,
16,20 492:7,12	565:18 566:5		20 562:5 568:19
498:17 566:7	570:8	Eubanks 582:3	examined 334:21
enhanced 551:16	environments	evacuated 526:3	406:7 459:10 467:14 491:25
ensure 348:13	510:9	evacuation 527:23	506:11 541:25
398:9 424:20	envision 454:22	evaluate 390:6	562:14 563:7,10
445:12 552:18	530:8	563:14	564:1 570:25
entailed 364:24	EPA 349:10	evaluated 418:22	575:11
enter 350:21 357:1	364:11,20 382:20	537:10 563:11	examines 563:25
418:21 428:7	equal 357:6,13	564:12	examining 565:14
433:16 447:8,14,	377:2,10,11,12	evaluating 537:16	566:8
24 560:1 576:23	384:1,7	564:10	Examples 422:24
entered 574:23	equipment 435:13	evening 540:14	Excel 450:9
576:17	483:17 522:15,17	event 335:17	
entering 447:11	Equitable 363:1	525:22 531:15	Excellent 439:9
538:7	equity 421:16,19	533:2 538:23	excess 397:10,24
enterprise 523:5	423:2 442:12	events 533:9	exclude 338:16
enterprises	445:5,9	535:13	339:11,19
522:21	ERCOT 520:25	Evergy 352:10	excluded 339:4
entire 339:7,12	521:4,13,14 524:3	evidence 358:8,	exclusive 382:9
415:24 416:2,11	errata 405:7	17,23 359:2,19	415:12
429:13 497:14	414:3,5,8	365:22 408:7	excuse 341:3
523:21 565:14	error 405:13	461:10 468:23	347:8 351:18
entirety 338:24	essentially 358:3	475:6,9 493:11 508:22 543:10	362:2 419:15
entities 417:25	438:14 502:21	560:6 564:8 572:6	427:21 430:22 432:14 501:17
528:11,15	546:4,6 547:8	577:8	
entity 350:17	552:2 578:24	exact 367:11	excused 458:17
433:7 441:1,2,5	establish 554:5	376:7 437:7	466:18,20,21 491:3 540:11
457:24	established		541:3,8,9 556:5,7
			3 : : : 3,5,5 : 300: 3,7



570:1,3 574:20,21 581:20,21,22 executable 409:6 execute 424:7 473:9 547:9,13 executed 446:4, 22,23 473:7,9,12, 13,14 488:15 554:3 executing 452:21 execution 449:15 exhibit 341:2 345:7 405:11 406:20,21 407:23 459:19,23 461:5, 8,9,12 468:3,5,14, 16,20 474:8,12,18 475:5,8,9,23 476:8,18 492:15, 16 493:4 508:14. 15 542:19,20 543:6 561:16 571:13,15,25 576:15,17 577:1 **exhibits** 407:2,9, 21 408:3,4,6 468:22 493:2,8,10 508:19,20,21 543:3,9 559:17 560:1,3,4,5 572:3, 5 574:23 576:5,24 577:5,7 **exist** 343:19 366:23 379:22 384:2 525:2 532:6 533:1,20 544:9 552:14 **existed** 484:15 existence 484:19 515:11 527:9 existing 488:5 527:13 528:25

581:10

exiting 533:15,22 exorbitant 484:17 **expand** 523:8 Expanded 394:24 395:13 397:5 expansion 525:23 527:17 expansive 565:14 **expect** 341:10 448:12 473:9 537:15 expectation 389:8,24 421:3 533:6 534:1 expected 338:12 348:10 446:6 448:2 451:2,12 474:1 477:5 expenditures 348:3 **expenses** 424:25 444:21 expensive 539:3 experience 351:11 424:9 465:19 526:20 527:4,13, 14,20 experienced 470:25 538:19,20 experiencing 470:21 **expert** 350:18 358:25 366:6,14 381:4 554:9 expertise 416:16 **expires** 479:10 explain 341:1 345:24 347:25 349:16 352:7 360:7 361:15

366:10 373:24 377:7 394:18 403:21 444:7 469:19 489:21 496:10 558:4 565:1,19 573:18 explained 355:18 411:21 465:11 explains 368:5 explanation 403:15 538:4 explanations 345:11 explicit 381:2 383:22 385:16 explicitly 397:14 express 334:4 343:19 348:4 395:9 397:10,25 433:16 444:3 478:18 480:20 485:15 496:2,4 524:14 537:13 541:11 544:4 550:22 555:24 556:20 557:2,9 566:12 expressed 526:25 561:25 562:20,24 563:5 expression 424:7 427:1 **extend** 391:16 extended 384:19 **extent** 439:25 **external** 528:11,15 extreme 533:9 535:13

F face 551:12 facetious 374:11 facilitate 553:12 facilities 341:22 363:12 374:14 388:22 433:17 490:18 519:3 524:17 525:23 526:21 527:22 529:9 539:16 549:20 550:20 557:3,10 **facility** 341:18 342:7 380:8,10 481:14 547:19 facing 383:15 fact 342:14 359:2, 4,19 380:18 382:21 452:21 513:6 522:19 527:25 factor 341:5 343:2 400:19,20,23 401:3,8,18 402:2, 6,21 403:5,6,11, 12,14 465:12 484:13 factored 383:9 **factors** 340:25 341:9 342:19,23, 24 388:10 389:13 401:1 436:22 465:9,19 facts 358:8,16,22 359:1 366:22 factual 355:19,20 factually 454:16 fair 358:24 359:6. 24 360:4,8 366:8,



find 354:15 383:15

	Evidentiai	ry nearing June of
14 373:5 392:24	472:6	481:16
412:2 442:20	fees 436:8,10,24	finalize 421:1
501:1 513:8,13 515:2	447:20 449:23	finalized 410:19
	454:1 535:13,19,	411:23 421:2
fairly 373:4 399:17	20,25	422:17 479:15
fall 357:25 425:12,	FERC 476:11	481:18
17 581:9	516:25 520:7	finally 460:7
falling 372:9,12	532:3 537:20 539:24	519:17
familiar 335:1,5		finance 406:18
340:13 376:10	FERC's 407:5	409:7 417:17
381:24 388:3,6	field 534:18	418:13 424:10,20
413:25 415:3	564:24 565:1	425:7 438:13
423:25 527:7 530:18 531:5	568:18	447:17 448:9 449:9
538:11,16 573:12,	figure 336:19,23	
16	337:2 341:4,8	financed 445:5
family 563:2	342:5 346:22 374:19 375:25	453:19,22
_	374:19 373:25 378:20 415:25	financial 340:16
fan 511:8	430:20 431:11	346:4 381:6
farms 563:19,25	435:9 436:2,16	409:8,16,20,21 411:24 413:17
farther 389:18	437:15 438:5	418:22 419:4
fast 410:15 538:14	475:13 477:8	421:2 423:18,21
faster 470:10	485:14 519:11	444:3,10 445:13,
	figures 336:9	19,22 446:24
feasibility 392:15	337:9,19,24 341:23 343:4	447:6,23 450:6,9 452:15,17 458:2
409:4,5,10,17,19 452:14,15,17	347:12 519:2	·
476:5	521:1	financials 452:7,9
feasible 452:20	figuring 539:1	financing 414:15
		416:21 417:18,22
February 512:23	file 405:4 451:3	420:7,13 421:18 427:23 428:7
federal 352:22,23	filed 341:2 349:19	435:14,16,21
359:13,16,24	405:13 406:19 468:3 492:11,14	436:1,3,8,10,12
361:21 365:16,18, 24 396:13 420:7,	507:3 524:15	437:24 438:1,7
9,10 421:19	542:11,12,16	442:12 444:8,9,
423:21 544:10	559:14 567:17,18,	15,25 445:1,2,4,9,
557:6,13	20 571:13 575:23,	11,17 446:2,3,5,
federally 361:9	24 576:3,6,7	20 447:4,16 448:3,6,25 449:3,
feed 403:13	files 576:4	11,18 453:11,14
feedback 562:11	filling 403:3	454:2,11,18,24,25
feel 372:22 442:5	final 368:17	455:8,9 523:15
464:10 465:4	407:12 422:13	financings 444:6
104.10 400.4		

422:18 428:17 498:12 501:12,25 532:17 537:19,22 539:16 Finder 552:11 finds 405:12 fine 367:18 579:12 **finish** 355:4 358:21,22 367:24 finished 439:8 540:8,17 **finite** 370:16 403:1,3 firm 379:13 413:14 436:11 524:18 525:13 526:1 **firmed** 527:12 **firming** 524:22 fit 458:9 fits 362:3 558:5 **fixed** 368:17 **flare** 531:13 fleet 363:8 388:24 flexibility 498:10 525:24 **flights** 541:6 flow 445:12,19 483:4,7,11 485:5, 22 486:2,7,10 529:5 530:2,5 531:2 flows 436:4,5 446:10,11,15 focus 352:9 573:21 focused 346:5 372:5 458:8



	LVIGOTILIA	ly ricalling banc bo	, 2020inack. Tolksgigawat
folks 352:10	390:18 427:2	functionality	gears 458:21
386:25 514:20	449:19 498:2,15	554:5	general 365:6
531:6	521:17 522:7,11	fund 423:14	378:7 424:5 447:4
follow 377:22	523:5 534:4,12	fundamental	466:7 546:9 552:7
382:14 413:8	536:2 539:1,13,23 540:1,4	396:10 522:18	generally 336:3
454:5 463:23	,	550:19	349:8 351:9
521:22 535:10	fossil 356:25		353:10 361:11
548:11	found 340:15	funding 409:23	389:19 425:8
follow-up 505:10	522:19	funds 422:24	439:3 446:14,16
574:7	foundation 359:21	furthest 391:14	452:2 486:7
food 523:3,19	497:3,13 514:16		493:14 543:14
·	·	future 352:24 353:1 354:13	562:1,21 573:19
foot 497:6,16	foundations	355:2 356:8	generate 350:23
footnote 338:15,	497:15,23	358:23,25 359:5,	351:1 353:16
20 339:18 368:4	frame 363:9	15 362:19 365:17	444:14 454:13
377:15 378:1	377:23 378:16	371:9 372:25	455:2
396:2,7 407:14	389:23 473:10	374:18 378:23	generated 445:13
footprint 370:25	499:2	382:22,23 395:19,	524:17
482:16,17 497:16,	framework 383:11	25 397:1,9,21	
24 521:3	394:19	398:4 403:23	generates 401:23 402:22
Force 549:21	frankly 364:9	458:23 463:11	
550:11		472:10 481:3	generating 374:13
forced 383:19	free 360:5 415:19	514:8 537:25	455:7 519:3
	frequencies	538:23	generation
forces 551:25	494:16	futures 395:25	340:10,17,23
forecast 404:2,13	frequency 494:12,	397:4	341:22 342:7,15,
410:2	13,14,15 551:16	fuzzy 379:18	25 344:16 348:1
forecasted 351:6	froggy 351:19		370:7 383:16
		G	400:19,20 401:5, 20 402:4,21 470:9
forecasting 404:5	front 345:6 416:6 422:4 430:1,11		486:20 501:19,21
foregone 369:24	432:25 433:4,14,	G37 428:16 429:6,	518:18 519:9
forget 413:8	16,20,25 434:5,9,	22	525:9 526:8
forgot 506:18	10,12,17,23 435:4	G39 429:18 430:17	539:12 547:18
form 383:5 400:12	437:21,23 441:17	431:8 474:3,7,23	552:25
423:21 524:18	451:3 464:12	garden 402:25	generators 356:25
550:21	465:13 566:19	gas 340:10 383:8	363:25 401:10
forma 452:7,9,12	fruition 364:14	403:23 404:1,3,8,	530:8 539:2
	fuel 523:16	13 533:20	geofence 521:5
Fort 549:20	full 519:25 523:21	gas-fired 363:8,12	geomagnetic
Fortunate 511:11	525:6,7 558:17		531:1
forward 352:2		GBX 341:5,6	
361:8,12 362:5	fully 412:17	394:24 395:13	gigahertz 494:14
366:2 373:4	502:25 503:12,13	397:5 521:9	gigawatt 480:14
		1	



	LVIGCITIA	.,	ozomack. gigawattsnabite
gigawatts 402:16	352:22 359:13,16,	510:4,13 511:24	grocery 399:20
480:12,16,17	24 365:24 370:17	512:1 513:1,5	gross 338:7,8,13
522:1	420:9,10 421:19	514:20 515:11	339:5 340:1
aire 220:40	423:22	516:7,12 517:1,6,	
give 338:18	O = 1 = 000 + 0	10,15,20 518:1,16	341:23
405:19 441:13	Governor 363:3	519:5,12 521:12	ground 454:20
446:15,18 459:1	governors 530:5	522:3 524:14	grounds 567:4
464:13 467:3,19	GPCM 403:20,22	525:13 531:25	
474:14 491:15	404:10,13	532:12 535:17	group 416:21
496:15 505:22	404.10,13	537:13 539:24	479:24 480:6,11,
539:19 541:15	GPS 494:5,11,15	540:23 541:3,11	20
556:11 570:13	grab 451:4	544:3 546:6 547:6	groups 530:13,14,
575:2 580:25		550:22 555:24	22
global 373:11	Grain 334:4	556:9,20 557:2,9,	
	335:18,23 338:4	21 558:12 564:23	grown 563:20
globally 361:10	340:5,22 342:24	566:12 570:10	guarantee 420:3,
GMD 530:25	343:11,19 344:1,	574:2	4,6,16,19,22
are ferricand DEO.40	5,10,15 348:4	314.2	422:9,19 445:10
go-forward 352:12	384:19 388:9	great 383:13	498:22,24
398:8	393:16 395:9	384:22 388:14	,
goal 501:5,7	397:10,25 399:6	494:11 551:9	Guard 548:18
502:12	402:5,11 404:20,	greater 336:1	guess 345:17
goals 384:3	21 410:17 414:16,	343:23 402:3	352:5 360:22
	19,23 415:6,9,20	567:3	370:9 375:4 383:7
Goggin 580:16	417:5 418:17		385:6 391:15
good 334:3,18,19	419:6,24 421:22,	Greenwald 391:2	402:23 440:24
364:7 368:1 376:2	23,24 422:3	408:16 455:22	462:21 471:22
378:13 391:13	423:20,22 424:10	462:13 471:9	541:1 581:24
393:25 400:1	428:2,15 430:8	487:13 494:24	
406:3,4,5 408:22,	432:25 433:7,10,	509:6,10 510:17	guessing 381:3
24 413:3,5 439:10	16 434:19,20,25	536:13 543:21,25	guidance 544:21
462:25 463:2	435:1 436:13	545:7 554:22	
467:11 469:4	437:14 441:1,2,8,	560:16 569:5	Guidehouse
471:15 473:22	22 442:6 444:3,12	572:16 577:18	506:17 507:11,12
485:1 493:23,25	445:25 446:3	584:4,9	509:12 511:14,16,
495:5,7 497:20	453:12,13 457:4	grid 351:5 391:3	25 517:19,25
500:14,15 509:7,8	462:18 463:5,6,17	408:17 455:23	521:8 524:16
511:3,5 522:25	464:1 466:24,25	462:14 468:1	528:5 537:11
526:11 540:3,12	469:13 470:11,20	471:10 487:14	guidelines 464:8,
541:23 543:21,23	473:2 477:6	494:25 510:19	20
545:18,20 548:6,8	483:13 484:5,14,	517:3,7 524:7	470.04
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	18 485:15 486:21	531:14 536:14	guys 478:21
558:23 570:21,23 577:22 24 25	488:25 489:21	545:11 551:24	
577:22,24,25	491:10,12 496:2,4	554:23 560:17	Н
goods 370:2,3	498:2,12,22	569:6 572:17	
Google 372:17	500:22 501:16	577:19 580:15	habitat 371:19
•	503:22 505:16,18	311.18 300.13	463:21 567:2,4,6,
government	509:17,20,24	grids 470:7	7 568:5
		İ.	į.

Haden 351:15,18, 21,23 353:9,15 354:5,7,10 358:9, 13,20,21 359:9,20 360:12,21 361:1 365:18,25 366:25 367:15,17,20,21, 22,23,25 368:6, 11,18,22,24 369:11,19,21 375:6 393:7 396:17 439:20,23 443:8 456:22 462:1 478:3 488:18 504:10 520:12 536:23 548:1 555:7 561:2 569:16 572:24 583:4,10 **half** 411:1,6 416:10 457:15 Hampshire 571:7 **hand** 405:18 505:21 541:14 570:12 575:1 **handed** 404:23 474:20 476:18 handle 498:25 handout 414:2 **handy** 477:8 Hang 450:19 **happen** 347:16 361:15,23 364:6 378:19,24 381:3,7 383:8,18 389:8 443:1 456:8,13 482:23 502:13,14 526:12 530:19 happened 531:21 happening 362:9 375:5 401:18

happy 336:14

346:1 377:21 387:8,15 495:23 540:10 hard 351:25 410:15 411:16,17, 18,25 412:2 hardening 550:22 harm 551:9 hate 439:4 **hazard** 375:3 385:16 **hazards** 551:19 **HC** 407:24 450:22 493:8 **HCC** 419:17 **he'll** 431:2 535:6 **head** 377:23 385:20 388:6 523:12 **heads** 577:13 hear 366:7 410:8 437:5 574:13 **heard** 353:18 372:22 381:17 383:1 411:8 437:6 535:22 553:21 hearing 334:5 405:5,19 459:1 466:10,19 467:4 491:16 505:22 541:15 543:6 556:11 570:13 575:2 heavy 533:16 539:11,15 **held** 395:12,17,22 **helical** 497:12 helped 470:22,23

helpful 470:15 472:9 **hey** 354:12 **high** 340:13 348:18 364:6 373:4 374:24 446:7 449:17 470:24 high-voltage 502:3 **higher** 341:10 388:10 389:13 403:5 425:18 494:12,14,16 536:5 **highly** 407:13 408:4 450:2,4 493:4 hire 448:16 historic 563:1 historical 363:14 388:21 526:21 538:10,24 historically 526:12,15 history 528:1 538:17 **hoc** 374:15,24 **hold** 449:6 hole 403:1 **Holiday** 478:18 holistically 549:25 Hollander 344:20, 21 393:8,9 443:10,11,14 456:23,24 462:2,3 478:4,5 488:19,20 504:11,12 520:14, 15 536:24 548:2 561:3 569:17

Holsman 381:11, 12,15 384:9 479:19,21 484:22 487:24 524:8,9,11 535:3 549:13,14, 16 554:14 561:11, 12,14 564:15 583:5,20 584:6, 10,13 home 389:21 523:1,4 Honor 334:16 344:21 390:23,25 393:4,7,9 408:12 413:3 427:12 431:19 437:11 443:12 455:18 456:20,22,24 461:24 462:3,17 466:6 469:3 471:2,7 473:21 474:5 475:5,11 477:25 478:3,5 487:9,22 488:18, 20 493:16.23 494:20 500:12 504:7,10,12 509:2,4 511:3 520:13,15 536:9, 21,23 543:17 545:18 548:1 554:18,20 555:5,7 556:6 560:8,12, 14,25 561:2 569:1,14,16,24 570:2 572:11,22, 24 577:14 hope 349:13 377:8 511:8 564:21 574:18 hoping 393:23 527:7 561:20 hornet's 375:14 horrible 531:21



527:16

hose 403:1 **Illinois** 339:4 importance ı 362:24,25 363:16, 465:22 **host** 531:14 17,21,22 383:3,5, important 346:25 **hot** 347:5 ice 530:1 14 384:6 406:14 435:25 465:12 418:16,19 467:22 hour 342:6 389:12 **ICF** 519:23,25 539:14 485:21 486:5 520:5 **hourly** 346:10 importantly 550:12 559:8 idea 383:22 346:16 366:12 hours 388:23 575:18 386:19 522:2 389:7 401:9,20 **impose** 423:6 **Illinois'** 384:2 527:24 528:22 402:22 403:4,9 **imposed** 361:9,10 **imagine** 380:22 ideal 498:10 house 346:8 385:2 531:20 impossible 361:19 **ideas** 514:6 huge 393:21 imminent 530:2 improve 482:7 identification hundred 544:2 **impact** 343:15,16, improvement 474:8 hurt 354:14 17 356:11 371:10, 553:3 identified 377:16 376:14,23 384:2 13 372:5,7 376:6, improvements 407:9 476:3 477:1 7,22 383:9,12 **hurts** 376:18 512:6 528:7,10,14 523:6 550:2,19 400:7 402:21 **HVC** 469:24 470:6 476:5 480:14 identify 507:12 improves 554:10 481:11,22 482:21 508:1 516:1 **HVDC** 483:14 improving 517:11, 495:16 497:4 550:13 552:17.25 485:12 496:7,18 16 546:16,20 553:21 497:8 524:20 identity 398:24 **in-state** 341:7 563:22 578:8 551:15 555:23 343:20 399:8 **idiot** 400:22 578:25 579:2,15 impacted 453:1 inadvertently **idling** 383:7 495:19 496:6 **hydro** 533:17 450:7 562:25 563:5 **IEP** 550:8 hypersonic 551:7 incidences 501:16 **impacts** 356:23 ignition 532:18 hypothesized 372:7 384:18,20 **incidents** 501:7,20 401:13 ii 339:9 383:1,2, 385:10 386:24 538:1 10,12,18 384:1,6, 395:13 400:3 hypothesizing **include** 338:24 8 385:22.25 379:14 562:8 565:7,18 339:21 341:16 386:1,4 394:24 566:1,4 568:21 hypothetical 343:8 347:1 348:6 402:13 429:15 impediment 400:18 401:14,15 349:4 354:12 447:25 448:8,9, 442:22,23 484:12 480:1,7 356:13,18,19 10,11,22,25 513:5,9,15 515:4 449:4,5,7,18,20, 357:5 379:19 **impetus** 384:6 525:4 526:23 398:4 422:24 21 451:17,18,24 implement 382:7 527:9 529:23 435:9 436:2 452:3,12,15,20,23 530:11 implementation 442:14 445:10 453:9 454:2,23 544:21 452:11 477:21 455:8 456:9,14 hypothetically 522:14,19,23 478:25 479:2 415:6 416:13 implemented 548:17 565:4 496:8 502:21,23 430:16 431:2,7 396:4 503:4,7,8,14,23 433:20,22 included 338:2 implementing 504:1 549:25 346:14 375:20 544:15



379:9 433:14

435:18 436:15

557:10,14 578:22

579:3,6,7,8,14

437:25 438:2,4,6 incremental 386:2 566:5 567:25 548:17,22 550:8, 452:7 472:7 516:16 577:1,3 25 553:2,19 475:17 476:7,8, 554:2,6 infrastructure incrementally 18,20,22 514:22 538:9 548:25 550:21,24 instance 417:9 525:3 546:10 551:9,20,24 incur 435:16 instruments 381:6 567:1 552:18,24 553:5, 436:13 integrate 530:15 **includes** 353:21 16,18 554:1 incurred 430:8 552:12 415:10 435:12 **initial** 384:20 436:3,23 454:2 437:14 445:15 intelligence 551:6, 421:25 482:11 478:25 488:11 independent 22 initially 486:1 518:24 521:11 448:17 intend 405:3 409:6 568:15 including 338:12 **Indiana** 339:4,10 **intense** 368:3 initiate 529:1 339:12 340:8 362:24 363:18,19 530:3 355:14,21,22 intensive 390:8 383:4 463:20 356:23 357:8 initiative 361:17 524:21 528:22,24 intent 415:22 398:16 408:4 567:5 552:17 553:15 inject 472:20 429:13 436:22 indirectly 343:13 477:16 480:21 intention 339:16 443:21 444:20 535:14 481:6 490:14 458:10 468:20 interactions 493:8 535:23 individual 389:7 injected 486:15 479:25 541:7 549:20 414:16 544:10 injecting 481:4 interchange 557:7,15 575:25 **induce** 339:20 480:24 injection 394:23. 576:8,14,16 577:5 **induces** 356:25 25 472:3,12,13,18 578:14 interchangeably 477:18 481:2 409:12 inclusion 390:5 industrial 523:5 482:2,6 485:7 interconnect Industries 344:24 inclusive 521:25 489:14,20,21 402:16 393:13 443:15 490:14 509:24 inconsistent 457:2 462:8 478:8 522:1 526:6 interconnected 368:13 488:23 504:15 528:20 386:21 402:5 incorporate 520:18 537:2 524:19 injections 510:9 373:12,20 548:5 555:10 interconnecting **Inn** 478:18 561:5 569:20 incorporated 402:9 477:22 573:2 413:17 562:13 input 404:9 426:25 interconnection industry 346:3 increase 453:3 **inquiry** 366:14 429:17 438:19 396:25 398:7 472:2,12,13 439:1 443:2 **inside** 510:4 403:18,23 404:11 482:12 488:9 471:25 472:2,16 523:18 536:5 522:21 539:22 489:14 473:3,4,6,7,8 install 557:2,9 Inflation 350:4,9 476:3 478:21 increased 452:25 397:16 installation 480:23 481:10,21 523:16,20 544:11,14,18 482:3 488:2,5,8, information increases 354:18 545:5 548:21 11 552:10 407:24 419:17 356:6 550:15 554:7 427:3 450:9 464:3 interconnections increasing 350:6 468:17 474:10 installations 468:1 476:14 351:6,9 472:17 484:21 531:1,4 544:3,7,8,11,16 477:20 533:9



interconnects 383:23 528:9 **interest** 352:13 414:16,21 415:2, 7,10,11,19,20 416:1,5,11 417:1, 5,13 418:1,4,12 419:7,12 424:7 425:1 426:10 427:1 435:10 436:23 440:10,14 441:4 449:22 480:20 526:25 537:19 interested 382:14 481:4 524:22 531:10 interesting 372:15 382:1 533:14 interfacing 544:7 interference 494:5,9,17 503:5 internal 355:8 437:16 international 519:25 520:1 551:21 interregional 483:13 487:2 532:4 539:25 550:25 551:15 interrupt 353:3 432:15 439:5 interruptible 525:9 533:25 534:2 interrupting 439:7 intervene 547:16

intervenors

558:18,21

introduced 382:13

Invenergy 339:16 348:5,12 371:9 406:17 416:25 417:4 421:16,20 423:20 437:13 441:5 444:23.24 445:8 454:16 455:6 467:25 492:6 501:16,18, 21,22,23 502:3,6, 10 519:23 520:6 525:13 559:11 566:7 575:21 Invenergy's 501:17 inverse 384:4 investment 379:16 380:1,19 546:13 553:3,18 investments 518:18 553:16 investor-owned 350:13 investors 421:17 424:9 invitations 530:22 **invited** 422:14 **involve** 555:23 involved 374:7 414:23 416:24 417:3,6,8 421:24 433:21,22 476:14 530:11 550:7 **IPCC** 373:15 **IRA** 379:4,15,22 380:6,9,14,22 397:14,16,21 **IRP** 377:17 378:4, 8 irradiance 373:17

isolate 395:12 **ISOS** 348:11 378:2 387:13 552:15 **issue** 422:3 563:24 issued 423:11,15 566:13 **issues** 383:15 568:11 **ITC** 380:2 479:13 488:13 item 337:13 563:6 items 450:12 512:11,13 539:13, 17 iterative 525:19 J J-E-N-N-I-F-E-R 556:16 J-O-N-A-T-H-A-N 541:21 **January** 476:11 559:16 **Jen** 581:20 Jennifer 556:15 558:25 559:6,14 584:12 **JM-1** 542:13 **JM-2** 542:13 **job** 369:12 Jobs 363:1 joining 561:15 joint 434:3 **Jonathan** 541:11, 20,24 542:11,15 581:20 584:8

JS-1 559:16 **Judge** 334:2,17 335:7,10,15 344:18,19,22,24, 25 351:15 353:14 354:3 358:12,20 359:7 360:9,18,24 366:16,20,25 367:13,14,20,22, 23,24 368:1,11, 19,22,23 369:5, 11,18 375:6,7 381:8.10 384:10. 11,14 390:19,24 391:1,3,5,7,8 392:8 393:3,6,8, 10,12,15,19,23 394:4,8,11 396:20 403:17 404:16,19, 21,22 405:10,16, 17,22 406:1 407:20,23 408:2, 10,13,15,17,19, 21,22 413:2 419:15,18,20 427:7,10 428:22, 24 429:2 430:22 431:3,12,16,20 432:14 437:5 439:4,8,9,14,19, 20 443:9,10,13, 15,16,17,21,24 450:1,5,8,12,15, 17,24,25 451:4,6, 10 453:23,25 454:6,10 455:13, 14,19,21,23,25 456:2,3,19,21,23, 25 457:2,4,7 458:12,14,18 459:3,7,8 461:7, 11,14,16,20,22,25 462:1,2,4,6,8,10, 12,14,16,18,20, 21,25 464:21 466:1,7,12,13,16, 20,22 467:2,6,10



ISO 387:19

468:13,16,19 469:1 470:1 471:5,8,10,12,14, 15 473:19 474:9, 12,14 475:7 478:1,4,6,8,9,10 479:17,18 484:23, 24,25 487:4,5,10, 12,14,16,18,20,21 488:17,19,21,23, 24,25 489:2 490:23,24 491:4, 9,12,14,17,18,22, 23 492:17 493:1, 4,7,14,21,22 494:21,25 495:2, 4,5 500:10,13 504:8,11,13,15, 16,17,20,23 505:9,12,13,15, 16,20,25 506:4,7 507:16,19 508:18, 25 509:3,5 510:19,22,24,25 511:1,2 512:21 513:19,22 520:10, 14,16,18,20 521:15,20 524:8 535:3,4,9 536:7, 10,12,14,16,18, 19,20,22,24 537:2,3,4 540:7, 12,21 541:4,7,12, 18,22 543:5,13, 18,20 545:10,13, 15,16,17 547:23, 24 548:2,5 549:5, 12 554:15,19,21, 23,25 555:2,4,6,8, 10,11,12 556:3,8, 13,17 557:16,19 558:1,4,20,23 560:2,10,13,15, 17,19,21,22,23 561:1,3,5,7,8,11 564:16,17,20 565:21 568:22

569:2,4,6,8,10,11, 13,15,17,20,21, 23,25 570:4,7,10, 11,16,20 571:16, 24 572:2,9,12,15, 17,19,20,21,23,25 573:2,3,4,7,11 574:6,9,12,15,17, 20,22 575:5,9 576:25 577:4,11, 15,17,19,21,22 579:21 580:1,4,8, 9,13,24 581:6,14, 22,24 582:2,5,8 583:6,10,25 584:6,13,15 **judicial** 368:14

judicial 368:14 July 473:10

jump 535:6

juncture 526:23 527:1

June 334:4 505:3,

jurisdictional 515:21

Κ

K-E-V-I-N 575:7

Kansas 341:1,6,9, 19 342:12,16,17 362:14 389:22 402:10 485:7,18 486:21 502:19,22 503:1,6,7,24 504:2,6 510:12 524:21 525:10 532:14

KC-1 575:25 576:14

KC-2 576:3 577:3

KC-5 575:25 576:14 578:4,5

KC-6 576:8,16

KC-7 576:8,16

Kevin 562:23 564:2,4,8 575:7, 10,23 576:6,15 584:16

key 349:14 401:11 416:3 438:13 447:13 454:15 482:15

kids 521:18

kind 336:21,22 348:7 349:8 365:3 373:7 374:23,24 378:23 379:17 385:1,2,3,5 387:13,16,17 388:15 401:12 422:10 452:16 454:7 456:9 465:7 470:2 483:1,5 496:20 498:21 533:1 534:13

King 506:20

538:7 580:12

knew 568:16

knowing 376:6

knowledge 423:24 443:4 461:2 484:13 498:6,13 516:25 528:16 547:15

Kolkmeyer

484:24,25 485:4 487:3 535:5 549:10,11 583:20

kv 482:2 496:23, 25 497:1,8

L

I-e-k 567:10

land 341:16 371:1 442:14

landowner 573:25 579:13

landowners

440:25 441:10,15, 25 442:8,11 487:21 561:17,25 562:20,25 563:5 578:19 579:4,14

Lane 571:6

language 557:22 578:14

laptop 451:5

large 347:21 370:10 484:16 501:4 525:18 532:11 533:19 534:4,8 565:13

largely 455:10 480:2,8 526:7

larger 342:14 391:25 497:9

largest 347:15

lastly 349:18

late 540:13,16 549:18

latest 428:14

lattice 497:11,25 498:17,22,25 499:7,11

Laughter 478:19 511:9

law 361:18 363:3

lawyer 360:2 364:16

laymen's 497:17

lays 369:25

LCC 470:3,9

	Evidentia	Ty Hoaling 0	une 06, 2023index. leadlot
480:16	Leonard 549:20	lines 347:24 357:2	local 371:21 372:1
lead 377:12	lesser 567:2,6	390:15 414:14	544:7
leading 396:18,19	568:5	427:21 483:18 494:5,7 495:15	locate 526:5
Leafs 511:9	letter 426:10	512:7,15 515:13	located 383:16
lean 521:16	level 340:14	518:21 519:22	389:17 390:1 463:17 501:12
lease 414:15,21	348:18 361:10	539:2,24 563:22 566:12 578:7,15,	524:21 548:14
415:1 416:8,25	362:7,11 374:24 396:13 410:9	20	location 481:20
417:4,12 418:1,4,	445:18,19 447:7,	links 524:24	532:9
21 440:5	11 515:21 551:8	list 475:2 501:15	logically 434:12
leasing 419:7	leveling 534:18	512:5 517:22	LOLE 533:6,10
440:1,2	levelized 340:16	518:3,6	534:6
leaving 539:15	341:13,25 342:5, 13,17 399:15,16	listed 450:13	long 353:10
left 334:25 443:2, 14 536:24	400:12	475:20 512:11 566:23	361:19 369:5
	levels 527:23	lists 502:5,9	370:17 390:10 479:7 490:6,19
legacy 387:18 563:2	leverage 350:18	,	539:3
legally 426:24		literally 370:22	long-term 390:16
legislation 379:5	leveraging 350:16	litigated 364:11,14	410:2,3,18 413:10
383:21,22,25	liaison 482:23	living 352:25	416:8 424:23 438:13 446:9
legislative 396:12	license 530:21	LLC 406:17 467:25 492:6	447:5 553:25
legislature 363:3	licensed 530:21	542:10 559:11	longer 335:25
legislatures	lie 357:22	575:21	336:3
362:21	life 335:18,22	load 346:17,21	lookback 538:18
lek 567:10	336:1,3,25 387:17 435:23 531:8	351:9 389:4,19	looked 346:15,17,
leks 567:3	lights 346:8	390:1 471:1 522:7,8,13 523:13	23 347:6 349:2
lender 416:19	likelihood 361:21	533:5 534:1	383:14 442:18 484:14 503:19
420:24 421:5	362:9 449:17	loading 497:1,9,10	Loomis 581:7,13
422:12 423:14	likewise 515:3	499:1	·
448:1,9 449:21	limit 362:6 363:13	loads 550:19	loosely 335:5
lender's 425:17	479:9	551:2 552:14,20	loss 357:16 470:25 522:7,8
lenders 418:23 421:14 422:22	limited 361:22	loan 419:25 420:2,	523:1,13,19 533:5
421:14 422:22	363:15 365:7	3,4,5,6,7,8,16,19 421:1,19,23 422:9	534:1
438:24 446:14	444:11	423:8,9,19 424:10	losses 522:20
447:18,19,21 448:14	limiting 363:4	425:2	lost 364:21 370:3
	limits 370:18	loaning 420:11	371:3,12,19,21
lends 438:2	line-commutated	loans 418:6	522:21
lengthen 580:11	469:24 470:3	435:11	lot 341:24 351:5 357:16 449:17
			301.10 773.11



470:8 565:15 maintaining man 531:22 mathematic 539:18 346:20 low 526:15 manager 492:11 maintenance 544:12 548:21 matter 356:16,17, lower 337:21 446:22 501:24 559:12 19 367:2 387:21 338:1 342:13,17 541:13 409:8 415:23 357:14 425:15,16, managers 544:14 422:17 465:22 17 534:14 major 350:1,3 545:5 501:1 502:12 363:6 499:2,3 **LRTP** 509:13,18, **manmade** 531:13 553:10 556:19 534:25 548:15 24 510:2 551:19 **matters** 334:13 majority 352:19 lunch 334:8 439:5. manner 388:13 385:12 428:5 Mccredie 482:2 422:21 537:16 445:4 499:6 meaning 338:7 **Maple** 511:9 **make** 334:12 364:22 424:17 М Marc 345:3 335:7,14 352:5,14 means 355:21 355:23 366:2 **M-I-S-O** 378:1 March 451:14 395:18 401:22 369:20 371:3,18, 417:18 444:8,10, mark 334:20 M-O-N-K-E-N 21,25 372:8,19 16 446:8 454:18 405:11 583:3 541:21 373:14 374:5 496:24 551:24 377:3,13 378:22 **M-T-E-P** 546:11 marked 406:20,21 measurable 379:5 380:16 459:19,23 468:3,4 **M5**x 506:21 528:7,10,14 381:6 398:13 474:7.12 492:14. **machines** 533:17, 402:1 405:6 16 542:19,20 **measure** 402:17 18,19 416:21 422:13 559:17 571:13,14 497:4 428:23 434:1 576:14,16 made 350:5 352:4 measured 336:6 438:12,17,24 358:9 375:4 market 376:24 440:12 450:18 measurement 392:23.25 408:7 380:21 395:13 453:15 463:22 402:17 416:4 420:21 396:10 455:11 490:17 494:19 422:2,9,11,20 measuring 383:7 **Markets** 406:18 514:10 525:11 461:10 468:23 **MEC** 390:22 542:25 547:4 mask 534:3 469:13 475:10 408:11 413:12 553:16 556:20 493:11 508:22 **mate** 567:4 427:15 455:17 557:22 559:20 514:9 525:11 462:16 469:2 562:7 567:19 material 339:21 527:15,18 530:22 487:7 493:17,18 573:8 579:4 410:23 411:1,4 540:14 543:10 509:1 536:8 580:18 430:13 457:12,16 557:17 560:6 543:16 554:17 471:22,23 472:3, 561:23 563:4,12, makes 350:20 560:11 568:25 5,17,23 489:8,15, 14,16 568:20 356:24 357:2 572:10 577:13 19,23,25 490:5,13 572:6 577:8 498:9 498:16,19 meet 384:3 550:18 **Madrid** 531:13 **making** 347:4 551:1 566:9 materialize 375:24 361:13 364:5 magically 356:6 meet all 464:1 369:12 370:19 materials 527:11 magnitude 482:11 378:7 379:14,16 **meeting** 383:24 math 337:5 346:15 397:1 398:7 main 346:5 387:12 447:9 479:24 347:8 356:9,17 465:23 514:5 499:15 562:14 563:7 385:1,9,20,24 557:24 573:24 581:16 400:22 496:20 maintain 416:20 579:12,17



meetings 561:17 memorandum 423:25 memory 347:18, 19 454:7 mention 386:7 414:14 519:22 533:15 544:2 561:18 mentioned 347:14 380:13 383:4 387:3 405:3 452:3 481:12 483:2,3 515:5 527:21 532:7,23 mentioning 469:15 merchant 413:14 477:15 537:13 Merrimack 571:6 **meshed** 482:7 messy 391:17 540:2 met 526:12,19 527:21,23 529:17 method 517:11. 16.21 518:2 522:5 methodology 373:14 389:5,17 metric 399:18 424:19 426:11 **MHCP** 477:12 **Michael** 410:22 582:2 microphone 406:2 micropiles 497:12 micrositing 573:15,16,23

574:2

middle 357:18 401:17,19 403:10 512:4 532:13 Midwest 352:9 373:1 midwestern 388:11 401:21 mike 335:8 506:5 miles 383:2 496:11,15 526:10 milestones 447:10 military 544:2 548:13 million 411:4 429:23 430:2,14, 20,21 431:10,11 475:3,13 518:18. 22,23 521:2,10,22 522:6 523:18 528:18 **millions** 503:20 mind 345:19 454:2 485:5 547:12 mine 355:16 358:21 minimization 566:10 **minimize** 503:4,9 562:8,16 566:2 568:16,20 minor 405:6 507:10 minus 348:20 minute 428:23 548:12 570:6 minute-by-minute 346:10 minutes 353:18 **minutia** 350:10 379:24

mishear 377:7 misnetting 567:5, 24 **MISO** 338:25 343:12 344:2 378:1 387:4 388:16,19 389:2 390:10,13 391:12, 15 404:12 438:20 439:2 473:10 477:6,11,16,20 481:7,8,13,15,16, 17 482:14,16,19, 20,24 484:8 486:6,19,20 490:1 509:25 510:2,4,6, 16 516:25 517:5 518:24 520:7 521:24 528:23 530:18 534:9,15 537:10,14,15 546:17 552:4 555:18,23 MISO's 546:11 mispronounce 413:23 misread 519:7 **missing** 524:23 **mission** 550:20 551:25 554:6 **missions** 547:10, 14 551:2 554:3,6 Missouri 338:22, 24,25 339:1,6,8, 11,14 340:1,7,8,9, 21,23 341:1,8,19 342:12,16,18,25 343:12,20 344:2, 6,11 346:18 348:24 362:11 370:8 383:2 385:11,13 386:9 388:4 389:19

391:1 394:23,25 398:22 408:15 455:21 459:16 460:10,17 462:12 471:8 481:11 482:21 485:18 487:12,21 494:22 496:7,16,18 512:2 513:11,16 514:15, 21,22,25 515:5, 18,19,22 517:3, 12,17 518:11,23, 24 519:4 524:21 531:9 535:14 536:12 548:14 549:1 550:9,10 554:12,21 557:4, 6,8,11,13,15,20 560:15 577:17 Missouri's 549:18 Missourians 482:9,13 misstates 365:13, 21 366:12 mistaken 473:15 mitigate 470:24 514:4 518:17 522:4 551:18 553:3 562:8 566:3 mitigation 514:2 522:5 552:5 Mitt 381:21 MLA 393:3 399:4 400:10 413:2 456:19 457:23 461:23 466:5 473:20 475:9 493:19 496:5 500:11 511:2 536:20 545:17 555:4,17 560:23 569:13 572:21 579:21



MLA's 537:9
model 343:15 356:8 364:2,5 365:10,15 366:3, 8,9,10 369:23,25 372:18 373:3 378:8 387:3,5,7, 13,21,24 388:2,4 397:3 403:22 404:1,2,5,9,13 411:23,24 413:17 450:6 451:8,24,25 458:2,5,6,11
modeled 394:22 397:19
modeling 338:2 354:11 359:6 372:24 373:10 378:3 396:11 398:12 399:11 403:16,20 404:10
models 346:2,3 387:12,25 396:10 403:18
modification 481:23 539:22
modifications 481:19 490:18
Module 490:2
moment 411:9 486:22 510:25 527:21 532:6 567:22
monetary 392:6 516:16
money 370:18 375:24 420:11 424:10 435:15 503:23
Monken 541:11, 20,23,24 542:4, 11,15 543:22

548:7 556:4

Evidentiary
581:19,20 584:8
monopole 498:2
monopoles 497:2 498:12,17
Monroe 485:9,11, 12,17,20 486:4 528:21
Montana 391:16
month 481:15 523:3
months 351:2 389:4 452:2 529:14,16
more-so 388:1
morning 334:3,18, 19 345:3,5 351:19 375:9,10 380:13 398:6 405:7 406:4,5 408:23,24 413:4,5 414:3 432:17 526:14 580:7 581:15
MOU 424:3,6,11 425:20,22 426:2, 8,10,22 427:1,6
MOUS 424:12
mouth 396:18
move 357:12 360:22 361:12,21, 25 368:20,22 369:17 407:21 427:2,12 452:4 468:14 481:20 493:1 508:13 539:12 540:3 543:2 554:6 559:25 571:24 576:17,23
moved 362:5
movement 367:11

389:3 522:10 533:24	551:2 554:10 555:18	
MR-1 341:3	nationally 364:10	
MR-2 342:22 384:15 MR5 336:16 337:7 MTEP 546:11	natural 363:8,11 383:7 403:23 404:1,3,8 526:22 533:20 534:2 536:1 551:5,18	
multi-regional 534:21 555:23	nature 358:17 359:6 424:5	
multi-rto 534:21 multi-value 546:10 multiple 366:1 427:9 532:12 565:8	necessarily 352:24 358:22 359:1,21 370:14 396:12 411:4 418:7 537:18 necessity 499:7	
multiplication 346:20 MW 342:6 385:4 386:12 394:23,25	needed 423:2 434:19,25 453:20 484:2 517:6 negative 371:13 534:22 536:4	
400:19,20 402:4, 9,14,17,18 412:11,15 415:7 454:19 457:23 488:6,7,9,11 490:8,11 527:16	negotiate 427:2 436:8 447:24 483:10 544:12 negotiated 484:2	
N	negotiating 488:13	
nail 428:14	negotiation 411:22	
named 511:13 names 371:8 narrative 353:10 538:7	negotiations 412:4,9,12 436:9 573:25 NERC 351:3	
NARUC 553:10,11	nest 375:14	
nation 551:23 552:8 national 396:3,15, 23 546:5,17,21 547:1,5,7,9,14 548:18 550:1	net 337:15 339:13 343:22 348:14,19 401:3 402:6,21 424:24 network 338:12 348:10 429:13,24 430:6,19 431:9	



moving 362:20,21

432:9 434:18,25 474:2 475:2,24 neutral 356:12,14 367:7 **nicely** 510:1 **night** 401:17 402:24 478:19 **nod** 577:13 nonbinding 424:12 nonparticipants 456:10,16 nonpersistent 525:9 533:25 nonrecourse 444:10 nonsubscribers 456:16 noon 439:13 580:21 normal 357:25 483:18 510:7 normative 530:9 north 385:18 391:13 404:3 501:21 502:3 534:16 552:16 **note** 335:14 337:4 338:9,15 429:23 576:2,4,13 **noted** 338:16 339:18,19 352:6 521:10 **noticed** 561:17 **noting** 351:4 November 405:7

nuclear 533:18

551:7

number 345:25 347:16 349:11 353:20 366:4 367:11 370:10 371:15 372:3 376:7 382:17 386:20,25 403:14 412:7,14 430:21 431:11 432:1 435:22 437:1,8,9, 21,22,23 460:5 465:3,4 482:9,12 497:13 498:7 500:23 507:13,20, 25 508:1 530:23 535:22 538:12 548:13,18 549:19 561:17 562:24 numbered 464:21, 22 578:7 **numbers** 337:14, 19 338:6 347:17 348:5,7 370:1 373:7 411:15,16 412:10 431:13,15, 22 450:3,11,16 496:1 507:24 508:3 523:25 numerator 342:10. 12 424:22 **NW** 542:6 0 **O&m** 501:23 **Obama** 362:4 **object** 427:7 500:3 objected 381:18 objecting 369:14 objection 358:7, 24 359:8 360:8,23

431:13 437:2 461:7 475:7,8 493:7 499:25 508:18 543:5 578:14 objectionable 361:3 417:11,14,16 503:4 516:1 24,25 444:17 445:19 496:3 obligations 25 occur 419:3.4 564:2 529:4 531:12 538:21 offer 461:5 **offered** 441:15 offering 417:12 office 360:11 552:21 officed 553:7 official 369:10 576:5 **offload** 441:23 offsetting 347:25

396:17,19 430:23 offtaker 386:23 446:21 offtakers 350:12 386:20 398:24 399:2,3 560:2 572:2 577:5 oftentimes 566:3 Ohio 485:21 **OMS** 482:24 objections 408:3 one-factor 355:20 468:19,21 572:3 one-for-one objective 387:17 357:19 one-half 415:25 one-page 414:2 obligation 441:8, **ongoing** 369:14 370:2,3,10 419:9, 11 463:14 464:4 539:6 445:14,22 447:23 online 389:9 535:6 **obtained** 438:18. **Ontario** 506:21 obtaining 422:25 **OPC** 580:2 open 353:8 501:3 529:5 536:1 **operate** 356:25 389:11 416:20 occurred 512:19 494:12,13 530:21 537:21 operating 388:22 occurring 539:8 389:7 403:10,12 424:25 429:25 430:12 436:3,4 444:20 446:12 483:9,24 528:25 530:9 537:22 538:25 552:15 operation 451:13 501:23 510:3,7,8 513:2 529:4 533:23 538:8 operational



502:25 503:12

513:6 522:14

365:13 366:11,21

367:3 368:20

529:8 530:17 500:5 530:7 532:3 453:8 455:4 Ρ 539:18 582:3 461:10 468:23 475:10 478:24 orderly 531:20,24 operations **p.m.** 389:20 493:11 502:18 363:13,14 372:14 organic 563:19,25 580:20 582:12 507:16,18 508:22 388:21 409:22 520:2 526:1 529:7 orientated 480:3,8 **PA** 394:21 401:3 426:5 444:20 539:6 543:10 446:21 500:24 oriented 480:10 packing 403:2 551:23 558:5 529:9 original 349:18 560:6 562:17 pager 404:24 operators 387:23 563:18 568:12 385:3 392:10 pages 464:7,18, 486:8,10 552:7 431:4 432:18 572:6 577:8 23,24 512:9 488:7,8 492:9 **opinion** 399:12 **partial** 418:21 **paid** 416:6,9 403:19 449:7 originally 382:12 participate 547:16 429:24 430:1,7,11 453:6 463:8 **OSHA** 501:15,20 433:14,15,24 471:23 554:9 participating 502:4,6,9 435:4,10 441:21 480:20 opportunities 501:2 outage 532:20 371:19,22 532:18 parties 424:8 painless 574:18 427:1 531:4 562:6 **outages** 483:5 503:9 **paired** 380:8 opportunity parties' 556:24 524:18 370:20 480:21 outcome 357:8 partisan 382:1 482:12 522:22 396:13 525:5 pancake 482:18 partisanship 558:17 580:9,10 **outcomes** 396:11 pancaking 483:12 381:18 opposed 380:4 535:20,25 outlets 482:3,4 parts 348:12 576:3 400:23 415:16 **paper** 426:12 **outlier** 538:22 417:19 420:5 party 382:10 432:9 488:6 paragraph 429:21 **outline** 384:18 440:1,9,11,21 490:13 441:2 473:2 parallel 529:11 **outlined** 534:13 **optimal** 391:21 **pass** 350:19 parameters 490:7, outright 420:2 392:3 412:20 359:25 20 516:20 431:23 **option** 381:21 passage 350:4 **paren** 430:2 overcast 525:17 399:19 417:23 362:17 parent 444:16,17, 458:8 overnight 334:14 **passed** 359:13 22 445:10 526:13 **options** 417:21 360:15 362:25 parenthetical 420:14 oversizing 402:20 363:2 377:6 416:7 383:5,21 397:17 order 334:11 owned 501:22 park 525:11,25 338:11 365:16 **passes** 359:16 owner 432:24 401:7 402:6 part 340:11 341:25 433:1,4,6,11 **passing** 454:21 417:17 427:4 364:3 368:12 434:18,24 501:25 446:2 447:16 past 341:20 351:2 384:23 400:14 ownership 415:19 448:6 458:19,24 374:20 448:23 407:6 408:7 440:2 460:8,15 472:10 501:20 538:1,11 418:23 422:14,15 477:16 483:16 579:24 423:13 430:8 owns 433:7 484:16 489:25 433:20 434:6 Path 552:11 498:1,6,8,11 440:23 449:9



paths 532:17 421:4,8,11,13,15 521:2 527:4,15 529:25 539:20 438:3 440:20,23 **Petti's** 335:13 phasing 453:1,7, 441:9,16,17 **pattern** 401:22 511:21 524:13 17,19,21 456:7,12 445:7,21 579:7 525:7 578:12,19 528:4 patterns 373:1,17 579:5,11 percentage 403:7 **PG&E** 527:5,15 347:17 410:16 **phones** 494:10,12, **Paul** 571:6 **phase** 339:8,9 415:12,13,15 13 382:25 383:1,2, 416:6 440:18 pause 539:10 10,12,18 384:1,6, physical 370:21 **perform** 454:21 pay 338:4 339:14 8 385:11,13,18, 412:7 440:3,16,17 346:6 347:3 performance 22,25 386:1,4,5,6 529:12 551:19 352:17 432:24 445:23 552:19 391:22 402:13 552:25 433:4,17,19,24 412:21 415:14,15, performed 517:19, picks 389:19 434:8,10,16 16,20 416:2,11 25 564:25 441:8,25 442:7, **piece** 346:24,25 417:5,13 422:12 performing 11,13 535:15 426:12 483:17 428:10 429:15,24 389:22,23 436:3,4 444:6 paying 442:16 pier 497:3,6,16 446:2,20,24 523:17 **period** 336:7 **piers** 497:12 447:19,22,25 346:23 429:25 payment 416:5 448:1,2,3,4,5,8,9, **piles** 497:13 430:12 433:1,5 434:12,17,23 10,11,13,21,22,25 436:23 522:22 **pilot** 553:14 441:17 444:20 449:1,4,5,6,7,18, permit 530:21 578:8,9,21,24 **PJM** 395:6,8 20,21,22 451:1, 579:2,15 438:20 439:2 11,12,17,18,19,24 **permits** 422:25 475:24 476:2,4, 452:3,4,7,9,12,15, payments 416:4 460:9,17 557:7, 10,14 481:7,8 20,21,22,23 442:14 578:8,15 14.23 484:7 486:6,11, 453:8,9,13,20,21, 579:8 permitting 463:24 19,20 508:5 22 454:2,23 **pays** 434:5 561:20 510:16 521:11,24 455:7,8 456:9,10, **peak** 347:10 perpetual 483:24 528:24 532:13 14,15 477:13 388:23 389:7,12 546:22 552:4,10 478:24 479:1,2 **person** 355:1 526:17 495:19 496:1,7,8, 387:25 514:8 **place** 364:10 14,18,21 502:20, 564:3 pedestrian 538:13 366:2 369:13 23,25 503:3,5,7,8, 370:13,25 382:16 **pending** 481:14 personally 373:18 10,11,14,18,23 388:25 418:11,12 524:21 504:1 531:15 **people** 355:19 423:3 426:24 549:25 550:4 368:14 381:5 perspective 409:5 438:14 439:10 557:3,7,10,14 389:21 402:1 416:18 425:17 442:25 443:5 565:15 578:16,21, 482:21 444:9 448:25 483:8 486:6,18 22 579:3,6,8,14 471:25 472:1,22 488:2 506:15 perceive 548:24 480:23 481:25 530:1,24 532:5 **phases** 391:20 **percent** 336:23 482:5,20 499:21 534:22 539:4 392:1 412:20,23 339:15 347:19,20 540:12 447:17 448:20 pertaining 525:1 374:17 380:3 449:8,12,16 placement 573:20 385:6 400:19,20, **Petti** 335:1,17 453:5,14,19 23 401:8 403:11, 506:23 507:7 **places** 485:20 454:12,13 455:2



478:22,25 479:5

508:9,15 511:16

12 410:12 420:20

plains 373:5
plan 362:10 409:6 440:23 441:7,10, 23 451:18 452:21 540:13 550:8
planned 537:14 555:18,19,22
planner 513:25
Planner/gis 571:11
planning 352:8 378:8,17 388:5 390:16 393:22 509:22 513:17,18 514:7 527:16 533:3,13 537:15 538:10,15,24 539:21 554:1
plans 362:6 550:16
plant 378:21 501:24
plants 539:15
play 526:16
players 396:25 398:7
PLEXOS 387:15
plugging 378:4
Pluta 556:19 558:3,7,23 559:3, 25 560:7 569:24 584:12
POI 472:1
point 336:13 337:11,15,16,17 339:25 348:21 349:1,14 353:25 354:22,24 361:16 362:24 372:22 389:14 399:17

423:17 426:19

Evidentiar
427:3 428:1,9 436:18 437:20 442:11 449:2 463:10,21 469:8 470:11 472:2 481:21 482:1,3 484:2 485:7 486:24 488:10,14 509:24 513:2 519:6 528:3,21 529:19 534:22 536:4 538:17 573:22,23
pointed 532:8
points 512:5,11 517:22 518:4,6 526:6
poking 375:14
policies 544:15,22
political 382:8,10
politically 358:5
politics 382:2
portfolio 509:13, 19
portfolios 549:23
portion 338:25 339:1 346:11 416:7 430:6 440:10 446:18 502:22 503:1,6, 14,24 504:2,5 565:15 568:14 574:3 578:25
position 384:4 400:11 489:22
positioning 539:13
positions 475:24 476:1,2
possession 551:6
possibility 373:14

Ticaling Suite 60, 2	0201110
391:21 499:5 528:3 535:21	pra 52
possibly 359:25 416:25 417:4	pra 52
527:8 533:12	pra
post 374:15 562:13 563:7	pra
post-mortems 373:22,25	pra 56
potential 350:12 412:4 413:21	pre 52
419:16 426:2	pre
521:9,23 528:18 531:14 546:17 550:17 551:14	pre 40
552:5 553:4 561:18 565:6	pre 48
potentially 350:20	pre
383:12 409:22 434:8,10 523:4	pre 44
526:1 530:1 535:25 539:15	pre
540:3 551:8,12 564:4	pre 57
Poudel 349:13	pre 36
power 343:16 346:16,21 353:17	pre
357:6,8,14,16 372:6 378:21	57
385:14 386:20,24	pre 33
387:2 404:5 470:10,12,18,20	40
482:6 483:11,21	55
484:3 486:10,14, 19,24 510:5,8,9,	pre
11,13,14 517:12,	pre Pre
17 522:3 523:20 524:16,24 527:12	pre
528:19 529:3	55
530:7 532:15,25 534:22 535:16	pre
538:8 549:23	15 56
PRA 509:11	pre

practical 415:23 527:20
practicalities 526:19
practice 483:8
practices 538:11
prairie 567:2,3,6 568:5
pre-establish 529:4
precisely 563:15
predominantly 400:4
preexisting 483:24
preface 499:13
prefer 384:8 447:12
preferable 405:10
preferred 390:5,18 573:23
prefiled 368:2 369:7 494:4
preliminaries 574:24
preliminary 334:13 362:5 404:23 499:13,21 556:19
prelims 405:3
premise 335:21
Preparation 531:9
prepare 348:16 552:7
present 337:10, 15,18 366:6 410:5 564:14
presented 337:15, 16 338:7



presently 410:17 532:1 president 360:14 361:17 406:18 467:25 presidential 357:23 presuppose 358:5 presupposes 358:5 pretty 348:22 351:25 441:14 484:16 498:1 499:21 509:22 574:17 577:25 579:11 prevent 456:8,14 previous 342:4 365:14 384:21 448:23 469:22 476:3 528:18 previously 334:21 350:16 385:8 453:7 459:19,23 480:16 price 352:20 356:6 357:8 376:5 378:6 379:1 382:19 386:24 390:17 399:22 404:5,8 534:22 536:4 **prices** 343:16 346:13,16,21 347:7,9 357:7,14, 16 362:1 372:6 400:5,6 403:24 404:3,13 427:3 470:24 536:3,5 pricing 396:3,8, 15,23 primarily 372:5

424:23 435:12

487:24 551:10 **primary** 417:11 554:6 principal 425:1 534:20 542:10 principles 349:8 **Pringle** 391:8,10 393:1 408:22 409:1 412:24 453:17 456:3,5,18 459:7,8,13 461:4, 14,20 464:14 466:12 471:15,19 473:16 487:19 489:14 493:20 495:5,9 500:7 510:25 536:19 545:16 555:3 557:19 560:22 569:11 572:20 577:22,25 578:3 579:19 582:1,7 583:6,9,11,14,18, 24 584:17 **print** 370:18 prior 379:22 380:6 392:16 415:5 418:22 419:4 442:2 444:5 446:24 460:11,18 498:1 548:20 581:19 prioritization 551:11 prioritize 553:2 priority 500:23 Pritzker 363:3 privately-owned 552:13 privileged 566:19 **pro** 336:22 385:2,5 452:7,9,11

problem 461:15 procedural 337:13 530:17 procedure 368:18 483:9,25 530:9 procedures 528:25 537:23 proceed 506:8 proceeding 340:11,20 342:4 384:24 400:15 418:17 547:17 566:15 proceedings 334:1 368:14 472:11 582:11 **process** 377:17 388:17 390:11 420:23 428:1 446:21 465:15 472:15,16 476:4, 10 477:12,15,17 480:2,8,9 481:10 532:15 534:8,9 537:15 processes 388:12 509:22 procuring 544:6 **produce** 401:16 **produces** 342:16 producing 342:8 401:10 production 343:14 379:6,21 380:1,17 399:11 403:25 527:19 productive 480:2, 8,9 professional 374:6 389:8 459:17 465:19

profile 346:17 profiles 425:15 profitability 353:22 354:14,18 **program** 352:23 361:21 362:13,17, 23 363:16,21,22 364:10 365:20 366:1 377:12 420:19 552:11,23 553:13,14 programs 362:8 544:13 progress 527:11 568:10 **project** 335:18,23 336:1 337:1 338:4,17 339:19, 20 340:22 343:11 344:1,5,10,15 348:1 354:18 374:12 384:20 388:9 391:20 394:18 395:9 397:11,25 398:24 403:23 409:7,14 411:2,3 414:16,21 416:2 417:19 418:24 419:25 420:20,25 421:9, 12 423:2,15,23 424:10,20 425:3, 7,12,15,16,18 426:5,14 427:22, 23 428:2,9,15 429:13 430:1,7,9 432:10 433:8,14, 15 435:9,24 437:18,25 438:2, 13,18,25 442:13 444:5,7,11,12,13, 18,25 445:13,19, 20,22,23 446:3,5, 10,14,20 447:2,8, 9,13,16 448:9,10,



June 06, 2023Index: Project's..Q3

	Lviderillai	y ricaring Suite of	o, zozomaek. i rojectoQo
20 452:25 453:1, 3,9 454:13,17 457:19 469:23 470:12 472:1 480:11,15 481:9, 11,17,19 482:10, 11 483:14,15 496:6 501:4,8 509:21 512:1,6 513:1 516:2,7,12, 17,19 517:2,6,10, 15,21 518:2,17 519:5,12,14 524:19 525:3,7,20 528:5,9 529:10, 14,18,19,24 530:16,20 531:11,	534:16 537:19,20 539:25 546:10,14, 17 555:19,22 prolong 427:5 PROMOD 387:7, 14 promote 547:1 pronouncing 349:13 property 557:4,11 563:1 573:20 proportional 502:24 proposal 415:5	430:21,25 454:25 455:7 460:8,16 465:10 469:18 470:9 484:21 496:3 500:6 501:23 506:19 512:6 528:6 542:4 544:21 546:5 552:4 566:22 567:23 575:15 provided 425:13 431:11,14 463:9 469:20 474:1 484:8 495:20 498:7 501:20 531:4 567:25	pull 444:1 486:19 498:4 578:10 pulled 486:11,24 purchase 355:7 399:25 413:10 415:23,24 416:7 418:11 426:2 427:16 purchased 415:7 purchasing 415:8 purport 513:9,14 515:3 purpose 529:25 546:1,4
16,17 535:1,12 537:13 545:1,3 546:6,21 547:6 549:24 550:14 551:10 554:10 555:25 565:4,7,15 566:9 568:12,14	proposed 362:10, 13,23 385:4 423:8,9 457:12 489:19 516:3 556:23,25 558:9, 12,15 568:11 578:23	providers 438:12 526:24 providing 448:3 464:14 514:2 526:14 provisions	purposes 525:5 pursuant 496:3 pursuing 392:6 purview 371:6 563:23 push 354:19 366:5
573:21,22 574:4 578:12,13,25 Project's 340:6 410:1,9 project-specific 444:5,7,9,15 445:9 projected 336:24 429:12,17,25 435:8	proposing 470:5 proposition 547:13 propounded 345:10 prospective 398:10 484:12 510:12 protected 565:5	397:14,21 proxy 390:6 396:16,24,25 397:21 398:17 prudency 355:1 prudent 352:14 355:1 public 391:5 398:13 408:19 441:14 455:25	put 337:13 349:10 352:16 355:5 369:13,16 370:24 378:20 384:6 385:1 396:18 401:25 483:2 490:9 497:2 498:2,15 522:7 530:24 539:4 puts 490:10
projecting 374:18 projection 435:20 projections 346:4 373:20 428:14 projects 374:11 379:5 425:8,10 447:12 501:19,21, 22 527:5,8,10 529:10 530:12,13 531:6 532:4	Protection 361:25 362:5 protocol 529:8 protocol-based 530:17 protocols 579:13 prove 455:2 provide 348:7 420:7 422:23	459:16 462:6 471:12 487:16 495:2 500:22 510:22 536:16 543:4 545:13 554:25 560:19 562:13,21 563:7, 17 569:8 571:16 574:9 published 373:13 Puget 527:5	putting 351:11 356:1 377:2 381:2 398:9 400:2 510:3,5 Q Q&a 407:2 Q2 422:5,7 Q3 422:5,7
		İ	l .



June 06, 2023Index: qualify..read

raised 445:18

ramifications

range 390:10

425:13,14,17,18

494:14 496:19

574:25

553:25

541:14 570:12

qualify 368:16 quantified 515:19 quantifies 514:19 quantify 349:16 373:16 511:25 512:9 513:9,14 514:13 515:3,17 516:6,11 519:11 547:4 question 337:12 345:10 353:4,7,9 354:1,3,5 356:21 357:11 358:24 359:6,9,17 360:4, 9,11,19,20,25 366:8,17,18,22 368:21,24 369:2 370:4,5,6,8 371:7 372:11,15 376:2, 13 377:1,25 378:5,13 381:17, 19 382:25 383:13 384:1,22 386:25 388:14,24 391:13 394:18 402:23 411:11 412:19 413:9 417:2 419:2 425:24 426:9 427:8 431:4,23,24 432:3 434:4,7,13, 22 437:10 438:23 441:11 443:2 450:10,19 451:9 454:3 456:6,11 462:22 464:7 465:1,6 466:9 474:6 478:17 480:4 482:25 484:10 485:23 494:8,11 499:8 503:11 504:21 505:10 514:13,18 516:23 522:25 523:11,14 533:14 534:7 554:9 555:20 558:21

562:2,18,22 563:18 564:7 574:7,11 576:18 578:17

questioned 457:22

questioning 392:9 399:9 454:7 457:13 549:19 579:22

questions 335:6 351:13,18 359:21, 22 360:3 368:7 375:8,12 376:20 381:9,11,14 384:12,13 390:20, 21,22 393:2,4,11, 14 403:17 404:15 407:16 412:25 414:4 430:5 442:16 443:11,16, 17,18,23 452:16 454:8,11 455:15, 16 457:1,17,23 460:23 462:5.9. 11,23 463:3 464:9,19 465:3 466:2,3,5,9,10,11 468:10 471:20 473:17 478:7,9, 10.14 479:19.20 485:3 487:5,7,23 488:18,22,24 489:7 492:23 500:8 504:14,16, 17,22 505:10 508:8 510:18 511:1 520:12,17, 19,20,23 524:10, 13 535:5,7,8 536:8,23 537:1,3 540:6 542:21 545:16 548:1,4,12 549:3,6,7,11,15 554:16,17 555:9, 11 556:2 558:14

559:22 560:8 561:2,4,6,9,13,21 564:18,19 568:23, 24 569:11,19,21 571:21 572:24 573:1,3,5,8,10 574:7,8,14,25 576:19 579:20 580:2,7,10,11 583:5,6,10,11,15, 19,20,25 584:5,6, 10,13,15

queue 475:23 476:9

quick 356:22 361:4 439:21 451:5 487:23

quickest 381:22

quickly 351:24 385:20 389:15 470:12 543:21

quo 394:24 395:1 397:4

quote 355:15 396:18 418:20,24 429:23 430:5

quoted 430:13

R

R-E-A-L-G-Y 413:15,24

R-O-B-E-R-T 506:3

R-O-D-R-I-G-U-E-Z 467:9

R-O-L-A-N-D-A 405:24

rabid 511:8

raise 405:18 418:13 421:5 445:3,7 505:20

ranked 465:16 ranking 465:8

rata 336:23 385:3, 5

rate 337:22,23 373:4 434:6 523:15

ratepayer 339:21 345:20 375:18 384:18 385:10

ratepayers 339:3, 14 343:17,23 348:24 350:19 352:13,16 372:7 392:5 522:23 523:17

rates 372:9,12,20 449:22 482:18 544:12

ratio 424:18 425:2, 9,19,21 426:2,4,8, 14,15,20,25 427:4 445:16

rationale 453:7 ratios 425:7,25

RB-1 507:4 reach 428:2

reached 447:12

reaches 427:23

read 335:4 364:22, 25 365:7 366:16, 18 367:17 368:4,6



	Lviderillai	y ricalling Sune 00	, 2023index. readilyreioin
395:1,14 396:6 453:24 495:23 496:2 556:24	399:8 400:17 402:4 418:20 455:4 457:10,13,	recommends 460:15	555:13,15 569:23 574:14,15 583:7, 12,21 584:7,11
readily 431:18	23 489:6 494:3 497:5 524:25	reconcile 430:20 431:10,14	redirected 377:16
reading 335:20	532:9 537:8	record 334:3	redirecting 535:16
345:18 557:1	555:19,21 566:15	335:11,14 359:23	reduce 565:18,24
reads 433:13	receive 453:14 465:10 535:15	367:18 369:12,13, 16 373:8 374:3,5	reduced 336:9,19
ready 334:14 366:21 449:2,9	579:7,15	385:2 388:21 394:6,9 405:8	337:1,10,19,23
454:23 525:18	received 408:6	406:12 408:7	reducing 349:6,7, 9 357:6
540:23 556:18 574:22	428:6 460:11,18 461:9,19 463:10	428:25 429:3 439:12,14,15	Reduction 350:4,9 397:17
real 381:12 441:3 451:5 484:1	468:22 475:6,9 493:10 508:21	441:15 461:6,10 467:19 468:23	reductions 398:20
548:24 Realgy 457:24	530:20 543:9 560:5 561:16 562:5,15 572:5	475:10 491:7,10 493:11 508:22 540:19,22 542:5,	redundancy 550:21,24
458:1	577:8	18 543:3,7,10	redundant 554:5
realized 400:21 512:16 516:7,12	receiving 579:6	556:24 557:1 558:11 560:1,6	refer 396:3 407:14 430:13,18
realizing 401:18	546:11	571:5 572:4,6 574:9 575:16	reference 407:13
rearrange 581:3	recently 419:24	576:2,5,24 577:8	410:22 414:19 450:21 458:24
reason 335:3 349:4 350:11	495:25	580:2,14 582:9,10 recordable 501:15	527:15 564:22
356:15 362:16	recess 394:7 439:13 491:8	502:4,6,9	568:3 referenced 379:6
398:16 405:12 410:13,14 450:17	540:20	recourse 444:11, 16	432:1
454:12,22 497:10 503:8,22,23 519:4	recognize 388:12 389:13	recover 434:11	references 383:22 442:21
533:15 558:16 570:4 581:2	recognizing 382:21 389:1	456:15	referred 399:14
reasonable	476:17	recovery 456:10 539:5	400:10 424:3 520:5
337:23 349:11,24, 25 361:23 553:17	recollection 336:21 348:6	red 508:1,3 578:7, 15,20	referring 395:7,9 425:6 432:15
reasoning 411:19	365:6 379:18 494:6	red-line 578:10	445:25 450:5,8
reasons 472:4 565:8	recommend 460:7	red-lined 404:24 432:16	451:25 503:3 refine 565:18,19,
rebuttal 459:22	recommendation	redirect 393:16,19	24 566:9
460:2,3,24	471:21	394:10,12 457:4,8	refined 565:20
recall 335:20	recommended 453:11 455:1	458:12 466:11,12	reflected 396:9
340:19 382:13 384:24 392:8	700.11 700.1	488:25 489:4 505:11,12 537:4,6	reform 476:10



LVIGERIIA	Ty ricaring Sunc 50, A	2025IIIdex. regardrequired
relevant 353:22	554:21 560:15	506:1 541:19
441:20 460:9,16	569:4 572:15	567:9 584:18
531:4	577:17	reports 566:22,24,
roliability 3/17:/	ronowahlo 351:12	25
_		
		represent 519:2
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	representation
		489:16 524:12
	renewables 350:5	
	354:19 356:25	Repsher 334:5,18,
•		20 335:7,12 345:3
	•	351:14 354:7
349.23 332.10	395:7 444:24	359:11,18 366:10
reliable 469:17	445:8	391:11 394:3,10,
510:3 514:10	renewed 479:10	14 404:16 412:19
relied 523:24		583:3
	renumbered 450:6	Repsher's 368:5,9
	repay 424:21	•
536:5	432:25 433:10	Republicans
rely 532:1	444:17 445:10	382:13
	manage 447.0	request 336:14
relying 343.20		337:7 420:2 422:9
remain 407:17		428:16 429:18,22
441:5 492:24		430:17,24 431:8
508:10,12 550:4		474:3,23 490:1,
559:23 571:22		10,11 496:5
579:3	317.13,24 323.11	501:13 566:21,23,
remainder 348·10	rephrase 360:22,	25 567:22
	24 361:2 396:21	requested 423:20
	replace 539:17	447:18 501:18
	•	
423:1 441:9	replaced 397:21	requesting 499:20
remand 498:6	replicate 398:6	requests 336:12
remember 350.3	449:17	476:4,6 477:12
	report 335:4 341:2	501:9
•	<u> </u>	require 363:7
		422:22 472:21
		479:3 483:15
	, ,	528:19 529:2,15
	· ·	530:6
397:20	1	
Renew 391:1		required 438:19
408:15 455:21		439:1 463:24
462:12 471:8		471:24 479:1
487:12 494:22	_ ·	483:20 490:19
509:5 536:12		504:3 531:16
İ.	171.15 101.10	566:14
543:20 549:18	474.15 491.19	500.14
	relevant 353:22 441:20 460:9,16 531:4 reliability 347:4 348:13 351:4 481:23 482:5,8 511:25 517:2,11, 16 518:17 524:15 528:7 531:15 535:11,24 537:25 538:1 547:1 549:23 552:16 reliable 469:17 510:3 514:10 relied 523:24 relieve 517:6 536:5 rely 532:1 relying 343:20 remain 407:17 441:5 492:24 508:10,12 550:4 559:23 571:22 579:3 remainder 348:10 413:20 445:5 remaining 421:15 423:1 441:9 remand 498:6 remember 350:3 377:10,23 392:22 442:17 478:20 528:2 530:25 532:23 563:15 remove 357:13 397:20 Renew 391:1 408:15 455:21 462:12 471:8 487:12 494:22	relevant 353:22 441:20 460:9,16 531:4 reliability 347:4 348:13 351:4 481:23 482:5,8 511:25 517:2,11, 16 518:17 524:15 528:7 531:15 535:11,24 537:25 538:1 547:1 549:23 552:16 reliable 469:17 510:3 514:10 relied 523:24 relieve 517:6 536:5 rely 532:1 relying 343:20 remain 407:17 441:5 492:24 508:10,12 550:4 559:23 571:22 579:3 remainder 348:10 413:20 445:5 remaining 421:15 423:1 441:9 remand 498:6 remember 350:3 377:10,23 392:22 442:17 478:20 528:2 530:25 532:23 563:15 remove 357:13 397:20 Renew 391:1 408:15 455:21 462:12 471:8 487:12 494:22 reporter 405:1,23 467:7



		, 3	
requirement 472:6	respond 464:10	resulting 412:3	revisit 375:15
requirements	465:4,14 546:4	results 397:23	rewind 354:22
383:25 464:2	responded 463:6	508:6 515:19,20	rig 404:6
529:13	465:6	568:9	rights 440:16
requires 500:5	responding	resume 334:4,14	489:15,20,23
538:14	464:18	394:9	rigorous 347:1
residents 338:22	responds 464:7	retail 338:3	
339:6,14 340:2	response 354:2	retain 440:2 441:8,	risk 352:14 375:14 390:7 416:18
346:17	403:16 429:8,11,	25	425:15,16,18
resides 509:24	22 430:17,24	return 434:12	risks 447:13
residual 521:1	431:7 435:3 442:15 463:7,9,12	523:15	531:14 552:5,8
resilience 481:23	464:10 471:21	reveal 419:16	553:4
535:12 552:10,22	474:23 495:22	revenue 409:15,24	river 499:2 550:11
resiliency 512:1	496:3,5 498:5	410:1,3,4,9	
524:15 528:8	514:17 561:23	418:23 424:21	riveting 364:25
531:14 549:24	563:4,10,16 566:13,14,24	446:7 447:20	Rob 335:13
resilient 514:10	574:10	454:13 455:3,7	Robert 505:19
535:24	responses 337:4	revenues 411:15	506:2,10 507:2 508:16 584:3
resource 342:11	375:16 428:16	426:16,19 427:6 429:25 430:7	
352:8 378:17	463:19 487:23	444:13,19 446:17	robust 469:17 470:7
390:16 397:1 398:8 401:14,15	561:24 562:19	448:2,12,14	_
524:18 533:4	responsible	reversal 528:19	Rodriguez 429:19 430:18 431:8
resources 340:25	445:21 544:15	529:2	434:4,7,13 443:3
341:8 342:11,15,	responsive	reverse 470:10,12,	467:1,2,8,13
17,20 343:16,21	353:25	17 483:4,7,11	468:2 469:4 470:1
352:15 383:16,19	rest 367:9 433:16	485:5,22 486:9	471:3,16 472:25 473:22 474:7,17
388:9,11,12 389:2,7,11,17,21,	466:19	529:5	478:12 485:1
25 390:8,18 399:8	restate 464:25	reversed 483:21	489:6 490:25
401:25 403:11	507:19 562:18 564:7	reviewed 340:13	532:8,16 583:17
444:4 524:23		484:18	Rodriguez's 432:2
532:13 562:9,16 565:6,11 566:6	restatement 457:17	reviewing 538:1	Rolanda 404:22
567:8 568:7,13,		550:8 561:15	405:24 406:6,19
16,18,21	restoration 518:7,	revised 428:15	541:1 583:8
respect 342:18	restricted 565:9	429:13 433:12,13 442:18 517:1,6	role 537:16 544:20
419:11 423:22		519:4	roll 368:13
respectfully	restrictions 353:2	revision 556:23	Romney 382:5
366:25 400:15	result 359:10,18 370:6 411:1	558:15	Romney's 381:22
respective 395:5	463:18	revisions 453:11	room 443:14



548:2 rude 354:8 412:4 413:22 506:25 507:9 541:1 508:17 542:13,19 rough 348:7 ruled 368:20 571:15,25 575:25 satellites 531:2 roughly 378:9 rules 529:4 566:15 576:8,11,14,16 385:7 411:7 425:3 **save** 503:23 504:4 ruling 364:24 **school** 364:6 503:17 369:16 **saving** 503:18 **Schulte** 335:11 route 463:18 run 387:25 **savings** 336:2,6,8, 353:7,15 358:7,19 561:18 564:24 18,24 337:1,9,24 359:7,8 365:13,21 running 466:8 568:11 573:23 338:16,22,24 367:13,15,24 553:14 579:14 339:2,3,5,11,18, 368:1,17 393:18, runs 347:7 routed 568:15 21 343:23 345:25 20,21 394:2,10, 347:13 348:15,16, 11,13 396:21,22 **Rupp** 375:8,9,11, routing 464:8,20 19 349:1,3,12,15 404:14 505:18 13 381:8 443:18, 562:4,6 563:9 350:6,24 351:1 19 454:6,9 455:13 506:9,14 507:15, row 508:5 356:7 375:19,20 462:25 463:4 18,22 508:13,23 376:1 385:7 537:5,7 540:5,24 rows 348:22 464:17,24 465:2, 397:10,24 484:14 541:5,10,23 542:3 25 478:12,15 **RS-1** 406:22 512:15 513:4,10. 543:2,8,11 479:17 504:19 407:9,22 15 515:4 518:22 555:14,16 556:1 520:22,24 521:21 521:2,5,9,23 **RS-3** 407:3,4,10, 575:14 576:23 524:1,4,7 549:7 522:6 528:18 12 450:1 577:2,9 581:9,18, 561:10 573:6 23 583:7 584:4,7, 583:5,11,15,19 **RS-3S** 450:7 **scale** 340:9 344:6, 584:5 8,11,17 11 527:10 533:5 **RS-4** 406:22 551:21 scientist 372:16 Russia-ukranian 407:10,14 408:1 551:21 411:13 450:6 scenario 343:19 **scooch** 406:2 359:24 394:22,24 452:6,9 **scope** 371:17 397:23 448:19 S **RTO** 475:20 565:13 scenarios 342:24 481:10 484:6 **Scott** 550:11 **S-H-I-N-E** 405:25 343:7 394:22 517:5 scratch 472:15 395:4,12,20 S-T-E-L-Z-L-E-N-I RTO's 388:11 448:15 556:16 **SEAMS** 482:23 **RTOS** 378:2 schedule 334:7 483:2,11,19 **safe** 505:9 531:23 398:13 483:6,19, 342:22 358:1 **Sean** 580:15 25 484:5 517:1 **safely** 531:24 384:15 386:7 530:6 532:12 **season** 351:20 **safety** 500:22 407:3,13,25 408:1 535:15 552:7,15 501:2,5 423:3 450:1,2,3, seasonally 565:9 RUBENSTEIN 20 451:17 479:12 **sale** 376:15,17 seconds 355:4 390:25 408:14 507:4,13 559:16 414:15,20 415:1, 455:20 462:11 576:3 577:3 section 341:4 11 418:1,14,21 471:7 487:11 580:17 581:10 342:21 433:11 419:11 424:11 494:23 509:4 schedules 406:22, sector 404:1 **sales** 446:4 536:11 543:19 25 407:3,9,22 554:20 560:14 **secure** 427:22 **Sane** 388:15 452:5 468:5,15,17 569:3 572:13 389:15 390:12 **secured** 454:18 492:16,20 493:2 577:16 410:5 411:21



		Evidentia	y Hea
	securitization	series 346:2	Sh
	484:16 522:9	352:11 457:23	40
	523:16	489:6 524:13	6,
	security 546:5,17,	565:3	4
	21 547:1,5,7	serve 537:15	4
	550:1 552:21,22		45
	554:11 555:18	served 539:21	45
	seek 456:9,15	service 346:18	58
	,	347:11 356:5	Sh
	segment 415:16,	378:21 386:8,21	40
	18	389:18 400:2,4	shi
	selected 497:11	424:18,22 425:19 426:1,13,20	sho
	selecting 573:23	444:17,21 445:16	
	sell 416:12,15,25	446:13,17 447:20,	sho
	417:4,12 418:4	22 448:1 459:16	39
	440:9,10,15,16,	490:3,9,10 503:9	49
	20,23 441:1,3,4	531:25 535:18	sho
	442:4	services 433:17	sho
		503:5 529:20	38
	seller 353:24		
	354:15 355:16	set 463:11 527:20	sho
	seller's 354:24	530:14,23	34 44
	selling 417:19	sets 401:23	5′
	419:7 440:1	507:24 542:22	_
	sells 441:19	554:7	sho
	Senate 531:9	setting 514:16	sho
		settled 404:23	sho
	send 486:20	severely 363:4	40
	senior 459:17	520:25	sh
	467:25 492:11	shadow 352:20	shu
	552:9 559:12 571:11	376:5 378:9 379:1	53
	37 1.11	382:19 390:17	sid
	sense 370:21	396:9	Siu 14
	498:9 525:11,12		-
	546:24	share 412:14	sid
	sentence 395:4	420:23 441:3	Sie
	396:6,8 433:13	shareholders	40
	460:7	398:14	46
	separate 376:8	Shashank 541:1	48
	482:15 516:5,10		50
	521:14	she'll 405:6	54
		sheet 405:7 414:3,	56
	serial 476:4	5,9	57
- 1			I

ine 404:22 **sign** 446:8 448:11 05:17,24 406:4, ,19 408:23 11:15 412:18,24 13:4 439:24 56:6 457:10 58:15 541:1 83:8 ine's 404:25 05:4 ipped 486:11 oes 355:5 398:9 **ort** 390:9 93:24 394:2 91:5 orten 580:10 ortly 379:12,17 81:3 **ow** 343:25 48:25 397:9,24 46:4 517:20 18:1 521:8 owed 386:8 own 522:5 ows 343:21 00:2 465:8,15 ut 531:24 utdown 363:7 31:20 532:10 **de** 527:3 532:13, 4,22 delined 521:10 erra 390:24 08:13 455:19 62:10 471:6 87:10 494:22 09:3 536:10 43:18 554:19 60:13 569:2 72:12,13 577:15

signed 363:3 410:18,20 426:23 428:4 447:6 473:2 significance 551:11 significant 341:21 481:19 534:10 548:18 552:5 553:25 563:1 significantly 470:22 497:8 **signing** 361:18 449:3 458:9 **similar** 388:13 409:18 422:20 448:8 449:20 452:11,22 460:14 461:16 494:11 **similarly** 347:8,11 **simple** 400:25 401:4,12 402:3 simplified 534:23 simplify 558:12 simplistic 399:18 **simply** 368:4 416:1 417:19 424:3 449:6 **single** 357:13 396:12 401:12 405:2 497:3 514:24 singular 426:6 sir 335:24 336:17 343:1,8 344:3 345:8,15 349:21 391:19 393:1 464:16 473:5,16 488:16 495:15,17 514:13 545:19 546:15 577:25



را.	une 06, 2023Index: sitStaff			
531:2 22	specifics 419:19 443:7 563:8			
:4 15	spell 405:22 459:3 467:6 491:18 506:1 541:18 556:14 570:17 575:6			
. •	spelling 406:11			
	split 479:4			
6:3	spoiled 523:3			
7	spoke 342:4			
2	spoken 386:14 417:25 521:16 553:24			
	sponsor 441:6 445:8,20			
1:11	spot 491:5 539:15			
17 spotted 567:4				
568:4 9,16 6,23 3 4 6 6 6 6 7:18	SPP 339:1 387:11 388:16 473:8,12, 13 478:20 479:4, 23,24 480:15,24 481:1,2,4,6 484:7 485:16,23 486:1, 12,14,15,24 488:3 508:5 510:15 512:16 521:3,11, 24 528:22 546:22 552:4 555:19,23			
3,15,	spreading 391:24			
3:4,	spreadsheet 450:9 465:8			
889:6, 8:19	Spilliuliela Saczi			
3,19 3,10 21	stability 517:2 551:16			
3	stable 446:10			

sit 371:14 427:14
sited 351:8 568:15
sites 526:8
siting 573:22 574:1
sitting 360:2 476:25
situation 486:8,18
situations 487:1
size 403:1 411:3 472:2 480:11 490:6 497:19,23 527:22 576:4
skip 386:11
skipped 351:16 502:2 580:5
skunk 567:4
sleep 511:12
slot 530:16
slow 361:5 367:18 539:9
small 346:24 457:6 573:24
smaller 347:16 496:25 497:1
snapshot 523:20
SO2 349:7 372:9, 12,20
social 370:2,3,10 376:11,14
societal 349:3 376:9
soft 521:16

solar 340:9,25

341:6,7,9 342:25

344:6,11 372:10,

14 373:17 380:8

389:21 401:14,16

403:8,9,11 486:23

Evident
524:17 531:13 539:10
sold 380:17,20 440:8 441:22 442:2
solely 424:10
solemnly 405:18 458:25 467:2 491:14 505:21 541:14 556:10 570:12 575:1
solid 514:1
solutions 497:13
solvent 442:10
sooner 454:14
sort 346:3 352:15 358:25 378:16 385:25 387:14,18 443:5 483:14 484:12 529:17 531:22 535:18 538:12
sorts 343:15 368:14 374:13 551:18
sought 522:10
Sound 527:5
sounds 337:5 558:23
source 410:4 418:23 470:5 480:13
sources 340:18 354:15 409:23
sources' 526:16
south 406:13 467:21 521:11 534:15 559:7 575:17
southwest 485:18

space 403:35 span 335:18,2 336:1,3 spanned 499 **spans** 497:9 sparing 522:1 speak 479:11 527:9 564:11 speaking 336 351:9 446:14 515:12 535:1 548:12 **speaks** 538:1 spearheaded 552:11 Specialist 57 **species** 463:1 565:5 567:6 5 specific 359:9 362:9 365:15 368:7 378:25 384:25 386:23 394:18 398:24 399:3 411:14 420:18 426:5 427:2 444:12 460:10,17 49 512:5 515:7 5 546:16,20 54 552:17 557:8 20 561:23 56 19 specifically 3 11 395:5 398: 404:12 425:8 435:13 442:2 470:19 483:3 514:21 515:23 534:9 552:12,24

578:20

standpoint 449:16

551:5

400:17 408:21 410:22 413:9 452:16 453:10,12, 15 456:2 457:11, 12 459:23 460:2, 15 461:5,11 463:16,21,25 471:14 487:18 489:7 493:20 495:4 499:20,25 504:24 510:24 536:18 545:15 555:2 556:22 557:5,12 560:21 566:13 567:18 569:10 572:19 577:21 582:3
staff's 400:11 458:18,21 459:18 461:9 463:7 489:18 541:7 557:17 583:13
stage 427:23 428:2 498:10 499:14
Stahlman 582:3
Stahlman's 410:22 471:21
stakeholder 388:17
stand 334:6 365:9 400:21 405:6 410:6 431:2 447:22 448:4 512:24 514:8 538:16
standalone 380:10
standard 404:10

483:9,24 528:25

standards 533:13

533:10 579:15

standby 581:1

start 341:4 378:25 383:6 409:2 431:5 446:25 451:18,20 453:13 454:19,20 466:17 472:14,15 493:15 524:14 526:20 529:21 530:14 531:15,19 551:4 562:10 580:7 581:15
started 363:5 373:16 379:14,15 386:4 476:6 537:24
starting 345:9 357:22 362:3 363:5,6 382:19 399:17 425:4 532:16
starts 362:3 460:6, 7 485:8 531:10
state 341:11 343:20 346:19 350:13 361:10 362:7 363:8,12,18 365:24 370:7 383:14,17,19,20, 21,24 384:2 385:15 391:12 394:21 396:13 398:22 406:12 429:22 432:23 438:12 500:21 501:25 502:18 505:25 506:15 511:24 512:2 514:14,21,22 515:18,20,21 518:16 530:4,5 531:9 547:17 548:14,19 550:10 551:23 552:8 553:17 556:13

/ Hearing	June 06, 2
557:2 559:4 566:12 571:4 575:5	
stated 359:4 375:18 377:5 379:4 406:11 420:12 431:8 467:18 502:2 521:7 558:8	
statement 35 368:7 369:20 384:4 400:13 433:6 465:18	,16
statements 359:23	
states 339:3 341:18,22 36 21 395:11 54 551:25 552:1 554:11	· 1
stating 400:1 418:20 453:1	
station 411:7 481:20 485:9 486:13 490:7 12 502:19,23 503:1,12,24 526:17	,8,9,
stations 434:: 435:2,6 485:1 509:25 510:6 524:20 526:9	10
status 394:24 395:1 397:4 4 447:2	
stay 449:23 478:18 540:1	6
staying 516:1	7
Stelzleni 556: 558:13,25 55 6,14 560:7 58 584:12	9:4,

6	, 2023Index: staff'sstorm
	Stelzleni's 463:5 556:21 558:7
	Stemme 344:22, 23 393:10,11 443:13 456:25 457:1 462:4,5 478:6,7 488:21,22 504:13,14 520:16, 17 536:25 537:1 548:3,4 555:8,9 561:3,4 569:18,19 572:25 573:1
	stenographer 353:13 358:11 366:19 524:2,6
	step 404:19 426:22 491:1 505:14 538:6 540:8
	stepping 341:12 540:9
	steps 514:2 568:17
	stipulation 570:8
	stop 353:4 355:9 368:19
	storage 380:10 524:18,22 525:1, 2,24 526:5 527:5, 8,13,18,22 528:3 534:4
	store 399:21
	storm 470:19,21 484:7,17 512:17, 19 520:25 521:8 522:4,5,13,16 523:19,22 530:2 531:21 532:10,11
	storms 347:5 470:16 483:5 487:1 515:5,10,18 528:18 538:2.19



stove 346:9 straight 449:19 straightaway 380:4 **strands** 539:16 Strategies 542:10 strategy 452:22 559:13 **stream** 409:15 446:7 **streams** 561:19 **Street** 506:20 542:6 strength 364:2 strengthen 390:1 strengthening 548:25 **stress** 448:15,19 strict 370:20 **Strike** 454:3 strikeout 405:2 strived 501:8 **strong** 482:3 structural 497:1,9, 10 499:1 structure 444:10 445:2 498:7,9,16 499:5 573:19 578:24 579:2,7 structured 444:18 445:12 structures 415:4 496:25 497:2,7, 19,22,23 498:1,3, 18,23,25 499:11 562:25 **studied** 555:18

studies 460:10,18 463:9,14 464:4 476:6 477:3 480:13 481:2 517:20,25 519:22 557:8,15,20 564:25 565:1,4,7, 9,11,13,16 567:12 568:1,9 **study** 335:22 336:7 349:19,22 350:23 368:17 392:15,16 397:9. 13,24 398:17,23 399:1,5 401:4,8 464:9,20 476:5 480:15,23,25 481:1,9,14 520:5, 6 523:7 525:6 subject 340:4 387:6 390:4 419:24 427:18 435:8 438:8 447:9 502:15 515:25 553:10 subjects 428:13 **submit** 420:14 422:13,15 459:22 461:12 submitted 392:16 411:25 422:15 423:13 429:18 495:21 511:17 520:6 557:4,11 submitting 558:13 subscribed 413:21 subscription 410:9 subsequent 512:9 subsequently 339:19

substantial 579:22 substantially 337:20,24,25 508:11,12 542:23 576:21 substation 386:13 482:2,4 substations 383:3 subtract 367:10 subtracting 356:4, 10 successful 538:25 successfully 444:18 449:8 **sudden** 356:5 suffer 522:20 sufficient 424:21 444:14,19 445:12 446:12 447:20 448:12 suggest 384:5 531:11 suggested 453:12 suggestion 414:25 579:18 suggestions 563:12 **Suite** 406:13 467:21 506:21 559:7 571:6 575:17 **sulfur** 349:7 summarize 563:10 summarizing 497:20 **summer** 483:5 **sun** 372:21 401:23

526:11,15

super 538:14 superior 389:2 supplement 463:12 566:14 supplemental 495:21 496:3,5 **supply** 357:6 527:2 529:20 supplying 499:25 **support** 409:15,22 420:25 444:20 470:9 520:6 545:4 547:17 550:25 551:2,17 552:19 553:2,19 558:19 supporting 528:1 553:11 supposed 336:2, 8,18 337:1 478:16 512:15 516:6,11 517:22 518:3 surprise 391:15 surrebuttal 345:6 406:21 407:7,17 410:21 411:13 463:5 464:6.15 468:4 475:17.20 476:8,23 477:9 489:11 492:15,23 495:10,21 498:5. 14 499:17 507:3,8 508:10,16 509:11 519:18,20 542:16, 20 544:1 558:8 559:15 566:11 567:17,18,20,22 571:14 576:7,15, 20 surround 553:20 **surveys** 565:17 567:8,13 568:7 573:25



Evidentiary Hearing June 06, 2023Index: sustainterritories			
sustain 396:20		target 551:24	538:20
sustained 366:22	T	targeted 550:16	technology
swapping 582:2	tab 428:20,21	551:19 553:4	455:10 469:14,15,
swear 405:18	table 404:24	564:24	16,22,23,24 470:2,4,6 480:12,
458:25 467:3	501:21 507:21	tariff 490:3	16,18 527:11
491:14 505:21	508:4	taste 400:1	·
541:14 556:10	takeaway 402:2	tax 350:6,10,15,	telemetry 567:5
570:12 575:1		17,19 352:1,23	telling 527:24
swings 534:8	takeaways 398:23 399:2	354:13 359:4,12,	ten 355:4 394:5
switch 458:21		13,16,25 360:15	503:20 525:22
sworn 334:21	takes 411:23 510:14 565:15	361:7 362:11	532:3 533:5,10
406:7 459:10		366:1,24 369:6,10 375:15,23,24	534:6 538:17 579:22 581:17
467:14 491:25	taking 334:11	376:4,14,16,18,22	
506:11 541:25	362:8 419:2	377:2,6,12,17,19	ten-minute 394:5
559:1 570:25	talk 345:20 347:23	378:3,9 379:6,9,	tender 408:9
575:11	357:21 369:22	12,16,19,21	461:21 468:24
synchronized	370:9 382:25	380:1,7,10,14,16,	493:13 560:8
539:6	427:22 439:25 482:24 486:8	18,19 381:4,16,	term 376:10
synchronous	529:23 533:3	19,20,23 382:4,	423:25 528:2,14
533:17,19	580:18	12,16 390:4,5 395:19,24 397:8,	546:24
system 347:5	talked 355:22	20	terminal 525:10,
348:12 351:10	363:20 369:1,5	taxes 352:2 382:9	23 526:10
352:16 357:1	370:1 403:8,16	444:21	terminate 423:9
365:10 387:18	411:20 425:25		terminus 402:10
388:19,23 390:2	441:14 452:14	taxing 484:12	terms 341:24
400:3 407:5 476:5 477:6,11 480:15	479:23 484:10	TCA 473:2,3,9	343:23 349:1
481:25 482:6,7,8	497:25 515:9 528:17 551:3	team 559:13	364:19 369:1
486:11 510:7,8	553:22	562:4,14 563:9,	411:22,24 413:25
514:3,4,5,7,10		24,25 564:1 566:8	416:19 423:8
517:12,17 518:7,	talking 336:14 341:23 342:3	teams 566:7	427:2 436:8
11 528:8 529:11,	343:14 348:2	technical 551:15	449:24 455:8,9
18 530:12 531:3	351:7 352:10	552:2	482:11 497:17 509:23 510:2,11
532:19 534:5 537:21 538:8,13,	357:1 363:17	technically 368:3	514:2,6 531:6
21,25 539:7,12,	376:4 388:15	440:22	533:22,23,25
14,16,19 546:25	390:11 415:14	technique 340:17	539:10 546:9
552:10	432:8 434:23	522:5	551:11,14 553:25
systems 434:20	435:23 440:13,17 442:15 451:20		563:22
435:1 531:23	479:23 481:8	techniques 538:15 539:21,23	terrible 470:16
	503:17,20 504:24	574:3	531:21
	511:21 523:9		territories 346:19
	548:20 570:8	technological	347:11 389:18



		.,	,,,,
552:15	463:6 466:16	374:25 379:9	436:11,22 437:4
torritory 206:0.22	467:3 468:3,4,7	382:7 400:7	444:14 455:11
territory 386:9,22	469:9 476:23	416:17 422:22	460:1,13 461:5,20
387:1 481:22	479:23 481:12	440:14 465:16,22	468:8,14 473:1,10
testified 334:21	490:25 491:15	523:10 529:22	474:5 479:9
359:11,14 366:23,	492:9,10,14,15,	531:5 532:1,5	481:18 482:25
24 367:4,16 369:6	20,23 494:4	536:1 539:6	483:10 484:2
382:5 392:23	495:11 498:14,18	540:17	492:20 493:1
397:13 399:5	499:17 500:19		500:8 522:24
406:8 418:16,19	502:16 505:14,22	thinking 375:3	526:18 532:7,12,
459:10 467:14	506:23 507:3,7,8	379:11 561:10	24 539:3 540:14
489:14 491:25	508:9,10,14,16	thinks 360:6,15,16	552:9 559:20
494:4 506:11			
509:11 541:2,25	511:17,19,20,24	third-party 421:16	565:10,16 567:23,
559:1 570:25	512:5,14 515:6	441:24 448:17	24 568:19 571:19,
575:11 581:19	518:4,7,14 519:18	thought 377:4	24 574:1 580:3,
373.11301.19	524:13 527:6	437:9	18,20,21,22
testify 358:18	528:4,20 535:11		time-based
369:8 392:12	540:8 541:15	thoughts 388:16	532:22
469:10,13	542:12,16,18,20,	threats 551:12	tim alim a 070.0
testifying 367:15	22 544:1 545:24		timeline 378:2
	546:2 548:20	throw 543:13	437:19 450:22
testimonies	550:2 551:3	574:8	timely 483:22
576:11,20	556:4,10,22	Thursday 540:16	times 347:9
testimony 335:1,	557:17 558:2,8,11	581:4	
13 338:9,16	559:15,20 564:22	4:- 000-0	365:14,23 366:1
339:20,24 340:12,	567:22 570:1,13	tie 398:3	375:4,16 376:5
14 345:13,18	571:13,14,18	tied 396:12 536:2	425:3 427:9 483:4
347:24 349:17,18	573:13 575:2,24	Tiger 463:18	484:1 510:7
353:18,23 359:3	576:7,13,15	496:8,11,22,23	525:11,15 536:4
360:1 365:14,15,	Texas 524:7	1 ' ' '	538:9 540:2
· · ·		499:6,10,14,22	580:25
22 366:7,12	theoretically	568:11,14 574:3	timing 378:5 447:4
367:1,6 368:2,5,8,	370:17,25	579:1	4:41- 400:40 47
9,15 369:3,7	thereabouts	time 350:16	title 406:16,17
381:16 383:4	521:10	353:14 358:12	407:4 467:24
384:16 388:8		360:3 361:19	492:5,8,11 506:16
394:15 398:19	thermal 470:8	363:8 369:5 375:1	542:9 559:10
404:17,25 405:4,	thing 348:22	377:22 378:10,16	571:9,10 575:20,
19 406:20,21,25	350:25 365:3	380:4 381:1	21
407:2,8,17 410:8	387:14,17 389:14	389:23,24 392:16	to/dependent
414:12,19 420:13	450:19 452:18	393:25 397:19	396:12
425:4,6 427:19	469:21 506:2,20	398:14 406:25	4 - 1 004 - 44
432:2,6,16,18	526:13 531:21	407:21 410:19,20	today 334:11
433:3 438:21	535:19 538:6	413:24 414:23	365:9 371:14
442:18,20 443:25	582:1	416:9 420:19	376:18 382:21
452:5 458:15,20,		421:25 423:10,15	388:25 407:18
25 459:22 460:2,	things 343:16	433:18,25 435:4	427:14 442:18,22
3,13,24 461:17,19	350:1,3 370:13,22	100.10,20 700.7	458:19 460:23
	1	1	1



Tuesday 334:3 468:11 542:22 transcript 461:18 U 559:22 561:15 transfer 381:1 tune 527:24 571:22 576:20 418:10 522:16 turn 336:14 **U-R-I** 513:15 today's 334:7 551:1 338:18 345:9 **U.S.** 349:10 352:9 told 541:8 transferability 346:8 394:14 361:24 363:25 350:10,15 380:14, 414:11 427:18 tomorrow 540:16 364:20 374:14 21 432:5 438:8 580:16,21 581:7 378:14 401:21 489:10 495:13 582:2,12 translate 553:15 **Uh-huh** 370:12 500:18 502:16 tool 387:4 404:10 transmission 416:14 441:18 509:7 518:13 338:10 343:3,5,9 519:17 545:23 538:3 top 377:23 388:6 348:4 351:11 578:6 394:17 403:17,18 **ultimate** 348:16 355:24,25 356:1,2 515:6,7 turned 365:4 ultimately 338:4 383:23 390:10,15 526:9 top-down 336:22 343:17 348:5,18 410:18 425:3,10, 404:7 12,16 432:24,25 **twelve** 351:2 **Toronto** 506:20 433:1,4,6,10 389:3 511:8 unamended 434:18,20,24 519:13 twelve-ish 339:13 **Toss** 582:7 435:1 440:15 **unaware** 362:20 **TWG** 480:19 473:4,7 477:14,15 total 338:8,21 479:24 480:6,10 339:1 341:24 uncertain 373:19 tying 353:5 440:24 346:22 402:14 482:17 483:4,18 uncertainty **type** 379:15 490:3,9,10 492:6, 420:20 421:8,11 349:25 399:21,22 446:5 11 496:24 501:4, 429:12 430:9,14 483:14 497:23 unclear 369:3 19 502:3 513:18, 438:2 475:1,13,14 499:5 523:7 376:25 415:9 477:4 495:16 25 525:5 528:8 535:19 539:25 534:21 537:14 419:5 496:1 539:2,20 546:10, types 410:2 423:5 uncontracted tower 370:24 25 547:18 550:24 425:14 483:16 446:15,19 371:1 497:14 553:1 557:3,10 497:22 498:7 underlying 369:22 towers 497:11 564:23 575:22 514:6 529:21 499:8 531:5 536:1 understand transparent 367:9 539:21 353:19 354:11 trade 352:23 **travels** 483:12 366:5,11 369:17 363:23 364:10 **typical** 388:10 365:10,19 484:11 trend 466:17 370:4 372:11 420:23 424:11,19 374:17 376:3 425:2,20 426:8 **trouble** 486:19 traditional 421:14 388:17 425:24 447:1 true 372:23 trailing 452:2 436:25 440:2,12, typically 401:23 438:17,24 461:1 19 469:8,16 **Tranche** 509:13, 417:6 433:13 476:13 477:4 truth 405:20 459:1 19 510:2 444:16 447:3 490:17 515:12 467:4 491:16 448:17 465:6,8, transaction 418:5 521:19 523:13 505:23 541:16 14,21 419:3 421:25 527:6 533:4 564:1 556:11 570:14 424:8 425:8 576:25 578:17 575:3 transactions understanding tube 403:1 425:7 337:12 367:3



370:8 373:15 380:23 413:19 424:1 435:7 458:7 497:18 574:5 579:2 understood 528:20 566:21 580:12 undertaking 565:3 underway 552:20 567:15 568:13 underwrite 424:13 underwriting 420:24 undiscounted 337:16,17 undivided 414:21 415:2,7,9,11,20, 25 416:5,10,25 417:5,13 418:1,12 419:7,12 unfolding 538:13 unforeseen 480:1 **Uniform** 407:5 **unique** 544:9 555:25 unit 402:17 **United** 551:25 552:1 554:11 units 533:21 unknown 362:19 437:3 477:2 504:4 unlocking 524:24 unquantifiable 547:11 **unquote** 355:15 unrelated 457:20

unusually 525:16

update 350:23 433:11 474:1 479:4 480:11,12 496:1,5 505:2 566:23 **updated** 349:22 430:18 431:9 475:14,16,17 479:11 504:25 567:13 **updates** 429:16 479:12,14 567:18 **upfront** 442:17 **upgrade** 338:12 348:10,12 429:13, 24 430:10 433:13, 23 475:2,24 480:22 **upgrades** 430:3,6, 14,19 431:9 432:9,24 433:4,18 434:16,18,25 435:4 442:17 474:2 477:5,18 upper 425:18 **ups** 454:5 **upset** 510:7 **Uri** 470:19 484:7, 15 486:5 512:17 513:10,15 520:25 521:9 523:22 **USA** 571:10 user 535:19 utilities 340:9 350:13 352:8,19 353:5 355:4 356:7 378:2,14,18 390:15 398:12,13 480:19 484:16 518:11 522:10 526:24 535:15 544:7,13 552:13

utility 344:6,11 378:4,10 388:4 415:7 488:14 534:11 utilization 390:7 403:5.14 utilized 350:7 386:20 404:2 533:13 **UVA** 374:2,4 V vagarities 534:2 valuation 519:7 564:5 values 337:10,18 338:16 339:18 475:17 484:21 512:1 524:15 variable 396:11 **variety** 531:12 **varying** 396:10 vast 352:18 385:12 vehicles 351:7 vein 525:8 verbatim 502:1 verified 429:8 version 405:4 408:5 461:12 578:10 **versus** 341:1 342:17 374:25 385:5 392:7 399:19,22 453:9 viability 409:10,13 **viable** 381:20 409:7 417:21

423:4 448:6

452:24 479:7 Vice 406:18 467:25 view 337:15,16,17 354:23,24 361:19 362:9 448:24 452:19 483:15,20 490:16 534:1 vis-a-vis 516:17 visual 565:6 vocal 545:4 volatility 533:8 voltage 470:5,9 480:12 **volume** 403:3 voluntary 441:9, 16 **VSC** 469:16 470:6 vulnerabilities 550:13,16 W **W-H-I-T-E** 491:21 **Wacker** 406:13 467:21 559:7 575:17 wait 358:11 393:25 447:12 454:22 469:10 582:1 waiting 464:8 walk 423:17 478:19 521:6 **walked** 381:18 549:18 **walking** 345:12 400:21 wanted 369:19



375:17 398:6 wetland 567:7 344:2 372:25 528:3 568:6 wanting 348:7 wetlands 565:5 22,23 403:8 532:3 558:6 what-have-you 486:23 524:17 War 551:21 347:6 526:11,13,14 539:10 whatnot 346:9 **warming** 373:11 window 372:14 Washington 542:6 whichever 378:4 553:8.9 winter 347:5 **Whipple** 390:23 water 565:5 567:7 408:12 455:18 484:7 487:1 568:6 462:17 469:3,7 512:17 520:25 471:2 487:9 Waters 364:20 521:8 523:22 493:16,18,23 538:1 **waterways** 561:19 494:2,18 509:2 536:9 543:17 ways 342:2 357:7 554:18 560:12 361:15 362:6 wire 539:1,2 569:1 572:11 382:3,6 433:25 577:14 583:18,23 wires 497:9 434:16 514:1 531:18 553:16 wiring 539:19 White 491:13,20, 566:8 24 492:4,14 withdraw 432:3 493:15,24 495:6 weak 470:7 480:21 481:6 497:17 499:16 weapons 551:7 500:8,14 505:14 weather 531:2 583:22 5,16,19 533:8,9 535:13 Whiteman 549:20 withdrawing week 364:25 505:8 wholesale 395:13 481:4 weeks 340:13 526:2 witness's 461:17 whooping 567:1 weighed 465:9 558:2 wide 425:13 **weight** 364:6 witnesses 357:5 **wildlife** 371:19 weighted 465:14, 448:24 451:7 535:23 540:25 18 **Williams** 391:6 541:2 581:19 weighting 464:19 408:20 456:1 582:4 583:2,16 465:11,19 462:7 471:13 584:2 487:17 495:3 **welfare** 349:15 510:23 536:17 wells 404:7 545:14 555:1 Wood 549:20 560:20 569:9 west 389:18 **wording** 461:19 574:9,13 580:1,4 391:14 486:7,12 **words** 355:16 win 358:6 381:20 West-east 508:5 565:25 wind 340:7,8,23, western 389:22 work 341:19 25 341:5,6,7.9 391:11 402:9 389:21 442:1 342:25 343:12

502:3 509:23 373:4,8,17 380:8 510:1,2 511:13 389:23 401:15,19, 530:1,25 541:13 553:12 574:1 work-related 501:3 worked 351:25 511:16 529:19 562:4 470:19,21 483:4 worker 500:21 working 479:13,24 480:6,10,11,20 502:10 523:12 530:13,14,22 wintertime 525:16 549:22 568:4 works 335:25 388:20 403:25 497:21 510:2 world 355:3,21,23, 24,25 356:1,3,4 370:17,21 374:14 withdrawal 481:2 398:6 533:15,21, 489:20,23 490:1, 24 538:8 worlds 356:9,24 390:14 wrestling 364:6 write 463:11 wrong 354:17 360:7 373:7 375:2 380:6 453:24 **WSP** 571:10 Υ wondering 451:11 year 350:5 362:25 363:13 378:14,19 389:10 397:17 422:5,7 476:11 479:8,16 505:5



512:19 518:18

553:13

525:22 534:6,10

444:4 496:22

years 335:23 352:17 374:6,10 378:22 382:12 414:18 417:12 470:17 479:9,13 501:20 502:5 514:8,11 523:17 526:20 532:3 533:5 538:18 565:8

yesterday 334:25 337:12 338:23 343:14 346:2 351:25 352:6 355:18 359:5 360:1 362:19 369:6 379:3 383:1 386:18,22 388:15 389:15 390:12 399:1 401:13 405:3 410:5 411:21 412:5 413:22 485:15,16

Ζ

zeroes 356:17 zone 389:24 518:24 532:7,24 534:16

zones 534:15 536:5

