

Exhibit No.:
Issues: Public Comment Summary
Witness: Natelle Dietrich
Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Case No.: EA-2015-0146
Date Testimony Prepared: October 21, 2015

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

NATELLE DIETRICH

AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS

CASE NO. EA-2015-0146

*Jefferson City, Missouri
October 2015*

Staff Exhibit No. 27
Date 1/25/16 Reporter JE
File No. EA-2015-0146

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

NATELLE DIETRICH

AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS

CASE NO. EA-2015-0146

Q. Please state your name and business address.

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

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

A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission as Staff Director.

Q. Please describe your education and relevant work experience.

A. I received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in English from the University of Missouri, St. Louis and a Master of Business Administration from William Woods University. During the early years of my tenure with the Commission, I worked in many areas of telecommunications regulation. In October, 2007, I became the Director of Utility Operations. The division was renamed the Tariff, Safety, Economic and Engineering Analysis Department in August 2011. In that position, I oversaw the technical staff of the Energy, Water and Sewer, Telecommunications and Manufactured Housing Units. On October 1, 2015, I was named the Staff Director, which includes oversight of the technical staff, auditing staff and Staff Counsel's Office.

My responsibilities include activities related to implementing sound energy policy in Missouri. I was the lead director for the Commission's rulemakings on the implementation and rewrite of the Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act, the Chapter 22 rewrite and the

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natelle Dietrich

1 Commission's regulations related to renewable energy. I am the director on activities related
2 to transmission issues, cybersecurity and infrastructure security issues and environmental
3 compliance issues. Relevant activities relate to general transmission issues, Missouri
4 compliance efforts respecting the Federal Clean Power Plan (Section 111(d)), energy
5 efficiency, demand-side management, demand response and smart grid. I was a member of
6 the Missouri Delegation to the Missouri/Moldova Partnership through National Association of
7 Regulatory Utility Commissioners ("NARUC") and the U.S. Agency for International
8 Development.

9 I am a member of the NARUC Staff Subcommittee on Telecommunications, and in
10 that capacity I have served as First Vice Chair and assisted on the Federal Legislation
11 Subgroup. I serve on the Staff of the Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service, as lead
12 Staff for the Missouri Universal Service Board and was a member of the Governor's
13 MoBroadbandNow taskforce.

14 Q. Have you previously testified before the Commission?

15 A. Yes. My Case Summary is attached as Attachment ND-R-1.

16 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

17 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide a high level summary of the written
18 public comments submitted to the Commission's Electronic Filing and Information System
19 ("EFIS") in response to ATXI's request for a certificate of public convenience and necessity
20 authorizing it to construct, own, operate, maintain, control and manage electric transmission
21 facilities from a substation near Palmyra, Missouri, and extending through Marion, Shelby,
22 Knox and Adair Counties, to a new substation located near Kirksville, Missouri (the Zachary
23 Substation) and proceeding through Schuyler County to a connection point on the Iowa

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natelle Dietrich

1 border, together with a 2.2-mile connector line from the Zachary Substation to Ameren
2 Missouri's Adair Substation. The summary will not include a summary of comments
3 submitted to the docket sheet via filings and will not address comments made through
4 testimony at the local public hearings.

5 Q. How many public comments were submitted to EFIS?

6 A. As of October 20, 2015, there are approximately 3,000 public comments in
7 EFIS. It should be noted that the EFIS field "Total Public Comment(s)" indicates there are
8 1,266 comments; however, there are petitions with approximately 1,700 signatures that were
9 entered as batches of approximately 25-50 signatures per batch so the additional 1,700
10 signatures are not reflected individually in the "Total" field of EFIS.

11 Q. Can you provide an estimate of the number of comments that support the
12 request versus the number of comments that are opposed to the request?

13 A. Yes, I can provide an estimate. EFIS does not have an easy way to sort the
14 comments by "support" or "against"; however, I have reviewed all the comments submitted in
15 the case file. Based on that review, I would estimate there are less than 10 comments
16 providing support for the request, and over 2,900 opposed to the request. Without providing
17 any commentary on the positions put forth in the comments, the reasons presented for the
18 positions will be summarized later in my testimony.

19 Q. You state there are approximately 3,000 comments in EFIS. Are any of the
20 comments submitted in EFIS duplicate comments?

21 A. Yes. It is difficult to specifically quantify the number of duplicate comments
22 in the case, especially since some are contained in batch entries; however, as previously
23 stated, I have reviewed all the comments so I can provide some general information regarding

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natelle Dietrich

1 duplicate entries. All duplicate comments are comments opposing the request. Some of the
2 comments were submitted to the Office of the Public Counsel (“OPC”), the Commission’s
3 Data Center or the Commission’s Consumer Services Unit. Therefore, some comments are
4 entered into EFIS a couple of times depending on how they were received. Some commenters
5 submitted one comment, which was signed by multiple family members. For instance, Joe
6 Smith and Mary Smith signed the same comment. This comment is entered into EFIS under
7 “Joe Smith” and also under “Mary Smith”. This may be considered by some as a duplicate
8 comment.

9 Q. You state “petitions” are entered as public comments. Can you describe the
10 petitions?

11 A. Yes. The petitions are signed by multiple individuals. Petition language is
12 similar to the following:

13 Petition to Stop the Mark Twain Transmission Project

14 Petition Summary: We are opposed to the building of this 345,000 volt
15 transmission line through Northeast Missouri.

16
17 Action Petitioned For: We the undersigned are concerned citizens who urge
18 our leaders to act now to stop the Mark Twain Transmission Project.

19
20 Q. Are there other types of comments submitted in EFIS?

21 A. Yes. In addition to the petitions, there are comments that appear to be “form”
22 letters. More specifically, there are several comments that state:

23 Dear Commissioners:

24
25 Re: Case #EA-2015-0146

26
27 I am strongly opposed to Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois’ proposed
28 Mark Twain Transmission Project, and ask that they be denied public utility
29 status and the project not be approved. The state of Missouri does not need the
30 energy, or benefit from the project.

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natelle Dietrich

1
2 The proposed Mark Twain Transmission Project would violate our property
3 rights, and could reduce real estate values up to 50%. The poles would
4 significantly impede farming, make it impossible to graze with portable
5 electric fences, and destroy many century farms. High voltage power lines
6 increase the risk of childhood leukemia, miscarriage, and draining batteries in
7 pacemakers. They create a dangerous fire hazard if poles go down in a storm
8 or tornado. The Mark Twain Transmission Project would cause countless
9 acres of deforestation, restrict future land use options, and tarnish rural
10 landscapes.

11
12 Thank you for your consideration.

13
14 Sincerely,

15
16
17 Signature
18 Printed Name
19 Address
20

21 Another type of form letter states:

22
23 Dear Commissioners:

24
25 I am writing in regard to case number EA-2015-0146.

26
27 I am opposed to the proposed Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois'
28 (ATXI) Mark Twain Transmission Project and ask that you DENY public
29 utility status and a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity.

30
31 ATXI is not a public utility – it is not providing electricity to end customers
32 “for the greater good”—it is a for-profit retailer of electricity to other electric
33 companies, none in Missouri.

34
35 The proposed project would reduce our property value far more than ATXI
36 could ever compensate with a one-time, lump sum purchase of easement. It
37 would spoil our rural landscape, cause hundreds of acres of deforestation
38 (which will cause more atmospheric issues), create obstacles to farming, limit
39 future land use options, increase potential health risks to humans, livestock and
40 native wild animals.

41
42 The Mark Twain Transmission Project is not needed. Missouri has reduced
43 energy consumption because of higher efficiency in usage and little/no new
44 industry, and our population is not increasing. There will be no long-term jobs
45 or revenue for our state and no electric usage from the transmission lines going
46 through our state.

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natelle Dietrich

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Please consider that the disadvantages of this project far out-weigh the benefits and deny ATXI a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Signature

Printed Name

Address

Q. Are there any comments in EFIS that are not “form” letters or petitions?

A. Yes. There are also “non-form-letter” comments in support of and in opposition to the request. Comments in opposition were submitted by county commissioners and individuals, citing reasons such as: violations of individual landowner property rights related to utility status/eminent domain issues; unknown health concerns; no clear direct benefit to Missouri; the long-term impact to the beauty and landscape of Missouri; the effect on crops or livestock; the effect on the Amish community in the area; and, the effect on global positioning systems (“GPS”), pacemakers, cell phones, farming processes or technologies in the area. Several comments in opposition state the proposed line will affect the Possibility Alliance and Superhero Headquarters (“Possibility Alliance”). Possibility Alliance is characterized as a service organization that relies on the land and an electricity-free environment for its work. It is also the center of the Haul of Justice Bike Riders, a service group that, according to the comments, has provided, over the past 15 years, over 45,000 hours of community service all over the country.

Comments in support of the request include: increased tax revenue for the county, schools and road districts and the creation of jobs.

Rebuttal Testimony of
Natele Dietrich

1 Q. Did Staff investigate the various issues, whether positive or negative, raised in
2 the comments?

3 A. Yes. Other Staff witnesses address many of the issues raised in comments and
4 suggest conditions, where appropriate, to alleviate those concerns.

5 Q. Does this complete your rebuttal testimony?

6 A. Yes it does.

Natelle Dietrich
Case Summary

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

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

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

- Case No. ER-2012-0175, In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).
 - Case No. ER-2012-0345, In the Matter of Empire District Electric Company of Joplin, Missouri Tariff's Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Missouri Service Area of the Company. Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA).
 - File Nos. EO-2013-0396 and EO-2013-0431, In the Matter of the Joint Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc., Mid South TransCo, LLC, Transmission Company Arkansas, LLC and ITC Midsouth LLC for Approval of Transfer of Assets and Certificate of Convenience and Necessity, and Merger and, in connection therewith, Certain Other Related Transactions; and In the Matter of Entergy Arkansas, Inc.'s Notification of Intent to Change Functional Control of Its Missouri Electric Transmission Facilities to the Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator Inc. Regional Transmission System Organization or Alternative Request to Change Functional Control and Motions for Waiver and Expedited Treatment, respectively.
 - Case No. MX-2013-0432, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to Revise Manufactured Housing Rules Regarding Installation and Monthly Reporting Requirements.
 - Case No. TX-2013-0324, In the Matter of a Proposed Rulemaking to the Missouri Universal Service Fund.
 - Case No. EO-2014-0095, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Filing for Approval of Demand-Side Programs and for Authority to Establish Demand-Side Programs Investment Mechanism.
 - Case No. EA-2014-0207, In the Matter of the Application of Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing It to Construct, Own, Operate, Control, Manage, and Maintain a High Voltage, Direct Current Transmission Line and an Associated Converter Station Providing an Interconnection on the Maywood - Montgomery 345 kV Transmission Line.
-
- Actively participated in or prepared comments on numerous issues on behalf of the Commission to be filed at the Federal Communications Commission.
 - Prepared congressional testimony on behalf of the Commission on number conservation efforts in Missouri.
 - A principal author on Missouri Public Service Commission Comments on the Reduction of Carbon Emissions in Missouri under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.
 - A principal author on Missouri Public Service Commission Comments on the Environmental Protection Agency's "Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Unity".

Commission Arbitration Advisory Lead Staff for the following cases:

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