1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	   = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
4	BY OAK TREE ENERGY, LLC, AGAINST NORTHWESTERN ENERGY FOR REFUSING TO ENTER INTO A PURCHASE POWER
5	
6	AGREEMENT
7	
8	Transcript of Proceedings ORIGINAL February 14, 2012
9	
10	DEPORT THE DURING HELLIGIES COMMISSION
11	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN
12	KRISTIE FIEGEN, COMMISSIONER GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER
13	COMMISSION STAFF
14	John Smith Rolayne Ailts Wiest
15	Karen Cremer Kara Semmler
	Ryan Soye
16	Greg Rislov Ross Pedersen
17	Brittany Mehlhaff Matthew Tysdal
18	Matthew Tysdal Chris Daugaard Brian Rounds
19	Demaris Axthelm RECEIVED
20	Joy Irving MAR 07 2012
21	SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
	UTILITIES COMMISSION
22	
23	
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
25	•

1	APPEARANCES BY TELEPHONE
2	Mike Uda, Oak Tree Yvette LaFrentz, Oak Tree
3	Al Brogan, NorthWestern Tim Olson, NorthWestern
4	Tim Olson, Northwestern
5	
6	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the
7	above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State
8	Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,
9	South Dakota, on the 14th day of February, 2012,
10	commencing at 2:30 p.m.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CHAIRMAN NELSON: EL11-006, In the matter of the complaint by Oak Tree Energy, LLC against NorthWestern Energy for refusing to enter into a purchase power agreement. And the issue today is Oak Tree's Second Motion to Compel.

And with that, Mr. Uda or Ms. LaFrentz, would you like to proceed?

MR. UDA: This is Mike Uda. I'll be doing the oral argument today. I'm grateful for my colleague's taking the laboring ore yesterday morning at 8 a.m. Mountain Time. So I acknowledge her assistance yesterday and am grateful for it.

At the outset, I think it's important to remember the scope of discovery under South Dakota Law. And without belaboring the point, the scope of discovery is intentionally broad. (Inaudible) projection, if -- the information sought will be admissible at trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated -- (Inaudible).

(Discussion off the record)

MR. UDA: Okay. Fair enough. And I hope to make things as easy as possible on her.

At any rate, the point that I was making is that under South Dakota Law, the general rule is that information can be discoverable as long as it is

reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. South Dakota Law also permits under 15-6-26B, SDCL, the fact discovery of experts for discovery facts noted and opinions held by experts through Interrogatories, which was the device that we chose to use in this instance.

Now going to the substance of the dispute with those background sort of rules in mind, we're in a situation here where on November 7 -- or, excuse me, November 8 of 2011 we filed our first Motion to Compel.

And as the Commission may recall, the substance of that Motion was two things. One was a request that NorthWestern produce the information required by 18 CFR 292.302 with respect to five years of avoided cost energy data and 10-year avoided cost capacity data -- capacity requisitions by the utility.

And then the second part of that Motion was we required a Motion to require NorthWestern to produce a 20-year avoided cost forecast. And we did that because we were hoping to have essentially a full and fair and open debate about what NorthWestern's South Dakota utility long-term avoided cost was. Information up to that point we did not have.

The Commission granted our Motion in part and denied it in part. The part they granted was with

respect to the information that the federal rules already required NorthWestern to produce at least once every two years and denied the part with respect to the 20-year forecast. However, in doing that they did tell NorthWestern and reminded it of its discovery obligation to supplement in the event that that information became available.

Now as far as the facts go, what happened was is we had a discovery -- late filed discovery request on November 15, 2011 from Mr. Lewis. And that natural gas price forecast was disclosed to us after the close of discovery and after essentially what was the initial deadline in the initial scheduling order for scheduling depositions.

And because of that, we looked at the natural gas price forecast, and because it's simply an element of an avoided cost, you know, we didn't think anything of it and didn't make an issue out of it. It was not until we sought NorthWestern's rebuttal and direct prefiled testimony from Mr. Lewis on January 13, 2012 that we realized he was planning to testify as an expert and was attempting to use an electric price forecast to rebut the avoided cost forecast that was prepared by Oak Tree's expert, Mr. Lockhart.

Now this is important because what we are in the

situation then is that having the discovery deadline passed and the deposition deadline and the initial schedule said that depositions would be scheduled prior to the submittal of testimony, if possible, it was not possible at that point to schedule depositions. So we immediately contacted NorthWestern and attempted to schedule the deposition.

1.2

1.5

Ultimately, there was an informal prehearing conference with Mr. Smith. We agreed that we would submit limited discovery to NorthWestern instead of doing a deposition. And this goes back to those answers to our discovery.

And essentially this is a fairly simple motion despite all of the background. And I apologize if it's complicated and I'm complicating it more than I need to, but it's important to remember that what happens here is we requested avoided cost information for 20 years.

NorthWestern said it's unreliable; you can't have it.

When we looked at Mr. Lewis's testimony it appeared to me that they were using it as a substitute for an avoided cost forecast. To our mind that should have been something that was supplemented in discovery and provided to us.

And then when we read Mr. Lewis's testimony he then holds himself out as an electric price forecasting

expert. In fact, on page 4, lines 6 through 8 of his testimony, he says, "Lands Energy has used this method of price forecasting to advise numerous clients in the wholesale energy markets and specifically to support resource management decisions. This method provides a sound basis for making resource planning decisions."

So we submitted this limited discovery, as I mentioned, last week, and we got Mr. Lewis's answers last week. And essentially what Mr. Lewis said in response -- and what -- our questions were really very simple. We asked for the names of the clients in Interrogatory No. 12A, and Northwestern's response was that the question called for the disclosure of the identity of a nontestifying consulting expert. And then Mr. Lewis further stated he could not disclose the identity of these clients due to confidentiality reasons.

Our response is, first, Mr. Lewis is a testifying expert, and we're trying to determine the basis for his forecast. If some other person prepared this and the other forecast, then Mr. Lewis may not have the expertise to provide testimony in this proceeding. We don't know if this is true, but this is what we're trying to determine.

If, in fact, Mr. Lewis has never prepared a forecast at all, he is simply offering an unsupported

assertion and cannot offer expert opinion on this subject matter.

Furthermore, the case cited by NorthWestern,

Papke v. Harbert, 738 N.W.2d 510 (2007) does not support

Northwestern's argument that information may not be

disclosed because it comes from a nontestifying expert.

Paragraphs 82 and 83 of that decision make it clear that

if a testifying expert relies on the nontestifying

expert's report or information in forming an opinion,

that information can be disclosed.

what this all comes down to is Northwestern does not want to disclose the basis for Lewis's opinions until he is cross-examined at hearing. Since we specifically requested in discovery pursuant to our Motion to Compel all of Northwestern's avoided cost information which would necessarily include but not be limited to an electric price forecast and the PUC specifically reminded Northwestern of its continuing obligation to produce it, it is hardly surprising we are here again requesting this information.

Secondly, Oak Tree asks in Request For Production No. 30 for the reports prepared by Mr. Lewis for other clients so as to better understand Mr. Lewis's methodology and the basis for his opinion. Again, NorthWestern responded that this calls for a disclosure

of a nontestifying consulting expert. If Mr. Lewis did not prepare these reports himself, it calls into question whether he qualifies to offer an opinion at all in the proceeding.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NorthWestern also repeated its concerns about confidentiality. However, with respect to the confidentiality objection, NorthWestern can't have it both ways. Confidentiality cannot be used as both a sword and a shield.

And Schutterle v. Schutterle, 260 N.W.2d 341, 353 (S.D. 1977), overruled on other grounds, In discussing a claim of confidentiality in an antenuptial marriage agreement, the Court stated the owner of the privilege of preventing disclosure of confidential communications cannot, after testifying to or about them or to about any substantial part of them, without claiming his privilege, invoke that privilege to prevent other parties to the communications from testifying to them. He cannot by his silence lay down the shield of his privilege and assail another with the sword of his testimony to the privileged communications, and when his adversary essays to defend himself or by the testimony of other parties or witnesses to such communications, again seek the shield of its privilege and shut out all testimony as to the confidential communications but his

own, he has waived this privilege and such waiver is in no sense in contrary to public policy. Indeed, it is in the interest of truth and justice. And this is a quote from Stein v. First National Bank, Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals 298 F. 336 page 41.

In short, NorthWestern cannot claim that
Mr. Lewis's vast expertise in electric price forecasting
and that a number of utilities have relied on these
forecasts and resource planning and then simultaneously
refused to tell Oak Tree who these energies are in
disclosed reports Mr. Lewis prepared. If the concern is
one of confidentiality, we would obviously sign a
confidential agreement. And if, as may be the case,
Mr. Lewis did not prepare these forecasts himself, it is
probable that Mr. Lewis does not possess the requisite
expertise to testify about them.

Now NorthWestern makes much of the fact that discovery was closed and that NorthWestern permitted Oak Tree this additional discovery. As I stated previously, Oak Tree wanted depositions and the original scheduling order in this case permitted depositions following the close of discovery possible, a word that NorthWestern repeatedly neglected to include in its papers.

Since the schedule was amended and NorthWestern

was required to produce the requested information pursuant to Oak Tree's Original Motion to Compel on November 8, 2011, additional discovery was no longer possible from the time that Mr. Lewis first belatedly introduced his price forecast.

This was not a lack of diligence on Oak Tree's part, but we view it as contempt by NorthWestern to shield from discovery the basis for Northwestern's case.

Now with respect to Mr. Wagner, Mr. Wagner introduced the issue of the Aberdeen plant in his prefiled direct and rebuttal testimony. Mr. Wagner's testimony repeatedly discusses the Aberdeen plant and the need for it in order to meet NorthWestern's resource and capacity needs as well as the timing of the decision by NorthWestern Energy to build that facility.

In order to better understand the timing and the basis for NorthWestern's decision, Oak Tree asks two simple questions in Request For Production No. 40: All copies of studies and reports that Northwest Energy has prepared that support the decision and any analysis and study that looked at alternatives to the Aberdeen plant.

Northwestern's response was that it objected as irrelevant because this information is neither reasonably tailored to matters at issue in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence.

NorthWestern's decision to construct the Aberdeen plant is not an issue in this Docket which is addressed solely to the price that NorthWestern was paying Oak Tree for energy and capacity for a proposed wind generation facility located approximately 90 miles from Aberdeen.

1.8

Our response to this is, first, the information sought is highly relevant since NorthWestern decided to construct the Aberdeen plant instead of purchasing output from Oak Tree. Northwest Energy claims in part it does not need additional capacity because of the Aberdeen plant. Indeed, Oak Tree believes a small portion of the capacity from the Aberdeen plant could have been displaced as of February 25, 2011 or earlier had NorthWestern engaged in good-faith negotiations with Oak Tree.

Second, the utility resource planning decisions typically include a consideration of options. All options including existing power purchase agreements and the like. There is no basis for this relevance objection. NorthWestern appears not to want to provide the documents because they will undermine Northwestern's argument at hearing.

The third reason this information is relevant is because NorthWestern has raised the issue of legally enforceable obligations. And this has to do with time of

Northwestern's resource decisions. In order to understand the basis for Northwestern's decision and the timing of those decisions, we need the information that we've requested. We think that -- we think that this information is directly relevant to the issue of the calculation of avoided costs in this case regardless of where the plant is located.

Now today we've received Northwestern's argument that producing these documents would be burdensome. We believe that these documents exist. They should not be hard to locate or produce. We don't think the claim of burdensomeness is very credible. We're not asking NorthWestern to create any document. Just asking them to locate documents which already exist.

And, finally, we would say that NorthWestern has an alternative. If it does not want to cooperate with discovery of Mr. Lewis and Mr. Wagner, it can simply withdraw the testimony and keep Mr. Lewis -- the identity of Mr. Lewis's clients and the reports secret and not discuss further the decision for the Aberdeen plant but we think this would undermine Northwestern's case.

But we think that in this instance we think that the information is directly relevant to making our case, and we don't see any real basis for their objection.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Does that conclude

```
1
     your --
              MR. UDA: I am finished for the time being.
     Although I would like to reserve an opportunity for
 3
     rebuttal.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. Certainly.
 5
 6
     Mr. Brogan.
              MR. BROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 7
                                                      Before I
     get going too much, I would ask you if the court reporter
 8
 9
     can hear me okay.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                There's a little bit of
10
11
     background noise.
              MR. BROGAN: That's probably my nervousness and
12
     my heavy breathing.
13
                                       I tell you what.
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay.
15
     go ahead and let you get started and I'll just kind of
     watch for a sign from the court reporter if it's not
16
     working and we'll try something different.
17
              Go ahead.
18
                           This hearing, as we well know, is
19
              MR. BROGAN:
     on Oak Tree's Motion to Compel requesting that the
20
     Commission order NorthWestern to provide information and
21
    documents that NorthWestern objects to providing.
22
              NorthWestern filed its Brief opposing Oak Tree's
23
    Motion to Compel at approximately 12:06 today Central
24
```

And I realize that the Commissioners may not have

25

Time.

had an opportunity to carefully review that Brief. I will try to avoid duplication, and I apologize in advance for any duplication that does occur.

1.2

Not surprisingly, perhaps, Oak Tree and NorthWestern have vastly differing views of the circumstances that have led to the parties being before the Commission today. Mr. Uda has provided Oak Tree's view. I would like to provide NorthWestern's view.

The Commission issued a scheduling order that provided for two rounds of discovery by the parties and one round of discovery by Commission Staff followed then by sequential testimony from Oak Tree, NorthWestern, Staff, and then Oak Tree on rebuttal.

The Commission issued an Amended Scheduling
Order that extended the deadlines for Staff discovery and
for testimony. Oak Tree had until December 16 to file
testimony. NorthWestern had until January 13. Staff
until January 27. In comparison to that schedule, all of
NorthWestern's responses to Oak Tree's discovery at issue
today including supplemental responses and Mr. Lewis's
market price forecast were provided to Oak Tree by
November 15.

Contrary to what might have been said earlier,

Oak Tree did have an ample opportunity to seek additional discovery both after NWE's initial response to Oak Tree's

second round of discovery on September 23 or after
NorthWestern's Third Supplemental Response on November
15. It did not do so.

2.3

2.4

After NorthWestern filed testimony in January
Oak Tree asserted that it wanted to depose Steve Lewis
and Dennis Wagner. After negotiations Oak Tree agreed to
forego deposing Dennis Wagner but still wanted to depose
Steve Lewis. NorthWestern offered to make Mr. Lewis
available for a deposition in Sioux Falls on February 2
or 3. Oak Tree rejected those dates because Mr. Uda was
scheduled to attend a CLE. Subsequently, NorthWestern
agreed to make Mr. Lewis available in Sioux Falls on
January 30.

Initially Oak Tree agreed but later wanted to hold the deposition by telephone. NorthWestern resisted such an arrangement. Through the good efforts of Mr. Smith, the parties agreed to allow Oak Tree to submit limited written discovery in lieu of deposing Mr. Lewis. On January 30 Oak Tree submitted four Interrogatories, two Requests For Admission, and 27 Requests For Production, if we count the subparts.

NorthWestern responded to all of them, including objecting to providing the identities of Mr. Lewis's other clients and to providing copies of reports that Mr. Lewis provided to other clients and then also to

providing analyses, studies, and reports that supported NorthWestern's decision to build the Aberdeen peaker plant or to compare the Aberdeen plant to other alternatives. Oak Tree filed its Motion to Compel last Wednesday, and we are here today.

At the outset I would say that the Rules of Civil Procedure are what apply. The Commission has adopted the Rules of Civil Procedure to apply in matters before it. That includes the appropriate discovery rules and the legal standards established under those rules. I don't think any of us disagree there.

I think it would be best to address two things -- or to address the two individuals, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Wagner, separately.

Mr. Uda discussed the scope of discovery. But he did not discuss the specific scope of discovery related to expert witnesses. South Dakota Law, and specifically SDCL 15-6-26D-4A(i) provides that a parties in time to discover the identity of experts, the subject matter on which a expert will testify, the substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert will testify, and a summary of the grounds for each opinion.

To the extent that Oak Tree has asked for this information, NorthWestern has provided it. However, neither the identities of other clients or reports

provided to other clients are within the scope of discovery.

I would like to respond to certain statements made in Oak Tree's Motion to Compel. Oak Tree states "Oak Tree is entitled to know the bases for Mr. Lewis's opinions in this proceeding and to test his testimony for credibility and accuracy." That's in their Motion at page 3. And generally NorthWestern agrees with this statement.

However, the Interrogatory and Request For Production at issue do not address either the bases of Mr. Lewis's opinions or his credibility and accuracy. They're asking for something totally separate. They're asking for identities of other people that he's provided information to, and they're asking for his stock and trade, the reports he's provided to them.

This statement that they're entitled to know the bases for Mr. Lewis's opinions does not support granting their Motion to Compel.

Secondly, Oak Tree states "Oak Tree also could not have requested additional discovery at the time that Mr. Lewis's natural gas price forecast itself was first disclosed on November 15, 2011 as no further opportunities for discovery were provided in the schedule." That also is in the Motion at 3.

That is totally inconsistent with Oak Tree's later assertion that it's entitled to discovery at this time. Furthermore, Oak Tree has not been bashful in this Docket about seeking discovery, whether or not it was provided for in the schedule. Certainly, if Oak Tree was concerned about Mr. Lewis's price forecast when it saw it November 15, any time between then and fighting its testimony in December, mid-December, December 16, it could have asked to depose Mr. Lewis. It did not do so.

Oak Tree also states with respect to Mr. Lewis
"Oak Tree is seeking information regarding the use of
Mr. Lewis's methodology by other utilities." And,
further, "If Mr. Lewis's methodology was not used at all
by these utilities, then it is simply irrelevant to this
proceeding." That's in their Motion at 6.

And, quite frankly, I'm flabbergasted by those statements. How other utilities use Mr. Lewis's methodology is not relevant to whether this Commission would decide what weight to give it. It just -- it's beyond the pail that anybody would argue that this is relevant. It has nothing to do with this proceeding.

Furthermore, this is information that is not within NorthWestern's possession, custody, or control. NorthWestern doesn't have any right to ask one of its experts to provide documents that it provided to other

clients. We also don't have any right to ask it -- ask an expert to tell us who else he's worked for. That's his business, not ours.

1.5

With respect to Mr. Lewis's qualifications as an expert, that's not the subject of this Motion to Compel. But I would point out that Mr. Lewis's curriculum vitae was attached to his testimony, and it provides ample evidence of the experience and training and education that Mr. Lewis has. Some of these questions may go to the weight of Mr. Lewis's testimony, but they certainly don't go to the admissibility of it.

With respect to Mr. Wagner, our sole issue has to do with all of the documents about the Aberdeen plant. The costs associated with the Aberdeen plant are not costs that NorthWestern can avoid by purchasing energy and capacity from Oak Tree. Mr. Uda says that NorthWestern states that because of Aberdeen it doesn't need capacity. That is only true for the period from 2013 to 2016. NorthWestern has certainly admitted that it needs capacity even after Aberdeen is built.

Secondly, the Aberdeen plant has been identified since at least NorthWestern's 2008 ten-year plan filed with the Commission on June 25, 2008. There is absolutely no reasonable excuse for Oak Tree to have not sought discovery with respect to it during the initial

discovery period. As set forth in NorthWestern's Brief,
Oak Tree was well-aware of NorthWestern's plans to build
Aberdeen prior to filing its Complaint.

Whether or not Mr. Uda believes there's any significant burden in providing this information is not at issue. We have the Affidavit of Sally Neill who is NorthWestern's Director of Records Management System and experienced in responding to discovery requests such as the one that Mr. Uda has propounded.

She testifies that it will take 45 to 60 days to search e-mail, capture the records, and review the results for relevant and privileged contact. We also believe this -- search all other storage locations, including network drives, hard drives, and physical warehouses to find every possible answer to Mr. Uda's request. This burden is substantial, and it's far in excess of any benefit that will be provided relative to the Aberdeen plant.

Finally, I would like to again speak to a couple of specific statements made in Oak Tree's Motion to Compel. Oak Tree states "Request For Production No. 40 was posed by Oak Tree to determine the underlying basis for the opinions offered in prefiled testimony by NWE witness Mr. Wagner."

That might be an appropriate date -- appropriate

Request For Production if Mr. Wagner had offered opinions. Mr. Wagner is a fact witness. He did not offer opinions. He described exactly what NorthWestern had done, when, and why.

At another place Oak Tree states "Second, a significant portion of Mr. Green's testimony falls under the heading Aberdeen Generating Station No. 2. In his testimony Mr. Green discusses the decision to build this plant."

I'd point out this discovery is addressed to Mr. Wagner. Now these may be mere typographical errors referring to Mr. Green rather than Mr. Wagner, but NorthWestern cannot be certain that that's the case.

We appreciate the burden that this is placing on the Commission, and we apologize for it. We have tried to give Oak Tree everything that it needed. Certainly the Rules of Civil Procedure provide for broad discovery, but it's not unlimited. It is still limited to matters that is relevant, and with respect to experts it's even further limited.

NorthWestern requests that the Commission deny Oak Tree's Motion to Compel. And I am available to answer any questions if any of the Commissioners have any.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Very good. Thank you,

11.

Mr. Brogan.

With that, we will go to Staff.

MS. SEMMLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Kara Semmler speaking on behalf of Staff today.

I'm going to start with just a real simple opinion regarding specifically and only the requests that were made by Oak Tree, and then I'd like to follow up with a brief reaction to some of the extra arguments that have been made.

So we're dealing with Interrogatory 12 and Request For Production 30 and names of clients, copies of reports. We see this as Oak Tree's attempt to understand whether or not the NorthWestern expert qualifies as an expert. We agree with NorthWestern this is not the time to challenge expert standing. But now is the time to obtain the materials necessary to do so at hearing should Oak Tree find it appropriate to do so.

This is a common request that we often see in discovery, and Staff believes Oak Tree is entitled to understand whether or not the expert -- or the witness has standing as an expert.

We do, however, understand NorthWestern Energy's argument that those documents are not in its possession, custody, or control as 15-6-34 requires. And although Oak Tree we think is entitled to the information, it may

need to seek it through other means. This may not be the appropriate venue -- discovery may not be the appropriate venue to do so.

2.0

Number two, Request For Production 40. This objection was based on relevancy. And Staff disagrees with the objection. We believe the request is relevant. Capacity need and the timing of the need is very real and relevant to an avoided cost analysis. Staff recommends the Commission grant this Motion as it relates to Request For Production 40.

NorthWestern Energy depicts the situation where this production could take 45 to 60 days. And it appears from the reply that it's been taken a bit to the extreme. The Request specifically asks for studies and reports, not every single piece of correspondence and every single e-mail that exists. If there are no studies and reports, well, then that's the answer. We can't force the production of something that doesn't exist. We don't see the request as asking, however, for every single piece of correspondence regarding the Aberdeen plant.

The issue before you today is a Motion to Compel. And as one would expect, in advocacy we've heard arguments for that Motion. We've heard arguments against it. We're also seeing, Staff believes, some arguments and positions that are outside the scope of the subject

matter before you today.

As a Staff we usually try to stay on point and ignore the sidebar arguments. With that said, I'm feeling compelled to mention our thoughts on a few of the arguments that have been made.

First, Oak Tree and NorthWestern clearly are employing different methods to determine avoided costs.

And they're using different data and different numbers to do so. We will hear all of that in March at the hearing.

Today, Commissioners, you're not being asked to come to any conclusion regarding those arguments, and we don't believe it's appropriate for you to do so. Those arguments are not pertinent to the discovery dispute before you today.

Two, as a compromise and resolution to a procedural dispute regarding depositions, of which you heard some significant background on today, the parties agreed to additional discovery. And it is clear that NorthWestern Energy seems disgusted with the requests that were made, and they probably had something different in mind. When they got those questions from Oak Tree they weren't expecting -- they weren't expecting that -- those particular questions. They weren't expecting the extent of those questions.

Nonetheless, we don't see anything about Oak

Tree's questions that are outside the scope of that compromise made.

1.7

And we are here for any questions of Staff, should you have them.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Mr. Uda, would you like a brief rebuttal?

MR. UDA: Yeah. I don't think I need to say a whole lot more. But I do want to point out, unless I've got the wrong statute, and I'm sure my South Dakota counsel will correct me if I do, but I believe under 15-6-26B with respect to the scope of discovery, Sub 4 says "Trial preparation: Experts, discovery facts known and opinions held by experts otherwise discoverable under the provisions of Subdivision 1," which is just the general relevance. So that's what we're really attempting to discover here.

Now the position that at this point Mr. Lewis has put us in -- and I'm not entirely sure what Ms. Semmler has in mind with respect to a compromised position, but the position Mr. Lewis has put us in is he's testifying as an expert. I believe Mr. Brogan made that clear. He's testifying about his expertise doing electric price forecasts.

We're trying to figure out, well, has he ever done this before? Is he qualified to testify as an

expert? We're trying basically to prepare for hearing.

Now the objection I'm hearing from NorthWestern is, well,
we don't have this information in our custody or control.

And I haven't researched that issue directly, but my
recollection is that if a party is testifying on behalf
of a entity, that that entity can request that
information and it's not outside of their control because
this person is under contract to them to provide
testimony.

1.3

They didn't have to introduce Mr. Lewis's testimony. That was a decision they made. And what we're being left with is something of a black box as far as Mr. Lewis's testimony. We're left with, okay, I'm an expert but you can't ask what I've done before or where I've done it. And I don't think that's entirely fair to Oak Tree.

I think the second point is that this information is directly relevant to creating a record with respect to in Mr. Lewis's expertise. You know, it's my expert's belief that Mr. Lewis is not an electric price forecast expert and he just wants to understand what he's done. As I said, we'd be willing to enter into any confidentiality agreement we have to in order to get the information so we can prepare our case for trial.

I think the other point with respect to

Mr. Lewis is is that again, as I pointed out earlier,
Mr. Lewis is testifying about his expertise and holding
himself out as an expert, but when we start asking about
the basis for that opinion he's saying you can't discover
this because it's all confidential.

This goes to the cite that I offered earlier from South Dakota with respect to using confidentiality as both a sword and a shield.

Now I don't understand entirely Mr. Brogan's statement with respect to Mr. Wagner because on page 4 of Mr. Wagner's testimony starting at line 27 it says "How does the addition of generating stations built by NorthWestern in NorthWestern's service territory factor into Northwestern's obligation to meet capacity?"

And it discusses at some length following that the addition of Northwestern's Aberdeen plant, the advantage to customers, the type of different generations that Northwestern could consider to meet capacity. It continues to talk about how long the generation station has been planned, all the rest of this information.

And all we're asking for is what analysis essentially did Northwestern perform to demonstrate that this was the best alternative and the timing and placement of this directly affects both the avoided cost calculation because it will determine when the legally

enforceable obligation under PURPA happens. 1 2 But also, more generally, if you read through that testimony, whether Northwestern is saying he's 3 offering an expert opinion or whether he's offering a lay 4 opinion is really irrelevant. He's offering an opinion, 5 and we need to understand the bases of those opinions. 6 7 And that's all I have. I'm available for questions if there are any. 8 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. 9 Mr. Brogan, any brief comments? 10 MR. BROGAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll pass. 11 12 CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. Ouestions from Commissioners? 13 Commissioner Fiegen. 14 15 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: For NorthWestern. possession, custody, and control of the requested 16 documentation, you would have control of some of your own 17 reports from Mr. Lewis; correct? 18 19 MR. UDA: Commissioner Fiegen, yes, that is 20 correct. So we could ask for that 21 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: discovery? According to how I see it. 22 23 MR. UDA: Commissioner Fiegen, without

committing whether or not we have any, because I'm not

familiar with everything that Mr. Lewis has ever provided

24

25

to NorthWestern Energy, as an aside I would say I've only
been with the company less than 10 months. But if we
have anything, yes, that would be in our possession and
control, and we could provide it.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. And then for Oak

Tree, a question on personally I do believe that the

Tree, a question on personally I do believe that the peaking station is relevant. But you're asking for study and reports, which are relatively pretty formal reports and studies; correct?

MR. UDA: Yeah. I mean, we're asking did you guys do like some kind of resource analysis and just, you know, whatever form that analysis exists.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Other questions?

This is Commissioner Nelson. I've got just a couple. Starting with Mr. Brogan.

In the documents you filed today you talked about Mr. Lewis, and you described him as a nontestifying expert witness because he did not testify for any of these other clients that we're talking about today; is that correct?

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Nelson -- or Commissioner
Nelson, excuse me, I think there's some confusion here.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: That's why I'm asking the

question. I am confused.

MR. BROGAN: We agree that Mr. Lewis is a testifying expert for NorthWestern in this Docket. What we were stating is that in these other dockets and for other clients he was a nontestifying expert. And I think that's clear from our answer where when we specifically stated that Mr. Lewis had not testified for those -- for other clients. Had he testified, we would have provided the docket. We would have provided either a link to or a copy of his testimony.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Let me follow up. And I'm looking at our statute, 15-6-26B Sub 4D. "A party may discover facts known or opinions held by an expert."

Mr. Lewis is your expert.

Certainly these reports -- and let me just ask, I mean, did Mr. Lewis prepare these reports that are at issue here?

MR. BROGAN: Commissioner Nelson, I can't say.

I don't know. I don't work for those other people. I

don't work for his other clients. I don't know exactly
what was done or who did it.

I agree that D provides a party may discover the facts known or the opinions held by the expert, but I don't see where D says anything about the facts that -- and reports that an expert provided to somebody who's not

a party to the docket.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: But those are still facts known and opinions held, if in fact Mr. Lewis did the work on them. And I understand your point about you don't know that.

MR. BROGAN: I am not certain that I would characterize reports provided to other people as facts known or opinions held.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Fair enough.

Let me -- a question for Staff. On this issue of NorthWestern not having the information on hand, perhaps. And you indicated that perhaps it should have been sought through some other means.

Can you expound on that?

MS. SEMMLER: Yes. This is Kara Semmler. I believe Oak Tree could subpoen the information directly from Lands Energy, and that maybe is -- I didn't take this particular Rule of Civil Procedure -- it wasn't part of my argument until we received the filing just this afternoon. And as I looked into it, it does seem to have some merit. Again, I still believe it could be obtained, just maybe not through this particular means of discovery.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can you maybe comment on Mr. Uda's contention that because NorthWestern has

Mr. Lewis under contract that, therefore, they do have access to it?

MS. SEMMLER: And when I read it honestly that was the first thought I had too. That now he's been employed, so to speak, so that extends to NorthWestern that -- nonetheless, Lands Energy isn't a party, and this statute does specifically say a party may serve the request upon another party. And the party to the proceeding is NorthWestern.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Brogan, would you like to comment on that particular question?

MR. BROGAN: Commissioner Hanson?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson.

MR. BROGAN: Excuse me. Commissioner Nelson. I apologize. I'm not as good with sounds as I should be.

What this strikes me as -- if I could -- I mean, analogies are tricky, and probably I shouldn't go into that. But it's like this: If there was a CPA talk -- providing testimony and we were suddenly trying to ask who else have you prepared income taxes for and please provide a copy of their income tax returns or if we had a doctor testifying and we asked that doctor who else have you treated and what have you done for them, neither one of those are within the proper scope of discovery. They don't make anything -- any fact that's at issue more

likely or less likely.

2.0

And then, finally, if by being employed by a single entity that would open up a company's files with respect to all of its other entities, they'd never be employed by that company, and it would force people like -- or entities like NorthWestern to have nothing but in-house Staff.

That's not really efficient. It's not something that I think that the rate payers would want to pay for. But it seems to be where we're -- if we're going to treat outside experts the same as we would employees with respect to materials that they have, we've gone a long way past existing case law and I think a long ways past where the rules intended us to go for discovery.

I've got is for Mr. Uda in dealing with the NorthWestern peaker plant. NorthWestern has filed an Affidavit talking about the voluminous search that would need to be done to find all the different items that might relate to that.

But my understanding was is that your request was fairly narrow and fairly tailored to simply get at reports; is that correct?

MR. UDA: That's correct, Commissioner Nelson.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I don't have any

further questions.

Commissioner Hanson?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that Staff did a real good job of summarizing the challenge that we have in front of us. There's a number of sort of loose ends and curiosities that I have if I could explore them just a little bit.

An Affidavit was filed just today I believe it was from Mr. Lewis that might answer a couple of the questions that we've been wondering about. On page 1 he states on item number 6 that I have not provided copies of the reports I've prepared for other clients to NorthWestern Energy. So he's intimating in item number 6 that he did prepare reports.

He's also stating that I have not provided testimony in any other forum regarding this price forecast methodology. And that brings me to a curiosity to ask NorthWestern, knowing that ultimately there's going to be a question as to whether or not Mr. Lewis is qualified as an expert to testify before us, how do you plan to cement that relationship and qualify him as an expert if, in fact, you don't present this information showing his experience and his capabilities and knowing that you have to provide that information?

Is it not incumbent upon you to present that to

Oak Tree prior to the hearing?

2.0

MR. BROGAN: Commissioner, this is Mr. Brogan.

And I assume that question was directed to me.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's correct.

MR. BROGAN: And I would go back to the SDCL 19-15-2, which indicates that a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education may testify thereto in the form of opinion or otherwise, that that's taking a very limited part of that statute.

When NorthWestern provided Mr. Lewis's testimony it did provide a copy of his curriculum vitae which shows his training, education, and experience. Mr. Lewis has testified at least a few times -- I was tempted to say several -- on behalf of NorthWestern and before the Montana Public Service Commission. His qualifications of an expert there have never been questioned. Mr. Uda has cross-examined him in some of those cases. I was surprised that this issue would come up.

However, I think that given the broad experience that is reflected in Mr. Lewis's curriculum vitae that NorthWestern has already met its burden to show that he is qualified as an expert.

Now as Staff said, Oak Tree and NorthWestern are employing different methodologies and different numbers.

It will be up to the Commission to weigh those methodologies and numbers, but that isn't the purpose of this dispute today.

2.0

COMMISSIONER HANSON: However, I do agree with Staff on the foundation that they laid that it's important information in order to -- it's a Catch-22 challenge that I put before you earlier.

On another subject, you had stated in your brief to us today that -- and this is one of the items that we take into consideration when we are making a determination on whether or not information must be compelled.

You state on page 6 that not only is the request for records untimely and irrelevant, you state that it would place a huge burden on NorthWestern. Not withstanding the information that you do not have, that you cannot produce, how can it be a huge burden to produce that information, which I would assume the board of directors and number of administrative people reviewed in making their decisions.

MR. BROGAN: Commissioner, I believe that that statement on page 6 was referring specifically to the Request For Production with respect to the Aberdeen plant, not with respect to --

COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's correct.

MR. BROGAN: And Mr. Uda's -- or excuse me.

Oak Tree's Request For Production specifically asks for a copy of all studies and reports that supported the decision for Aberdeen and also a copy of any analysis or study and associated report performed by NorthWestern that looked at alternatives to the Aberdeen plant.

1.2

To look at every -- to find every possible analyses, every possible study, every possible report is going to require that we look at basically lots of e-mails and lots of physical documents to find out -- to discover whether they're relevant, whether they answer this, and we ask our director of records management to take a quick look. And I'm relying on what she has told us.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, sir, a copy of an analysis or a study is not the same as requesting all of the e-mails that -- in order to gather that information.

A question -- thank you, Mr. Brogan.

A question for Mr. Uda. I'm curious, the timeliness that I mentioned just a moment ago that was on page 6, and Mr. Brogan mentions it a number of times -- I'm just curious why did Oak Tree not inquire about expert witnesses?

MR. UDA: Commissioner Hanson, I think the answer to that question is we were under the impression

following our first Motion to Compel -- and I can't recall if it was you or Commissioner Nelson that asked the question, but you posed the question at the last hearing on our Motion to Compel how is NorthWestern going to rebut Oak Tree's 20-year forecast if it's not going to produce one itself.

And NorthWestern has reiterated repeatedly that it's not producing an avoided cost forecast and instead is introducing something else. When we first saw Mr. Lewis's natural gas price forecast we assumed it was just an element of our prior discovery. We had no idea that NorthWestern was going to introduce it in this matter. And the purpose to which testimony is put matters a great deal because it changes the calculation.

Part of this is due to sort of the -- I'm not trying to be pejorative, but sort of the unusual nature of this case where discovery came first after the testimony, that's not been my experience, but, you know, that's how things were done here.

But ultimately the answer to the question about timeliness was even if we had on November -- I think it was the 15th was a Friday. Even if we had on November 18 followed up with additional discovery requests according to the schedule that existed at that time, there was no further opportunity for discovery.

We requested depositions because the schedule, the original schedule, said that we could schedule depositions at the end of discovery, if possible. But until we saw the testimony, we really didn't know what the bases for Mr. Lewis's opinion was or the bases for the opinions that were going to be offered in this proceeding by Mr. Wagner. So that's generally why we waited.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you.

That was Commissioner Nelson that asked that question. I

am not that great a soothsayer, a visionary, as he.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2.4

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Any other questions from the Commission?

Seeing none, are there any motions dealing with this request?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'm going to ask General Counsel to help me a little bit. But what I can see that we can do today is, first of all, ask NorthWestern to give the reports that they have been given from Mr. Lewis, especially to the Montana PUC I believe used it before. So those reports that they have in hand, they should give those over in discovery.

And the other item is for the reports and analysis. And those are formal reports and analysis is

my understanding they're asking for, and that was confirmed by Oak Tree, that they give over those for discovery. So however that Motion would be, General Counsel.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

Should that be subject to a protective order at all?

MR. SMITH: I guess I don't know what you -
MS. SEMMLER: I think the parties might already
have a confidentiality agreement.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. I guess I don't know. I would assume those documents maybe that were part of those Montana dockets, are those public documents,
Mr. Brogan?

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Smith, I believe some of those are public documents and would not be appropriately -- I guess I'm somewhat confused because I'm not sure -- we suddenly went from documents or reports basically in hand for Mr. Lewis that were used in various things including the Montana dockets, and then we started talking about formal reports and analyses, which I thought meant reports related to Aberdeen, which wouldn't have had anything to do with, you know, Montana and which I do think would probably be subject to a protective order.

Many of those are -- some are public. They were provided to the Commission probably and -- with the 2009 IRP data. But I think some were private and went to the company's board.

MR. SMITH: That's a good point. As I understood Commissioner Fiegen's Motion, the first thing was getting to the issue of just any of Mr. Lewis's work that's in your possession.

Is that correct, Commissioner Fiegen?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes.

MR. SMITH: That you actually have those done for you or that you have in your possession. So it meets the standard of 34A, Rule 34A.

MR. BROGAN: Yes.

2.0

2.1

MR. SMITH: I believe that was the point of it. And, you know, because it -- and I think part of this comes from the answer to his Interrogatory 12 and the answer, you know, with respect to documents having been -- that NorthWestern had used this method in its procurement plans filed with Montana. And so at least something would appear to have at some point been in the possession of NorthWestern.

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Smith, with respect to the first thing that Mr. Fiegen mentioned, that's how I understand it also.

MR. SMITH: Is that correct, Commissioner Fiegen? Or any other documents that you have, reports related to this particular methodology or the underlying basis for it that NorthWestern would have in its possession.

And I think to the extent -- do you want to add protective order, Commissioner Fiegen? To the extent any document is currently in a confidential state that it be subject to a protective order?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes. That would be -- MR. SMITH: Or an acceptable NDA to the parties.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Good suggestion of Commissioner Hanson.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. I want to just reiterate this from my understanding. So the motion would be to grant Interrogatory No. 12 and Request For Production No. 30 but only to the extent that that information is possessed by NorthWestern and to grant Requests For Production No. 40 in its entirety.

Is that correct?

MR. SMITH: As I understand it, with the understanding that there's no -- that this is not -- does not cover matters such as correspondence, communications of all types. But we're only talking here about things

```
that have reached the level of an actual report, study,
 1
     you know, something that anybody's going to know -- I
 2
     mean, you're going to know about that. There's no way in
 3
     heck that company people don't know about those kinds of
 4
 5
     things.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Very good. So we have a
 6
 7
     motion.
             Is there discussion?
              Seeing none, all those in favor vote aye.
 8
 9
     Commissioner Hanson.
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
10
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
11
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN:
                                    Fiegen votes aye.
12
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Nelson votes
13
     aye. Motion carries. We are concluded on that docket
14
15
     for the moment.
              MR. BROGAN: Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Brogan.
16
     May I ask one question with respect to the action you
17
18
     just took?
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly.
19
              MR. BROGAN: Am I correct in interpreting the
20
     action as basically excluding any requirement to search
21
     e-mails for the formal reports and analyses?
22
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: That is our understanding, but
23
     let me just ask Mr. Uda. Do you have any objection to
24
```

our understanding of this?

25

```
1
              MR. UDA:
                        No.
                             I mean, really we're interested
 2
     in -- really we're more interested in final reports than
 3
     we are anything else.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yep. That would be my
 4
 5
     understanding. I think we're all on the same page, which
 6
     is a good thing here.
 7
              MR. BROGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: You are welcome. Thank you.
 8
 9
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman, if I can
10
     thank the parties for coming to us quickly because I know
11
     that was a quick turnaround, and we certainly appreciate
12
     that. Thank you.
13
                          May I butt in here, Mr. Chairman.
              MR. SMITH:
14
              CHAIRMAN NELSON:
                                Certainly.
15
                          Maybe the parties and myself could
              MR. SMITH:
     do this by via prehearing conference. We had a second
16
17
     question. And that is -- because now we're up against
18
     the wall.
19
              The prehearing deadline is on the 17th. I just
20
     don't think it's a physical possibility to achieve that.
              CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, do we need formal
21
22
    Commission action on that?
23
              MR. SMITH: Well, let me ask the parties.
     you still on, Al, or are you off now?
24
25
              MR. BROGAN: I'm still on.
```

MR. SMITH: Would you rather just handle this via informal prehearing conference here whenever you can get the time following your hearing, Al? MR. BROGAN: I'm certainly willing to do that. MR. SMITH: Mr. Uda. MR. UDA: Yeah. I don't see any problem with that. Why don't we try do it that way so MR. SMITH: we can move along here, rather than have a lengthy discussion about schedule today right now. All right. Thanks, everyone. Thank you. MR. UDA: MR. BROGAN: Thank you and good-bye. 

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)		
2	:SS CERTIFICATE		
3	COUNTY OF SULLY )		
4			
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered		
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and		
7	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:		
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed		
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings		
10	had in the above-entitled matter on the 14th day of		
11	February, 2012, and that the attached is a true and		
12	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.		
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 6th day of		
14	March, 2012.		
15			
16			
17	Ch. Ma		
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and		
19	Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter		
20	Coltilled Realtime Reporter		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	2/1 141 0:10	above entitled on
1	341 [1] - 9:10	above-entitled [2] -
	34A [2] - 42:13	2:7, 47:10
1 (2) - 26:14, 35:10	353 [1] - 9:11	absolutely [1] - 20:24
10[1] - 30:2		acceptable [1] - 43:11
10-year [1] - 4:15	4	access [1] - 33:2
12 [3] - 23:10, 42:17,		according [2] - 29:22,
43:17	4 [3] - 7:1, 26:11,	39:23
12:06 [1] - 14:24	28:10	accuracy [2] - 18:7,
	<b>40</b> [5] - 11:18, 21:21,	18:12
12A [1] - 7:12	24:4, 24:10, 43:20	achieve [1] - 45:20
13 [2] - 5:20, 15:17	41 (1) - 10:5	acknowledge [1] -
14 [1] - 1:8	<b>45</b> [2] - 21:10, 24:12	3:11
14th [2] - 2:9, 47:10	4D[1] - 31:12	action [3] - 44:17,
<b>15</b> [5] - 5:10, 15:22,	40[1]-31.12	44:21, 45:22
16:3, 18:23, 19:7	F	actual [1] - 44:1
15-6-26B [3] - 4:3,	5	add [1] - 43:6
26:11, 31:12		addition [2] - 28:12,
15-6-26D-4A(i [1] -	<b>500</b> [1] - 2:8	28:16
17:18	<b>510</b> [1] - 8:4	additional [7] - 10:19,
<b>15-6-34</b> [1] - 23:24	0.0[7] 0.4	11:3, 12:10, 15:24,
15th [1] - 39:22	6	18:21, 25:18, 39:23
<b>16</b> [2] - 15:16, 19:8	0	address (3) - 17:12,
17th [1] - 45:19	•	17:13, 18:11
18 [2] - 4:14, 39:22	<b>6</b> [7] - 7:1, 19:15,	addressed [2] - 12:2,
<b>19-15-2</b> [1] - 36:6	35:11, 35:13, 37:13,	22:10
1977 [1] - 9:11	37:22, 38:21	administrative [1] -
	60 [2] - 21:10, 24:12	37:19
2	6th [1] - 47:13	admissibility [1] -
	1	20:11
	7	admissible [3] - 3:17,
<b>2</b> [2] <b>-</b> 16:9, 22:7	•	4:2, 11:25
<b>20</b> [1] - 6:17		admission [1] - 16:20
<b>20-year</b> [3] - 4:19, 5:3,	7 [1] - 4:9	admitted [1] - 20:19
39:5	738 [1] - 8:4	adopted [1] - 17:8
2007 [1] - 8:4		
<b>2008</b> [2] - 20:22, 20:23	8	advance [1] - 15:2
2009 [1] - 42:2		advantage [1] - 28:17
<b>2011</b> (5) - 4:10, 5:10,		adversary [1] - 9:22
11:3, 12:13, 18:23	8 [4] - 3:10, 4:10, 7:1,	advise [1] - 7:3
2012 [5] - 1:8, 2:9,	11:3	advocacy [1] - 24:22
5:20, 47:11, 47:14	<b>82</b> [1] - 8:7	affects [1] - 28:24
2013 [1] - 20:19	83 (1) - 8:7	Affidavit [3] - 21:6,
2016 [1] - 20:19		34:17, 35:8
<b>23</b> [1] - 16:1	9	afternoon [1] - 32:20
<b>25</b> [2] - 12:13, 20:23		AGAINST [1] - 1:4
<b>260</b> [1] - 9:10	00 42.5	ago [1] - 38:20
<b>27</b> [3] - 15:18, 16:20,	90 [1] - 12:5	agree [4] - 23:14,
28:11		31:2, 31:22, 37:4
<b>292.302</b> [1] - 4:14	<b>∤ A</b>	agreed [6] - 6:9, 16:6,
298 [1] - 10:5		16:12, 16:14, 16:17,
	a.m [1] - 3:10	25:18
2:30 [1] - 2:10	Aberdeen [25] - 11:10,	AGREEMENT[1] - 1:6
	11:12, 11:21, 12:1,	agreement [5] - 3:4,
3	12:5, 12:8, 12:10,	9:13, 10:13, 27:23,
	12:12, 13:20, 17:2,	41:9
3 [3] - 16:10, 18:8,	17:3, 20:13, 20:14,	agreements [1] -
18:25	20:17, 20:20, 20:21,	12:18
,	20.11, 20.20, 20.21,	

24:20, 28:16, 37:23,

21:3, 21:18, 22:7,

38:4, 38:6, 41:23

agrees [1] - 18:8

ahead [2] - 14:15,

Ailts [1] - 1:14

47:11

14:18

336 [1] - 10:5

30 [5] - 8:22, 16:13,

16:19, 23:11, 43:18

alternative [2] - 13:16, 28:23 alternatives [3] -11:21, 17:4, 38:6 amended [2] - 10:25, 15:14 ample 121 - 15:24, 20:7 analogies [1] - 33:17 analyses [4] - 17:1, 38:8, 41:22, 44:22 analysis [9] - 11:20. 24:8, 28:21, 30:11, 30:12, 38:4, 38:16, 40:25 answer (10) - 21:15. 22:23, 24:17, 31:6, 35:9, 38:11, 38:25. 39:20, 42:17, 42:18 answers [2] - 6:11, 7:8 antenuptial [1] - 9:12 apologize [4] - 6:14, 15:2, 22:15, 33:15 Appeals [1] - 10:5 appear [1] - 42:21 APPEARANCES [1] -2:1 appeared [1] - 6:20 apply [2] - 17:7, 17:8 appointed [1] - 47:8 appreciate [2] - 22:14, 45:11 appropriate [7] - 17:9, 21:25, 23:17, 24:2, 25:12 appropriately [1] -41:17 argue [1] - 19:20 argument [6] - 3:9, 8:5, 12:22, 13:8, 23:23, 32:19 arguments [8] - 23:8, 24:23, 24:24, 25:3, 25:5, 25:11, 25:13 arrangement [1] -16:16 aside [1] - 30:1 assail [1] - 9:20 asserted [1] - 16:5 assertion [2] - 8:1, 19:2 assistance [1] - 3:11 associated [2] -20:14, 38:5 assume [3] - 36:3, 37:18, 41:13 assumed [1] - 39:10 attached [2] - 20:7,

Al [3] - 2:3, 45:24, 46:3

allow[1] - 16:17

attempt [1] - 23:12 attempted [1] - 6:6 attempting [2] - 5:22, 26:16 attend [1] - 16:11 available [5] - 5:7, 16:9, 16:12, 22:22, 29:7 Avenue [1] - 2:8 avoid [2] - 15:2, 20:15 avoided [14] - 4:14. 4:15, 4:19, 4:22, 5:17, 5:23, 6:17, 6:21, 8:15, 13:6, 24:8, 25:7, 28:24, 39:8 aware [1] - 21:2 Axthelm [1] - 1:19 aye [4] - 44:8, 44:10. 44:12, 44:14

В background [4] - 4:8, 6:14, 14:11, 25:17 Bank [1] - 10:4 based [1] - 24:5 bases [6] - 18:5, 18:11, 18:18, 29:6, 40:5 bashful [1] - 19:3 basis (12] - 7:6, 7:19, 8:12, 8:24, 11:8, 11:17, 12:19, 13:2, 13:24, 21:22, 28:4, 43:4 became [1] - 5:6 BEFORE [1] - 1:10 behalf [3] - 23:4, 27:5, 36:15 belaboring [1] - 3:15 belatedly [1] - 11:4 belief (1) - 27:20 believes [4] - 12:11, 21:4, 23:19, 24:24 benefit [1] - 21:17 best [2] - 17:12, 28:23 better (2) - 8:23, 11:16 between [1] - 19:7 beyond [1] - 19:20 bit [4] - 14:10, 24:13, 35:7, 40:18 black [1] - 27:12 board [2] - 37:18, 42:4 box [1] - 27:12 breathing [1] - 14:13 Brian (1) - 1:18 brief [7] - 14:23, 15:1, 21:1, 23:8, 26:6,

29:10, 37:8 brings [1] - 35:17 Brittany [1] - 1:17 broad [3] - 3:16, 22:17, 36:20 Brogan [12] - 2:3, 14:6, 23:1, 26:21, 29:10, 30:17, 33:10, 36:2, 38:18, 38:21, 41:15, 44:16 BROGAN [23] - 14:7, 14:12, 14:19, 29:11, 30:23, 31:2, 31:18, 32:6, 33:12, 33:14, 36:2, 36:5, 37:21, 38:1, 41:16, 42:14, 42:23, 44:16, 44:20, 45:7, 45:25, 46:4, 46:13 Brogan's [1] - 28:9 build [4] - 11:15, 17:2, 21:2, 22:8 Building [1] - 2:8 built [2] - 20:20, 28:12 burden [6] - 21:5, 21:16, 22:14, 36:22, 37:15, 37:17 burdensome [1] -13:9 burdensomeness [1] - 13:12 business [1] - 20:3 butt [1] - 45:13 BY [2] - 1:4, 2:1 bye [1] - 46:13

# C

calculated [3] - 3:18, 4:1, 11:25 calculation [3] - 13:6, 28:25, 39:14 cannot [7] - 8:1, 9:8, 9:15, 9:19, 10:6, 22:13, 37:17 capabilities [1] -35:23 capacity [12] - 4:15, 4:16, 11:14, 12:4, 12:10, 12:12, 20:16, 20:18, 20:20, 24:7, 28:14, 28:18 Capitol [2] - 2:8 capture [1] - 21:11 carefully (1) - 15:1 carries [1] - 44:14 case [11] - 8:3, 10:13, 10:21, 11:8, 13:6, 13:21, 13:23, 22:13,

27:24, 34:13, 39:17 cases [1] - 36:18 Catch-22[1] - 37:6 cement [1] - 35:21 central [1] - 14:24 certain [3] - 18:3, 22:13, 32:6 certainly [11] - 14:5, 19:5, 20:10, 20:19, 22:16, 31:15, 44:19, 45:11, 45:14, 46:4 CERTIFICATE [1] -47.2 Certified [2] - 47:6, 47:19 **CERTIFY** [1] - 47:8 CFR [1] - 4:14 chair [2] - 40:12, 41:5 CHAIRMAN [32] -1:11, 3:1, 13:25, 14:5, 14:10, 14:14, 22:25, 26:5, 29:9, 29:12, 30:15, 30:25, 31:11, 32:2, 32:9, 32:24, 33:10, 33:13, 34:15, 34:25, 40:13, 41:11, 43:15, 44:6, 44:11, 44:13, 44:19, 44:23, 45:4, 45:8, 45:14, 45:21 chairman [8] - 14:7, 23:3, 29:11, 30:14, 35:3, 44:16, 45:7, 45:9 Chairman [1] - 45:13 challenge [3] - 23:15, 35:5, 37:7 changes [1] - 39:14 characterize [1] - 32:7 CHERI [1] - 47:5 Cheri [2] - 1:24, 47:18 chose [1] - 4:6 CHRIS [1] - 1:11 Chris (1) - 1:18 Circuit [1] - 10:4 circumstances [1] -15:6 cite [1] - 28:6 cited [1] - 8:3 civil [1] - 32:18 Civil [3] - 17:7, 17:8, 22:17 claim [3] - 9:12, 10:6, 13:11 claiming [1] - 9:17

claims [1] - 12:9

clear [4] ~ 8:7, 25:18,

CLE[1] - 16:11

26:22, 31:6

clearly [1] - 25:6

clients [16] - 7:3, 7:11, 7:16, 8:23, 13:19, 16:24, 16:25, 17:25, 18:1, 20:1, 23:11, 30:21, 31:5, 31:8, 31:20, 35:12 close [2] - 5:11, 10:22 closed [1] - 10:18 colleague's [1] - 3:9 coming [1] - 45:10 commencing [1] -2:10 comment [2] - 32:24, 33:11 comments [1] - 29:10 Commission [18] -4:11, 4:24, 14:21, 15:7, 15:9, 15:11, 15:14, 17:7, 19:18, 20:23, 22:15, 22:21, 24:9, 36:16, 37:1, 40:14, 42:2, 45:22 COMMISSION [3] -1:1, 1:10, 1:13 Commissioner [23] -29:14, 29:19, 29:23, 30:16, 30:23, 31:18, 33:12, 33:14, 34:24, 35:2, 36:2, 37:21, 38:24, 39:2, 40:10, 42:6, 42:9, 43:1, 43:7, 43:13, 44:9, 44:11, 44:13 COMMISSIONER [21] - 1:11, 1:12, 29:15, 29:21, 30:5, 30:13, 35:3, 36:4, 37:4, 37:25, 38:15, 40:9, 40:17, 41:5, 41:10, 42:10, 43:10, 43:12, 44:10, 44:12, 45:9 Commissioners [4] -14:25, 22:23, 25:10, 29:13 committing [1] - 29:24 common [1] - 23:18 communications [6] -9:15, 9:18, 9:21, 9:23, 9:25, 43:24 company [3] - 30:2, 34:5, 44:4 company's [2] - 34:3, 42:4 compare [1] - 17:3 comparison [1] -15:18 Compel [15] - 3:5, 4:10, 8:14, 11:2, 14:20, 14:24, 17:4,

18:4, 18:19, 20:5,

21:21, 22:22, 24:22, 39:1, 39:4 compelled [2] - 25:4, 37:12 Complaint [1] - 21:3 complaint [1] - 3:2 COMPLAINT [1] - 1:4 complicated [1] - 6:15 complicating [1] -6:15 compromise [2] -25:15, 26:2 compromised [1] -26:19 concern [1] - 10:11 concerned [1] - 19:6 concerns [1] - 9:5 conclude [1] - 13:25 concluded [1] - 44:14 conclusion [1] - 25:11 conference [3] - 6:9, 45:16, 46:2 confidential [5] - 9:14, 9:25, 10:13, 28:5, 43:8 confidentiality [9] -7:16, 9:6, 9:7, 9:8, 9:12, 10:12, 27:23, 28:7, 41:9 confirmed [1] - 41:2 confused [2] - 31:1, 41:18 confusion [1] - 30:24 consider [1] - 28:18 consideration [2] -12:17, 37:10 construct [2] - 12:1, 12:8 consulting [2] - 7:14, contact [1] - 21:12 contacted [1] - 6:6 contempt [1] - 11:7 contention [1] - 32:25 continues [1] - 28:19 continuing [1] - 8:18 contract [2] - 27:8, 33:1 contrary [2] - 10:2, 15:23 control [7] - 19:23, 23:24, 27:3, 27:7, 29:16, 29:17, 30:4 cooperate (1) - 13:16 copies [4] - 11:19, 16:24, 23:11, 35:11 copy (6) - 31:10, 33:21, 36:12, 38:3, 38:4, 38:15 correct [14] - 26:10,

29:18, 29:20, 30:9, 30:22, 34:23, 34:24, 36:4, 37:25, 42:9, 43:1, 43:21, 44:20, 47:12 correspondence [3] -24:15, 24:20, 43:24 cost [12] - 4:14, 4:15, 4:19, 4:22, 5:17, 5:23, 6:17, 6:21, 8:15, 24:8, 28:24, 39:8 costs [4] - 13:6, 20:14, 20:15, 25:7 Counsel [2] - 40:18, 41:4 counsel [1] - 26:10 count [1] - 16:21 COUNTY [1] - 47:3 couple [3] - 21:19, 30:17, 35:9 court [3] - 9:13, 14:8, 14:16 Court [1] - 10:4 cover[1] - 43:24 CPA [1] - 33:18 create [1] - 13:13 creating [1] - 27:18 credibility [2] - 18:7, 18:12 credible [1] - 13:12 Cremer [1] - 1:14 cross [2] - 8:13, 36:18 cross-examined [2] -8:13, 36:18 CRR [1] - 1:24 curiosities [1] - 35:6 curiosity [1] - 35:17 curious [2] - 38:19, 38:22 curriculum [3] - 20:6, 36:12, 36:21 custody [4] - 19:23, 23:24, 27:3, 29:16 customers [1] - 28:17

# D

Dakota [11] - 2:7, 2:9, 3:14, 3:24, 4:2, 4:21, 17:17, 26:9, 28:7, 47:7, 47:13 DAKOTA [2] - 1:2, 47:1 data [4] - 4:15, 25:8, 42:3 date [1] - 21:25 Dated [1] - 47:13 dates [1] - 16:10

Daugaard [1] - 1:18 days [2] - 21:10, 24:12 deadline [4] - 5:13, 6:1, 6:2, 45:19 deadlines [1] - 15:15 deal [1] - 39:14 dealing [3] - 23:10, 34:16, 40:15 debate [1] - 4:21 December [4] - 15:16, 19:8 decide [1] - 19:19 decided [1] - 12:7 decision [11] - 8:7, 11:14, 11:17, 11:20, 12:1, 13:2, 13:20, 17:2, 22:8, 27:11, 38:4 decisions [6] - 7:5, 7:6, 12:16, 13:1, 13:3, 37:20 defend [1] - 9:22 Demaris [1] - 1:19 demonstrate [1] -28:22 denied [2] - 4:25, 5:3 Dennis [2] - 16:6, 16:7 deny [1] - 22:21 depicts [1] - 24:11 depose [3] - 16:5, 16:7, 19:9 deposing [2] - 16:7, 16:18 deposition [5] - 6:2, 6:7, 6:11, 16:9, 16:15 depositions [8] - 5:14, 6:3, 6:5, 10:20, 10:21, 25:16, 40:1, 40:3 described [2] - 22:3, 30:19 despite [1] - 6:14 determination [1] -37:11 determine (5) - 7:18, 7:23, 21:22, 25:7, 28:25 device [1] - 4:5 different [9] - 14:17, 25:7, 25:8, 25:20, 28:17, 34:19, 36:25 differing [1] - 15:5 diligence [1] - 11:6 direct [2] - 5:19, 11:11 directed [1] - 36:3 directly [6] - 13:5, 13:23, 27:4, 27:18, 28:24, 32:16

director [2] - 21:7,

38:12 directors [1] - 37:19 disagree [1] - 17:11 disagrees [1] - 24:5 disclose [2] - 7:15. 8:12 disclosed [5] - 5:11, 8:6, 8:10, 10:11, 18:23 disclosure [3] - 7:13, 8:25, 9:14 discover[6] - 17:19, 26:16, 28:4, 31:13, 31:22, 38:11 discoverable [2] -3:25, 26:13 discovery [58] - 3:14, 3:15, 4:1, 4:3, 4:4, 5:5, 5:9, 5:12, 6:1, 6:10, 6:12, 6:22, 7:7, 8:14, 10:18, 10:19, 10:22, 11:3, 11:8, 13:17, 15:10, 15:11, 15:15, 15:19, 15:25, 16:1, 16:18, 17:9, 17:15, 17:16, 18:2, 18:21, 18:24, 19:2, 19:4, 20:25, 21:1, 21:8, 22:10, 22:17, 23:19, 24:2, 25:13, 25:18, 26:11, 26:12, 29:22, 32:23, 33:24, 34:14, 39:11, 39:17, 39:23, 39:25, 40:3, 40:23, 41:3 discuss [2] - 13:20, 17:16 discussed [1] - 17:15 discusses [3] - 11:12, 22:8, 28:15 discussing [1] - 9:12 discussion [2] - 44:7, 46:10 Discussion [1] - 3:20 disgusted [1] - 25:19 displaced [1] - 12:13 dispute [4] - 4:7, 25:13, 25:16, 37:3 DO [1] - 47:8 docket [3] - 31:9, 32:1, 44:14 Docket [3] - 12:2, 19:4, 31:3 dockets [3] - 31:4, 41:14, 41:21 doctor [2] - 33:22 document [2] - 13:13, 43:8 documentation [1] -

29:17

documents (16) -12:21, 13:9, 13:10, 13:14, 14:22, 19:25, 20:13, 23:23, 30:18, 38:10, 41:13, 41:14, 41:17, 41:19, 42:18, done [10] - 22:4. 26:25, 27:14, 27:15, 27:22, 31:21, 33:23, 34:19, 39:19, 42:11 down [2] - 8:11, 9:19 drives [2] - 21:14 due (2) - 7:16, 39:15 duly [1] - 47:8 duly-appointed [1] -47:8 duplication (2) - 15:2, 15:3 during [1] - 20:25

E

e-mail [2] - 21:11, 24:16 e-mails [3] - 38:10, 31:20 38:17, 44:22 East [1] - 2:8 36:18 easy [1] - 3:22 education [3] - 20:8, 36:8, 36:13 efficient[1] - 34:8 efforts [1] - 16:16 Eighth [1] - 10:4 either [2] - 18:11, 31:9 EL11-006 (1) - 3:1 electric [6] - 5:22, 6:25, 8:17, 10:7, 34:13 26:23, 27:20 element [2] ~ 5:16, 30:12 39:11 employed [3] - 33:5, 34:2, 34:5 25:23 employees [1] - 34:11 employing [2] - 25:7, 36:25 end [1] - 40:3 ends [1] - 35:6 energies [1] - 10:10 **ENERGY** [2] - 1:4, 1:5 Energy [10] - 3:2, 3:3, 11:19, 12:9, 24:11, 25:19, 30:1, 32:17, 33:6, 35:13 energy [6] - 4:15, 7:2, 7:4, 11:15, 12:4, 20:15 31:5, 31:13, 31:14, Energy's [1] - 23:22 31:23, 31:25, 35:20, enforceable [2] -35:22, 36:7, 36:17,

12:25, 29:1 engaged [1] - 12:14 ENTER[1] - 1:5 enter [2] - 3:3, 27:22 entirely [3] - 26:18. 27:15, 28:9 entirety [1] - 43:20 entities [2] - 34:4, 34:6 entitled [7] - 2:7, 18:5, 18:17, 19:2, 23:19, 23:25, 47:10 entity [3] - 27:6, 34:3 errors [1] - 22:11 ES11-006 [1] - 1:4 especially [1] - 40:21 essays [1] - 9:22 essentially [5] - 4:20, 5:12, 6:13, 7.9, 28:22 established [1] -17:10

event [1] - 5:6 evidence [3] - 4:2, 11:25, 20:8 exactly [2] - 22:3, examined [2] - 8:13, excess [1] - 21:17 excluding [1] - 44:21 excuse [6] - 4:9, 20:24, 30:24, 33:14, 38:1, 41:5 exist [3] - 13:10, 13:14, 24:18 existed [1] - 39:24 existing [2] - 12:18, exists [2] - 24:16, expect [1] - 24:22 expecting [3] - 25:22, experience [6] - 20:8, 35:23, 36:7, 36:13, 36:20, 39:18 experienced [1] - 21:8 expert (38) - 5:21, 5:24, 7:1, 7:14, 7:18, 8:1, 8:6, 8:8, 9:1, 17:17, 17:20, 17:21, 20:2, 20:5, 23:13, 23:14, 23:15, 23:20, 23:21, 26:21, 27:1, 27:14, 27:21, 28:3, 29:4, 30:20, 31:3,

36:23, 38:23 expert's [2] - 8:9, 27:20 expertise [6] - 7:21 10:7, 10:16, 26:22, 27:19, 28:2 experts [8] - 4:3, 4:4, 17:19, 19:25, 22:19, 26:12, 26:13, 34:11 explore [1] - 35:7 expound [1] - 32:14 extended [1] - 15:15 extends (1) - 33:5 extent [5] - 17:23. 25:24, 43:6, 43:7, 43:18 extra [1] - 23:8 extreme [1] - 24:13

# F

facility [2] - 11:15, 12:5 fact [8] - 4:3, 7:1, 7:24, 10:17, 22:2, 32:3, 33:25, 35:22 factor[1] - 28:13 facts [9] - 4:4, 5:8, 17:21, 26:12, 31:13, 31:23, 31:24, 32:2, fair [3] - 4:20, 27:15, 32:9 Fair [1] - 3:21 fairly [3] - 6:13, 34:22 faith [1] - 12:14 falls [1] - 22:6 Falls [2] - 16:9, 16:12 familiar [1] - 29:25 far [3] - 5:8, 21:16, 27:12 favor [1] - 44:8 February [5] - 1:8, 2:9, 12:13, 16:9, 47:11 federal [1] - 5:1 few [2] - 25:4, 36:14 Fiegen [9] - 29:14. 29:19, 29:23, 42:9, 42:24, 43:2, 43:7, 44:11, 44:12 FIEGEN [11] - 1:11. 29:15, 29:21, 30:5, 30:13, 40:17, 42:10, 43:10, 43:12, 44:12, 45:9 Fiegen's [1] - 42:6 fighting [1] - 19:7 figure [1] - 26:24 file [1] - 15:16

filed [10] - 4:10, 5:9, 14:23, 16:4, 17:4, 20:22, 30:18, 34:17, 35:8, 42:20 files [1] - 34:3 filing [2] - 21:3, 32:19 final [1] - 45:2 finally [3] - 13:15, 21:19, 34:2 finished [1] - 14:2 First [1] - 10:4 first [13] - 4:10, 7:17, 11:4, 12:6, 18:22, 25:6, 33:4, 39:1, 39:9, 39:17, 40:19, 42:6, 42:24 five [1] - 4:14 flabbergasted [1] -19:16 follow [2] - 23:7, 31:11 followed [2] - 15:11, 39:23 following [4] - 10:22, 28:15, 39:1, 46:3 FOR [1] - 1:5 force [2] - 24:17, 34:5 forecast [20] - 4:19, 5:4, 5:11, 5:16, 5:22, 5:23, 6:21, 7:19, 7:20, 7:25, 8:17, 11:5, 15:21, 18:22, 19:6, 27:21, 35:17, 39:5, 39:8, 39:10 forecasting [3] - 6:25, 7:3, 10:7 forecasts [3] - 10:9, 10:14, 26:23 forego [1] - 16:7 form [2] - 30:12, 36:8 formal [5] - 30:8, 40:25, 41:22, 44:22, 45:21

#### G

furthermore [3] - 8:3,

forming [1] - 8:9

forum [1] - 35:16

foundation [1] - 37:5

forth [1] - 21:1

four[1] - 16:19

frankly [1] - 19:16

Friday [1] - 39:22

front[1] - 35:5

19:3, 19:22

full [1] - 4:20

GARY [1] - 1:12 gas [4] - 5:10, 5:16, 18:22, 39:10

gather [1] - 38:17 general [2] - 3:24, 26:15 General [2] - 40:17, 41:3 generally [3] - 18:8, 29:2, 40:7 generating [2] - 22:7, 28:12 generation [2] - 12:4, 28:19 generations [1] -28:17 given [2] - 36:20, 40:20 good-bye [1] - 46:13 good-faith [1] - 12:14 grant [3] - 24:9, 43:17, 43:19 granted [2] - 4:24, 4 25 granting [1] - 18:18 grateful [2] - 3:9, 3:12 great [2] - 39:14, 40:11 green [2] - 22:8, 22:12 green's [1] - 22:6 Greg [1] - 1:16 grounds [2] - 9:11, 17:22 guess [3] - 41:7, 41:12, 41:18 guys (1) - 30:11

# Н

hand [3] - 32:11, 40:22, 41:19 handle [1] - 46:1 HANSON [10] - 1:12, 35:3, 36:4, 37:4, 37:25, 38:15, 40:9, 41:5, 41:10, 44:10 Hanson [5] - 33:12, 35:2, 38:24, 43:13, 44:9 Harbert [1] - 8:4 hard [2] - 13:11, 21:14 hardly [1] - 8:19 heading [1] - 22:7 hear [2] - 14:9, 25:9 heard [3] - 24:22, 24:23, 25:17 hearing [10] - 8:13, 12:22, 14:19, 23:16, 25:9, 27:1, 27:2, 36:1, 39:4, 46:3 heavy [1] - 14:13 heck [1] - 44:4

held [7] - 2:6, 4:4, 26:13, 31:13, 31:23, 32:3, 32:8 help [1] - 40:18 HEREBY [1] - 47:8 highly (1) - 12:7 himself [5] - 6:25, 9:2, 9:22, 10:14, 28:3 hold [1] - 16:15 holding [1] - 28:2 holds [1] - 6:25 honestly [1] - 33:3 hope [1] - 3:21 hoping [1] - 4:20 house [1] - 34:7 huge [2] - 37:15, 37:17

# ı

identified [1] - 20:21

identities [3] - 16:23,

idea [1] - 39:11

17:25, 18:14

identity [4] - 7:13, 7:15, 13:18, 17:19 ignore [1] - 25:3 immediately [1] - 6:6 important [4] - 3:13, 5:25, 6:16, 37:6 impression [1] - 38:25 IN [1] - 1:4 in-house [1] - 34:7 Inaudible [1] - 3:16 Inaudible) [1] - 3:19 include [3] - 8:16, 10:23, 12:17 includes [1] - 17:9 including [5] - 12:18, 15:20, 16:22, 21:14, 41:20 income [2] - 33:20, 33:21 inconsistent [1] - 19:1 incumbent [1] - 35:25 indeed [2] - 10:2, 12:11 indicated [1] - 32:12 indicates [1] - 36:6 individuals [1] - 17:13 informal [2] - 6:8, 46:2 information [42] -3:17, 3:18, 3:25, 4:13, 4:22, 5:1, 5:6, 6:17, 8:5, 8:9, 8:10, 8:15, 8:20, 11:1, 11:23, 12:6, 12:23, 13:3, 13:5, 13:23, 14:21, 17:24, 18:15,

19:11, 19:22, 21:5, 23:25, 27:3, 27:7, 27:18, 27:24, 28:20, 32:11, 32:16, 35:22, 35:24, 37:6, 37:11, 37:16, 37:18, 38:17, 43:19 initial [5] - 5:12, 5:13, 6:2, 15:25, 20:25 inquire [1] - 38:22 instance [2] - 4:6, 13:22 instead [3] - 6:10, 12:8, 39:8 intended [1] - 34:14 intentionally [1] - 3:16 interest [1] - 10:3 interested [2] - 45:1, 45:2 interpreting [1] -44:20

Interrogatories [2] -4:5, 16:19 Interrogatory [4] -7:11, 23:10, 42:17, 43:17 interrogatory [1] -18:10 intimating [1] - 35:13 **INTO** [1] - 1:5 introduce [2] - 27:10, 39:12 introduced [2] - 11:5, 11:10 introducing [1] - 39:9 invoke [1] - 9:17 IRP [1] - 42:3 irrelevant [4] - 11:23. 19:14, 29:5, 37:14 Irving [1] - 1:19 issue [18] - 3:4, 5:18, 11:10, 11:24, 12:2, 12:24, 13:5, 15:19, 18:11, 20:12, 21:6, 24:21, 27:4, 31:17, 32:10, 33:25, 36:19, 42:7

issued [2] - 15:9, 15:14

item [3] - 35:11, 35:13, 40:24

items [2] - 34:19, 37:9 itself [2] - 18:22, 39:6

### J

January [6] - 5:20, 15:17, 15:18, 16:4, 16:13; 16:19 job [1] - 35:4 John [1] - 1:13 Joy [1] - 1:19 June [1] - 20:23 justice [1] - 10:3

#### K

Kara [3] - 1:15, 23:4, 32:15

Karen [1] - 1:14

keep [1] - 13:18

kind [2] - 14:15, 30:11

kinds [1] - 44:4

knowing [2] - 35:18, 35:23

knowledge [1] - 36:7

known [5] - 26:12, 31:13, 31:23, 32:3, 32:8

KRISTIE [1] - 1:11

# L

laboring [1] - 3:10 lack [1] - 11:6 LaFrentz [2] - 2:2, 3:6 laid [1] ~ 37:5 Lands [2] - 32:17, 33:6 lands [1] - 7:2 last [5] - 7:8, 17:4, 34:15, 39:3 late [1] - 5:9 Law [4] - 3:14, 3:24, 4.2, 17:17 law [1] - 34:13 lay [2] - 9:19, 29:4 lead [2] - 4:1, 11:25 least [4] - 5:2, 20:22, 36:14, 42:20 ied [1] - 15:6 left [2] - 27:12, 27:13 legal [1] - 17:10 legally [2] - 12:24, 28:25 length [1] - 28:15 lengthy [1] - 46:9 less [2] - 30:2, 34:1 level [1] - 44:1 Lewis [44] - 5:10, 5:20, 7:9, 7:14, 7:17, 7:20, 7:24, 8:22, 9:1, 10:11, 10:14, 10:15, 11:4, 13:17, 13:18, 16:5, 16:8, 16:12, 16:18, 16:25, 17:13, 19:9, 19:10, 20:9,

26:17, 26:20, 27:20, 28:1, 28:2, 29:18, 29:25, 30:19, 31:2, 31:7, 31:14, 31:16, 32:3, 33:1, 35:9, 35:19, 36:13, 40:21, 41:20 Lewis's [28] - 6:19, 6:24, 7:8, 8:12, 8:23, 10;7, 13:19, 15:20, 16:23, 18:5, 18:12, 18:18, 18:22, 19:6, 19:12, 19:13, 19:17, 20:4, 20:6, 20:10, 27:10, 27:13, 27:19, 36:11, 36:21, 39:10, 40:5, 42:7 lieu [1] - 16:18 likely [2] - 34:1 limited [7] - 6:10, 7:7, 8:16, 16:18, 22:18, 22:20, 36:9 line [1] - 28:11 lines [1] - 7:1 link [1] - 31:9 LLC [2] - 1:4, 3:2 locate [2] - 13:11, 13:14 located [2] - 12:5, 13:7 locations [1] - 21:13 Lockhart [1] - 5:24 long-term [1] - 4:22 look [3] - 38:7, 38:9, 38:13 looked [5] - 5:15, 6:19, 11:21, 32:20, 38:6 looking [1] - 31:12 loose [1] - 35:6

#### Μ

mail [2] - 21:11, 24:16 mails [3] - 38:10, 38:17, 44:22 management [3] - 7:5, 21:7, 38:12 March [2] - 25:9, 47:14 market [1] - 15:21 markets [1] - 7:4 marriage [1] - 9:13 materials [2] - 23:16, 34:12 matter[7] - 2:7, 3:1, 8:2, 17:20, 25:1, 39:13, 47:10 MATTER [1] - 1:4 matters [5] - 11:24,

17:8, 22:18, 39:14, 43:24 Matthew [1] - 1:17 MCCOMSEY [1] - 47:5 McComsey [2] - 1:24, 47:18 mean [5] - 30:10, 31:16, 33:16, 44:3, means [3] - 24:1, 32:13, 32:22 meant [1] - 41:22 meet [3] - 11:13, 28:14, 28:18 meets [1] - 42:12 Mehlhaff [1] - 1:17 mention [1] - 25:4 mentioned [3] - 7:8, 38:20, 42:24 mentions [1] - 38:21 mere [1] - 22:11 merit [1] - 32:21 met [1] - 36:22 method [3] - 7:2, 7:5, 42:19 methodologies [2] -36:25, 37:2 methodology [6] -8:24, 19:12, 19:13, 19:18, 35:17, 43:3 methods [1] - 25:7 mid [1] - 19:8 mid-December [1] -19:8 might [5] - 15:23, 21:25, 34:19, 35:9, 41:8 Mike [2] - 2:2, 3:8 miles [1] - 12:5 mind [4] - 4:8, 6:21, 25:21, 26:19 moment [2] - 38:20, 44:15 Montana [6] - 36:16, 40:21, 41:14, 41:21, 41:24, 42:20 months [1] - 30:2 morning [1] - 3:10 motion [3] - 6:13, 43:16, 44:7 Motion [27] - 3:5, 4:10, 4:12, 4:17, 4:18, 4:24, 8:14, 11:2, 14:20, 14:24, 17:4,

18:4, 18:7, 18:19,

18:25, 19:15, 20:5,

21:20, 22:22, 24:9,

24:21, 24:23, 39:1,

39:4, 41:3, 42:6,

44:14

motions [1] - 40:15 mountain [1] - 3:11 move [1] - 46:9 MR [50] - 3:8, 3:21, 14:2, 14:7, 14:12, 14:19, 26:7, 29:11, 29:19, 29:23, 30:10, 30:23, 31:2, 31:18, 32:6, 33:12, 33:14, 34:24, 36:2, 36:5, 37:21, 38:1, 38:24, 41:7, 41:12, 41:16, 42:5, 42:11, 42:14, 42:15, 42:23, 43:1, 43:11, 43:14, 43:22, 44:16, 44:20, 45:1, 45:7, 45:13, 45:15, 45:23, 45:25, 46:1, 46:4, 46:5, 46:6, 46:8, 46:12, 46:13 MS [4] - 23:3, 32:15, 33:3, 41:8 must [1] - 37:11

# Ν

N.W.2d [2] - 8:4, 9:10 names [2] - 7:11, 23:11 narrow [1] - 34:22 National [1] - 10:4 natural [4] - 5:10, 5:15, 18:22, 39:10 nature [1] - 39:16 NDA [1] - 43:11 necessarily [1] - 8:16 necessary [1] - 23:16 need [12] - 6:15, 11:13, 12:10, 13:3, 20:18, 24:1, 24:7, 26:7, 29:6, 34:18, 45:21 needed [1] - 22:16 needs [2] - 11:14, 20:20 neglected [1] - 10:23 negotiations [2] -12:14, 16:6 Neill [1] - 21:6 Nelson [10] - 30:16, 30:23, 30:24, 31:18, 33:13, 33:14, 34:24, 39:2, 40:10, 44:13 NELSON [32] - 1:11, 3:1, 13:25, 14:5, 14:10, 14:14, 22:25, 26:5, 29:9, 29:12, 30:15, 30:25, 31:11, 32:2, 32:9, 32:24,

33:10, 33:13, 34:15, 34:25, 40:13, 41:11, 43:15, 44:6, 44:11, 44:13, 44:19, 44:23, 45:4, 45:8, 45:14, 45:21 nervousness [1] -14:12 network [1] - 21:14 never [3] - 7:24, 34:4, 36:17 noise [1] - 14:11 none [2] - 40:15, 44:8 nonetheless [2] -25:25, 33:6 nontestifying [6] -7:14, 8:6, 8:8, 9:1, 30:19, 31:5 Northwest [2] - 11:19, 12:9 NORTHWESTERN [1] - 1:5 Northwestern [87] -

2:3, 2:3, 3:2, 4:13, 4:18, 5:2, 5:5, 6:6, 6:10, 6:18, 8:3, 8:11, 8:18, 8:25, 9:5, 9:7, 10:6, 10:17, 10:18, 10:23, 10:25, 11:7, 11:15, 12:3, 12:7, 12:14, 12:20, 12:24, 13:13, 13:15, 14:21, 14:22, 14:23, 15:5, 15:12, 15:17, 16:4, 16:8, 16:11, 16:15, 16:22, 17:24, 18:8, 19:24, 20:15, 20:17, 20:19, 22:3, 22:13, 22:21, 23:13, 23:14, 23:22, 24:11, 25:6, 25:19, 27:2, 28:13, 28:18, 28:22, 29:3, 29:15, 30:1, 31:3, 32:11, 32:25, 33:5, 33:9, 34:6, 34:16, 34:17, 35:13, 35:18, 36:11, 36:15, 36:22, 36:24, 37:15, 38:5, 39:4, 39:7, 39:12, 40:19, 42:19, 42:22, 43:4, 43:19 Northwestern's [27] -4:21, 5:19, 7:12, 8:5, 8:15, 11:8, 11:13, 11:17, 11:22, 12:1, 12:21, 13:1, 13:2, 13:8, 13:21, 15:8, 15:19, 16:2, 17:2, 19:23, 20:22, 21:1,

21:2, 21:7, 28:13,

28:14, 28:16 Notary [2] - 47:7, 47:18 noted [1] - 4:4 nothing [2] - 19:21, 34:6 November [10] - 4:9, 4:10, 5:10, 11:3, 15:22, 16:2, 18:23, 19:7, 39:21, 39:22 number [7] - 10:8, 24:4, 35:5, 35:11, 35:13, 37:19, 38:21 numbers [3] - 25:8, 36:25, 37:2 numerous [1] - 7:3 NWE [1] - 21:23 NWE's [1] - 15:25

#### 0

Oak [70] - 2:2, 2:2, 3:2, 3:4, 5:23, 8:21, 10:10, 10:19, 11:2, 11:6, 11:17, 12:3, 12:9, 12:11, 12:14, 14:20, 14:23, 15:4, 15:7, 15:12, 15:13, 15:16, 15:19, 15:21, 15:24, 15:25, 16:5, 16:6, 16:10, 16:14, 16:17, 16:19, 17:4, 17:23, 18:4, 18:5, 18:20, 19:1, 19:3, 19:5, 19:10, 19:11, 20:16, 20:24, 21:2, 21:20, 21:21, 21:22, 22:5, 22:16, 22:22, 23:7, 23:12, 23:17, 23:19, 23:25, 25:6, 25:21, 25:25, 27:16, 30:5, 32:16, 36:1, 36:24, 38:2, 38:22, 39:5, 41:2 OAK [1] - 1:4 oak [1] - 10:20 objected [1] - 11:22 objecting [1] - 16:23 objection [7] - 9:7, 12:20, 13:24, 24:5, 24:6, 27:2, 44:24 objects [1] - 14:22 obligation [4] - 5:5, 8:18, 28:14, 29:1 obligations [1] - 12:25 obtain [1] - 23:16 obtained [1] - 32:21 obviously [1] - 10:12 occur[1] - 15:3

OF [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:6, 47:1, 47:3 offer [3] - 8:1, 9:3, 22:3 offered [5] - 16:8, 21:23, 22:1, 28:6, 40.6 offering [4] - 7:25, 29:4, 29:5 often [1] - 23:18 Olson [1] - 2:3 once [1] - 5:2 one [10] - 4:12, 10:12, 15:11, 19:24, 21:9, 24:22, 33:23, 37:9, 39:6, 44:17 Onida [1] - 47:13 open (2) - 4:21, 34:3 opinion [12] - 8:1, 8:9, 8:24, 9:3, 17:22, 23:6, 28:4, 29:4, 29:5, 36:8, 40:5 opinions [16] - 4:4, 8:12, 17:21, 18:6, 18:12, 18:18, 21:23, 22:2, 22:3, 26:13, 29:6, 31:13, 31:23, 32:3, 32:8, 40:6 opportunities [1] -18:24 opportunity [4] - 14:3, 15:1, 15:24, 39:25 opposing [1] - 14:23 options [2] - 12:17, 12:18 oral [1] - 3:9 order [15] - 5:13, 10:21, 11:13, 11:16, 13:1, 14:21, 15:9, 15:15, 27:23, 37:6, 38:17, 41:6, 41:25, 43:7, 43:9 ore (1) - 3:10 original [3] - 10:20, 11:2, 40:2 otherwise [2] - 26:13, 36:9 output [1] - 12:8 outset [2] - 3:13, 17:6 outside [4] - 24:25, 26:1, 27:7, 34:11 overruled (1) - 9:11 own [2] - 10:1, 29:17 owner[1] - 9:13

# P

p.m [1] - 2:10 page [9] - 7:1, 10:5,

18:8, 28:10, 35:10. 37:13, 37:22, 38:21, 45:5 pail [1] - 19:20 papers [1] - 10:24 Papke [1] - 8:4 paragraphs [1] - 8:7 part [13] - 4:17, 4:24, 4:25, 5:3, 9:16, 11:7, 12:9, 32:18, 36:9, 39:15, 41:13, 42:16 particular [5] - 25:23, 32:18, 32:22, 33:11, 43:3 parties [12] - 9:18, 9:23, 15:6, 15:10, 16:17, 17:18, 25:17, 41:8, 43:11, 45:10, 45:15, 45:23 party [8] - 27:5, 31:12, 31:22, 32:1, 33:6, 33:7, 33:8 pass [1] - 29:11 passed [1] - 6:2 past [2] - 34:13 pay [1] - 34:9 payers [1] - 34:9 paying [1] - 12:3 peaker [2] - 17:2, 34:17 peaking [1] - 30:7 Pedersen [1] - 1:16 pejorative [1] - 39:16 people [6] - 18:14. 31:19, 32:7, 34:5, 37:19, 44:4 perform [1] - 28:22 performed [1] - 38:5 perhaps [3] - 15:4, 32:12 period [2] - 20:18, 21:1 permits [1] - 4:2 permitted [2] - 10:18, 10:21 person [2] - 7:19, 27:8 personally [1] - 30:6 pertinent [1] - 25:13 physical [3] - 21:14, 38:10, 45:20 piece [2] - 24:15, 24:19 Pierre (1) - 2:8 place [2] - 22:5, 37:15 placement [1] - 28:24 placing [1] - 22:14 plan [2] - 20:22, 35:21 planned [1] - 28:20 planning [4] - 5:21,

7:6, 10:9, 12:16

plans [2] - 21:2, 42:20 26:23, 27:21, 35:16, plant [21] - 11:10, 11:12, 11:21, 12:1, 12:8, 12:11, 12:12, 13:7, 13:20, 17:3, 20:13, 20:14, 20:21, 21:18, 22:9, 24:20, 28:16, 34:17, 37:24, 38.6 point [15] - 3:15, 3:23, 4:23, 6:5, 20:6, 22:10, 25:2, 26:8, 26:17, 27:17, 27:25, 32:4, 42:5, 42:15, 42:21 pointed [1] - 28:1 policy [1] - 10:2 portion [2] - 12:11, 22:6 posed [2] - 21:22, 39:3 position [3] - 26:17, 26:20 positions [1] - 24:25 possess (1) - 10:15 possessed [1] - 43:19 possession [8] -19:23, 23:23, 29:16, 30:3, 42:8, 42:12, 42:22, 43:5 possibility [1] - 45:20 possible [10] - 3:22, 6:4, 6:5, 10:22, 11:4, 21:15, 38:7, 38:8, 40:3 power[2] - 3:3, 12:18 POWER [1] - 1:5 prefiled [3] - 5:19, 11:11, 21:23 prehearing [4] - 6:8, 45:16, 45:19, 46:2 preparation[1] -26:12 prepare [6] - 9:2, 10:14, 27:1, 27:24, 31:16, 35:14 prepared [8] - 5:23, 7:19, 7:24, 8:22, 10:11, 11:20, 33:20, 35:12 present [2] - 35:22, 35:25 pretty [1] - 30:8 prevent [1] - 9:17 preventing [1] - 9:14 previously [1] - 10:20 price [16] - 5:11, 5:16, 5:22, 6:25, 7:3, 8:17, 10:7, 11:5, 12:3,

15:21, 18:22, 19:6,

39:10 private [1] - 42:3 privilege [6] - 9:14, 9:17, 9:20, 9:24, 10.1 privileged [2] - 9:21, 21:12 probable [1] - 10:15 problem [1] - 46:6 procedural [1] ~ 25:16 procedure [1] - 32:18 Procedure [3] - 17:7, 17:8, 22:17 proceed [1] - 3:7 proceeding [8] - 7:21. 9:4, 11:24, 18:6, 19:15, 19:21, 33:9, proceedings [2] -47:9, 47:12 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:6 Proceedings [1] - 1:8 procurement [1] -42:20 produce [9] - 4:13, 4:18, 5:2, 8:18, 11:1, 13:11, 37:17, 37:18, 39:6 producing [2] - 13:9, 39:8 production [8] - 8:22, 11:18, 16:21, 18:11, 21:21, 24:12, 24:18, 43:20 Production [7] - 22:1, 23:11, 24:4, 24:10, 37:23, 38:2, 43:18 Professional [2] -47:6, 47:19 projection[1] - 3:16 proper [1] - 33:24 proposed [1] - 12:4 propounded [1] - 21:9 protective [4] - 41:6, 41:25, 43:7, 43:9 provide [11] - 7:21, 12:20, 14:21, 15:8, 19:25, 22:17, 27:8, 30:4, 33:21, 35:24, 36:12 provided [22] - 6:23, 15:7, 15:10, 15:21, 16:25, 17:24, 18:1, 18:14, 18:16, 18:24, 19:5, 19:25, 21:17, 29:25, 31:8, 31:9, 31:25, 32:7, 35:11,

35:15, 36:11, 42:2

provides (4) - 7:5. 17:18, 20:7, 31:22 providing [6] - 14:22, 16:23, 16:24, 17:1, 21:5, 33:19 provisions [1] - 26:14 Public [3] - 36:16, 47:7, 47:18 public [4] - 10:2, 41:14, 41:17, 42:1 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 PUC [2] - 8:17, 40:21 purchase [2] - 3:3, 12:18 PURCHASE [1] - 1:5 purchasing [2] - 12:8, 20:15 PURPA (1) - 29:1 purpose [2] - 37:2, 39:13 pursuant [2] - 8:14, 11:2 put [4] - 26:18, 26:20, 37:7, 39:13

### Q

qualifications [2] -20:4, 36:16 qualified [4] - 26:25, 35:20, 36:6, 36:23 qualifies [2] - 9:3, 23:13 qualify [1] - 35:21 questioned [1] - 36:17 questions [15] - 7:10, 11:18, 20:9, 22:23, 25:21, 25:23, 25:24, 26:1, 26:3, 29:8, 29:13, 30:15, 35:1, 35:10, 40:13 quick [2] - 38:13, 45:11 quickly [1] - 45:10 quite [1] - 19:16 quote [1] - 10:3

## R

raised [1] - 12:24 rate [2] - 3:23, 34:9 rather [3] - 22:12, 46:1, 46:9 reached [1] - 44:1 reaction [1] - 23:8 read [3] - 6:24, 29:2, 33:3 real [4] - 13:24, 23:5,

24:7, 35:4 realize [1] - 14:25 realized [1] - 5:21 really (7) - 7:10, 26:15. 29:5, 34:8, 40:4, 45:1, 45:2 Realtime [2] - 47:6, 47:19 reason [1] - 12:23 reasonable [1] - 20:24 reasonably [4] - 3:18, 4:1, 11:23, 11:25 reasons [1] - 7:16 rebut [2] - 5:22, 39:5 rebuttal [5] - 5:19, 11:11, 14:4, 15:13, 26:6 received [2] - 13:8, 32:19 recollection [1] - 27:5 recommends [1] -24:8 record [2] - 3:20, 27:18 records [4] - 21:7, 21:11, 37:14, 38:12 referring [2] - 22:12, 37:22 reflected [1] - 36:21 refused [1] - 10:10 refusing [1] - 3:3 **REFUSING** [1] - 1:5 regarding [6] - 19:11, 23:6, 24:20, 25:11, 25:16, 35:16 regardless [1] - 13:6 Registered [2] - 47:5, 47:19 reiterate [1] - 43:16 reiterated [1] - 39:7 rejected [1] - 16:10 relate [1] - 34:19 related [3] - 17:17, 41:23, 43:3 relates [1] - 24:9 relationship [1] -35:21 relative [1] - 21:17 relatively [1] - 30:8 relevance [2] - 12:19, 26:15 relevancy [1] - 24:5 relevant [13] - 12:7, 12:23, 13:5, 13:23, 19:18, 19:21, 21:12, 22:19, 24:6, 24:8, 27:18, 30:7, 38:11 relied [1] - 10:8 relies [1] - 8:8 relying [1] - 38:13

repeated (11 - 9:5) repeatedly isi - 10:23. 11:12, 39:7 reply [1] - 24:13 report [4] - 8:9, 38:5, 38:8, 44:1 Reported [1] - 1:24 Reporter [4] - 47:6, 47:19, 47:19 reporter [3] - 14:8, 14:16, 47:9 reports [33] - 8:22, 9:2, 10:11, 11:19, 13:19, 16:24, 17:1, 17:25, 18:16, 23:12, 24:14, 24:16, 29:18, 30:8, 31:15, 31:16, 31:25, 32:7, 34:23, 35:12, 35:14, 38:3, 40:20, 40:22, 40:24, 40:25, 41:19, 41:22, 41:23, 43:2, 44:22, 45:2 Request [7] - 22:1, 23:11, 24:4, 24:9, 37:23, 38:2, 43:17 request [16] - 4:12, 5:9, 8:21, 11:18, 18:10, 21:16, 21:21, 23:18, 24:6, 24:14, 24:19, 27:6, 33:8, 34:21, 37:13, 40:16 requested [7] - 6:17, 8:14, 11:1, 13:4, 18:21, 29:16, 40:1 requesting [3] - 8:19, 14:20, 38:16 requests [8] - 16:20, 21:8, 22:21, 23:6, 25:19, 39:23, 43:20 require [2] - 4:18, 38:9 required [4] - 4:13, 4:18, 5:2, 11:1 requirement[1] -44:21 requires [1] - 23:24 requisite [1] - 10:15 requisitions [1] - 4:16 researched [1] - 27:4 reserve [1] - 14:3 resisted [1] - 16:15 resolution [1] - 25:15 resource (7) - 7:5, 7:6, 10:9, 11:13, 12:16, 13:1, 30:11 respect [23] - 4:14,

remember [2] - 3:14,

reminded [2] - 5:5,

6:16

8:17

5:1, 5:3, 9:6, 11:9, 19:10, 20:4, 20:12, 20:25, 22:19, 26:11, 26:19, 27:19, 27:25, 28:7, 28:10, 34:4, 34:12, 37:23, 37:24, 42:18, 42:23, 44:17 respond [1] - 18:3 responded [2] - 8:25, 16:22 responding [1] - 21:8 response [7] - 7:9. 7:12, 7:17, 11:22, 12:6, 15:25, 16:2 responses [2] - 15:19, 15:20 rest (1) - 28:20 results [1] - 21:12 returns [1] - 33:21 review [2] - 15:1, 21:11 reviewed [1] - 37:19 Ríslov [1] - 1:16 rolayne [1] - 1:14 Ross [1] - 1:16 round [2] - 15:11, 16:1 Rounds [1] - 1:18 rounds [1] - 15:10 RPR [1] - 1:24 rule [3] - 3:24, 32:18, 42:13 Rules [3] - 17:6, 17:8, 22:17 rules [5] - 4:8, 5:1, 17:9, 17:10, 34:14 Ryan [1] - 1:15

### S

S.D[1] - 9:11 Sally [1] - 21:6 saw [3] - 19:6, 39:9, 40:4 schedule [12] - 6:3, 6:5, 6:7, 10:25, 15:18, 18:25, 19:5, 39:24, 40:1, 40:2, 46:10 scheduled [2] - 6:3, 16:11 scheduling [5] - 5:13, 10:21, 15:9, 15:14 Schutterle [2] - 9:10 scope [9] - 3:14, 3:15, 17:15, 17:16, 18:1, 24:25, 26:1, 26:11, 33:24 SDCL [3] - 4:3, 17:18, 36:6

search [4] - 21:11, 21:13, 34:18, 44:21 second [7] ~ 3:4, 4:17, 12:16, 16:1, 22:5, 27:17, 45:16 secondly [3] - 8:21, 18:20, 20:21 secret[1] - 13:19 see [9] - 13:24, 23:12, 23:18, 24:18, 25:25, 29:22, 31:24, 40:18, 46:6 seeing [3] - 24:24, 40:15, 44:8 seek [3] - 9:24, 15:24, 24:1 seeking [2] - 19:4, 19:11 seem [1] - 32:20 SEMMLER [4] - 23:3, 32:15, 33:3, 41:8 Semmler [4] - 1:15, 23:4, 26:19, 32:15 sense [1] - 10:2 separate [1] - 18:13 separately [1] - 17:14 September[1] - 16:1 sequential (1) - 15:12 serve [1] - 33:7 Service [1] - 36:16 service [1] - 28:13 set [1] - 21:1 several [1] - 36:15 shield [5] - 9:9, 9:19, 9:24, 11:8, 28:8 short[1] - 10:6 shorthand [2] - 47:9 show [1] - 36:22 showing [1] - 35:23 shows [1] - 36:12 shut [1] - 9:24 sidebar [1] - 25:3 sign [2] - 10:12, 14:16 significant [3] - 21:5, 22:6, 25:17 silence [1] - 9:19 simple [4] - 6:13, 7:10, 11:18, 23:5 simply [5] - 5:16, 7:25, 13:17, 19:14, 34:22 simultaneously [1] -10:9 single [4] - 24:15, 24:19, 34:3 Sioux [2] - 16:9, 16:12 situation (3) - 4:9, 6:1, 24:11 skill [1] - 36:7 small [1] - 12:11

Smith [6] - 1:13, 6:9, 16:17, 41:11, 41:16, 42.23 SMITH [15] - 41:7, 41:12, 42:5, 42:11, 42:15, 43:1, 43:11, 43:14, 43:22, 45:13, 45:15, 45:23, 46:1, 46:5, 46:8 sole [1] - 20:12 solely [1] - 12:2 somewhat [1] - 41:18 soothsayer[1] - 40:11 sort [4] - 4:8, 35:6, 39:15, 39:16 sought [6] - 3:17, 3:18, 5:19, 12:7, 20:25, 32:13 sound [1] - 7:6 sounds [1] - 33:15 South [11] - 2:7, 2:9, 3:14, 3:24, 4:2, 4:21, 17:17, 26:9, 28:7, 47:7, 47:13 SOUTH [2] - 1:2, 47:1 Soye [1] - 1:15 speaking [1] - 23:4 specific [2] - 17:16, 21:20 specifically [10] - 7:4, 8:13, 8:17, 17:18, 23:6, 24:14, 31:6, 33:7, 37:22, 38:2 SS [1] - 47:2 Staff [17] - 15:11, 15:13, 15:15, 15:17, 23:2, 23:4, 23:19, 24:5, 24:8, 24:24, 25:2, 26:3, 32:10, 34:7, 35:4, 36:24, STAFF [1] - 1:13 standard [1] - 42:13 standards [1] - 17:10 standing [2] - 23:15, 23:21 start [2] - 23:5, 28:3 started [2] - 14:15, 41:21 starting [2] - 28:11, 30:17 STATE [2] - 1:2, 47:1 state [3] - 37:13, 37:14, 43:8 State [2] - 2:7, 47:7 statement [4] - 18:9, 18:17, 28:10, 37:22 statements [3] - 18:3, 19:17, 21:20 states [7] - 18:4,

18:20, 19:10, 20:17, 21:21, 22:5, 35:11 stating [2] - 31:4, 35:15 station [3] - 22:7, 28:19, 30:7 stations [1] - 28:12 statute [4] - 26:9, 31:12, 33:7, 36:10 stay [1] - 25:2 Stein [1] - 10:4 Steve [2] - 16:5, 16:8 still [6] - 16:7, 22:18, 32:2, 32:21, 45:24, 45:25 stock[1] - 18:15 storage [1] - 21:13 strikes [1] - 33:16 studies [6] - 11:19, 17:1, 24:14, 24:16, 30:9, 38:3 study [6] - 11:21, 30:7, 38:5, 38:8, 38:16, 44:1 sub [2] - 26:11, 31:12 subdivision[1] -26:14 subject [8] - 8:1. 17:19, 20:5, 24:25, 37:8, 41:6, 41:25, 43:9 submit [2] - 6:10, 16:17 submittal [1] - 6:4 submitted [2] - 7:7, 16:19 subparts [1] - 16:21 subpoena [1] - 32:16 subsequently [1] -16:11 substance [3] - 4:7, 4:11, 17:20 substantial [2] - 9:16, 21:16 substitute [1] - 6:20 suddenly [2] - 33:19, 41:19 suggestion [1] - 43:12 SULLY [1] - 47:3 summarizing [1] -35:4 summary [1] - 17:22 supplement [1] - 5:6 supplemental [2] -15:20, 16:2 supplemented [1] -6:22 support [4] - 7:4, 8:4, 11:20, 18:18 supported [2] - 17:1,

38:3 surprised (1) - 36:19 surprising [1] - 8:19 surprisingly [1] - 15:4 sword [3] - 9:9, 9:20, 28:8 system [1] - 21:7

#### Т

trade [1] - 18:16 training [3] - 20:8, 36:7, 36:13 tailored [2] - 11:24, Transcript[1] - 1:8 34:22 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:6 tax [1] - 33:21 transcription [1] taxes [1] - 33:20 47:12 telephone [1] - 16:15 treat [1] - 34:10 TELEPHONE [1] - 2:1 treated [1] - 33:23 tempted [1] - 36:14 TREE [1] - 1:4 ten [1] - 20:22 Tree [54] - 2:2, 2:2, ten-year [1] - 20:22 3:2, 8:21, 10:10, term [1] - 4:22 10:19, 10:20, 11:17, territory [1] - 28:13 12:3, 12:9, 12:11, test [1] - 18:6 12:15, 15:4, 15:12, testified [3] - 31:7, 15:13, 15:16, 15:21, 31:8, 36:14 15:24, 16:5, 16:6, testifies [1] - 21:10 16:10, 16:14, 16:17, testify [8] - 5:21, 16:19, 17:4, 17:23, 10:16, 17:20, 17:21, 18:4, 18:5, 18:20, 26:25, 30:20, 35:20, 19:3, 19:5, 19:10, 36:8 19:11, 20:16, 20:24, testifying [10] - 7:18, 21:2, 21:21, 21:22, 8:8, 9:15, 9:18, 22:5, 22:16, 23:7, 26:21, 26:22, 27:5, 23:17, 23:19, 23:25, 28:2, 31:3, 33:22 25:6, 25:21, 27:16, testimony [35] - 5:20, 30:6, 32:16, 36:1, 6:4, 6:19, 6:24, 7:2, 36:24, 38:22, 41:2 7:21, 9:21, 9:22, Tree's [17] - 3:4, 5:23, 9:25, 11:11, 11:12, 11:2, 11:6, 14:20, 13:18, 15:12, 15:16, 14:23, 15:7, 15:19, 15:17, 16:4, 18:6, 15:25, 18:4, 19:1, 19:8, 20:7, 20:10, 21:20, 22:22, 23:12, 21:23, 22:6, 22:8, 26:1, 38:2, 39:5 27:9, 27:11, 27:13, trial [3] - 3:17, 26:12, 28:11, 29:3, 31:10, 27:24 33:19, 35:16, 36:11, tricky [1] - 33:17 39:13, 39:18, 40:4 tried [1] - 22:15 THE [5] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, true [3] - 7:22, 20:18, 1:10 47:11 therefore [1] - 33:1 truth [1] - 10:3 thereto [1] - 36:8 try [4] - 14:17, 15:2, third [2] - 12:23, 16:2 25:2, 46:8 thoughts [1] - 25:4 trying [6] - 7:18, 7:23, Tim [1] - 2:3 26:24, 27:1, 33:19, timeliness [2] - 38:20, 39:16 39:21 turnaround [1] - 45:11 timing [5] - 11:14, two [9] - 4:12, 5:2, 11:16, 13:3, 24:7, 11:17, 15:10, 16:20, 28:23 17:12, 17:13, 24:4, TO [1] - 1:5 25:15

today [20] - 3:4, 3:9,

type [1] - 28:17

types [1] - 43:25 typically (1) - 12:17 typographical [1] -22:11 Tysdal [1] - 1:17

13:8, 14:24, 15:7,

15:20, 17:5, 23:4,

24:21, 25:1, 25:10,

30:21, 35:8, 37:3,

37:9, 40:19, 46:10

took [2] - 44:18, 47:9

totally (2) - 18:13, 19:1

25:14, 25:17, 30:18,

### U

Uda [15] - 2:2, 3:6, 3:8, 15:7, 16:10, 17:15, 20:16, 21:4, 21:9, 26:5, 34:16, 36:17, 38:19, 44:24, 46:5 UDA [12] - 3:8, 3:21, 14:2, 26:7, 29:19, 29:23, 30:10, 34:24, 38:24, 45:1, 46:6, 46:12 Uda's [3] - 21:15, 32:25, 38:1 ultimately [3] - 6:8, 35:18, 39:20 under[11] - 3:14, 3:24, 4:2, 17:10, 22:6, 26:10, 26:13, 27:8, 29:1, 33:1, 38:25 underlying [2] - 21:22, 43:3 undermine [2] - 12:21, 13:21 understood [1] - 42:6 unless [1] - 26:8 unlimited [1] - 22:18 unreliable [1] - 6:18 unsupported [1] -7:25 untimely [1] - 37:14 unusual [1] - 39:16 up [8] - 4:22, 23:7, 31:11, 34:3, 36:19, 37:1, 39:23, 45:17 utilities [4] - 10:8, 19:12, 19:14, 19:17 UTILITIES [2] - 1:1, 1:10 utility [3] - 4:16, 4:22, 12:16

#### V

various [1] - 41:20 vast [1] - 10:7 vastly [1] - 15:5 venue [2] - 24:2, 24:3 via [2] - 45:16, 46:2 view [3] - 11:7, 15:8 views [1] - 15:5 visionary [1] - 40:11

vitae [3] - 20:6, 36:12, 8 36:21 voluminous [1] -34:18 vote [1] - 44:8 votes [2] - 44:12, 44:13

#### W

Wagner [14] - 11:9, 13:17, 16:6, 16:7, 17:14, 20:12, 21:24, 22:1, 22:2, 22:11, 22:12, 28:10, 40:7 Wagner's [2] - 11:11, 28:11 waited [1] - 40:8 waived [1] - 10:1 waiver[1] - 10:1 wall [1] - 45:18 wants [1] - 27:21 warehouses [1] -21:15 watch [1] - 14:16 ways [2] - 9:8, 34:13 Wednesday [1] - 17:5 week [2] - 7:8, 7:9 weigh [1] - 37:1 weight [2] - 19:19, 20:10 welcome [1] - 45:8 well-aware [1] - 21:2 whole [1] - 26:8 wholesale [1] - 7:4 Wiest [1] - 1:14 willing [2] - 27:22, 46:4 wind [1] - 12:4 withdraw [1] - 13:18 withstanding [1] -37:16 witness [5] - 21:24, 22:2, 23:20, 30:20, 36:6 witnesses [3] - 9:23, 17:17, 38:23 WITTLER [1] - 47:5 Wittler [2] - 1:24, 47:18 wondering [1] - 35:10 word [1] - 10:22 written [1] - 16:18

### Y

year [1] - 20:22 years [3] - 4:14, 5:3,

6:17 yesterday [2] - 3:10, 3:11 Yvette [1] - 2:2