¥			Final
		1	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Good morning. Welcome,
		2	everybody. We will begin the hearing in Docket NG16-014,
	1 THE PUBLIC UTILITTES COMMISSION	3	In the Matter of Commission Staff's Petition for
	2 OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA	4	Declaratory Ruling Regarding Farm Tap Customers.
	3 *************************************	5	The time is 10:00 a.m. The date is December 14,
	4 IN THE MATTER OF COMMISSION NG16-014 STAFF'S FETITION FOR DECLARATORY 5 RULING REGARDING FARM TAP	6	2016. The location of the hearing is the Matthews
	CUSTOMERS	7	Training Center in the Foss Building, Pierre,
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	8	South Dakota.
	Transcript of Proceedings8December 14, 2016	9	My name is Chris Nelson. I am Commission
	9	10	Chairman, With me are Commissioners Fiegen and Hanson.
	10 BEFORE THE POBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, CHRIS NELSON, CHAIRMAN 11 XRISTIE FIEGEN, VICE CHAIRMAN	11	I am presiding over this hearing. The hearing
	GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER 12	12	was noticed pursuant to Commission's Order for and Notice
	COMMISSION STAFF 13 Adam de Hueck, Commission Attorney Karen Cremer, Commission Attorney	13	of Hearing issued on November 30, 2016.
	14 Greg Rislov, Staff Advisor Patrick Stoffenson, Staff Analyst	14	- The issues at the hearing are, number one,
	15 Brittany Mehlhaff, Staff Analyst 16	15	whether the Commission has jurisdiction over any utility
	ΔPPEARANCES 17	16	providing natural gas to farm tap customers taking
	Kristen Edwards, appearing on behalf of Commission Staff 18	17	natural gas from the transmission line owned and operated
	Gregory Porter and James Talcott, appearing on behalf of 19 Northern Natural Gas	18	by Northern Natural Gas Company.
	20 Timothy P. Olson, appearing on behalf of NorthWestern	19	Number two, if the Commission has jurisdiction,
	 Brett Koenecke, appearing on behalf of Montane-Dakota Utilities 	20	which company, NorthWestern Corporation, doing business
1	23	21	
	24 Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR Precision Reporting, Onida, South Dakota	22	as Northwestern Energy, or Northern Natural Gas Company
	25	23	is a public utility as defined by SDCL Chapter 49 with
			respect to these farm tap customers.
1		24	And, number three, are the farm taps in whole or
		25	In part subject to state jurisdiction for the purpose of
1	2 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the		4
		1	pipeline safety pursuant to SDCL 49-348.
2	above-entitied matter, at the Matthews Training Center,	2	All partles have the right to be present and to
3	Foss Building, 523 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,	3	be represented by an attorney. These rights and other
4	South Dakota, on the 14th day of December, 2016,	4	due process rights may be forfeited if not exercised at
5	commencing at 10 oʻclock a.m.	5	this hearing,
6		6	After the hearing the Commission will consider
7		7	the matter. The Commission will then issue a declaratory
8		8	ruling. As a result of this hearing the Commission will
9		9	make decisions on the issues set forth above. The
10		10	Commission's declaratory ruling may be appealed by the
11		11	parties to the Circuit Court and the Supreme Court as
12		12	provided by law.
13	·	13	And at this point I'd like to deviate and do
14		14	just a couple of housekeeping type announcements. For
15		15	those we really don't have much of an audience today.
16		16	But the Rushmore Network is the public WiFinetwork. And
17		17	so if you're searching for a network, that's the one you
18		18	want to be on.
19		19	We are live webcasting. Now we are not in our
20	EXHIBIT	20	normal environment up on fourth floor of the Capitol and
21		21	so we did a little bit of experimenting over whether we
22		22	ought to try to set up our own sound system in here and
23	³	23	have that feed into the webcast system. That didn't work
24		24	out so well,
25		25	And so what we are relying on are these
Lof 53	sheets Page 1 to	4 of 1	33

1 of 53 sheets

. ¥

«• ;

And the second second

Page 1 to 4 of 133

1		1	7
1	5		
	microphones in the ceiling that are picking up the	1	MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck, all
2	webcast. What they are not doing is obviously amplifying	2	parties. I am Kristen Edwards for Staff. With me are
3	what we are saying. And so we want to make sure we are,	3	Staff Analysts as well as our Pipeline Safety personnel
4	on our own, speaking loud enough that everybody in the	4	Bolce Hillmer.
5	room can hear what we are saying. But suffice it to say,	5	Over the past several months Staff has been
6	I've been told these microphones are very accurate and	6	struggling with the issue of what to do to protect the
7	will pick up the smallest of sounds so if you have side	7	nearly 200 farm tap customers receiving natural gas
8	bar conversations, make sure it's truly a side bar	8	service pursuant to a contract between NorthWestern and
9	conversation, lest it may be webcast for the world to	9	Northern Natural which is set to expire at the end of
10	hear. And they are live all the time. So just beware of	10	2017.
11	that. We will shut them off during breaks.	11	It presents a difficult balancing act in trying
12	Cheri Wittler from Precision Reporting will be	12	to protect customers' access to the gas service they rely
13	transcribing the hearing. Anyone who wishes a transcript	13	on while also ensuring the safety of natural gas users in
14	of the hearing should contact Cherl directly at some	14	South Dakota.
15	point today and make appropriate arrangements.	15	The facts and history behind the farm taps are
16	We've got a number of our Staff back here.	16	detailed in the Memorandum attached to our Petition and
17	Katlyn and Tina will be staffing today, and so if you've	17	In our Reply Brief.
18	got any needs, let the two in the back know and they will	18	In summary, Northern Natural operates natural
19	do everything they can to take care of that.	19	gas transmission service lines in this state. Along
20	With that, I will now be turning the proceedings	20	those lines are farm taps which provide natural gas
21	over to Mr. Adam de Hueck, our Commission attorney, who	21	service for domestic use to end users at retail.
22	will act as Hearing Examiner and will conduct the hearing	22	I would like to clarify at this point that Staff
23	subject to the Commission's oversight.	23	is not asking the Commission to do to evaluate
23 24	Mr. de Hueck, the floor is yours.	24	discontinuing regulation. What we are asking in part is
24 25	MR. DE HÜECK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	25	whether the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin
20	FIRE DE HOLERE, Michaely Par, Branman,	<u> </u>	8
4	Good morning, everyone. With that, we'll begin		
			with Additionally, we are not asking the Commission In
1		1	with. Additionally, we are not asking the Commission in
2	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with	2	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated
2 3	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner.	2	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users,
2 3 4	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for	2 3 4	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe.
2 3 4 5	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and	2 3 4 5	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this
2 3 4 5 6	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst.	2 3 4 5 6	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to
2 3 4 5 6 7	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern.	2 3 4 5 6 7	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Taicott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development. MR. DE HUECK: Very good.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development. MR. DE HUECK: Very good. MDU.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to provide service unless a request has been made and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development. MR. DE HUECK: Very good. MDU. MR. KOENECKE: Brett Koenecke, the lawyer from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to provide service unless a request has been made and granted to discontinue such service.
$ \begin{array}{r} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 \\ 12 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 15 \\ 16 \\ 17 \\ 18 \\ 20 \\ 21 \\ \end{array} $	 with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Taicott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development. MR. DE HUECK: Very good. MDU. MR. KOENECKE: Brett Koenecke, the lawyer from 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to provide service unless a request has been made and granted to discontinue such service. If the answer is no, we need not look any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with appearance of the parties. And we'll begin with Staff as the Petitioner. MS. EDWARDS: Kristen Edwards, Counsel for Staff. With me is Patrick Steffensen, staff analyst, and Brittany Mehlhaff, staff analyst. MR. DE HUECK: And Northern. MR. PORTER: Greg Porter, Vice President and General Counsel of Northern Natural Gas, and with me is Jim Talcott, who is Assistant General Counsel, and Laura Demman, who is our Vice President of Regulatory Government Affairs. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. DE HUECK: NorthWestern. MR. OLSON: Good morning. Tim Olson on behalf of NorthWestern. With me today is Melissa Baruth from our DOT Department and Reed McKee, Strategic Development and Business Development. MR. DE HUECK: Very good. MDU. MR. KOENECKE: Brett Koenecke, the lawyer from Pierre flying solo for MDU today. MR. DE HUECK: Thank you. At this point we'll	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	this Docket to consider whether to allow a regulated utility service to discontinue service to farm tap users, as some customers may have been led to believe. Discontinuing service is not at issue in this Docket. Essentially, all this Docket would do is to determine if the Commission ever had jurisdiction to begin with over the company providing service. If the answer is yes, it would be the responsibility of that company to seek Commission approval to discontinue service, and that would come in a different docket, not by a Staff request. The first question is whether the Commission has jurisdiction over the utility providing natural gas to farm tap users. In this sense jurisdiction refers to the Commission's authority to regulate aspects such as rates and reliability under SDCL 49-34A and, perhaps more importantly, to require the utility to continue to provide service unless a request has been made and granted to discontinue such service. If the answer is no, we need not look any further Into what company is a public utility. It is

2 of 53 sheets

J.

	9		11
1		1	local distribution company three-way valve which would
2		2	allow them to shut off natural gas service.
3		3	However, since we submitted that Reply Brief I'm
4		4	no longer quite sure that that's the case, and I think
5		5	there's disagreement between the two partles as to
6		6	whether or not NorthWestern actually has any ownership of
7		7	any of these facilities attached to the farm tap, which
8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8	is an important question because as our statute defines
9	we do have reason to believe it passed on to MERC when	9	public utility, owning and controlling facilities is a
10	MERC purchased the assets of Aquila.	10	pivotal element in the determination. So that might be a
11	In what Staff determined to be a parallel but	11	question for those companies, and clarification is
12	completely separate string of events, a 30-year contract	12	something we would greatly appreclate.
13	for utility services was made in 1987 between Northern	13	Regarding the issue of pipeline safety
14	and Peoples. That 30-year contract was assigned as	14	jurisdiction, as the Commission is aware, its
15	detailed in our Brief and ultimately assigned to	15	jurisdiction and responsibility to conduct pipeline
16	NorthWestern in 2011 and was in a tariff docket that was	16	safety inspections differs greatly from its regulatory
17	approved by the Commission in NG11-001.	17	authority under 34A, the rate setting authority, as
18	It was always understood to have an end date of	18	Boice could attest to we inspect plenty of pipelines that
19	December 31, 2017, after that Docket was brought to the	19	we don't have rate regulatory jurisdiction over.
20	Commission.	20	Pursuant to Chapter 49-34B, the Commission has
21	Because NorthWestern has all of the obligations	21	safety jurisdiction over intrastate transportation of gas
22	and responsibilities of a public utility through 2017,	22	and gas pipeline facilities. Thus, answering the
23	NorthWestern is a public utility until the end of 2017.	23	question of jurisdiction posed in the first question does
24	Because of federal law and because they effectively	24	not necessarily answer the jurisdictional question for
25	transferred their responsibilities, Northern is not a	25	the purposes of pipeline safety.
25	10	25	the purposes of pipeline safety. 12
1	10 public utility.	25 1	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking
1 2	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC		12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home.
1 2 3	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in	1	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not
1 2 3 4	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more	1 2	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home.
1 2 3 4 5	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that	1 2 3	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those
1 2 3 4 5 6	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is	1 2 3 4	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local	1 2 3 4 5	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail.	1 2 3 4 5	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the initiative to come forward and be here today and for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017 and is, therefore, a public utility until the end of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017 and is, therefore, a public utility until the end of 2017.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the initiative to come forward and be here today and for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017 and is, therefore, a public utility until the end of 2017. I would note that when we submitted our Reply	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the initiative to come forward and be here today and for always allowing our pipeline safety staff to inspect
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information In the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017 and is, therefore, a public utility until the end of 2017. I would note that when we submitted our Reply Brief we were also working off of the assumption based	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the initiative to come forward and be here today and for always allowing our pipeline safety staff to inspect their farm taps and make sure they are safe for MDU's customers. Regrettably, at this point we have likely left
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	10 public utility. And that federal law I am referring to is FERC Order 636, which was appealed to the DC Circuit Court in 1996, and that decision is available online, for more clarification. But it is our understanding through that Order and subsequent Court Decisions that Northern is prohibited from providing gas service as a local distribution company to an end user at a retail. Thus, this is, unfortunately, unclear at this point if any entity will be serving the 197 customers as a public utility after the end of this year. We do recognize that our position with respect to NorthWestern has changed slightly between the initial filing and our Reply Brief. The positions we took in the Reply Brief were largely based off of information that we received through the Briefs of the other parties. After carefully reviewing this information in the three days or so we had to do so, it appears that NorthWestern did contract to control facilities in this state through 2017 and is, therefore, a public utility until the end of 2017. I would note that when we submitted our Reply	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	12 When we discuss this issue we are not talking about the line from the meter to the customer's home. That is understood to be customer owned and not jurisdictional, unfortunately, to either the Federal Government, to PHMSA, or to pipeline safety. Those lines, it is understood, are not inspected. Our main concern, however, is that someone is inspecting these farm taps, and it is our impression that that is not the case and neither PHMSA nor the South Dakota Public utilities Commission at this point are inspecting those farm taps. I will just briefly mention the intervenor, Montana-Dakota Utilities, just to say that we have no information on the record as to the location, inspection history, and ownership arrangement and, therefore, none of our positions taken in this docket should be assumed to automatically apply to MDU. I would just commend them for taking the initiative to come forward and be here today and for always allowing our pipeline safety staff to inspect their farm taps and make sure they are safe for MDU's customers.

•

٤

r	13	- <u> </u>	15
		1	MR. HILLMER: Actually when we were there we
		2	would look at everything. It doesn't mean that we have
		3	jurisdiction over everything. Obviously, we do not have
		4	jurisdiction over the inlet on the farm tap.
5		5	We probably would ask the operator to make sure
e		6	that their outlet valve or their three-way valve, as
7	•	7	they're calling it, is operational. So, I mean, we would
8		8	inspect that. To be honest with you, on these it's more
g		9	of a visual inspection to make sure that coatings and
10	•	10	everything are good.
11		111	And in 2014 Mary was the one that inspected
12		12	them. I don't know if she asked them to check relief
13		13	settings and stuff like that,I highly doubt it.It was
14	-	14	probably more of a visual inspection as far as that goes.
15	more for the listening public than anything, but	15	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Did she inspect all 195 of
16	frequently the PUC gets questions about, well, do you	16	these?
17	regulate water service in the state? People think of	17	MR. HILLMER: No.
18	that as a utility type service. And the law doesn't give	18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can you tell me how many were
19	us the authority to regulate or oversee water service.	19	inspected?
20	And so what I'm hearing you saying is there may	20	MR. HILLMER: I do not know, Commissioner
21	be a question under the law whether or not we have	21	Nelson, at this time.
22	authority in this area also. Is that accurate?	22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So then there was some
23	MS. EDWARDS: That's accurate. These farm taps	23	discussion about the fact that a request was made to do
24	were put into place before we had our regulatory	24	an inspection in 2016. Northern resisted that, as I
25	jurisdiction, which came about in roughly 1975, 1976, and	25	understand, and you all can correct me if I'm wrong
	14		. 16
1	this isn't something the legislature may have	1	later.
2	contemplated us having jurisdiction over.	2	But would it have been true that you would have
3	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. And at this point,	3	been able to inspect the red portion of this since
	Mr. Hillmer, If I could ask you some questions.	4	Northern is telling us that they don't control the red
5	In Staff's Brief there was discussion about the	5	portion?
6	fact that these farm taps were inspected in 2014. And I	6	MR. HILLMER: That is true.
7	want to thank Northorn for the nictures that you	1 7	CHAIDMAN NELSON, But you didn't do that, is
1 0	want to thank Northern for the pictures that you	7	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But you didn't do that; is
8	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful.	8	that correct?
9	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these	8 9	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not.
9 10	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive	8 9 10	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is
9 10 11	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one.	8 9 10 11	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct.
9 10 11 12	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the	8 9 10 11 12	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That
9 10 11 12 13	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view.	8 9 10 11	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang
9 10 11 12 13 14	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the	8 9 10 11 12 13	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That
9 10 11 12 13	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above? MR. KOENECKE: Which exhibit is that,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on March 8, 2011, that from which an Order came out.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above? MR. KOENECKE: Which exhibit is that, Commissioner?	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on March 8, 2011, that from which an Order came out. In response to Commission questions at that
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above? MR. KOENECKE: Which exhibit is that, Commissioner? CHAIRMAN NELSON: Hang on a second. I've got a	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on March 8, 2011, that from which an Order came out. In response to Commission questions at that hearing, PUC Staff clearly stated that it would be
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above? MR. KOENECKE: Which exhibit is that, Commissioner? CHAIRMAN NELSON: Hang on a second. I've got a question here as to which exhibit number. I'm going to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on March 8, 2011, that from which an Order came out. In response to Commission questions at that hearing, PUC Staff clearly stated that it would be Northern's responsibility to continue to provide gas
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	submitted as an attachment. Very, very helpful. And so, Mr. Hillmer, I want to refer to these pictures. In particular this one, the comprehensive one. Actually let's go to this one. Let's go to the wider view. MR. HILLMER: Okay. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In 2014 how much of the facility did you inspect? Was it the blue, the red, the yellow, or all of the above? MR. KOENECKE: Which exhibit is that, Commissioner? CHAIRMAN NELSON: Hang on a second. I've got a question here as to which exhibit number. I'm going to have to look that up.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that correct? MR. HILLMER: No, we did not. If what Northern is saying is true, that is correct. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. Understand. That may be all the questions I have for you. But just hang tight. And so, Ms. Edwards, there's been some discussion in your Briefs about the position the Commission took in NG11-001. And there was a hearing on March 8, 2011, that from which an Order came out. In response to Commission questions at that hearing, PUC Staff clearly stated that it would be Northern's responsibility to continue to provide gas following 2017 to the farm tap customers.

Page 13 to 16 of 133

-	17		19
. 1	don't know exactly what went on as far as data requests	1	NorthWestern's burden.
2	behind the scene. But by responsibility they might have	2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: In Staff's initial Brief there
3	interpreted it as responsibility to find a subsidiary or	3	was considerable amount of talk about the yellow portion
4	another company who could legally not in contradiction to	4	of the line, the line going from the odorizer to the farm
5	FERC Order 636 provide service. Maybe a subsidiary as	5	itself.
6	Peoples did originally, but not being here in 2011, I	6	And forgive me if I'm interpreting this wrong,
7	can't be sure.	7	but I got the impression that Staff's position in that
8	I think what Staff was working under the	8	initial Brief really denigrated the ability of the
9	assumption was that there would always be a utility	9	farmer, the customer, to maintain their own line. There
10	willing to come forward and do this and that the parties	10	was considerable question, I think, about whether those
11	had made sure that was the case.	11	customers could take care of their own line.
12	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Did you listen to the	12	And we've heard, since that, significant public
13	recording of that hearing? Have you listened to that?	13	comment from those customers talking about the thousands
14	MS. EDWARDS: I did. It's been a while, but I	14	of dollars that they have invested in upgrading their
15	did listen to it.	15	lines, taking care of their lines, doing that type of
16	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I just listened to it within	16	thing.
17	the last couple of days, and it seemed to me that	17	Does any of that public comment that we have
18	Commission's questions to Staff at that point were pretty	18	received since your initial Brief, does any of that
19	pointed in that we wanted to be assured of who would	19	change your opinion as to the ability of these farmers to
20	continue providing this service after 2017, and the clear	20	take care of their own lines?
21	response was from Staff at that point was that it would	21	MS. EDWARDS: I'm certain that some of them are
22	be Northern's responsibility.	22	maintaining excellent facilities. Some of their
23	But I appreciate your clarification at this	23	facilities may be even better than some of our operator's
24	point.	24	facilities. And I'm sure some of them are doing an
25	If we could go to Staff's Brief, page 6 and I	25	excellent job.
	. 18		20
1	should say Staff's Reply Brief. I apologize. Page 6,	1	But I know in other jurisdictions there have
2	Section B, Paragraph 1. You've made the statement, and	2	been instances where lives have been lost because maybe
3	you reiterated it this morning, that Northwestern Energy	3	somebody who didn't know where that line was, hit that
4	is a public utility as it relates to the farm taps today.	4	line while they were tilling or putting in tile.
5	That is your position; correct?	5	And I know we've had consumer issues in the past
6	MS. EDWARDS: It is. If they have the ability	6	where somebody had a leak for a year and didn't know it
7	to shut off gas service, then by our definition of	7	because they simply don't have the technology at their
8	controlling service, if you can shut it off, if you can	8	disposal to determine whether or not they're losing gas
9	close the valve and shut off gas service, I think it	9	between their tap and where they're receiving it.
10	would be difficult to argue that you didn't have control	10	So if there's one tap out there that's not being
11	over gas service to an end user.	11	monitored and not being watched and there's an explosion,
12	Also when I looked at the contracts submitted by	12	that's too many. I'm very, very grateful that so many
13	the parties I believe there was a statement in the	13	consumers are taking such great care of their lines.
14	agreement that said Peoples would serve as a public	14	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So today in your presentation
15	utility and that was assigned to NorthWestern	15	you used the word "unfortunately" as it relates to
	utility, and that was assigned to NorthWestern.	1	
16	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that	16	whether or not you may have the ability to inspect that
16 17	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today?	17	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability
16 17 18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is.	17 18	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety.
16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply	17 18 19	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is
16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply then in 2018 to Northwestern Energy?	17 18 19 20	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is that you wish you did have the ability to inspect that
16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply then in 2018 to Northwestern Energy? MS. EDWARDS: There's an argument to be made,	17 18 19 20 21	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is that you wish you did have the ability to inspect that line. Is that accurate?
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply then in 2018 to Northwestern Energy? MS. EDWARDS: There's an argument to be made, and it would be the burden of NorthWestern to advance	17 18 19 20 21 22	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is that you wish you did have the ability to inspect that line. Is that accurate? MS. EDWARDS: From a resources standpoint it
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply then in 2018 to Northwestern Energy? MS. EDWARDS: There's an argument to be made, and it would be the burden of NorthWestern to advance that argument that when the Commission approved a tariff	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is that you wish you did have the ability to inspect that line. Is that accurate? MS. EDWARDS: From a resources standpoint it would be very difficult to inspect all of those lines,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is it your opinion that SDCL 49-34A-2.1 applies to Northwestern Energy today? MS. EDWARDS: Yes, it is. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And why would that not apply then in 2018 to Northwestern Energy? MS. EDWARDS: There's an argument to be made, and it would be the burden of NorthWestern to advance	17 18 19 20 21 22	line. You said unfortunately you don't have the ability to inspect that line for safety. So I take it to mean that Staff's position is that you wish you did have the ability to inspect that line. Is that accurate? MS. EDWARDS: From a resources standpoint it

: 4

_		T	
	21		23
1	leak or to have some assurance that they don't have a	1	accurate?
2	leak and to help make sure their line is locatable when	2	MS. EDWARDS: If there was a large enough leak,
3	they're farming every spring, we would love to be able to	3	yes, they should. They would notice a substantial
4	help them out, and to some extent that's regrettable.	4	increase in their gas bill. If it was a small leak,
5	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So help me understand	5	maybe, maybe not.
6	how that differs from the tens of thousands of private	6	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. I think that's all the
7	propane lines that are scattered across this state that	7 8	questions I have for Staff at this point. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes. I do have a question
8	are not inspected that customers themselves take	· ·	
9	responsibility for.	9 10	of Pipeline Safety Staff.
10	What's the difference? Is there one?	ł	In 2014 it appears that you inspected the farm taps, which that area now is being considered interstate
11	MS. EDWARDS: We don't have any jurisdictional	11 12	
12	propane in the state so I'd have to ask Boice for sure.	12	according to Northern? MR. HILLMER: I believe that is correct.
13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm talking about the safety	14	They're saying it's nonjurisdictional.
14	aspect of it. I mean, you're talking about that we	14	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So that would be
15	wished we had the ability to inspect these farmer-owned	16	interstate?
16	lines to maintain and make sure that they are safe.	17	MR. HILLMER: Yes.
18	So does that also then carry over to the private	18	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Help me understand as a
19	propane lines? I'm just trying to figure out where the line is here so far as what your position is with regard	19	Commissioner why that is interstate? Because it's not,
20	to safety.	20	you know, going from state to state. It's coming to a
21	MR. HILLMER: Can I help her answer that	21	farm tap.
22	question?	22	MR. HILLMER: It's kind of maybe that's a
23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Absolutely.	23	question better answered by Northern, but it's coming off
24	MR. HILLMER: I think the difference here is	24	of their interstate line. And to the point of the
25	that in a propane typically the propane tank's within 50,	25	valves, I know we inspect other utilities, and some of
	22		
1	100 foot of the house. So you're talking about a 50 foot	1	the other utilities they've basically taken it over to
2	of downstream line. Where in this circumstance these	2	the valves off of the interstate line so that they own
3	farm taps can be a quarter mile, half a mlle out in the	3	everything after that. But that's obviously not the
4	middle of a farm field serving this residence.	4	circumstances here.
5	So there's a lot more footage of pipe there that	5	So I don't know how you know, I don't know
6	is not being inspected and a lot more places for things	6	where I think there's a point there where we're trying
7	to go wrong, I guess.	7	to figure out where their jurisdiction, Northern Natural,
8	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.	8	ends and where NorthWestern ends, and that's the real
9	Are these meters they're self-read monthly or	9	question here.
10	more often or less often?	10	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Do you figure that with
11	MS. EDWARDS: My understanding and	11	PHMSA? I mean, are you working with PHMSA on that?
12	NorthWestern would probably be the better one to answer	12	MR. HILLMER: Mary has been in contact with them
13	this, but just dealing with consumer issues in the past	13	quite a bit. She's been in contact with PHMSA and FERC,
14	is that NorthWestern's going out there once a year and	14	and she has not gotten a straight answer one way or the
15	doing something of a true-up and hoping that the customer	15	other.
16	is reading it more accurately and has not always been the	16	Like the question she posed was if these farm
17	case. But NorthWestern has been going out and trueing it	17	taps are all jurisdictional, why isn't PHMSA coming out
18	up once a year.	18	with a ruling that all farm taps are jurisdictional.
19	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But it would be the	19	Which they're not at this time.
20	expectation that the customer's reading it monthly and	20	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
21	self-reporting monthly?	21	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one for you as
22	MS. EDWARDS: Yes.	22	well, Mr. Hillmer. Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So if there is a leak and the	23	MR. HILLMER: Yes, sir.
24	customer is doing as they're supposed to, they should be	24	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm assuming you're
25	able to detect that within 30 days or less? Is that	25	concerned about the safety issue with farm taps.
	Page 21 to	24 of	133 6 of 53 sheets

÷

. .			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
́ а	25		27
1		1	say "we."
2		2	MS, EDWARDS: Mr, Commissioner, could I add on
3	any, does the PUC, do you, inspect at the present time?	3	to that?
4	MR. HILLMER: I would say there's probably about	4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Certainly,
5	100 of them.	5	MS. EDWARDS: Just to clarify, when he sald they
6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And are there challenges	6	inspect 100 farm taps, many of those are off of
7	with those farm taps? Are there safety issues with those	7	intrastate transmission lines such as SDIP. So the
8	farm taps that we have run into?	8	intrastate and interstate jurisdictional issue is not
9	MR. HILLMER: You've got the same safety issues	9	present, and It's a lot more clear for Pipeline Safety
10	as you would with a border station. You want to make	10	staff.
11	sure that their reliefs are set correctly, their regs are	11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. I was making
12	working properly.	12	that assumption, but I appreciate you taking me away from
13	I mean, it's some of the same exact concerns	13	the assumption.
14	that you would have with a border station in a town,I	14	Thank you. Appreciate it.
15	mean, you're checking the same thing.	15	I do have questions of Ms. Edwards.
16	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Excuse me. Go ahead,	16	First of all, and correct me if my premises are
17	MR. HILLMER: And it might be a higher level	17	inaccurate, but from the information that we have here
18	risk because you're coming off of a transmission line	18	and what you've stated today, it's your belief that
19	that's serving, I don't know, 6, 800 pounds, whatever it	19	NorthWestern is the utility and it's also your belief
20	is, and they're cutting It down to 10 pounds. So if that	20	that that comes under South Dakota Codified Law and it
21	reg station isn't working, you're blowing 800 pounds up	21	must receive PUC permission to withdraw.
22	against a residential customer's service, possibly.	22	And as I understand from your filings, you
23	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Have there been some	23	believe that the Public Utilities Commission has already
24	challenges that you're aware of in South Dakota with the	24	given that permission under NG11-001. Is that a correct
25	farm taps? Is there a history of challenges?	25	premise so far?
	26	1	28
1	MR. HILLMER: Last year when I was doing an	1	MS. EDWARDS: I certainly believe that there's
2	audit, I mean, I did find some that were not set	2	an argument to be made that they did, but it's not a
3	properly, not where they said they were set. They've got	3	clear argument. No.
4	to keep a book where each one of them's set. Not	4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. My question is,
5	everyone's set the same.	5	similar to the Legislature, cannot the PUC subsequent to
6	So yeah. There are challenges. Or maybe the	6	one action make a change in an action that it took, a
7	relief isn't popping off where it's supposed to. Yes,	7	previous action that it took?
.8	there are challenges there.	8	In other words, can we not in a present or
9	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Perhaps you've answered	9	future docket rule that in NG11-001 that they no longer
10	this in the question with Commissioner Fiegen, but I am	10	have that permission?
11	curlous on the farm taps. Is there a requirement from	11	MS. EDWARDS: Absolutely. The Commission is
12	PHMSA that you are aware of that farm taps must be	12	never bound by precedent of past decisions. And I would
13	Inspected?	13	certainly encourage NorthWestern not to rely on an
14	MR. HILLMER: There's kind of a muddy water	14	assumption that the Commission already made that
15	there.	15	decision. If they feel that's the case, they should
16	PHMSA says yes, we should be inspecting farm	16	bring a declaratory ruling to ensure that's the case, and
17	taps. But then operators are saying that FERC has	17	that is what the Commission believes.
18	jurisdiction over them; therefore, they're not	18	COMMISSIONER HANSON; Thank you. And
19	inspectable by PHMSA or us.	19	argumentative question here.
20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Who do we take our orders	20	The Commission, recognizing that Northwestern
21	from?	21	Energy is a utility at the present time, can we not rule
22	MR. HILLMER: Me as a gas pipeline safety? All	22	that they are prohibited from shutting off the customers,
	of you. But PHMSA is my driver, I guess, in the safety	23	and by that ruling they would continue to be because
23	or you. But this to my driver, i guess, in the salety		
23 24 25	end of it. That's where I take my orders from. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm being inclusive when I	24	excuse me.

٨

		-1	31
	29	1	also provided quite a bit of information, two Briefs in
1	they shut off the consumer, if we prohibit them from	2	this proceeding. We've tried to be as helpful as we can
2	shutting off the consumer, do they not continue to be a	3	be in understanding the complexities of the issues. Many
3	public utility?	4	of the issues already discussed here today as far as the
4	MS. EDWARDS: I guess I don't want to be argumentative, but that question assumes they have the	5	difference between retail and wholesale, first sale of
5		6	gas, those are issues that aren't dealt with every day
6	ability to turn the valve and shut off and that that's their obligation. Right now I'm not sure that's the	7	and are important to fully understand the jurisdictional
7		8	lines that are drawn here.
8	case. But without that barring that assumption, I	9	We realized early on as we started to deal with
9	would agree with your statement that you have the ability	10	this in South Dakota that there was no common view in
11	to force them to continue doing that.	11	South Dakota regarding the responsibility of service to
12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.	12	farm tap customers, responsibility of utility service to
13	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	13	customers,
14	MR. DE HUECK: Advisors, are there any	14	We believe the historical facts are very
15	questions?	15	important, and that's what we've tried to bring to the
15		16	Commission is the understanding of the history and the
	MR. RISLOV: No.	17	corporate structure that has been in place. We've
17	MR. DE HUECK: If you don't mind, I had a	18	repeatedly Northern's repeatedly made clear that if
18	question I'd like to ask Ms. Edwards.	19	the current utility, NorthWestern, terminates service
19 20	What type of service do these farm taps fall into? Is this the retail sale of gas? Is it the	20	effective December 31, 2017, the obligation to provide
20	wholesale sale of gas, or is this some other category of	21	utility service does not default to Northern.
22	the sale of gas?	22	That is not a point that we're trying to say not
23	How do you characterize this sale of gas?	23	us. We're trying to make sure that everybody understands
24	MS. EDWARDS: This is the retail sale of gas,	24	the jurisdiction, understands that the two agreements
25	and it's covered by their tariff. I believe Section 1.8?	25	that I'll talk about later, but the two agreements and
	30		32
	00		UL.
1	1.1 of NorthWestern's tariff which establishes	1	the importance of those agreements that are part of the
1	1.1 of NorthWestern's tariff, which establishes	1	the importance of those agreements that are part of the history of farm taps in South Dakota.
2	the general rate.	2	history of farm taps in South Dakota.
2 3	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's	2	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern
2 3 4	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail?	2 3 4	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm
2 3 4 5	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end	2	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are
2 3 4 5 6	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position.	2 3 4 5	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of
2 3 4 5 6 7	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to	2 3 4 5	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument.	2 3 4 5 6 7	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued
2 3 4 5 6 7	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and continues to be to ensure that a common understanding of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and we, Northern Natural Gas, and then I'll get into the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and continues to be to ensure that a common understanding of what will happen if no one provides utility service to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that If awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and we, Northern Natural Gas, and then I'll get into the arguments or the questions that have been raised by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and continues to be to ensure that a common understanding of what will happen if no one provides utility service to the 195 or nearly 200 farm tap customers that received	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and we, Northern Natural Gas, and then I'll get into the arguments or the questions that have been raised by Commission Staff.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and continues to be to ensure that a common understanding of what will happen if no one provides utility service to the 195 or nearly 200 farm tap customers that received notice their utility service will end as of December 31,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and we, Northern Natural Gas, and then I'll get into the arguments or the questions that have been raised by Commission Staff. I tried to as preparing for these comments think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the general rate. MR. DE HUECK: Could you elaborate on why it's the retail sale? What makes it retail? MS. EDWARDS: Because it's sale of gas to an end user, would be my position. MR. DE HUECK: With that, we'll turn it over to Northern and let you make your oral argument. MR. PORTER: Thank you. Good morning. As I said earlier, my name is Rick Porter. With me is Jim Talcott and Laura Demman. Appreciate the opportunity. First of all, I notice Ms. Edwards stood. Do you have a preference whether we stand or sit? Okay. I didn't want to be disrespectful. If it's okay, I'll sit. Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to address these issues this morning. Our goal has been and continues to be to ensure that a common understanding of what will happen if no one provides utility service to the 195 or nearly 200 farm tap customers that received notice their utility service will end as of December 31, 2017.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	history of farm taps in South Dakota. Our persistence has been driven by our concern that if awareness is not brought to these issues, farm tap customers will be without utility service. These are farm tap customers that have enjoyed the convenience of natural gas for 50 to 60 years. To allow farm tap service to be discontinued and I take Counsel's point that this isn't necessarily about discontinuation, but we can see what the end path is. To allow the farm tap service to be discontinued when there's an existing regulated utility infrastructure, as we're finding out and we should have expected, is difficult for farm tap customers to understand. As a this might be a little unconventional, but what I'm going to do with the time that I have this morning, I'm going to start with what we recommend and we, Northern Natural Gas, and then I'll get into the arguments or the questions that have been raised by Commission Staff. I tried to as preparing for these comments think about the complexities of the issues and what would be

. 		_	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
	33		35
		1	accounting, all of those things would need to be worked
2		2	out. Again, I'm not suggesting that it's an easy,
3		3	straightforward process.
4	,	4	The point is a fairer arrangement would make it
5		5	economically worthwhile for NorthWestern. Farm tap
6		6	customers would continue to get gas utility service. The
7		7	public and the Commission could be assured utility
8		8	service is being safely provided by a sophisticated
9		9	utility. And from a customer service perspective there
10		10	would be continuity of service from the existing
11		11	provider.
12		12	You might ask, along the presumptuous path, who
13	was made that that would be Northern's. We tried to make	13	are you to come in here and make this recommendation?
14	clear we fundamentally disagree with that. We don't	14	Fair question. Fair question.
15	think the law or the facts support that. I think Staff	15	However, the bottom line is the Commission and
16	is right to begin to come around on that issue.	16	NorthWestern cannot or to the extent they cannot
17	We do not see anywhere in that Order that it	17	reach an agreement, it is likely that service as of
18	says that Northwestern Energy's public utility obligation	18	December 31, 2017, will be terminated. Because the other
19	ends. So need to distinguish and we'll talk further	19	options available to the Commission will be more
20	about that, but the distinction between what a public	20	expensive and time-consuming.
21	utilities obligation is and what an agreement to provide	21	For instance, as demonstrated in this
22	service as the 1987 Agreement, what that Agreement	22	proceeding, in 1985 InterNorth transferred the assets and
23	means different than the Northwestern Energy's statutory	23	liabilities of Peoples Natural Gas to UtiliCorp. So as
24	obligations.	24	of 1985 UtiliCorp owned Peoples and owned the obligation
25	Okay. So what we recommend is the Commission	25	and the responsibility to provide farm tap service in the
	34	1	36
1	since there's a lot of hair on this issue, we recommend	1	State of South Dakota. That's all covered in our Brief.
2	that the Commission sits down with NorthWestern and works	2	There's a diagram in the Brief. I'd refer you to that.
3	out an arrangement that is satisfactory to the	3	So there have been transfers. UtiliCorp
4	Commission, satisfactory to NorthWestern, and that allows	4	transferred those assets to different companies after
5	service to continue. The bottom line is we think service	5	1985. They've transferred the Minnesota and South Dakota
6	ought to continue to folks that have had service for 50	6	assets, originally transferred that to MERC. They've
7	to 60 years.	7	transferred some of the other assets to other utilities.
8	Assuming so what would that deal look like?	8	So as of 1985 it was all Peoples was owned by
9	It may be you may be sitting there it may be	9	UtiliCorp.
10	presumptuous, first of all, for me to suggest that the	10	If, as Staff suggested at least in its initial
11	Commission and NorthWestern ought to work out a deal.	11	Brief, Northwestern Energy has no obligation to serve
12	And I apologize. I don't mean it that way. But I just	12	after termination, that would mean there are two
13	think that given what I'm going to describe and what we	13	successors that the Commission could look to, and that
14	see, that's the most practical and probably the best path	14	would be Aquila and MERC. So UtiliCorp became Aquila
15	forward.	15	through a change in name. Aquila then sold the assets
16	An arrangement would of that nature would	16	and liabilities to MERC. And then MERC and NorthWestern
17	include NorthWestern providing the utility service to the	17	entered into the arrangement over the Milbank sale.
18	farm tap customers. It would also allow NorthWestern to	18	The point being if a deal is not worked out and
19	recover the costs and earn a fair regulated return for	19	if the Commission would decide that Northwestern Energy
20	doing so. In the same manner that other utilities have	20	doesn't have a utility obligation again, we think that
21	their operating costs and to the extent they own the	21	would not be the right decision, but if that was the
22	plant, they have that in their rates as well.	22	Commission's decision, the Commission would have a choice
23	I understand that there's the existing rates and	23	of pursuing Aquila or MERC or allowing service to be
24	whether it's rolled in rates or whether, until their next	24	discontinued.
25	rate case, there's regulatory asset and liability,	25	These aren't great options. Discontinuing

		_	
	37		39
1	service would deprive service to customers currently	1	Staff in its Reply Brief agreed that the first
2	receiving utility service. And, as I have mentioned,	2	agreement I mentioned, the 1985 Agreement, transferred
3	they've been receiving service for 50 or 60 years. This	3	all the assets to Peoples Natural Gas. So there was some
4	would do, in our view, a disservice to the public	4	disagreement. It just from a legal and factual
5	interest, the very interest the Commission is obligated	5	perspective, once that liability was transferred to
6	to uphold.	6	UtiliCorp, there's not a legal or any reasonable factual
7	If the Commission decides farm tap customers	7	point where that reverts to Northern somehow. And that's
8	should continue to receive utility service, the only	8	the point that we've been trying to make. I think we've
9	option under that circumstance would be to pursue MERC	9	made it now and had the opportunity in briefing to do so
10	and Aquila. That would be a difficult process, I	10	and appreciate that opportunity to do that.
11	believe. MERC and Aquila, to my knowledge, neither of	11	The last thing I want to do is just reference
12	which are subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. I	12	or not reference but address, excuse me, the questions
13	think that would be an expensive and time-consuming	13	that have been posed in this proceeding. And those
14	effort, the certainty of which would certainly be in	14	questions are does the Commission have jurisdiction over
15	doubt.	15	the utility providing the farm tap service? Which
16	So, in summary, Northern would respectfully	16	entity, NorthWestern or Northern, is a public utility
17	submit that the choices would be, one, find that	17	with regard to the farm tap service? And are the farm
18	Northwestern Energy is the utility now, which I believe	18	taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety?
19	there's agreement in the briefing on that, and after	19	The first question is does the Commission have
20	December 31, 2017, that they continue to be and they have	20	jurisdiction over the utility providing the farm tap
21	the obligation to provide farm it happen service	21	service. As outlined in our briefing, the answer is
22	utility farm tap service.	22	clearly yes. Both NNG, Northern, and Staff agree that
23	If that's not the choice the Commission makes,	23	NorthWestern is a gas utility subject to the Commission's
24	then I think the decision the best option would be to	24	exclusive jurisdiction under Section 49-34A.
25	work out an arrangement with Northwestern Energy to	25	Northwestern Energy operates, maintains, and
	38		40
1	provide that service.	1	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas
1 2	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues,	2	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern
	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to	2	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility.
2	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two	2 3 4	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes
2 3	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985	2 3 4 5	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to
2 3 4	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and	2 3 4 5 6	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility.
2 3 4 5 6 7	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities	2 3 4 5 6 7	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, Is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy Is a public utility today, and, as I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had aiready transferred.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had already transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had already transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had aiready transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had already transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time. Since 1930. So the guys in the field knew how things	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the purpose of serving 195 farm tap customers but it is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had aiready transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time. Since 1930. So the guys in the field knew how things operated. They knew who provided utility service. And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the purpose of serving 195 farm tap customers but it is a public utility for the purposes of serving other farm tap
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had already transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time. Since 1930. So the guys in the field knew how things operated. They knew who provided utility service. And they knew who provided the interstate service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the purpose of serving 195 farm tap customers but it is a public utility for the purposes of serving other farm tap customers that It had served prior to the MERC contract
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had aiready transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time. Since 1930. So the guys in the field knew how things operated. They knew who provided utility service. And they knew who provided the interstate service. After the sale in 1985 It was thought best to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the purpose of serving 195 farm tap customers but it is a public utility for the purposes of serving other farm tap customers that It had served prior to the MERC contract and for the purpose of serving 60 communities and 86,000
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	provide that service. There are two important issues, takeaway issues, that we hit in our Brief that I would just like to summarize. Because they are two there are two agreements that are important here. One is the 1985 Agreement that I mentioned between InterNorth and UtiliCorp that transferred all the assets and liabilities and obligations of Peoples to UtiliCorp. The sale from InterNorth to UtiliCorp expressly required UtiliCorp to assume the obligations with regard to the farm taps in South Dakota. The second agreement is referred to as the 1987 Agreement. And that was an agreement between Northern and Peoples Natural Gas. It was entered into in 1987 so almost two years after the assets and liabilities had already transferred. The 1987 Agreement was merely to write down on paper what had been a well settled practice between two affiliates that were commonly owned for a long time. Since 1930. So the guys in the field knew how things operated. They knew who provided utility service. And they knew who provided the interstate service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	controls equipment for the purpose of providing gas service to the public in South Dakota. NorthWestern squarely fits this definition of public utility. Chapter 34A-4 of the South Dakota Statutes require the Commission require the Commission to regulate every public utility. The second question is which entity, Northwestern Energy or Northern, is a public utility with regard to farm tap customers. The answer is Northwestern Energy is a public utility, as we have discussed. Northern is not. There is agreement between Staff, Northern, and NorthWestern that Northern is not a public utility. Northwestern Energy is a public utility today, and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe will be after December 31, 2017. However, that's a question that has come up in this proceeding. I would ask how can such a large gas and electric utility say it's not a gas utility for the purpose of serving 195 farm tap customers but it is a public utility for the purposes of serving other farm tap customers that It had served prior to the MERC contract

10 of 53 sheets

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Ň	41		43
1	utility referenced earlier, as well as the size and	1	subject to the exclusive safety jurisdiction of PHMSA.
2		2	Any attempt by the South Dakota Public Utilities
3		3	Commission to regulate the Northern facilities so
4	Northern's view, to conclude NorthWestern is a public	4	Northern facilities being upstream of what was referred
5	utility even after December 31, 2017.	5	to as the three-way valve, would be barred by the
6	As an aside, it is interesting to note the same	6	United States Constitution and the express provisions of
7	1987 Agreement Northwestern Energy is citing to say the	7	the Pipeline Safety Act at 49 U.S.C. Section 60104.
8	obligation terminates has been partially assigned to MERC	8	In summary, the Commission has jurisdiction over
9	in Minnesota and Black Hills in Iowa. NorthWestern is	9	farm tap utility service as well as the utility providing
10	the only utility proposing to terminate utility service	10	it. Today that utility is Northwestern Energy.
11	to farm tap services or to farm taps.	11	Northwestern Energy is a public utility. Northern is
12	All others, including MidAmerican, serve farm	12	not. Northern is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction
13	tap customers and will continue to serve farm tap	13	of FERC and for pipeline safety for PHMSA. And
14	customers.	14	Northern's facilities, as I said, are not subject to
15	NorthWestern argues that it only agreed with	15	state plpeline safety inspection.
16	MERC to take assignment of farm taps until December 31,	16	Let me end by, first of all, again thanking you
17	2017. The Commission should not view NorthWestern's	17	for the time and your attention but the time to address
18	commitment so narrowly. It's important to keep in mind	18	these questions. I appreciate the proceeding being
19	that NorthWestern was in the process of buying the	19	initiated to allow parties to provide information that at
20	Milbank Pipeline from Northern in 2011, but in order to	20	the end of the day hopefully is helpful in the
21	do so it had to deal with MERC because MERC had service	21	Commission's deliberative process.
22	off of that Milbank line.	22	I would like to conclude with what I believe is
23	To take care of MERC and purchase the Milbank	23	a real life question but one which I pose today
24	Pipeline from Northern, a deal had to be reached, and it	24	rhetorically for your consideration as you deliberate.
.25	was. The deal was that MERC would agree to take service	25	Is the public interest being served if on December 31,
	42		44
1	42 from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to	1	44 2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility
1		1 2	
1	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to		2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility
2	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation.	2	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly
2 3	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications	2 3	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve?
2 3 4 5 6	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC	2 3 4	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to
2 3 4 5 6 7	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern.	2 3 4 5	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given	2 3 4 5 6 7	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions, First of all, I want to thank you for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions, First of all, I want to thank you for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill In some gaps in that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill In some gaps in that history between really the initiation of building a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill In some gaps.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill In some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revolve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline or no Northern facilities subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill In some gaps in that history between really the initiation of building a pipeline in 1985 and try to fill In some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revoive around the easement between Northern and a number of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline or no Northern facilities subject to state pipeline safety inspection.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill in some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revolve around the easement between Northern and a number of the landowners. And I'm going to use the one that Staff put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline or no Northern facilities are used to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill in some gaps in that history between really the initiation of building a pipeline in 1985 and try to fill in some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revolve around the easement between Northern and a number of the landowners. And I'm going to use the one that Staff put on as an attachment that you all used as an attachment in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline safety inspection. Because the Northern facilities are used to transport natural gas in interstate commerce, does not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill in some gaps in that history between really the initiation of building a pipeline in 1985 and try to fill in some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revoive around the easement between Northern and a number of the landowners. And I'm going to use the one that Staff put on as an attachment that you all used as an attachment in your last Brief to us because I think that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	from Northwestern Energy, and Northwestern Energy had to take assignment of the farm tap. Part of the value proposition for NorthWestern was taking assignment of the farm tap service obligation. It's not clear in the record where the communications broke down in the Milbank approval process between MERC and NorthWestern. I think the Commission asked the right question, and clearly the wrong answer was provided. But given this miscommunication, I would submit to you that the farm tap customers should not lose service because of it. Farm tap utility service shouldn't be abandoned because of a misunderstanding. The third question was are the farm taps subject to state jurisdiction for pipeline safety? Unequivocally in regard to Northern facilities and we've made reference to the exhibit that we had attached to our Brief, and that's the purpose that that was provided the answer is no. Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline or no Northern facilities are subject to state pipeline or no Northern facilities are used to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	2017, 195 rural customers that have received gas utility service on a continuous basis for 50 to 60 years abruptly lose service, not because of anything they did but because no South Dakota utility had the obligation to serve? And, with that, I'd be happy to answer questions. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have questions. First of all, I want to thank you for the considerable amount of time that you spent in your Brief talking about the history. I think that's key to all of this. But it also struck me that, for the most part, in your Briefs history to you all starts in 1985. And I think the history of this goes back much sooner than that. So I want to try to fill in some gaps in that history between really the initiation of building a pipeline in 1985 and try to fill in some gaps. And so my initial questions are going to revolve around the easement between Northern and a number of the landowners. And I'm going to use the one that Staff put on as an attachment that you all used as an attachment in

· · · ·			
1	find what is being done here, and it talks about a right,	1	be made a tap at any gas pipeline constructed by grantee
2	privilege, an easement to construct, maintain, and	2	upon the above-described premises for the purpose of
3	operate pipelines and impertinences thereto over and	3	supplying gas to grantor. And I think we all have an
4	through the following the described lands.	4	understanding that the tap you're talking about there,
5	And so you would agree, would you, that that's	5	you're going to make a hole in the pipe and provide
6	what Northern was seeking from the landowners? Is that	6	the essentially in your picture, the blue portion.
7	correct?	7	Is that accurate?
8	MR. PORTER: That is correct.	8	MR. PORTER: Correct.
9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: The second thing that I think	9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And then that paragraph ends
10	is important in the easement for the history of this is	10	with the phrase "and gas to be taken under this provision
111	how long was Northern seeking this right? And In the	11	shall be measured and furnished to the grantor at the
12	second paragraph it spells that out.	12	rates and upon the terms as may be established by grantee
13	It says To have and to hold that almost	13	or by any vendee of the grantee from time to time."
14	sounds permanent so long as such pipelines and	14	And so my question coming out of that last
15		15	phrase is would you agree that per that language either
16	Impertinences thereto shall be maintained okay. That's a little bit less than forever together with	16	Northern or Northern's vendee has a responsibility to
17	-	17	
	the right of ingress to and egress from said premise for		provide gas to the grantor as long as the pipeline is
18	the purposes of constructing, inspecting, repairing,	118	operational? One of those two parties?
19	maintaining, and replacing the property of the grantee	19	Is that correct?
20	located thereon or the removal thereof in whole or in	20	MR. PORTER: Yes. Subject to knowing what
21	part.	21	furnish gas means.
22	And so would it be accurate that the expectation	22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So let me ask you, what do
23	is that this easement would last as long as Northern	23	you think that means to the farmer that granted the
24	maintains and operates the pipeline? Is that correct?	24	easement?
25	MR. PORTER: That's correct.	25	MR. PORTER: It means they're going to get gas.
	10		0 k
	46		48
1	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the	1	That's exactly right.
2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could	2	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the
2 3	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner,	2 3	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is
2 3 4	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that?	2 3 4	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in
2 3 4 5	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks	2 3 4 5	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota.
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing	2 3 4 5 6	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a	2 3 4 5 6 7	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, If	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, lf you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, lf you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easement. We've got a lot of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to grantor any damages that may arise to growing crops,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easements with what we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, lf you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to grantor any damages that may arise to growing crops, trees, shrubbery, fences, or buildings from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easement. We've got a lot of easements. Northern has a lot of easements with what we refer to as a farm tap provision in It that are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to grantor any damages that may arise to growing crops, trees, shrubbery, fences, or buildings from the construction, maintenance, or operation of said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easement. We've got a lot of easements. Northern has a lot of easements with what we refer to as a farm tap provision in it that are not receiving gas. They've just never asked for it. They've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soil. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to grantor any damages that may arise to growing crops, trees, shrubbery, fences, or buildings from the construction, maintenance, or operation of said pipelines. Okay. That makes sense. If you damage	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easement. We've got a lot of easements. Northern has a lot of easements with what we refer to as a farm tap provision in it that are not receiving gas. They've just never asked for It. They've never asked for a tap.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so then we get to the third portion of what in exchange for this, what could be a forever commitment on the part of the landowner, what does the landowner get in return for that? And, obviously, in the first paragraph it talks about some monetary compensation, and if you're crossing a quarter section, the landowner got 160 bucks for a forever commitment. Would you agree? MR. PORTER: Yes. CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the last set of paragraphs there are some additional compensation or agreements, if you will, that state As further consideration for this grant, the grantee herein agrees as follows. Number one, that it will bury all pipelines laid upon said land to a sufficient depth so as to not interfere with the cultivation of soll. Beneficial to both parties, obviously. Second, that the grantor that it will pay to grantor any damages that may arise to growing crops, trees, shrubbery, fences, or buildings from the construction, maintenance, or operation of said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	That's exactly right. That does not mean that Northern is selling the gas to them. And that's the distinction that I think is important. We have never sold the gas to the end user in the State of South Dakota. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. But in this phrase, this phrase leaves open the possibility of that or that if Northern chooses not to, that you will have the responsibility of finding a vendee to do that. Is that accurate? MR. PORTER: I agree with that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so the landowner that signed these easements in the 1950s, would you agree that it was their expectation that for as long as that pipeline is operational they will have gas available to them? MR. PORTER: Commissioner, I don't mean to hedge that, but I think I don't know what was in the person's mind signing this easement. We've got a lot of easements. Northern has a lot of easements with what we refer to as a farm tap provision in it that are not receiving gas. They've just never asked for it. They've

12 of 53 sheets

_	10		P.4	
1	49 were planning on asking for service, they were looking	1		
2	for access to the pipeline, and then arrangements would	2	terms of what that and the price of what that's being	
3	have to be made for the gas.	3	provided for is established by vendee.	
4	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And that's fair, I would	4	I think the language earlier is what addresses	
5	agree with that. You can't know what was in each	5	Northern's obligation to make available.	
6	person's mind 60 years ago.	6	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is NorthWestern today your vendee?	
7	So maybe the last question I've got from the	7	MR, PORTER: We don't refer to them as a vendee	
8	actual easement is this: Is it correct that it would	8	In normal conversation, but under the language of this	
9	violate the easement provisions if neither Northern nor	9	easement, I would say yes.	
10	Northern's vendee continued to provide gas?	10	I would say I've never referred to them as a	
11		11	vendee.	
12	does.	12	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Understand. There's obviously	
13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And please explain that.	13	language in here that we don't use so much anymore. But	
14	MR. PORTER: I will. Thank you.	14	going back again, going back to the beginning of	
15	Northern's obligation as the law has changed	15	history, you would consider them to be your vendee today.	
16	over time, Northern's obligation is as a interstate	16	And so then I guess maybe the ultimate question	
17	pipeline. We get gas to our farm tap facilities. Farm	17	is if they cease to be your vendee, do you have a	
18	tap facilities owned by us. It is somebody else's	18	responsibility for a replacement vendee under the	
19	responsibility, today Northwestern Energy's, to purchase	19	language of the easement?	
20	the gas, nominate it on our pipeline for receipt, and	20	MR, PORTER: I do not think Northern Natural has	
21	then delivery at the delivery point.	21	an obligation to go out and get somebody under the terms	
22	It's not Northern's responsibility should, in	22	of this easement.	
23	this case, the utility refuse to do that job, it's not	23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Let's go to your Brief,	
24	Northern's responsibility under this easement to do	24	your initial Brief, page 5. And the last sentence on	
25	anything other than what it agreed to do, and that is to	25	page 5 are you with me?	
	50		52	٦
1	make a tap available and furnish gas under the	1	MR. PORTER: Not yet, sir.	
2	circumstances involved. And that would be somebody's got	2	Okay. I'm with you.	
3	to nominate it. Somebody's got to buy it.	3	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Last sentence on page 5,	
4	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So I understand your	4	Although the pipeline easement permitting the pipeline to	
5	position and what you just said as it relates to Northern	5	be built across the landowner's property was granted to	
6	and particularly as It goes back to the FERC Order that	6	Northern, Peoples as a separate affiliate of Northern	
7	Staff mentioned.	7	provided natural gas utility service to farm tap	
8	But the easement language has an "or" in it. It	8	customers.	
9	says Northern or a vendee of Northern. One or the other.	9	So my question is was Peoples your vendee per	
10	And you've made the case, I think adequately so, that	10	the language of the easement?	
11	it's not Northern. It can't be.	11	MR. PORTER: Yes, Again, I've never thought of	
12	But that to me leaves the only other option, and	12	them, but under the language the wording in the	
13	that is that Northern must have a vendee to provide gas	13	easement I would say that they're the vendee.	
14	to the landowner. Is that not correct?	14	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So the document that is	
15 16	MR. PORTER: The language that you're referring	15	missing in all of this proceeding is where is the	
17	to, if I'm reading it correctly, says at the rates and	16	document that shows the rights, responsibilities,	
12	upon the terms as may be established by grantee or any vendee of grantee from time to time.	17 18	obligations, liabilities of Peoples at that point?	
10	I believe the way I read that provision may be a	19	I mean, obviously Peoples and Northern were	
20	little bit different.	20	affiliate companies, but there had to be some document	
21	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Feel free.	20	where Northern designated Peoples as the vendee per the	
22	MR. PORTER: To me what that is saying, it's	21	language of the easement and what the rights,	
~~	PINE FOR LENE TO THE WHAT HAT IS SAYING, ILS		responsibilities, obligations, assets were at that time.	
23	referring to the rates and upon the terms that may be	27	Where is that?	1
23 24	referring to the rates and upon the terms that may be established by the vendee pursuant to somebody earlier	23 24	Where is that?	
23 24 25	referring to the rates and upon the terms that may be established by the vendee pursuant to somebody earlier referred to NorthWestern's Tariff, Section 1.1. The	23 24 25	Where is that? MR. PORTER: I am not aware of a document as you described. What happened over time from the time that	

Page 49 to 52 of 133

... ..

. .

·

		T	55
	53		
1	Peoples was incorporated in 1930 was two affiliates		understand where I'm trying to fill in. And I'm going to
2	worked together. Northern provided interstate	2	go back to the very helpful picture.
3	transmission, the interstate service. Peoples provided	3	So I understand the blue. And I want to focus
4	the local retail service in Iowa, South Dakota,	4	on the red. We've got the three-way valve, and we've got
5	Minnesota, Kansas, all the states that Peoples was in.	5	the odorizing can. Who paid for it initially, and who
6	They worked side by side at the town border	6	installed it?
7	stations or at facilities all over our system. They had	7	MR. PORTER: Very good question. You asked that
8	a common ultimate owner.	8	earlier, and it wasn't my time so I appreciate you asking
9	I'm not aware of any document that lays out that	9	it again. Not Northern.
10	a person for Peoples is going to do this and a person for	10	So, again, I'm not trying to be evasive. We
11	Northern, the interstate transmission company's, going to	11	only know Northern only knows up to the end of the
12	do that. I was not aware of one. The only one I'm aware	12	blue. We have all of those facilities on our on our
13	of is in 1987 where they went to the effort of laying	13	books and records. We've received FERC certification to
14	that out.	14	construct under our blanket certificate. When we have to
15	We tried to supplement this board with a long	15	remove a facility we get approval, and we specifically
16	time employee that was manager of the operations at that	16	identify those facilities up to not including the
17.	time, Keith Peterson. We included his Affidavit to	17	three-way valve.
18	support the historical practices. But I wish I had a	18	So the three-way valve which goes down into the
19	document I could give you. There just isn't one.	19	mercaptan tank and then into the service line, we did
20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And you didn't bring	20	identify these pictures the way we did, and it does say
21	Mr. Peterson with you today.	21	LDC. I belleve, frankly, in my review you will see a
22	MR. PORTER: Did not.	22	mixture. So I'm not trying, again, to I'm just trying
23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I appreciate his attempt.	23	to be forthright.
24	His statements, obviously, were pretty vague that, yeah,	24	Downstream of our facilities, I'm not sure. I
25	I know, but beyond that they really weren't helpful in	25	would not I'm not qualified to say one way or the
	54		56
1	answering the question that I want answered.	1	other. I know I've seen it both ways.
2	And ultimately we've talked a lot about what the	2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So just so I'm clear, you
3	1985 Agreement, what it transferred, but what I don't	3	don't know who installed or who paid for the three-way
4	know is what did Peoples actually have to transfer?	4	valve or the odorizer can; is that correct?
5	Okay. Because we don't know what Northern provided to	5	MR, PORTER: Yeah.
6			
1 -	Peoples. We don't know what that relationship was back	6	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So Northern designated Peoples
7	Peoples. We don't know what that relationship was back in the 1950s. Okay.	6 7	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So Northern designated Peoples as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what
8	-		······································
	in the 1950s. Okay.	7	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what
8	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this.	7 8	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct?
8 9	in the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly.	7 8 9	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern
8 9 10	in the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch	7 8 9 10	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did
8 9 10 11	in the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-lnch binders that I've come across during this process that	7 8 9 10 11	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would
8 9 10 11 12	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't	7 8 9 10 11 12	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that.
8 9 10 11 12 13	in the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's paid for.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's pald for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's pald for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-Inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples Natural Gas's assets and liabilities are being purchased.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's paid for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The CHAIRMAN NELSON: The three-way valve and the odorizer can.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples Natural Gas's assets and liabilities are being purchased. I just want to make sure I didn't mean to mislead you	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's paid for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The CHAIRMAN NELSON: The three-way valve and the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples Natural Gas's assets and liabilities are being purchased. I just want to make sure I didn't mean to mislead you because there is that kind of documentation, but there is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's paid for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The CHAIRMAN NELSON: The three-way valve and the odorizer can.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-Inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples Natural Gas's assets and liabilities are being purchased. I just want to make sure I didn't mean to mislead you because there is that kind of documentation, but there is no document that says Joe that works for Peoples or Mary	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's paid for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The CHAIRMAN NELSON: The three-way valve and the odorizer can. MR. PORTER: That's what I was intending to
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	In the 1950s. Okay. MR. PORTER: Just let me try this. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly. MR. PORTER: There are three three- to four-inch binders that I've come across during this process that document the InterNorth sale to UtiliCorp. So I didn't mean to suggest that there weren't any documents. And they identify assets. They identify easements. They identify the things that you would expect to see in an asset purchase agreement. There's normal language of all of Peoples Natural Gas's assets and liabilities are being purchased. I just want to make sure I didn't mean to mislead you because there is that kind of documentation, but there is no document that says Joe that works for Peoples or Mary that works for Northern is going carries out these	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	as your vendee, but you don't know as your vendee what they paid for or what they installed; is that correct? MR. PORTER: As I sit here today for Northern Natural Gas, all those let's assume that Peoples did pay for that. I don't have any records that would Indicate that. CHAIRMAN NELSON; Okay. MR. PORTER: So I don't have any way to verify. I can verify what Northern's pald for. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. So who owns those two pleces today? MR. PORTER: I'm sorry. The CHAIRMAN NELSON: The three-way valve and the odorizer can. MR. PORTER: That's what I was intending to address. Not sure. We thought It was as laid out In the

	57		59
	end user, the farm tap owner, or the regulated utility.	1	who actually owns those two pieces. And I'm trying to
2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So we have we have a no	2	see the paper trail of from when they were installed to
3	man's land. Nobody wants to claim ownership of that. Is	3	today and obviously that's I'm not going to find that.
4	that accurate?	4	MR. PORTER: I appreciate what you're asking.
5	MR. PORTER: I believe that's accurate. Again,	5	Northern's records I want to be clear. We do have
6	I know it's not Northern, but I don't know what the	6	records on what Northern owns and operates, what we have
7	arrangement was between the utility and the farm tap	7	authority to construct and what we've over time
8	owner.	8	abandoned. We have a we have documentation for that.
9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I appreciate your patience	9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Right.
10	with me answering those questions to get us through	10	MR. PORTER: I can't speak to Peoples or the
11	pre-'85. So let's look at the 1985 Agreement.	11	utilities after that. I wish I could because I get your
12	In the first whereas clause, Part B, it says as	12	question, and I understand it.
13	part of the sale UtiliCorp is assuming all of Peoples'	13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So let's go to 1987 Agreement.
14	rights, duty, liabilities, and obligations in regard to	14	Section 5. "This agreement shall continue from its
15	farm taps along Northern's pipeline system.	15	effective date first written above to and including
16	So is there a document that defines what those	16	May 31, 2017. Peoples may terminate this agreement
17	are?	17	effective any time after May 31, 2017, by providing six
18	I mean, I find it amazing we've got a two-page	18	months' prior written notice to Northern."
19	agreement to sell an entire company? There's got to be	19	And so it was everybody's understanding who
20	more.	20	signed off on this, including Northern, that Peoples
21	MR. PORTER: Excuse me. No. There are three	21	could terminate the farm tap service in 2017; correct?
22	volumes of documents.	22	MR. PORTER: As far as I know, sir, everybody's
23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Those are the three you were	23	understanding regarding this agreement as written in
24	referring to?	24	regards to the termination provision.
25	MR. PORTER: Those are the three volumes.	25	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so with Northern
	58		60
1	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm going to regret asking the		understanding that in 1987, Northern would have also
2	question, but go ahead.	2	understood that if Peoples exercised their option to
3	MR. PORTER: InterNorth, Inc. selling the assets	3	cancel in 2017, that that would have left Northern without a vendee. Is that correct?
4	and liabilities of Peoples Natural Gas. So selling	4 5	MR. PORTER: We believe it would have done two
5	Peoples' assets and liabilities to UtiliCorp, Inc.		things in regards to the services that are identified
6	That was a large transaction with assets in six,	6	under this 1987 Agreement.
	seven, eight states from Kansas to Michigan, Minnesota,	8	There's meter reading. The vendee just from
8	South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And in Section A it talks	9	historical practices and what was transferred to
9	about the purchasing of the assets of Peoples. So was	10	•
10 11	the three-way valve and the odorizer part of Peoples'	11	UtiliCorp, dld not have any obligation to read the meter and give that information to us on a monthly basis.
12	assets to actually sell?	12	That is it makes sense for them to do that
13	MR. PORTER: Again, sir, I don't I don't	13	because they need that information anyway, but that would
14	know. We don't have the I will say this, Chairman:	14	not be covered, nor would the obligation which is covered
15	Looking through those three volumes of documents that	15	in the '87 Agreement, what do the parties do when a
16	transferred the assets and liabilities, they don't get	16	landowner that has a farm tap provision in their easement
17	down into that level of detail. They don't get down into	17	says I want service now and they give us written notice
18	three-way valves or mercaptan tanks.	18	that they want service. That also needed to be addressed
19	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I can appreciate that.	19	and is addressed in the '87 Agreement.
20	Obviously, what I'm struggling with is and you've said	20	So those two provisions, if the '87 Agreement
20	that Northern didn't install or pay for those.	21	was terminated, those two would be unresolved, would need
22	MR. PORTER: Correct.	22	to be addressed.
		23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But you would also lose a
23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But I don't have	140	
23 24	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But I don't have documentation I have your word. I don't have		
23 24 25	CHAIRMAN NELSON: But I don't have documentation I have your word. I don't have documentation of that. And so I'm trying to figure out	23 24 25	vendee that actually provides the gas to the customer; correct?

Service Service

		- <u>1</u>	
	61		63
1	MR. PORTER: I don't no, slr. I think that	1	We do we also believe that because the 1985
2	they have we would lose the vendee under this	2	transfer of the obligation to provide service, utility
3	contract, but It's their obligation to do those things	3	service, to farm tap customers, that even if they should
4	under the 1985 Agreement.	4	under the terms of the '87 Agreement terminate it, that
5	So I think they're still they may be able to	5	doesn't take away their obligation to serve.
6	terminate the '87 Agreement, but they can't terminate the	6	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And that's your opinion,
7	obligation that they took as a result of the corporate	7	of course. Not maybe everybody's opinion but certainly
8	purchase.	8	yours.
9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: In the same agreement, the	9	MR. PORTER: If I may, I mean, it's also the
10	'87 Agreement, under Section 1, Performance of Services,	10	effect of the corporate the 1985, the legal effect of
11	"Northern acknowledges that Peoples shall operate as a	11	the transfer of obligations and liabilities to UtiliCorp.
12	public utility."	12	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: In the 1985 if I
13	But when we compare that to the Section 5	13	remember right, in the 1985 Agreement that you signed,
14	termination clause, it appears that Northern acknowledged	14	though, couldn't you at any time there was a certain
15	that a public utility could terminate service. Is that	15	date that you could actually pull away that vendorship
16	accurate?	16	distribution to those customers? You could terminate the
	MR. PORTER: No, sir. I don't think it is.	17	agreement?
17		18	MR. PORTER: The 1987 Agreement allows Northern
18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Yeah.	19	-
19	MR. PORTER: I think it's more descriptive in	20	to COMMISSIONER FIEGEN; Terminate until '88 it
20	paragraph 1, saying they're going to operate as a public	1	
21	utility. The only statute, law, is going to define	21	was. Like July something of '88.
22	whether somebody is, in fact, a public utility or not.	22	MR. PORTER: I think that's I can give you
23	This agreement nor the nor would it change	23	that answer.
24	the status of Northwestern Energy in the transaction with	24	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Something like that.
25	MERC. It's got to be by statute.	25	MR. PORTER: It says Northern may terminate this
	62		64
1	62 CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the	1	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988.
1	_	1 2	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's
	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the		agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job.
2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point.	2	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's
2 3	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you.	2 3	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband.
2 3 4	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam.	2 3 4	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your
2 3 4 5	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming	2 3 4 5 6	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband.
2 3 4 5 6	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera,	2 3 4 5 6	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been
2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good Job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a distribution company wants to exercise their agreement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had service territories.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a distribution company wants to exercise their agreement that it looks like Northern signed, to me, that they can	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had service territories. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, okay. You're right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a distribution company wants to exercise their agreement that it looks like Northern signed, to me, that they can terminate the service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had service territories. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, okay. You're right. They don't have service territorles. But their trucks
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a distribution company wants to exercise their agreement that it looks like Northern signed, to me, that they can terminate the service. MR. PORTER: The words of the 1987 Agreement are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when 1 look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had service territories. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, okay. You're right. They don't have service territorles. But their trucks might be closer than other trucks because that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I've got at this point. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Adam. First of all, certainly thank you for coming here, and thank you for meeting with us, et cetera, because public interest of farm taps is certainly important to the Commission and that we continue the service. Also getting accurate information and not pointing fingers and et cetera. We just need to figure out this. And if the Commission can. This might, unfortunately, be a Circuit Court situation instead of a Commission situation. When I read everything, and as you know there's lots of information here, I'm amazed that Northern signed a couple of agreements with distribution companies that they could actually terminate their service in 2017. Help me understand why Northern signed those agreements and then are here today and are baffled that a distribution company wants to exercise their agreement that it looks like Northern signed, to me, that they can terminate the service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agreement effective any time after July 20, 1988. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, my husband's birthday. Good job. MR. PORTER: Well, happy birthday to your husband. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: There has certainly been lots of discussion with the farm tap customers from NorthWestern and from Northern Natural Gas. It appears that when I look at when we met you, you had a you had a farm tap line, and it looks like so many of your customers are in MidAmerican's territory. Do you know out of those 195 customers that you're talking about now and it looked like it was 206 when I met you maybe, but It must have went down to 195. How many of those are MidAmerican territory? MR. PORTER: I'm not sure of where are you talking from an electric perspective? I didn't understand I'm a little confused by the terminology because I didn't think gas distribution companies had service territories. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Well, okay. You're right. They don't have service territorles. But their trucks

•			27
1	65 MR. PORTER: Uh-huh. I understand what you're	1	67
2		1 2	issue with a LDC, a local distribution company, saying
3		3	they're no longer you know, maybe the homeowner moves
4	I don't know. I would guess down in the southeast corner I believe that's a MidAmerican area	4	and they don't need the tap with abandoned farm taps that FERC jurisdictional facilities would abandon
5	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Have you talked to	5	that.
6	MidAmerican? I mean, that is actually you guys have	6	
7	at least a little bloodline relationship.	7	So I just want to be clear. We've done that, but we've never had an issue where a regulating utility
8	MR. PORTER: With MidAmerican?	8	has just walked away and told us that they're not going
9	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes.	9	to provide service.
10	MR. PORTER: No, I have not.	10	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And when you talk about
11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Actually your parent	11	that, It appears that that was part of that Milbank
12	company has.	12	exchange when they bought the Milbank Pipeline. This was
13	MR, PORTER: That's right.	13	part of the deal. Somebody used the word "deal" today.
14	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And you guys have not	14	MR, PORTER: I did.
15	talked to MidAmerican about providing farm tap service to	15	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: That they would provide
16	South Dakota customers, although they're a distribution	16	service from whatever, 2011 to 2017. Which is not
17	company and they might serve areas that are relatively to	17	longstanding. I mean, that's very brief when you look at
18	these farm taps?	18	your history of service to farm taps in South Dakota.
19	And I understand there's no service territory,	19	But when you talk about other states are you
20	but they're relatively close. You guys have not talked	20	talking about apples to apples when you're talking about
21	to MidAmerican?	21	companies that have bought pipeline and then you gave
22	MR. PORTER: I have not. I don't know if	22	them like a or somebody gave them a five-year not
23	there's been certainly our owner knows that this issue	23	you, but MERC gave them a five-year deal to provide
24	is going on. I'm not aware of discussions. It is not	24	service. Is that the same thing or
25	something that they've probably given a lot of thought to	25	MR. PORTER: In the State of South Dakota,
	66		68
1	since it's not an issue. It's not their issue, And	1	Minnesota, Iowa. I'm not sure about Michigan. But at
2	they're plenty happy dealing with their own issues let	2	least those states that I mentioned were all states
3	alone Northern's. And we don't see it as our obligation.	3	served by Peoples Natural Gas, that Peoples Natural Gas
4	It's a good question. It might be worth	4	had service responsibilities to.
5	talking about. But as far as I'm aware, nothing.	5	And they're also states that Northern's
6	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Have you had the	6	Interstate pipeline goes through. So certainly as
7	opportunity to talk to MERC?	7	UtiliCorp that acquired all the assets and liabilities in
-8	MR PORTER: We have talked certainly we have	8	all the states, they've sold them off to maybe three
9	talked to MERC in regards to farm taps in Minnesota. And	9	different companies now.
10	those discussions are ongoing. They have the same issues	10	So Black Hills owns the Iowa facilities. MERC
11	that NorthWestern same agreement, 1987 Agreement, that	11	owns the Minnesota facilities. They did own or have
12	they're looking at and the same 1985 Agreement.	12	obligations to the South Dakota farm tap customers until
13	We have sent them the Briefs in this proceeding	13	the transfer to NorthWestern. I think I mentioned Iowa
14	so they would have them and so that they would know our	14	was Black Hills,
15	arguments and what we believe is going on. So, yes, we	15	Does that answer your question?
16	have had discussions in that regard.	16	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So then like Black Hills,
17	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You talked about in	17	when they bought some of the Iowa lines
18	your oral argument you talked about other farm taps that	18	MR. PORTER: Uh-huh.
19	you deal with in other states like Iowa, et cetera.	19	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: they also have the
20	Several, several states. And you pretty much have said	20	opportunity to terminate service in 2017?
21	that this is new that a distribution company would	21	MR. PORTER: They do. And they have a
22	terminate Is that what you said? Something like that,	22	proceeding that is ongoing right now in front of the
23	Greg?	23	Iowa Utilities Board that where Black Hills has
24	MR. PORTER: Not remembering exactly what you're	24	proposed not perfectly familiar with it, but has
25	referring to, but I would say that we have never had this 53 sheets Page 65 to	25	proposed an inspection program where they would inspect
		, 68 of	

Ń

`. `. ,

Page 65 to 68 of 133

		1	71
	69	1	FERC jurisdictional facilities subject to PHMSA, I know
1	the farm tap from Northern's jurisdictional facilities to	2	what facilities those are, and that's everything, if you
2	the farm tap owner's facilities.	3	will, upstream of the three-way valve.
3	They would look at that line. They would	4	So how PHMSA and trying to work with them on
4	inspect it. If it was not in if it didn't meet	5	a day-to-day basis, how they want us to we just
5	standards, it would replace it. And this filing before	6	oblige.
6	the utilities board then addresses, obviously, the cost		COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: All right. And I think
7	recovery of doing so. So that is an ongoing proceeding right now in	8	we're all working with all of that.
8	front of the Iowa Utilities Board. Over time there's	9	Mr. de Hueck, those are my questions for now.
10	been, and I cite in our Brief, one instance where	10	(Discussion off the record)
11	Black Hills has been before the Iowa Utilities Board.	11	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.
12	The Iowa Utilities Board has exercised jurisdiction over	12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good
13	farm tap services.	13	afternoon good morning still, I guess.
14	We've had that discussion. They know that the	14	MR. PORTER: It is for a few more minutes. Good
15	obligation is within their public utility jurisdiction to	15	morning.
16	regulate. So they have stepped up to that, and now	16	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm going to be asking
17	they're in the process of establishing what a Black Hills	17	questions on three documents that you filed with us.
18	program, if you will, will look like to be able to	18	Those three are a May 6 letter that's shown as Exhibit A
19	handle post-December 31, 2017, will be able to	19	that was sent to Mary Zanter from Mr. Talcott. The
20	transition long term.	20	second is a letter that was sent November 23. And that
21	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. That was	21	was created I'm not sure who created it, but it was
22	helpful.	22	sent by how do you pronounce your last name?
23	Also you saw the filing of our pipeline safety	23	MR. TALCOTT: Talcott.
24	manager on safety. Safety is always a concern.	24	MS. DEMMAN; Demman.
25	It appears that your company filed I don't	25	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Was sent by
	70	[72
-1	70 know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with	1	72 Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork.
·1 2		1	
	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with		Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork.
2	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me	2	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record)
2 3	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that?	2	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I
2 3 4	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why	2 3 4	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was
2 3 4 5	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution	2 3 4 5	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork.
2 3 4 5 6	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report?	2 3 4 5 6	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated
2 3 4 5 6 7	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look	2 3 4 5 6 7	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah. Interstate, intrastate, distribution transmission, all of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Mr. Talcott, I read somewhere years ago where at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah. Interstate, intrastate, distribution transmission, all of that. So that gets to be kind of confusing when PHMSA	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curlous. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Mr. Talcott, I read somewhere years ago where at least a third of all if not 40 percent of all e-mails
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah. Interstate, intrastate, distribution transmission, all of that. So that gets to be kind of confusing when PHMSA looks like I don't know if they changed their mind on some things or MR. PORTER: Yeah. I can't tell you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curlous. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Mr. Talcott, I read somewhere years ago where at least a third of all if not 40 percent of all e-mails are misinterpreted by the fact that we're reading
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah. Interstate, intrastate, distribution transmission, all of that. So that gets to be kind of confusing when PHMSA looks like I don't know if they changed their mind on some things or MR. PORTER: Yeah. I can't tell you, Commissioner, what's in PHMSA's mind as far as why they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curious. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Mr. Talcott, I read somewhere years ago where at least a third of all if not 40 percent of all e-mails are misinterpreted by the fact that we're reading something that someone's writing quickly, and sometimes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	know if it was with PHMSA or FERC. I think it was with PHMSA a distribution report. Can you help me understand that? MR. PORTER: The report or why COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Why was it a distribution report? Why was it a distribution report? MR. PORTER: Good question. And we do not look at facilities downstream of ours. So the three-way valve downstream, those are not our facilities. PHMSA we called up PHMSA and said, hey. How do you want us to handle it? It's not our facilities. They said file a distribution form. So that's what we've been doing. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Huh. That makes us all very confused, you know. MR. PORTER: Why is that? COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because yeah. Interstate, intrastate, distribution transmission, all of that. So that gets to be kind of confusing when PHMSA looks like I don't know if they changed their mind on some things or MR. PORTER: Yeah. I can't tell you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Ms. Demman. Rickie Mork. (Discussion off the record) COMMISSIONER HANSON: I believe the portion I ended with that you probably missed was the letter was prepared to be sent to a Rickie Mork. The third instrument is a November 3 dated November 3, and it was sent to Chairman Nelson from Ms. Demman as well. First of all, on the May 6 letter, the letter was in response to and refers to an e-mail from Mary Zanter. And that e-mail do we have a copy of that e-mail? MR. TALCOTT: I can't remember whether we made it part of the record or not. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't believe I've read that e-mail, but I was just curlous. MR. TALCOTT: We did provide a couple of e-mail strings, and I don't know how far back they went. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Mr. Talcott, I read somewhere years ago where at least a third of all if not 40 percent of all e-mails are misinterpreted by the fact that we're reading

r [73	-	75
1		1	
2		2	
3		3	
4		4	
5		5	and across all farm taps, but my best understanding is
6	•	6	it's not Northern that sends out that letter with respect
7		7	to farm taps.
8	Staff have over the Northern assets.	8	My understanding is that I don't know if it's
9	And I don't have the April 26 e-mail in front of	9	universal, but my understanding is the letter that's
10	me. I don't know if I brought it with me. But, as I	10	required by this regulation is actually sent by the
11	recall, the tenor of the e-mail was that someone in the	11	person providing service to those people, which would be
12	SD PUC Safety department was threatening enforcement	12	MERC, Peoples Natural Gas, Northwest Public Service.
13	action against Northern. And the whole purpose for this	13	That's a big explanation.
14	discourse was to lay out our position that the Commission	14	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes. I was looking for a
15	does not have safety jurisdiction over Northern's assets	15	yes or no, but I appreciate it. Thank you.
16	and so could not issue an enforcement letter.	16	So, yes or no, was there a letter sent? You've
17	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.	17	placed the foundation, an explanation of why a letter may
18	In your response you stated in the first	18	not have been sent. However, was a letter sent?
19	sentence and I won't read the entire sentence. You	19	MR. TALCOTT: To the best of my knowledge, in
20	referred to the letter. You state that Mary Zanter	20	the State of South Dakota a letter was not sent by
21	requested from Northern a copy from Northern to its	21	Northern to farm tap end users as a result of this
22	customers in South Dakota regarding, and then you cite.	22	regulation.
23	However, it does not appear that you provided	23	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Ms. Demman, is that your
24	that letter. You basically argue in your response not to	24	understanding as well?
25	provide that letter. Is that accurate?	25	MS. DEMMAN: I have no different knowledge than
	74		76
1	MR. TALCOTT: I think that's accurate. In the	1	Mr. Talcott on that Issue. Yes, it's my understanding.
2	background, as I recall it, I don't remember the back and	2	COMMISSIONER HANSON: The November 23 letter
3	forth regarding 49 CFR 192.16. I didn't prepare for that	3	or at least the letter that was sent to us on November 23
4	today. I was more prepared to talk about interstate	4	and addressed to Rick Mork, as it was filed with some
5	facilities and that.	5	other information before us at that time, Ms. Demman, is
6	The letter, as I understand it, my recollection	6	
7	The leavery as a understand by thy reconcetion	0	that a copy of that letter?
1 '	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation	7	
8			that a copy of that letter?
	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation	7	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the
8	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that	7 8	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge,
8 9 10 11	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained	7 8 9	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter.
8 9 10 11 12	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not	7 8 9 10 11 12	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a
8 9 10 11 12 13	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, It	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection is the purpose of this 49 CFR 192.16 is to let people	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the customers and to you.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection is the purpose of this 49 CFR 192.16 is to let people know downstream that that service line is not being	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the customers and to you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You also sent it to the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection is the purpose of this 49 CFR 192.16 is to let people know downstream that that service line is not being inspected by whoever sends the letter.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the customers and to you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You also sent it to the customers on November 23?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection is the purpose of this 49 CFR 192.16 is to let people know downstream that that service line is not being inspected by whoever sends the letter. That's my understanding of the regulation. And	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that a copy of that letter? MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the customers and to you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You also sent it to the customers on November 23? MS. DEMMAN: We did.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of 49 CFR 192.16 is a letter that that regulation requires go out to end users. And I think that subject to check, I think the purpose of the regulation is to let customers know downstream of certain assets that do transport gas and are inspected and maintained versus assets that transport gas downstream that may not necessarily be inspected and maintained by whoever is sending the letter whoever is required to send the letter on this regulation. It's to notify the customers downstream that and in this context here that we're talking about, it would be the service line. It would be the facilities from the three-way valve to the house. My recollection is the purpose of this 49 CFR 192.16 is to let people know downstream that that service line is not being inspected by whoever sends the letter.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that a copy of that letter? MS, DEMMAN: Yes. That's a one of the letters that was sent to customers. It was a mail merge, and so we gave you one as an example of one letter. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Might have to speak just a smidge louder. MS. DEMMAN: Yes. That was one of the letters that was sent. It was a copy of the same letter that went to 195 customers, and it was a mail merge so we gave you one to addressed to Mr. Mork. COMMISSIONER HANSON: So this is dated November 23 because you sent it to us on November 23; is that correct? MS. DEMMAN: Because we sent it on to the customers and to you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: You also sent it to the customers on November 23?

			79
1	MS. DEMMAN: Not by Northern Natural Gas.	1	answered that, yes, we are an interstate pipeline
2	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. Curlosity,	2	regulated by PHMSA.
3	Mr. Talcott. In the first sentence again on the May 6	3	COMMISSIONER HANSON: So if you are an
4	letter you stated that Ms. Zanter had requested a letter,	4	interstate pipeline regulated by PHMSA and the farm taps
5	That letter you referred to sent from Northern to its	5	are under FERC is that what you're saying?
6	customers in South Dakota.	6	MR. TALCOTT: The rate regulation is FERC, and
17	So do you regard those 100 plus to be your	7	the safety regulation of the Northern facilities as we
8	customers?	8	characterize them and describe them is under the safety
9	MR, TALCOTT: No, sir.	9	jurisdiction of PHMSA.
10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Because you state from	10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: So is PHMSA examining
11	Northern to its customers in South Dakota.	11	those farm taps?
12	MR. TALCOTT: I didn't put quotes on it, but I	12	MR. TALCOTT: They have the exclusive
13	believe to the best of my knowledge I was paraphrasing	13	jurisdiction to. My understanding of their attention or
14	the inquiry that came from Mary. Our customers are the	14	inspection of farm tap facilities is inconsistent across
15	shippers that have a contract with us under our FERC	15	Northern's pipeline system.
16	tariff to transport gas to the custody transfer point at	16	There are different areas of PHMSA. There's a
17	a farm tap, which is immediately before the three-way	17	regional office in Kansas City. There's a regional
18	valve.	18	office in Texas. I don't know where the Northern region
19	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.	19	is off the top of my head. Different PHMSA inspectors go
20	There's been a significant amount of discussion	20	out for different parts of the Northern system, and
21	and writing pertaining to who's on first here. And in	21	they're not necessarily consistent.
22	regards to whether FERC or PHMSA's regulating who where.	22	I know that in talking with Northern's Pipeline
23	In my experiences, oftentimes I find that there	23	Safety personnel in preparation for this meeting, I know
24	are more than one Fed department that feels that they're	24	for a fact that on some of the audits the farm tap
25	in charge. Is that possibly the case here, where FERC	25	facilities are, in fact, inspected by PHMSA inspectors.
	78		80
1	and PHMSA both have regulation responsibilities?	1	I can't say that it's consistent across the system.
2	MR. TALCOTT: Absolutely. There's no in our	2	But the fact if it is a fact that PHMSA
3	opinion there's no doubt about that.	3	inspectors do not go out and during a routine inspection
4	COMMISSIONER HANSON: And is not the PUC	4	don't go out and inspect each of the farm taps, that does
5	required to engage in those activities that are required	5	not defer them to state jurisdiction.
6	of us by PHMSA in regard to regulation and interaction in	6	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I understand that. It's a
7	this case with Northern?	7	curlosity with me. Because PHMSA, my familiarity with
8	MR. TALCOTT: If I understand your question	8	PHMSA is that they are extremely anal and that they are
9	carefully, I don't agree. The Federal Energy Regulatory	9	first on the scene to condemn if a state has not dotted
10	Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over Northern with	10	every I and done everything perfectly. So It would
11	regard to matters that are dealt with in the Natural Gas	11	surprise me if they are not examining the farm taps,
12	Act. By federal statute, by the same token, PHMSA has	12	And are you aware of how often, the frequency,
13	exclusive jurisdiction over the safety operation of	13	in South Dakota?
14	Northern's assets.	14	MR. TALCOTT: I am not, sir.
15	And as we've outlined in our Briefs and then I	15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: The November 3 letter,
16	think in the subsequent letter that we filed yesterday,	16	Ms. Demman, you state in the second paragraph at the end
17	by virtue of the Pipeline Safety Act, it expressly says	17	of the paragraph that "The impediment to continue the
18	that states may not may not regulate the safety	18	farm tap service is that no utility has stepped in to
19	aspects of interstate pipelines.	19	provide the retail distribution service NorthWestern
20	And we've demonstrated that we are an interstate	20	plans to abandon."
21	pipeline by virtue of the fact that we transport gas in	21	I understand, however, during the discussion
22	interstate commerce, and the facilities for which the gas	22	here that Northern has not made an effort to find another
	is transported to Northwest at these farm taps, those	23	operator. Is that correct?
23			
23 24 25	facilities are regulated by FERC. It's a two-prong question in the Pipeline Safety Act statute, very clearly	24 25	MS. DEMMAN: That's correct. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, if that is the

	81		83
1	Impediment, I have to ask why not.	1	service.
2	-	2	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Both of your statements
3	our view is that NorthWestern is currently the public	3	are interesting from the standpoint of the letter that
4	utility providing service. And it seems that it makes	4	was sent November 23. You say you have an obligation to
5	the most sense for them to continue providing service to	5	raise it and to have this forum apparently, and yet the
6	the customers who they're currently billing and providing	6	letter that was sent on November 23 is then inflammatory
7	services to.	7	and misleading because you state in the letter on page 2
8	And so we have not considered that some other	8	"Why would the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
9	that it's our obligation to provide some other utility to	9	allow discontinuance of my utility service?"
10	do that.	10	You're placing this in front of those consumers
11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, if you don't feel	11	as if why in the world would the Public Utilities
12	it's your obligation legally, morally don't you have an	12	Commission be doing this? And yet now you're sitting
13	obligation?	13	here saying that that is something that you wanted to see
14	MS. DEMMAN: We feel we had a moral obligation	14	done.
15	to raise this to the Commission and to bring it to your	15	You state "Does the South Dakota Public
16	attention because we're concerned about continuity of	16	Utilities Commission believe the longstanding service to
17	service to the farm tap customers. And we believe	17	farm tap customers is outdated or somehow inappropriate?"
18	NorthWestern is in the best position to continue to do	18	You have five different statements that you could have
19	that.	19	answered for those folks and explained to them of why
20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: So you have a distributor	20	we're having this, instead of alarming them.
21	of your product who's notified you that they're not going	21	For instance, the fourth statement, "If
22	to distribute your product anymore, but as a company you	22	Northwestern Energy no longer serves my farm tap, who
23	feel that you'll just not serve those customers anymore?	23	should I call to investigate possible leaks or respond to
24	MR. PORTER: Let me, Commissioner, address that	24	emergencies?" Well, there wouldn't be any leaks. There
25	if I may. When you say your product, first off, the	25	wouldn't be any emergencies if no one was serving them.
	82		84
1	natural gas is not Northern's. We are the highway that	1	So you're alarming them to all of these issues, but now
2	transports.	2	you're sitting here saying you have no moral obligation
3	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I understand that.	3	whatsoever and you have no legal obligation but yet
4	MR. PORTER: Okay. So when the gas is	4	you're inciting these consumers. And you're misleading
5	purchased, we will transport it. We will provide the	5	them as to the purpose of this meeting.
6	service that we're set up to and that we do provide and	6	I'll let you respond in a second.
7	provide reliably.	7	If you look at the first page, the second
8	So if somebody nominates it, goes out, finds the	8	paragraph, "The Commission is evaluating whether it
9	gas, and nominates on our system, we'll provide that	9	should discontinue regulation of farm tap service after
10	service.	10	doing so for decades." And I probably should read that
11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I understand that. And	11	entire paragraph prior to that because it all builds on
12	you stated that Northern does not have an obligation to	12	a on footings and on the foundation of trying to
13	pursue a vendor. And you are obviously speaking from a	13	incite those consumers. And I found it offensive.
14	legal aspect,	14	If you'd like to respond, you may.
15	But I'll ask you the same question. Don't you	15	MR. PORTER: Yes, I would, and Laura may as
16	believe that you have a moral responsibility?	16	weil.
17	MR. PORTER: No, sir.	17	First of all, in regards to you finding it
18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: None whatsoever?	18	offensive, I apologize on behalf of the company. That is
19	MR. PORTER: Our obligation is to raise it to	19	not the purpose or the Intent of the communication. The
20	this Commission. Moral obligation, if that's what we're	20	purpose and intent of the communication, we had for
21	taiking about, is to raise it to this Commission so that	21	months and actually over a year been reaching out to this
22	they can make a determination, since it's in our belief	22	Commission and to Staff trying to talk through issues.
23	under this Commission's jurisdiction under South Dakota	23	Northwestern Energy sent a letter out to its
24	Law that the Commission can make appropriate decisions		customers that we thought was very unbalanced and very
25	regarding the continuation or discontinuation of that	25	one sided. So we thought it was appropriate to send the

Page 81 to 84 of 133

	85			 87
1	easement holders a letter regarding what we see as the	1	If I'm wrong, but we don't have anywhere in the record of	•••
2	status, if you will, or the nature of ongoing service,	2	this proceeding that Peoples actually had that obligation	
3	And we tried to pose some questions that we	3	in order to transfer, Is that correct?	
4	think are fair questions. And the intention was not to	4	MR. PORTER: No. I think there is evidence.	
5	incite anything. It was to make sure they were aware of	5	And I think the evidence is in the Affidavit, the sworn	
6	both sides. And we tried to point those issues out to	6	Affidavit that we provided to point out what those	
7	them. Not trying to incite anything or offend anybody,	7	what the services were being provided prior to the sale	
8	but we did believe that a direct communication was	8	In 1985 and that those very same services were being	
9	appropriate.	9	provided after 1985.	
10	And given the feedback that we're receiving and	10	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.	
11	the calls that we received, we think it hit that mark.	11	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Rislov, do you have any	
12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Hit what mark?	12	questions?	
13	MR. PORTER: Hit the goal of encouraging the	13	MR, RISLOV: I may have one or two.	
14	customers to know what's going on and if they're	14	Mr. Porter, do you have something that describes	
15	interested or if they're concerned, to get involved.	15	what your definition of termination of service means,	
16	COMMISSIONER HANSON: The mark of informing them	16	something more expansive than what's in that agreement?	
17	of what was taking place could have been done by, for	17	MR. PORTER: What agreement are you referring	
18	instance, the three issues that were brought up at the	18	to, sir?	
19	beginning of this meeting for the purposes of this	19	MR. RISLOV: Well, the '87 Agreement, the	
20	meeting regarding who has jurisdiction.	20	agreement that appeared when NorthWestern took over for	
21	There are certain things in this letter that one	21	MERC where you talk about termination of service at a	
22	could construe could have been written far better. And	22	certain date.	
23	as you read this letter, I'm sure you would agree with	23	I know we're getting into deep in the	
24	me. And there are items in this letter that should have	24	legalities, but, as I read It, a layperson, it seems to	
25	been left out.	25	me termination of service means termination of service.	
	86	†		88
1	MR. PORTER: I haven't looked at the I'll	1	And I think your explanation to the Commissioners is	
2	directly respond, and then, Laura, please do.	2	something you have it saying something different than	
3	I haven't looked at the letter to see what we	3	that. You have it conditional termination, yet they	
4	could have done better or anything. But If I read It,	4	still have to provide all the services, and I find that	
5	I'm I can't read a document but think I could do	5	confusing.	
6	better than what I did the previous time. So I would	6	Do you have something that would explain that,	
7	agree with your statement to the extent that do we think	7	and was that presented to NorthWestern at that time you	
8	we could do better knowing what we know now? Yeah. I	8	signed that agreement or you approved them taking over	
9		9		
40	think we probably could.		service?	
10	think we probably could. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, If your Intent as	10	service? MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may.	
10		1		
	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your Intent as	10	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may.	
11	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, if your Intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" Instead	10 11	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination	
11 12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was	10 11 12	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the	
11 12 13	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this	10 11 12 13	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination In there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years	
11 12 13 14	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and	10 11 12 13 14	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985 .	
11 12 13 14 15	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that.	10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two	
11 12 13 14 15 16	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination In there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985.	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have a follow up. One	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985. MR. RISLOV: So if I can put this in ordinary	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have a follow up. One follow up.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985. MR. RISLOV: So if I can put this in ordinary language terms, not attorney terms, was NorthWestern	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have a follow up. One follow up. In response to one of Commissioner Flegen's	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985. MR. RISLOV: So if I can put this in ordinary language terms, not attorney terms, was NorthWestern aware of what you thought termination of service meant?	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have a follow up. One follow up. In response to one of Commissioner Fiegen's questions, Mr. Porter, you talked about the 1985	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985. MR. RISLOV: So if I can put this in ordinary language terms, not attorney terms, was NorthWestern aware of what you thought termination of service meant? Were they in agreement with that? Do you have any Idea?	
 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Weil, if your intent as you stated was to I'll use the word "arouse" instead of incite, but I believe it incited people. If that was your intent, to get action from them, then certainly this type of a letter with misleading statements and inflammatory statements certainly would accomplish that. However, if your first goal, as you said, was to inform the people, it was very lacking in that respect. Thank you, Mr. de Hueck. CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have a follow up. One follow up. In response to one of Commissioner Fiegen's questions, Mr. Porter, you talked about the 1985 Agreement where Peoples transfer "the obligation to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. PORTER: A couple of issues there, if I may. First of all, the 1987 Agreement has termination in there. That can terminate. It doesn't impact the obligations to serve that were transferred two years prior in 1985. So I encourage everyone to look at those two things differently. They overlap, but termination of the '87 Agreement does not dilute, minimize, or eliminate the obligation that was transferred in 1985. MR. RISLOV: So if I can put this in ordinary language terms, not attorney terms, was NorthWestern aware of what you thought termination of service meant? Were they in agreement with that? Do you have any idea? Because it appears today they don't agree. MR. PORTER: I do not have any idea, and I do agree with you that it doesn't I mean, today it seems	

22 of 53 sheets

۰ ۲ ۰۰۰			
1	89		91
2		1	dilutes the language of the easement.
3			MR. DE HUECK: Okay. Thank you.
4		3	With that, we'll recess? We'll reconvene at
5		4	1:30.
6	•	5	(A lunch break is taken)
7			MR. DE HUECK: Good afternoon, everyone. I will
8		7	call the hearing back to order in NG16-014. Again, my
9	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8	name is Adam de Hueck, and I'm the Hearing Examiner
10	question.	9	today.
11	MR. RISLOV: The same language UtiliCorp that they could terminate service. And I think It said	10	But before we proceed any farther with oral
12		11	argument, we do have a matter of housekeeping to take
13	May 31, 2017.	12	care of.
14	Were they aware of your interpretation.		Northern had made a Motion to Accept a
15	MR. PORTER: Oh, I'm sure they were, yes. I	14	Supplemental Brief, and now I'll turn it over to Chris.
16	mean, yeah. The '87 Agreement was entered into between	15	CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would move to grant
17	Northern and UtiliCorp. UtiliCorp, pursuant to the 1985	16	Northern's Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief
18	Agreement and all the states, the tariffs that they had	17	and Supplemental Brief of Northern Natural Gas Company.
19	on file with the states that regulated them, they knew	18	Discussion on the Motion?
	what their obligations were. Entered into the 1987	19	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Second.
20	Agreement to memorialize those obligations.	20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Discussion on the Motion.
21	As that agreement terminates It does not change	21	Hearing none, all those in favor will vote aye.
22	the obligation that	22	Those opposed, nay.
	MR. RISLOV: I understand that's what you think.	23	Commissioner Hanson.
24 25	I'm wondering what UtiliCorp thought.	24	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
20	MR. PORTER: I can't answer what UtiliCorp	25	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
	90		92
1 2	thought other than what I just said.	1	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Flegen votes aye.
3	MR. RISLOV: I think that's all I have.	2	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. The Motion
4	MR. DE HUECK: I have one quick question.	3	carries. The Motion is granted.
5	MR. PORTER: Yes, sir.	4	With that, I'll turn it back to Mr. de Hueck.
6	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Porter, I found your discussion with Chairman Nelson about the express terms	5	MR. DE HUECK: Before moving on with
7	of the easement very interesting. And whether or not	6	NorthWestern's oral argument, I'd like to ask the
8	Northern has an obligation to provide a vendee under the	8	Commissioners if they have any further questions for Northern,
9	terms of the easement,	9	
10	My question is to you has that issue ever been	10	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I just have a clarifying question, Mr. de Hueck, for Northern If I may ask.
11	litigated?	11	You talked a lot about obligation of service.
12	MR. PORTER: Not with Northern Natural or any	12	And we asked you about the the termination of service.
13	proceeding that I'm aware of.	13	So we talked about termination of service, and what I
14	Whether the term "vendee" has been litigated in	14	thought I heard you said is, yes, they can terminate
15	any jurisdiction, I'm not sure. But not regarding	15	their service according to those agreements that were
16	Northern.	16	signed. But the obligation of service is still there.
17	MR. DE HUECK: And then just very quickly, I	17	And I heard different places where the
18	want to make sure I'm following you here.	18	obligation of service. So could you clarify to me who
19	Termination of the '87 does not dilute the '85	19	
20	Agreement; correct?	20	the obligation of service is to or who has the obligation of service? Although they can terminate an agreement,
21	MR. PORTER: Yes, sir.	21	
22	MR. DE HUECK: But the '85 Agreement can dilute	22	who has the obligation of service?
23	the express language of the easement, no problem.	23	MR. PORTER: Yeah. That's a good question. Thank you.
24	MR. PORTER: I'm not sure I understand your I	23 24	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And I know you've answered
25	think there's a point there, but I wouldn't say that it	2 4 25	it. I just need it clarified again.
	Rahadta	20	

			95
	93		
	MR. PORTER: That's fair. The 1987 Agreement	1	obligation to find a vendor.
2	let me say it this way. The 1987 Agreement does not	2	MR. PORTER: Somebody may have a view on that.
3	affect the obligation and liabilities that were assumed	3	I don't know what that argument would be so it's hard to
4	by UtiliCorp.		address. I don't think their personally I don't see
5	So to the extent you find that the obligation to	5	that, but I don't know what that argument would be.
6	provide utility service to farm tap customers was	6	In regards to the obligation, we know that it
7	transferred from InterNorth to UtiliCorp, that obligation		went from it was at Aquila and went to MERC. To what
8	is with UtiliCorp and its successors, regardless of the	8	extent it went to MERC, we don't know. We know they
9	'87 Agreement or any other agreement. Unless it was	9	filed tariffs with the Commission to provide that service
10	further transferred.	10	to the farm tap customers. They were acting as if they
11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So successors as?	11	had the obligation. But, again, I don't know what the
12	MR. PORTER: Successors would be from UtillCorp,	12	documents said.
13	Peoples, so the same company, went to change the name to	13	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: But remind me, Mr. Porter,
14	Aquila. So same entity yet. Then to MERC. Some of it	14	in your agreements didn't you have to approve all those
15	went to other utilities that aren't in your jurisdiction.	15	agreements?
16	But relevant to this proceeding, would have been	16	MR. PORTER: No.
17	to MERC because MERC took Minnesota and the South Dakota	17	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay.
18	properties.	18	MR. PORTER: Excuse me. For assignment of the
19	And then the question is NorthWestern. What did	19	1987 Agreement Northern, had to approve that assignment.
20	they what did they assume in regards to the '87	20	But I'm not talking about the '87 Agreement. I'm talking
21	Agreement.	21	about the responsibility that was transferred in 1985.
22	Somebody in their briefing asked of those	22	That was transferred through an acquisition of the assets
23	original obligations, that obligation to serve utility	23	and liabilities.
24	utility service to farm taps, was that transferred to	24	There's not another obligation to further
25	NorthWestern?	25	transfer that, UtiliCorp to further transfer that, unless
	94		. 96
1	94 I don't know. We don't have any of those	1	96 they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets
1 2		1 2	
	I don't know. We don't have any of those		they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila
2	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is	2	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened
2 3	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila.	2	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila
2 3 4	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the	2 3 4 5 6	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern.	2 3 4 5	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved.
2 3 4 5	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies?	2 3 4 5 6	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that	2 3 4 5 6 7	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one, Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know it's not Northern, I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know it's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one, Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents. So UtillCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know it's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it is not we don't have those documents. So UtiliCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified to a number of customers, and NorthWestern is providing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents. So UtillCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents. So UtillCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was transferred, is not in the record.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified to a number of customers, and NorthWestern is providing services to those customers presently. If additional farmers, ranchers, or communities
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents. So UtiliCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was transferred, is not in the record. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. And so then the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified to a number of customers presently. If additional farmers, ranchers, or communities were Interested In having that same service provided by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have reaily no idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know it's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it is not we don't have those documents. So UtiliCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was transferred, is not in the record. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. And so then the obligation of service doesn't appear that legally we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified to a number of customers, and NorthWestern is providing services to those customers presently. If additional farmers, ranchers, or communities were Interested In having that same service provided by you, by another provider, would you be willing or do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I don't know. We don't have any of those documents. We don't see those documents. That is between the successors of I guess at that point Aquila. So we don't know what the transaction between Aquila and MERC or between MERC and NorthWestern. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you're telling me the obligation of service, you have really no Idea where that lies? MR. PORTER: I've got an Idea, but I don't have COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: A legal. MR. PORTER: Yes. I know It's not Northern. I know InterNorth transferred that to UtillCorp. After UtiliCorp I think it was Staff that said in their Reply Brief it Is not we don't have those documents. So UtiliCorp, Aquila to MERC, those aren't in the record. And the MERC, as far as I know, the MERC to NorthWestern, to the extent that obligation was transferred, is not in the record. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. And so then the obligation of service doesn't appear that legally we actually know for sure. According to your testimony	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they sign the agreement. But they can sell those assets and sell those liabilities, and that's what happened here. So there's no obligation for UtiliCorp or Aquila to come to Northern it wouldn't have been Northern. It would have been InterNorth, to get approved. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANSON: I have one. Excuse me. Forgive me if this has already been asked and answered. If NorthWestern wanted to serve additional customers along the line, do you know what Northern's position would be from a standpoint of allowing them to serve additional customers? Would you provide the same services that you are presently to NorthWestern so they could provide those services? MR. PORTER: I think I'm with you on the question. Along our line? So if a new COMMISSIONER HANSON: Well, presently you're serving up to that point that we discussed and clarified to a number of customers presently. If additional farmers, ranchers, or communities were Interested In having that same service provided by

~		Т	99
1		1	customers.
2	-	2	When we negotlated that acquisition of the
3	To the extent a easement grantor has a farm tap	3	Milbank Pipeline we were very explicit that we were
4	provision in their easement and they ask for a tap, we	4	willing to undertake those service obligations through
5	will provide that tap. We've got an obligation to	5	the end of 2017. That limitation was documented as part
6	furnish the tap. We will do that, as long as there is a	6	of that transaction. It was reviewed and adopted as part
7	utility to provide or somebody to provide the utility	7	of this Commission's Docket in NG11-001.
8	service.	8	I also want to point out that in that
9	Northern would not do that, but Northern would	9	acquisition of those Milbank Pipeline assets NorthWestern
10	get the gas to the through its facilities, Northern	10	did not acquire any of the assets of the farm tap
11	facilities.	11	customers that are a part of this docket. We don't
12	COMMISSIONER HANSON: So you're saying in a	12	operate any of those equipment or facilities. For the
13	sltuation where there's an existing easement and existing	13	most part we don't even know where the bulk of those
14	line as opposed to building additional transmission	14	facilities are.
15	systems,	15	We know where the farm tap is, and we know where
16	MR. PORTER: Yes. Northern generally is not	16	it enters the ground. But after those facilities enter
17	agreeing and I can't say it categorically, but we no	17	the ground, we do not know where the bulk of them are.
18	longer include farm tap provisions as a general rule in	18	We do provide a number of services pursuant to
19	our easements.	19	the 1987 Agreement that's been discussed, and the
20	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Okay. I just wanted that	20	assignment of a portion of those services to us. We fill
21	clarified. Thank you.	21	the odorant receptacle every year. We bill Northern's
22	Thank you.	22	farm tap customers on a monthly basis. We read the meter
23	MR. DE HUECK: With that, NorthWestern, you may	23	once a year, and, as has been discussed earlier, the farm
24	proceed.	24	tap customer is required to read it on a monthly basis.
25	MR. OLSON: Thank you. Tim Olson on behalf of	25	When that doesn't happen we estimate usage based on prior
	98		100
1	NorthWestern. Thank you, Commissioners, for this	1	usage.
2	opportunity.	2	We also are a first call responder for the farm
3	When this landed on my desk I first asked the	3	tap customers. If they believe there is a problem with
4	question why is there a service to these customers? And	4	their service, we are called to determine what that
5	that points all the way back to the 1950s and those	5	problem is. But if we discover the problem, a leak or
6	easements.	6	something else, we cannot fix it. We cannot address it.
7	Northern obtained those easements in exchange	7	It's either the customer's responsibility, the farm tap
8	for their agreements. And this was discussed earlier so	8	customer's responsibility if it's on their line, or it's
9	I don't need to go into depth on this, but those	9	Northern's responsibility if it's part of the farm tap.
10	agreements involved providing access via a farm tap and	10	There are there's a distinction that I think
11	furnishing gas, either by directly grantee, Northern, or	11	has been weaving its way through the discussion today,
12	indirectly by grantee. And it is in those shoes that	12	and that is the direct responsibility to serve and the
13	those vendee of grantee shoes that NorthWestern sits	13	indirect responsibility to serve. And when we look at
14	today.	14	that 1985 Agreement and the responsibilities that Peoples
15	If we would not have acquired that Milbank	15	sold as part of that or that Northern sold, those
		16	are those are the vendee responsibilities that left.
16	Pipeline, we would not be in front of the Commission		
17	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve	17	And what we haven't talked about on the 1985
17 18	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to		And what we haven't talked about on the 1985 Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second
17 18 19	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017.	17 18 19	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the
17 18 19 20	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017. But our role began in 2001 2011, excuse me,	17 18 19 20	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the responsibilities that "prior to closing were Northern's
17 18 19 20 21	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017. But our role began in 2001 2011, excuse me, when we acquired the unrelated Milbank Pipeline. A	17 18 19 20 21	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the responsibilities that "prior to closing were Northern's responsibility shall be Northern's responsibility after
17 18 19 20 21 22	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017. But our role began in 2001 2011, excuse me, when we acquired the unrelated Milbank Pipeline. A condition of that transaction was that we provide	17 18 19 20 21 22	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the responsibilities that "prior to closing were Northern's responsibility shall be Northern's responsibility after closing."
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017. But our role began in 2001 2011, excuse me, when we acquired the unrelated Milbank Pipeline. A condition of that transaction was that we provide assistance to Northern for a limited duration with	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the responsibilities that "prior to closing were Northern's responsibility shall be Northern's responsibility after closing." The 1985 Agreement did not change the 1950s
17 18 19 20 21 22	today. We would not have an obligation to publicly serve these customers. We have a contractual obligation to serve those customers through the end of 2017. But our role began in 2001 2011, excuse me, when we acquired the unrelated Milbank Pipeline. A condition of that transaction was that we provide	17 18 19 20 21 22	Agreement are what Northern retained. And in the second Paragraph, B, of that agreement it said the responsibilities that "prior to closing were Northern's responsibility shall be Northern's responsibility after closing."

×.

	104		. 103
	101		
1	One of the customers filed comments in these	1	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Earlier with Staff I made
2	proceedings. David and Deanna Brouwer. They own land	2	reference to the March 8, 2011, hearing in which we
3	subject to the easement. And I believe their comments	3	approved an Order In NG11-001. And in that hearing
4	amply summarized the roles that Northern and NorthWestern	4	NorthWestern upon Commissioner questioning clearly stated
5	are filling in this with this service.	5	that it believed it was Northern's responsibility to
6	And I quote "No matter how you define the	6	continue to serve customers with gas after 2017.
7	entities in this case, what has occurred here is a	7	And so my question is was it your was it
8	contract in which Northern in exchange for land easements	8	NorthWestern's clear understanding back in 2011 that come
9	has agreed to provide natural gas via a farm tap." The	9	2017 that was going to responsibility was going to
10	Browers continued, "I would consider NorthWestern's part	10	shift back to Northern? Is that correct?
11	in this situation as that of a subcontractor of Northern.	11	MR. OLSON: That is correct. We made that, our
12	UltImately it is Northern's responsibility to provide	12	belief there, very explicit as part of the negotiations
13	service to the current farm tap customers. That can	13	for that transaction.
14	continue to be done with renegotiation of NorthWestern's	14	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And, in fact, that's what you
15	contract or by finding another subcontractor to provide	15	clearly conveyed to the Commission; correct?
16	this service. In the past Northern has formed its own	16	MR. OLSON: That is correct.
17	subcontractor to provide this service, and that certainly	17	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Is it still NorthWestern's
18	could be an option once again at this time. I would say	18	position that Northern has that obligation after 2017?
19	that the current contract that NorthWestern has with	19	MR. OLSON: Yes.
20	Northern is just that, a contract that was made in 1987	20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: If you would pull out Staff's
21	that is due to be renegotiated at this time."	21	Reply Brief, I want to ask just a few questions from
22	We have reached out to Northern in an attempt to	22	that. And if we go to page 6, Staff Reply Brief page 6,
23	renegotiate the terms of this agreement which expire at	23	Section B, first paragraph. Staff makes a statement that
24	the end of next year. To this point we have not been	24	"NorthWestern Is a public utility only through 2017," as
25	able to get Northern to come to the negotiation table.	25	it relates to these farm taps.
	102	1	104
1	They have refused. I don't understand that, given their	1	Do you agree with that statement?
1	They have refused. I don't understand that, given their obligations in the easements to continue to provide a	1	Do you agree with that statement? MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement.
ł			
2	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here.	2	MR. OLSON; I don't agree with that statement.
2 3	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that	2 3	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer.
2 3 4	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here.	2 3 4	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have
2 3 4 5	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking	2 3 4 5	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect
2 3 4 5 6	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers.
2 3 4 5 6 7	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot fix issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are, We cannot fix issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot fix issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's vendee per the easement language?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in their mind is a quandary. And I'm wondering if you would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's vendee per the easement language? MR. OLSON: Yes. We do. The reason I say that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brlef, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in their mind is a quandary. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to, you know, provide your insight.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's vendee per the easement language? MR. OLSON: Yes. We do. The reason I say that Is we entered into this service arrangement pursuant to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in their mind is a quandary. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to, you know, provide your insight. Apparently in the '87 Agreement Peoples was able to close
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's vendee per the easement language? MR. OLSON: Yes. We do. The reason I say that is we entered into this service arrangement pursuant to a contract. That contract we were assigned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in their mind is a quandary. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to, you know, provide your insight. Apparently in the '87 Agreement Peoples was able to close Northern's inlet valve for nonpayment of bills.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	obligations in the easements to continue to provide a vendee for this gas, but that is what's happened here. To suggest, as they did earlier, that NorthWestern is just abandoning this service and walking away without doing anything is not accurate. I understand and can appreciate that the way Northern is organized today, they cannot directly provide the gas to the customers. But that doesn't change the promises they made in the easements. They can still find a vendee, a subcontractor, another party to provide that service. With that, I'll be happy to answer questions from the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I do have some questions. Thank you. And I think you answered this question at the outset, but I'm going to ask it again just to be clear. Does Northwestern Energy consider itself to be Northern's vendee per the easement language? MR. OLSON: Yes. We do. The reason I say that Is we entered into this service arrangement pursuant to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. OLSON: I don't agree with that statement. I personally find it a very difficult question to answer. We have some hallmarks of a public utility, and we have some hallmarks of not being a public utility with respect to these farm tap customers. We don't own any of these assets. We don't know where the assets are. We cannot flx issues with respect to these assets. But, on the other hand, the Order approved a rate for these, although it was simply adopting the rate that MERC used with respect to these customers. So I don't agree with Staff's position, but I also don't disagree with it so I'm being very unhelpful to the Commission. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, that's helpful. But thank you for your candor. I appreciate that. Moving to page 5 of that same Brief, the first paragraph, Staff does a nice job of laying out what in their mind is a quandary. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to, you know, provide your insight. Apparently in the '87 Agreement Peoples was able to close

	105		
1		1	don't know if it's on the second picture or not. It's
2		2	right at the meter there.
3		3	
4		4	Peoples document; correct?
5	Commission and the other participants here to the picture	5	MR. OLSON: That is from a Peoples document.
6	of the farm tap. And I can attempt to walk us through	6	MS. BARUTH: When I was given this document
7	that.	7	MERC I was told this is a document they use to tell
8	I would state today that the farm tap inlet	8	
9	valve on the blue side of the diagram in the lower	9	
10	left-hand corner is something that NorthWestern does not	10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	touch.	11	customers to tell them what they needed to put into the
12	On the other side of the diagram, the three-way	12	5
13	valve which the customer owns, if there were to be a	13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
14	failure to pay, that is the valve that we would turn.	14	included in those specifications are a series of
15	Now many of the farm tap services are not as	15	components, including the three-way valve, the farm tap
16	pretty as this one. They've been out in the fields for	16	wick odorizer, et cetera.
17	years. And so sometimes in situations we've come across	17	And I would also remind the Commission that w
18	those valves that customer-owned valves that we don't	18	we entered the picture here we did not acquire any of
19	care to touch because of what might happen. In those	19	these assets. Our only relation here is pursuant to that
20	situations we have to contact Northern to deal with the	20	1987 Agreement, a portion of which was assigned to us.
21	other valve.	21	We don't have any of these assets on our books. We are
22	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So fair to say that you've had	22	not depreciating any of these assets. We can't. We
23	to shut some of these off; is that correct?	23	don't own them.
24	MR. OLSON: Yes.	24	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, and I think this begin
25	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And when you say that they're	25	to maybe clear up what had been muddled in my mind
	106		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	not all as pretty as this, obviously this one has been	1	because we've had earlier discussion about we don't know
2	very recently painted and does look very, very nice. But	2	who ultimately or initially paid for that three-way valve
3	I can imagine that prior to it didn't look nearly as nice	3	or can. But what apparently Peoples in this document
4	as this does,	4	is claiming that the customers did. And then that's also
5	We're going to have just a little bit of	5	your understanding.
6	interruption, but we'll keep going.	6	MR. OLSON: That is our understanding, yes.
7	So you made the statement that you believe the	7	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so on this picture inste
8	three-way valve belongs to the customer?	8	of three colors, there should only be two colors. The
9	MR. OLSON: Yes.	9	red should be yellow; correct?
10	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So how did the ownership of	10	MR. OLSON: We believe that is inaccurate as
11	that does the customer also own the can?	11	depicted.
12	MR. OLSON: Yes.	12	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Northern referred to a lette
13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: So how did the ownership of	13	that apparently they believe NorthWestern sent to all of
14	that valve and can transfer from Peoples to the customer?	14	these farm tap customers. Is that in the record?
15	MR. OLSON: I have a document here that is not	15	MR. OLSON: Yes, it is.
16	part of the record. And I recognize that. But it is the	16	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can you refer me to
17	Peoples Natural Gas Construction Manual. And this is	17	MR. OLSON: It is very near the top of the
18	something that we have handed out to some of the farm tap	18	docket. November 14, 2016, Northwestern Energy Sample
19	customers.	19	Letter.
20	MS. BARUTH: I just had it as record from MERC.	20	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Perfect. That's all the
20	It was given to me by MERC as record.	21	questions I've got at the moment.
21		00	
21 2 2	MR. OLSON: Thank you,	22	Thank you.
21	MR. OLSON: Thank you. It defines the customer fuel line as the piping	22	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Flegen.
21 22 23	•		

1 MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson. 2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Neither do I. Thark you. 3 MR. DE HUECK: That means we've concluded our 4 first round of oral argument. 5 I'm surry, Brett. I forgot about you over 6 them. You're so quict. 7 MR. No EHUECK: Cutte okay, Adam. 8 Orlghally this docket startad out looking like 9 agerent broad question of what were the rights and 10 responsibilities of people providing farm top service. 11 MDU responsibilities of people providing farm top service. 12 through Williston basin and also through Its regulated 13 uillty, and so if felt like something MDU should show up 14 the seems after this question like it's a much 16 Th seems after this question like it's a much 16 Th seems after this question like it's a much 17 more narrow dispute than twas originally held out to 18 be. So I might on tifle a hind. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 oring this docket, It	_		<u> </u>	
2 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Neither do I. Thenk you, MR. DE NUECK. That means we've concluded our first our of oral argument. 2 So, with that, we've now finished our first 3 Tim sorry, Bratt. I forget about you over 6 there. You're so quet. 7 MR. KOENECKE: Quite okey, Adam. 6 Tim sorry, Bratt. I forget about you over 6 there. You're so quet. 5 I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 7 MR. KOENECKE: Quite okey, Adam. 6 It seems like we're more at conviduing remarks too. So 7 Tim K, NOENECKE: Quite okey, Adam. 6 It seems like we're more at conviduing remarks too. So 7 Tempositibilities of people providing farm taps envice. 6 It seems like we're more at conviduing remarks too. So 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 6 It seems like we're more at conviduing remarks too. So 12 through Willston Baain and also through its regulated 10 10 10 10 10 13 thore of mills and also through its people. 10 10 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11				111
3 MR. DE HUECK: That means we've concluded our 3 round of oral argument. 4 do is start black from the beginning starting with Start. 5 I'm sorry, Fertz I. forget about you over 6 there. You're so quiet. 5 I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 6 there. You're so quiet. 7 I'm sorry, Fertz Quite okay, Adam. 6 I's seems like we're more at concluding remarks too. So 7 MR. KOENECKE: Quite okay, Adam. 6 I's seems like we're more at concluding remarks too. So 8 originally this docket started out tooking like a general broad queestion of what were the rights and 10 responsibilities of people providing farm tap service. 11 Agreement as It's been partayed, it's esems odd to me that 12 have a farm thes gueston like it's a much 11 alrage sum of morey, even by today's standards, would 13 here sens after this queston like it's a much 15 broader queston. 16 It's seems after this queston like it's a much 15 broader queston. 17 responsibility to doke that the sen it's a social to a valid of innitates. I vouid 16 the seems after this queston like it's a much 18 broader queston. 16 the definition				
4 first round of oral argument. 4 do is start back from the beginning starting with Staff. 5 Tm sorry, Brett, I forgot about you over 6 Iterms to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 6 there, You're so quict. 5 I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 7 MR, KOENECKE: Quite okay, Adam. 5 I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 8 Originally this docket started out looking like a general forwal question. 6 8 Originally this docket started out looking like a general more question. 6 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 14 a large sum of money, even by today's standards, would 12 a large sum of money, even by today's standards, would 13 have changed hands in a calification transaction. 14 and be a part of. So Tm giad Tm here. It was a 15 proder question. 14 16 It seems after this question like it's a much 16 the definition of a public with start bet start back from the beginning starting with Staff. 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally meld out to 16 the definition of a public with start start back from the back of ormanications have transpreted back it band withe all 18 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				
5 I'm sorry, Brett, I forgot about you over 6 6 there, You're so quiet. I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 6 there, You're so quiet. I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 7 MR, KOENECKE: Quite okay, Adam. I wanted to call it a chance for a rebuttal, but 8 Originally this docket started out looking like 9 9 a general broad question of what were the rights and 10 responsibilities of poolpe providing farm taps 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 9 12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 13 13 broader question. 14 14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here, It was a 15 15 broader question. 15 parties seem to agree that through to general 16 the seems after this question like It's a much 16 the customers, no. company stepped forward to want the 17 more narrow dispute than it was oignaily heid out to 16 the customers, no. company stepped forward to want the 18 public. It's heid out to only these gener who have an 20 communications haso asked of Northern how many				
6 there. You're so quiet. The first sources has a first concerning to State down to and you may begin. 7 MR. KOENECKE: Quite okay, Adam. Sources has a first concerning to State down to and you may begin. 8 Originally this docket stated out looking like MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck, 9 a general broad question of what were the rights and Sources has an interest and provides farm taps 10 through Willston Basin and also through its regulated The Service Sources has an interest and provides farm taps 11 date a part of. So I'm giad I'm here. It was a The service source has a interest and provides farm taps 16 It seems like values. The service source has an interest and provides farm taps 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to The service source has a interest and provides farm taps 18 borader question. The service isn't hiel out to the general 19 tree definition of a public utility, of gas utility. Jif The service isn't held out to only those peopie who have an 26 And so it looks to me like the obligation to Serve comes from the easemetid document. That's a clicuit 10 who's got a pipe through the ground. 10 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 3 service isn't				
7 MR. KOENECKE: Quite okay, Adam. 1 8 Originally this docket started out looking like 3 9 a general broad question of what were the rights and 5 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 10 12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 11 12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 12 13 broader question. 14 Life also concerning to Staff that while all 14 Life also concerning to Staff that while all 15 15 broader question. 16 Its seems after this question like it's a much 16 Its seems after this question like it's a much 16 Its seems after this question like it's a much 16 Its seems after this question like it's a much 16 Its seems after this question like farm taps meet 17 more harrow dispute than it was originally held out to 16 Its assers after this question like farm taps 18 by you look at the statutes. Its assers after this question like farm taps meet 17 19 The service isn't held out to the general 23 would be interesting to have thoses filed in the record to		,,		
8 Originally this docket started out looking like 9 a general broad question of what were the rights and 9 a general broad question of what were the rights and 9 Commissioners. One thing that I would note is that if 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 11 Agreement was merely to darify the 1985 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 11 Agreement was merely to darify the 1985 12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 12 a large eum of money, even by today's standards, would 13 have changed hands in a clarification transaction. 13 have changed hands in a clarification transaction. 14 It's also concerning to Staff that while all 15 porties seem to agree that there is a moral obligation to 15 broader question. 16 the customers, no company stepped forward to wan the 16 the secons firm the down thel to me like farm taps meet 17 18 oblig will work, it deems't feel to me like farm taps meet 11 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 20 ormunications have transpired, buscet, it 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 22 The cormission also asked of Northern how many		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_	
 a general broad question of what were the rights and responsibilities of people providing farm top service. MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps through williston Basin and also through its regulated through Willston Basin and also through its regulated tuility, and so it fett like something MOU should show up and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a fis broader question. It seems after this question like it's a much from random dispute than it was originally held out to the so I might or might not file a brief. But since is a moral obligation to file a brief. But since is a moral obligation to file a brief. But since is any, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility. If you look at the statutes. The service lish't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 25 The Commission also asked of Northern how many 110 who's got a pipe through the ground. Moto's got a pipe through the ground. So be that as it may, it seems like a - it as serve consument? That's areal estate transaction. Moto's got a pipe through the ground. So be that as it may, it seems like a - it as serve. Gourt matter. That's a real estate transaction. So be that as it may, it seems like a - it to may be a breach of contract and sort it our there. Is the contraison of the service forw of the out and may be a breach of contract and sort it out three. Is the contraison of the service is filed and there worth on that. Like I So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I MidAmerican's tap and the file offer depending on the said. Timble offer and the service forw of the contracts the service area, sublicit to resolute offer and the service is follow. MidAmerican's tap and the service is follow. So be that as it may, it seems like a - it seems	1			
10 responsibilities of people providing farm tap service. 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 12 through Willston Basin and also through its regulated 13 hou resources has an interest and provides farm taps 14 through Willston Basin and also through its regulated 15 broader question. 16 It seems after this question like It's a much 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 11 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 14 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 10 the setwates. 110 The service lant held out to the general 14 been sant out by either party prior to the filing of this 10 who's got a pipe through the ground. 110 who's got a pipe through the ground. 111 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 112 how's so that as it may, it seems like a it 13 serve comes for mute easter transaction. 14 ubligation is	F			MS. EDWARDS: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck,
11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 11 MDU resources has an interest and provides farm taps 12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 13 utility, and so it felt like something MDU should show up 14 al arge sum of money, even by today's standards, would 15 broader question. 16 It is along on part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 17 more narrow dispute than it was ordjanaly held out to 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I'we got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, I' 23 The service lish't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those peopie who have an 25 The commission also asked of Northern how many 10 who's got a pipe through the ground. 2 I would point out that while MidAmerican's service area, 3 authority to regulate those documents. That's a clicuit fourt and 4 ort sub i dok kot me like the colligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. T			1.	
12 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 13 through Williston Basin and also through its regulated 14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 15 broader question. 16 It seems after this question like It's a much 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 18 bs out of might on might not file a brief. But since 19 I'w got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, If 22 you look at the statutes. 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 broads to in locks to me like the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 oblight on that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the commission has 6 authority to regulate these documents. That's a clicuit 7 out I do lens the as timay, it seems like a - it		1	1	
13 utility, and so it felt like something MDU should show up 13 have changed hands in a clarification transaction. 14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 14 It's also concerning to Staff that while all 15 broader question. 14 It's also concerning to Staff that while all 16 It seems after this question like it's a much 15 parties seem to agree that there is a moral obligation to 16 the seems after this question like it's a much 15 parties seem to agree that there is a moral obligation to 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 16 the customers, no company stepped forward to warm the 17 rund to microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 19 T'm note entrely certain of what all 20 communications have transpired, but if other letters have 21 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, If 22 docket or subsequent to the filing of this docket, it 23 The service isn't held out to the general 22 would be interesting to have those filed in the record to 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The Commission also asked of Northern how many 110 who's got a pipe through the groun				
14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 14 and be a part of. So I'm glad I'm here. It was a 15 broader question. 16 It seems after this question like it's a much 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I'w got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 14 I'm ot entirely certain of what all 20 communications have transpired, but if other letters have 21 you look at the statutes. 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 10 110 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's a circuit 10 the definition of a vabil. Use the billing of that service 3 obligation is found in that paragr				
15 broader question. 16 It seems after this question like It's a much 17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 22 you look at the statutes. 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The controls isn't held out to only those people who have an 26 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 10 who's got a pipe through the ground. 1 2 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 1 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as Tim reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the colmission has 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may		71		have changed hands in a clarification transaction.
16 It seems after this question like it's a much 17 It seems after this question like it's a much 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 21 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 21 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 22 or by filing the Docket. 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The Commission also asked of Northern how many 110 110 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 2 And so it looks to me like the colligation to serve comes from the easement document. That's where the obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 authority to regulate these documents. That's where the 6 outhorty to regulate those documents. That's a real estate transaction. 7 but I do know of the contacts that we've gott that are 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 see				
17 more narrow dispute than it was originally held out to 18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 Tve got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, if 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 The commission also asked of Northern how many 10 110 11 who's got a pipe through the ground. 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 5 that definite tariff their tariff in Section 2 of the tariff we 5 that they from the as it may, it seems like a it 8 so be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 toekn			15	parties seem to agree that there is a moral obligation to
18 be. So I might or might not file a brief. But since 19 I've got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 22 you look at the statutes. 23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 10 100 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 2 And so it looks to me like the colligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the commission has 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like lit's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the parvises to follow 13				
19 Twe got the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 10 We of the microphone for a couple of minutes, I would 20 say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet 11 1 I'm not entirely certain of what all 21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 22 ormunications have transpired, but if other letters have 23 The service isn't held out to the general 22 docket or subsequent to the filling of this 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 23 see what else customers have been told. 25 The commission also asked of Northern how many 110 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 110 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 110 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 3 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 5 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 6 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 7 8 So			17	customers until Staff filed their hand by forcing the
20say, you know, it doesn't feel to me like farm taps meet the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if you look at the statutes.20communications have transpired, but if other letters have tables customers have been sent out by either party prior to the filing of this docket or subsequent to the filing of this docket, it tables customers have been told.21public. It's held out to only those people who have an ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody20communications have transpired, but if other letters have 			18	or by filing the Docket.
21 the definition of a public utility, of gas utility, if 22 you look at the statutes. 23 The service Isn't held out to the general 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 25 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 10 10 110 110 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area. 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area. 2 And so it looks to me like the commission has obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 1 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the commission has 2 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 6 7 but I do know of the contacts that we've gotten that are 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 8 9 seemselike it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 1 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 10 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 11			19	I'm not entirely certain of what all
22you look at the statutes.22docket or subsequent to the filing of this docket, it23The service isn't held out to the general24would be interesting to have those filed in the record to24public. It's held out to only those people who have an24see what else customers have been told.25The Commission also asked of Northern how many1101who's got a pipe through the ground.25The Commission also asked of Northern how many1101of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area.3serve comes from the easement document. That's where the obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 'm reading15that. And it doesn't feel to me like the commission has a authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit67Court matter. That's a real estate transaction.88So be that as it may, it seems like a it69seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and910wayle a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the1011contract breached without the provision of that service1112found in No. 37Ad, if so, is specific performance a1213seid, I might or might not file a brief depending on1414through on its agreement?1515So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I1516said, I might or might not file a brief depending on1617that or suggested that it might be a good idea for	1	-	20	communications have transpired, but if other letters have
23 The service isn't held out to the general 24 would be interesting to have those filed in the record to 24 public. It's held out to only those people who have an 23 would be interesting to have those filed in the record to 25 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 110 112 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 25 The Commission also asked of Northern how many 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 3 unlike an electric territory, is not a territory, it is 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 5 detailed in their tariff in Section 2 of the tariff we 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 I don't know where all the 197 farm taps are, 6 Low of the contacts that we've gotten that are 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 8 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 9 those consumers do appear to be down there in that <th></th> <th></th> <th>21</th> <th>been sent out by either party prior to the filing of this</th>			21	been sent out by either party prior to the filing of this
24public. It's held out to only those people who have an 2524see what else customers have been told.25ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody24see what else customers have been told.11101121121who's got a pipe through the ground.1101122And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading1of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area.3serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading1of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area.3unlike an electric territory, is not a territory, is not a territory, is not a territory, is not a territory.1124detailed in their tariff in Section 2 of the tariff we 5 do discuss what communities they serve.16I don't know where all the 197 farm taps are, 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction.58So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service1011Yankton Gayville area, which is specifie in 111111Ware tare says they haven't reached out to 1113remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 141114through on its agreement?1115So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 161		you look at the statutes.	22	docket or subsequent to the filing of this docket, it
25 ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody 25 The Commission also asked of Northern how many 1 10 110 112 1 who's got a pipe through the ground. 10 112 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 10 112 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 10 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 1 of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area, 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 1 of their tariff in Section 2 of the tariff we 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 6 I don't know where all the 197 farm taps are, 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 those consumers do appear to be down there in that 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 10 Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 11 MidAmerican. Staff did, did make that	1	÷	23	would be interesting to have those filed in the record to
101101101who's got a pipe through the ground.1102And so it looks to me like the obligation to13serve comes from the easement document. That's where the14obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading15that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has16authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit17Court matter. That's a real estate transaction.68So be that as it may, it seems like a it69seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and910maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the1011contract breached without the provision of that service1111maybe a Signer matter?11012wasn't a successful attempt.13remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow1314through on its agreement?1515So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on17where this goes. This really feels like a very specific	1		24	see what else customers have been told.
1who's got a pipe through the ground.1of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area,2And so it looks to me like the obligation to2I would point out that while MidAmerican's service area,3serve comes from the easement document. That's where theobligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading2I would point out that while MidAmerican's service area,4obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading4detailed in their tariff in Section 2 of the tariff we5that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has5do discuss what communities they serve.6authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit6I don't know where all the 197 farm taps are,7Court matter. That's a real estate transaction.7but I do know of the contacts that we've gotten that are8So be that as it may, it seems like a it8filed in the docket from consumers. They appear to be9seems like it's ripe for an action In Circuit Court and9those consumers do appear to be down there in that10maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the10Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in11contract breached without the provision of that service11MidAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It13remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow13MidAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It14through on its agreement?14wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I15 <th>25</th> <th>ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody</th> <th>25</th> <th>The Commission also asked of Northern how many</th>	25	ability to have a farm tap in the first place. Somebody	25	The Commission also asked of Northern how many
 2 And so it looks to me like the obligation to 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as 1'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 10 or during the this goes. This really feels like a very specific 11 or that or suggested that it might be a good idea for 				112
 3 serve comes from the easement document. That's where the obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 			1	of the 197 customers are in MidAmerican's service area.
 4 obligation is found in that paragraph 3 as I'm reading 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 37 And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 	1		2	I would point out that while MidAmerican's service area,
 5 that. And it doesn't feel to me like the Commission has authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 6 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 			3	unlike an electric territory, is not a territory, it is
 authority to regulate those documents. That's a Circuit Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. So be that as it may, it seems like a it seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the contract breached without the provision of that service found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement? So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 	[4	
 7 Court matter. That's a real estate transaction. 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 7 but I do know of the contacts that we've gotten that are 8 filed in the docket from consumers. They appear to be 9 those consumers do appear to be down there in that 10 Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in 11 MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike 12 Northern says they haven't reached out to 13 might or might not file a brief depending on 14 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 17 that or suggested that it might be a good idea for 	_		5	
 8 So be that as it may, it seems like a it 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 	6		6	
 9 seems like it's ripe for an action in Circuit Court and 10 maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the 11 contract breached without the provision of that service 12 found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a 13 remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow 14 through on its agreement? 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 15 So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I 16 said, I might or might not file a brief depending on 17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 9 those consumers do appear to be down there in that 10 Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in 11 MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike 12 Northern says they haven't reached out to 13 MidAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It 14 wasn't a successful attempt. 15 We've also reached out to several other 16 companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated 17 that or suggested that it might be a good idea for 	7		7	but I do know of the contacts that we've gotten that are
10maybe a breach of contract and sort it out there. Is the contract breached without the provision of that service found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement?10Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike12found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement?10Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike13remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement?13MidAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific15We've also reached out to several other companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated to might be a good idea for			8	filed in the docket from consumers. They appear to be
11contract breached without the provision of that service11MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike12found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a12Northern says they haven't reached out to13remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow13MidAmerican. Staff dld, did make that attempt. It14through on its agreement?14wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I15We've also reached out to several other16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated17where this goes. This really feels like a very specific17that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			9	
12found in No. 3? And, if so, is specific performance a remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement?12Northern says they haven't reached out to14through on its agreement?13MIdAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific15Northern says they haven't reached out to wasn't a successful attempt.16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			10	Yankton Gayville area, which is specified in
13remedy? Can the court order one of the parties to follow through on its agreement?13MldAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It wasn't a successful attempt.14through on its agreement?14wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific15MldAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It wasn't a successful attempt.16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on where this goes. This really feels like a very specific16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			11	MidAmerican's tariff. Unlike
14through on its agreement?14wasn't a successful attempt.15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I15We've also reached out to several other16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated17where this goes. This really feels like a very specific17that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			12	Northern says they haven't reached out to
15So that's my two cents worth on that. Like I15We've also reached out to several other16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated17where this goes. This really feels like a very specific17that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			13	MIdAmerican. Staff did, did make that attempt. It
16said, I might or might not file a brief depending on16companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated17where this goes. This really feels like a very specific17that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			14	wasn't a successful attempt.
17 where this goes. This really feels like a very specific 17 that or suggested that it might be a good idea for			15	We've also reached out to several other
The state of suggested that it might be a goos idea to			16	companies and other jurisdictions. Northern stated
10 Indidate solution and we have been dependent of the transmission of the second se		•	17	that or suggested that it might be a good idea for
	18	incident going on and not a broader question like it was	18	Staff to work with NorthWestern to come to a workable
19 framed up to start. So we'll see where it goes, but I 19 solution like they have in other states. And we have			19	solution like they have in other states. And we have
20sat here long enough to think I could at least offer that20explored that. We have worked exhaustively to do that.				explored that. We have worked exhaustively to do that.
21 much up. 21 And we have reached out to the Kansas		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	21	And we have reached out to the Kansas
22 MR. DE HUECK: Are there any questions for 22 Commission. We've reached out to Alliant Energy,			22	Commission. We've reached out to Aliant Energy,
23 Mr. Koenecke? 23 Black Hills, We've had extensive discussions with				Black Hills, We've had extensive discussions with
24 CHAIRMAN NELSON: For the only time in my life, 24 Black Hills. How are they making this work in their				
25 no. 25 areas? What ideas could we take and implement here? Page 109 to 112 of 133	25			

			
1	113 And, unfortunately, with our rate structures	1	115 COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I do not.
2		2	
3	other ratepayers to make sure that they're not	3	COMMISSIONER HANSON: No.
4	subsidizing anything, we don't have that same opportunity		MR. DE HUECK: With that, the floor is Northern's.
5		5	
6	where Black Hills Energy was or the other customers	6	MR. PORTER: Thank you. Just a few comments,
7	were somehow structured to where it wouldn't be	7	One in regards to Northwestern Energy's on the facilities. As far as the three-way valve and the
8	inherently unfair for those, in their case, 1,500	8	odorant tank, I believe the record will be is clear,
9	customers to spread the cost of buying the system.	9	but I just want to clarify.
10	And when they say that the Iowa Utilities Board	10	What Mr. Olson said is not inconsistent with
11	has exercised jurisdiction, it's my understanding that	11	what our view is either. We know what we own, We don't
12	Black Hills Energy is actually buying that line and is	12	know who owns down. I think there's a combination.
13	going to control that customer line. And, I mean, other	13	Mr. Olson says pursuant to a document that I've never
14	analysts, Ms. Mehlhaff and Mr. Thurber, have had these	14	looked at, the Peoples construction documents that
15	discussions with Black Hills and might know a lot more	15	might be the farm tap owners. Grant you that. Don't
16	about that, but the jurisdictional question there is very	16	know. So I just wanted to clarify that.
17	clear because Black Hills Energy in Iowa and potentially	17	What is interesting is we're talking about
18	Nebraska and Kansas, depending on how things play out, is	18	jurisdictional Issues, and it's come up a few times.
19	going to own everything that is in red or yellow in those	19	Both NorthWestern and before NorthWestern MERC had
20	states.	20	tariffs on file with the Commission to provide service to
21	Beyond that, I don't think I have anything else	21	these farm tap customers,
22	to add, other than that I don't know if she's on the	22	It seems odd for a nonjurisdictional service to
23	phone now, but our Pipelíne Safety Manager, Mary Zanter,	23	be subject to tarlffs that are on file with the
24	was going to make herself available for any questions	24	Commission. It seems that the Commission has exercised
25	since she was the one that did the 2014 inspection and	25	jurisdiction over the area, required tariffs to be placed
	114		116
1	had those discussions with Northern.	1	on file, and the regulated entities have complied with
2	Thank you.	2	that.
3	MR. DE HUECK: Commission questions.	3	So based on the history of activity, it is it
4	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Just a couple. First a	4	seems clear to Northern that it's a jurisdictional
5	statement and then a question.	5	activity and one in which the Commission has exercised
6	I appreciate what you have just said now, kind	6	authority over.
	of Illuminating for all of us the efforts that Staff has	7	There's been quite a bit of discussion on the
8	gone through to try to resolve this, short of having to	8	'85 and the '87 Agreements. And I think that's
9	go through this proceeding and whatever may emanate from	9	appropriate. I think that's where focus ought to be. An
10	that. So I appreciate that.	10	opinion was offered on what the easements what the
11	The sole question I've got, Ms. Edwards, I spent	11	obligation is under the easement. And the easement says
12	a great deal of time earlier going through the Easement	12	what it does,
13	Agreement between landowners and Northern. I did that because I wanted to understand clearly the history of	13 14	However, to say that that is controlling,
15	that.	14 15	eliminates poof the '85 Agreement where the
16	But is it correct and your understanding that	16 16	obligations to provide specific services that we provided evidence on that indicate what was provided before the
17	this Commission does not have the authority under state	17	'85 Agreement and what was provided after the '85
18	law to adjudicate issues revolving around easements and	18	Agreement just is making null and void that '85 Agreement
19	easement rights?	19	to say that those obligations did not transfer.
20	MS. EDWARDS: It absolutely is. And that's	20	And I think that from a transactional
21	something that we are very forthright with landowners	21	perspective those obligations did transfer. They
22	about in our siting dockets that we have. That's an		transferred to UtillCorp. They are with UtiliCorp or one
23	accurate statement. Yes.		of UtiliCorp's successors.
24	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.	24	Just check my notes here.
25	MR. DE HUECK: Any other questions?	25	There was a comment made regarding the 1985
	i3 sheets Page 113 to		

•

			119
	117		
	Agreement not changing the easement. And I wanted to	1	I'm not sure I mean, Northwestern Energy is a customer
2	affirm that. The '85 Agreement transferred the	2	of ours. We don't, as a practice, intervene in our
3	obligations and how those obligations were being	3	utility's matters or customers' matters unless they
4	handled transferred those to UtiliCorp. The language	4	invite us to.
5	in the easement is the same, but it has to be read in the	5	Because once we intervene, we're subject to
6	context of who was providing those who was fulfilling	6	discovery and subject to questions, and we would much
7	those obligations and who acquired them. It doesn't	7	rather have just from a customer relations perspective
8	change the language of the easement.	8	we'd rather utilities need to manage that.
9	And I think that's all I have. I appreciate	9	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Did you listen to the
10	your time.	10	hearing at all or read the Order?
11	MR. DE HUECK: Any further questions for	11	MR. PORTER: No, ma'am.
12	Northern Natural Gas?	12	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Were you aware that the
13	Commissioner Fiegen.	13	Public Utilities Commission Staff and I certainly
14	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: NorthWestern talked a	14	appreciate Ms. Edwards explaining to the Commission today
15	little bit about asking Northern to come to the table to	15	how the Commission Staff has tried to work with different
16	negotiate. Were you part of those discussions or	16	entities to address this issue.
17	MR. PORTER: I was not.	17	Have you been aware of those discussions, or did
18	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Those requests.	18	you know the Staff was working on those?
19	MR, PORTER: I'm not sure there have been those	19	MR. PORTER: I do not know the extent. I knew
20	discussions.	20	Ms. Edwards and I have had a couple discussions, two,
21	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: The requests to come to	21	three discussions. We've brought up to the Commission
22	the table?	22	and to the Commission Staff the fact that the ongoing
23	MR. PORTER: I'm not sure what that means.	23	the proceedings ongoing in Iowa. So yes. I knew that
24	We've had conversations. Our commercial groups have had	24	they had had that conversation.
25	discussions regarding this docket about what's going to	25	I had also talked to the General Counsel of the
	118		120
1	happen on December 31, 2017. It's your obligation. No,	1	Iowa Utilities Board, and I knew that they had been
2	it's your obligation. We've had those discussions.	2	called. So I knew at a very high level that there had
3	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: But no negotiations type	3	been some interaction. I have no information regarding
4	of discussion?	4	the substance of those discussions.
5	MR. PORTER: There's nothing that I would call	5	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Were you aware that they
6	negotiations, no.	6	have visited with MidAmerican?
7	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Also we talk a lot	7	MR. PORTER: I was not aware of that.
8	about the Commission's Order and the discussion at a	8	Let me say, if Ms. Edwards told me that, I don't
9	hearing in 2011, the Natural Gas 11-001.	9	remember. So no. As I sit here, I was not aware of
10	MR. PORTER: Uh-huh.	10	that.
11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Did you intervene in that	11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So we did get a copy in
12	docket?	12	the docket, the letter that you sent to the customers
13	MR. PORTER: Not that I'm aware of.	13	that Commissioner Hanson has certainly asked you a lot of
14	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And why was that?	14	questions about. It certainly surprised me when I got
15	MR. PORTER: I can't speak specifically. I	15	that letter in my Inbox also.
16	don't know. But we very rarely intervene. And this is	16	Have you sent other letters to customers, or is
17	the first one I remember in a long, long time that we've	17	this it, the only letter you have sent?
18	intervened in.	18	MR. PORTER: First of all, they're easement
19	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And you have a Government	19	holders. They're not we would not consider those
20	Affairs Department; correct?	20	customers.
21	MR. PORTER: We certainly do.	21	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Tomato tomahto.
22	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: That certainly could have	22	MR. PORTER: It's important in a sense that we
23	intervened in the 2011 docket?	23	communicate with our customers all the time.
24	MR. PORTER: We could have, but I don't know what the reason would have been. We had an agreement.	24	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Correct,
25		25	MR. PORTER: Laura.

Page 117 to 120 of 133

·	121	1	
		1	123
2			
3	-	3	
4		4	
5	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	5	
6		6	
7	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So have you asked other	7	solutions out there that ought to be looked at and
8	people to participate so the communication is balanced?	8	pursued. Whether South Dakota or Iowa is pursuing one, I
9	MS. DEMMAN: We have encouraged customers to	9	100 percent agree with you, that may not fit for
10	participate so that their views can be known.	10	South Dakota, if that's the question.
11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: How about other like Staff	11	MR. RISLOV: And we've gone a little bit into
12	or NorthWestern or have you invited them to	12	the tariff, and you mentioned the tariffing and whether
13	participate?	13	or not that Indicated jurisdiction.
14	MS. DEMMAN: They are participating.	14	Do you know if this Commission ever approved
15	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. So they're going to	15	MERC's tariff?
16	participate at the Madison and Beresford?	16	MR. PORTER: In regards to farm taps?
17	MS. DEMMAN: I'm sorry. At that meeting. No,	17	MR. RISLOV; Yes.
18	We sent an invitation to the customers, to the farm tap	18	MR. PORTER: It was on file. Yes.
19	landowners, to answer any questions that they may have.	19	MR. RISLOV: Did the Commission approve it?
20	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And so the Staff has not	20	MR. PORTER: I'm not sure. It was on file and
21	been invited?	21	was replaced by you're making a distinction that I'm
22	MS. DEMMAN: I didn't copy the Staff on that.	22	not aware of.
23	MR. PORTER: I don't believe they have.	23	MR. RISLOV: Honestly, I'm not either. It was
24	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay, So okay.	24	handled by another employee, but it may have well been
25	So my last question on jurisdiction. And it	25	they were filed simply for informational purposes.
	122		124
1	sounds like Mr. Porter certainly believes the Public	1	Would you be surprised that there was discussion
2	Utilities Commission has jurisdiction. I don't know if	2	during the 1980s and confusion over exactly what
3	that's true or not, but I do this Is what I feel, just	3	jurisdiction we did have with regard to those farm tap
4	as one Commissioner, that our farm tap customers in	4	customers? Would that surprise you?
5	South Dakota will have to spend their financial resources	5	MR. PORTER: I would not be surprised about
6	possibly to litigate this in Circuit Court because I	6	that.
7	believe we don't have jurisdiction possibly over all the	7	MR. RISLOV: That's all I have. Thank you.
8	issues that our farm tap customers will have concerns	8	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Just one follow up,
9	about.	9	You made mention of meetings that you're going
10	So they will have to use their financial	10	to be conducting in I think you said Beresford and
11	resources possibly to deal with an easement contract and	11	Madison for the easement grantors.
12	to ask possibly Northern to live up to their easement	12	Would South Dakota PUC Staff be welcome to
13	contract. So that will be in Circuit Court and the	13	attend those meetings?
14	financial resources of the farm tap customers.	14	MS. DEMMAN: Yes. Yes, they would.
15	That's it.	15	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
16	MR. DE HUECK: Mr. Rislov,	16	MR. DE HUECK; I had a quick follow up to this
17	MR. RISLOV: Mr. Porter, you brought it up this	17	question probably belongs in Circuit Court, as
18	morning, and now Ms. Edwards brought it up today.	18	Mr. Koenecke explained. And it goes back to whether
19 20	But in comparison of what could happen in	19	Northern Natural Gas has an obligation to secure a vendee
20 21	South Dakota with Iowa and other states, do you realize	20	for these farm tap customers.
21 22	that the regulatory circumstances among all these states	21	And I understand there was a corporate
		22	transaction in 1985 where Northern Natural Gas relieved
		23	that burden that they were carrying by doing a corporate
23 24 25	benefit?	24	transaction and selling that obligation to another company to continue the service.

	125	T	127
	My question is were the easement holders at this	1	servicers prior to that. It's ironic that the servicers
1	corporate transaction when you sold the duty to have	2	prior to that were Northern's at the very beginning. But
2	service provided?	3	that was obscured in this letter.
4	Where were the easement holders? Don't they	4	And if Northern was willing to provide a copy of
5	have a stake in ensuring their easement isn't altered in	5	this letter to us, I can only imagine what the December 9
6	a significant way?	6	letter might say since they haven't been willing to
7	MR. PORTER: Easement holders would have, I	7	provide that copy.
8	believe, an interest if their easement was altered or	8	Thank you.
9	amended, one. Two, I don't think they were. They were	9	MR. DE HUECK: And, Mr. Koenecke or are there
10	transferred from excuse me. They weren't even the	10	any questions for NorthWestern? I'm sorry.
11	easements weren't transferred.	11	Mr. Koenecke.
12	The same entity that owned that had entered	12	MR. KOENECKE: Thanks, Mr. de Hueck. I
13	into the easements as we have discussed prior to 1985,	13	appreciate that. I'll try to be brief.
14	the easements that were entered into by Northern Natural	14	I wasn't trying to intimate that Northern would
15	are held today by Northern Natural.	15	be able to somehow simply escape liability for their
16	What was transferred was the utility service	16	agreements under the easement in Circuit Court by saying
17	that through historical practices had developed and	17	that somebody else now has the responsibility.
18	Peoples Natural Gas had provided from the beginning	18	I guess I want to make clear that it seems to me
19	had provided that utility service. Northern Natural	19	like it would be their obligation to third party in
20	never did. Peoples provided that service.	20	somebody who they think now has that.
21	That was transferred. It does not impact a word	21	And so thinking about that caused me to look at
22	of the easement. So I think the easement is unaffected.	22	the '85 and the '87 Agreements, and I found it curlous.
23	MR. DE HUECK: Thank you.	23	The reliance on the '85 Agreement seems to be somewhat
24	Anything else?	24	complete, that all of this was transferred in '85.
25	With that, we'll move to NorthWestern.	25	Well, if it was all transferred in '85, why is
	126	1	128
1	MR. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. de Hueck.	1	there an '87 Agreement? Why did you come back two years
2	So if the easement is not affected by that	2	later and do another agreement transferring these
3	transfer, then evidently there still is an obligation by	3	responsibilities? It seems like there must have been
4	Northern to provide a vendee of grantee in this	4	semathing record in IOE and then transferred in 197
5		1	something reserved in '85 and then transferred in '87.
	situation.	5	And if the argument is that all of these rights
6	And what has perplexed me throughout this	6	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else,
6 7		6 7	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement?
6 7 8	And what has perplexed me throughout this	6	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court
7	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today?	6 7 8 9	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody
7 8	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to	6 7 8 9 10	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that
7 8 9 10 11	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why	6 7 8 9 10 11	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony
7 8 9 10 11 12	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements,	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its predecessors have provided utility service to your farm	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that the customers have no remedy because I think they
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its predecessors have provided utility service to your farm tap since Northern Natural Gas first constructed the tap.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that the customers have no remedy because I think they certainly have a good argument to put forth.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its predecessors have provided utility service to your farm tap since Northern Natural Gas first constructed the tap. That is so inaccurate. NorthWestern did not enter this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that the customers have no remedy because I think they certainly have a good argument to put forth. Thank you.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its predecessors have provided utility service to your farm tap since Northern Natural Gas first constructed the tap. That is so inaccurate. NorthWestern did not enter this picture until 2011.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that the customers have no remedy because I think they certainly have a good argument to put forth. Thank you. MR. DE HUECK; Well, at this point I'd like to
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And what has perplexed me throughout this process is if, as Northern alleges, they gave up all of those obligations in 1985 in that corporate transaction, why are they here today? Why are they entering an agreement in 1987 to have others provide those services on their behalf? Why are they consenting to the assignment in 2011 to have others provide those services on their behalf? I think the answer the answer to me is clear. They understand their obligations under those easements, and they're trying to make other people perform those obligations on their behalf. We took a fair amount of flack based on their November 23 letter. Northwestern Energy and its predecessors have provided utility service to your farm tap since Northern Natural Gas first constructed the tap. That is so inaccurate. NorthWestern did not enter this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And if the argument is that all of these rights and responsibilities are transferred to somebody else, why is there an end date in the '87 Agreement? Those are questions that I think a Circuit Court is teed up to resolve. It would be helpful for anybody in your situation to have taken testimony. I think that would have probably helped here today, taken testimony from witnesses and have documents admitted. You know, hindsight's 20/20. But there are certainly questions here to be resolved, and I wouldn't want anybody to think they can't be resolved. I will follow up by saying I don't think the Commission has jurisdiction over farm taps. I do not think that is a public utility or a gas utility under the definitions in the code. But no one should think that the customers have no remedy because I think they certainly have a good argument to put forth. Thank you.

	129	<u> </u>	131
1	written comments into the record.	1	today to wave the magic wand and solve this problem for
2	And I'll ask the Commissioners if there's	2	those folks today,But I think we probably don't.At
3	anything else we need to cover with respect to this	3	least not today.
4	hearing.	4	And so if I could leave one thought with all of
5	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, I guess I do want to	5	you is go home and wrestle with this. Is it right for
6	make a final statement. But before I do that, I'm	6	either of your companies to walk away from this? Or is
7	looking at fellow Commissioners,	7	the right thing to do to come together and find an
8	Do we want to request any final briefs? Or are	8	agreement that works for everybody and keeps 195
9	we good with what's on the record thus far?	9	South Dakotans in the position that they've enjoyed for
10	COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm comfortable.	10	60 years and through no fault of their own find
11	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'm opposite of him.	11	themselves having to deal with this issue today.
12	Surprise, surprise.	12	That's all.
13	CHAIRMAN NELSON: And I'm really uncomfortable	13	MR. DE HUECK: Anything else?
14	right now.	14	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'm just thankful that
15	No. Actually I'm comfortable also, but I will	15	everybody came. I'm certainly thankful for all the
16	defer. If one Commissioner would like to have those, I	16	comments that the farm tap particlpants have sent to us.
17	think timing is the issue. My presumption is that we	17	It certainly enlightens us.
18	would make a decision probably at our January 3 meeting.	18	As a Commission, we all look at the public
19	And I'm looking at Ms. Edwards. Is our timing	19	interest, and just like Commissioner Nelson has said, we
20	okay if we make a decision at our January 3 meeting?	20	want to ensure those people continue to get service in
21	MS. EDWARDS: Well, under the Administrative	21	the future.
22	Rule, if the Commission asks for more information, I	22	We don't know where that will be, and that may
23	think that 60 days is somewhat told. So	23	be a decision in the Circuit Court. We do not know that
24	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, I personally don't want	24	today. And we'll make a decision soon.
25	to push it past that because we are not going to be the	25	MR. DE HUECK: Commissioner Hanson.
	130		132
1	final arbiter of this, and so I want to give as much time	1	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Nothing. Thank you.
2	as possible for folks to move down the line if needed.	2	MR. DE HUECK: With that, the hearing in
3	MS. EDWARDS: I have no objection to preparing a	3	NG16-014 Is adjourned. Thank you,
4	brief by or prior to January 3 to give you guys time	4	(The hearing is concluded)
5	to read and will comply with that order if you wish.	5	
6	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Chairman, I recant. I	6	
7	will not need a brief.	7	
8	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Are you sure?	8	
9	COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes.	9	
10	CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. Then that resolves that	10	
11	question.	11	
12	I guess the only statement that I would make	12	
13	first of all, I appreciate all four of the parties coming	13	
14	here and enduring our questions and putting your	14	
15	positions out in front of us.	15	
16	We have all, over the last three or four weeks,	16	
17	had the opportunity to read the comments of the people	17	
18	that really matter here.	18	
19	I know you all have business interests and	19	
20	shareholders you have to respond to to make prudent	20	
21	business decisions. But there are 195 South Dakotans	21	
22	that for 60 years have relied upon this service. It's	22	
23	part of their business. It's part of their home. It's	23	
24	how they stay warm. And we've heard from those people.	24	
25	And I dearly wish that we had the authority 3 sheets Page 129 to	25 132 o	

—	133
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 11	had in the above-entitled matter on the 14th day of
12	December, 2016, and that the attached is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 2nd day of
14	January, 2017.
15	
16	
17	
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler,
	Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter
20	Certified Realtime Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	<u> </u>

•	100:23, 100:24, 	3	9	78:25 - acting [1] - 95:10
	124:22, 125:13,			action [6] - 28:6, 28:7,
'85 [13] - 90:19, 90:22,	126:8	3 [8] - 72:6, 72:7,	9 [2] - 121:2, 127:5	73:13, 86:13, 110:9
116:8, 116:14,	1987 [25] - 9:13, 33:22,	80:15, 110:4,	• [-] · - · · · · ·	- activities [1] - 78:5
116:17, 116:18,	38:12, 38:14, 38:17,	110:12, 129:18,	Α	activity [2] - 116:3,
117:2, 127:22,		129:20, 130:4		116:5
127:23, 127:24,	38:25, 41:7, 53:13,	30 [2] - 3:13, 22:25		
	59:13, 60:1, 60:7,	30-year [2] - 9:12, 9:14	a.m [2] - 2:5, 3:5	actual [1] - 49:8
127:25, 128:4	62:23, 63:18, 66:11,		abandon [2] - 67:4,	Adam [5] - 1:13, 5:21,
87 [19] - 60:15, 60:19,	88:11, 89:7, 89:19,	31 [16] - 9:19, 30:22,	80:20	62:4, 91:8, 109:7
60:20, 61:6, 61:10,	93:1, 93:2, 95:19,	31:20, 33:7, 33:11,	abandoned (3) -	add [2] - 27:2, 113:22
63:4,87:19,88:17,	99:19, 101:20,	35:18, 37:20, 40:15,	42:12, 59:8, 67:3	additional [5] - 46:12,
89:15, 90:19, 93:9,	107:20, 111:10,	41:5, 41:16, 43:25,	abandoning [1] -	96:9, 96:12, 96:21,
93:20, 95:20,	126:10	59:16, 59:17, 69:19,	102:5	97:14
104:22, 116:8,	1988 [1] - 64:1	89:12, 118:1	ability [10] - 18:6,	additionally [1] - 8:1
127:22, 128:1,	1996 [1] - 10:4	34A [1] - 11:17	19:8, 19:19, 20:16,	address [8] - 30:18,
128:4, 128:7	1:30 [1] - 91:4	34A-4 [1] - 40:4	20:17, 20:20, 21:15,	39:12, 43:17, 56:22,
' 88 [2] - 63:20, 63:21			· · · · ·	81:24, 95:4, 100:6,
	2	4	29:6, 29:10, 109:25	119:16
1			able [10] - 16:3, 21:3,	addressed [5] - 60:18,
	-1		22:25, 56:24, 61:5,	60:19, 60:22, 76:4,
	2 [2] - 83:7, 112:4	40 [1] - 72:21	69:18, 69:19,	76:15
1 [3] - 18:2, 61:10,	20 [1] - 64:1	49 [5] - 3:22, 43:7,	101:25, 104:22,	addresses [2] - 51:3,
61:20	20/20 (1) - 128:13	74:3, 74:7, 74:20	127:15	69:6
1,500 [1] - 113:8	200 [2] - 7:7, 30:21	49-34A [2] - 8:17,	above-described [1] -	adequately [1] - 50:10
1.1 [2] - 30:1, 50:25	2001 [1] - 98:20	39:24	47:2	adjourned [1] - 132:3
1,8 [1] - 29:25	2011 [14] - 9:16, 16:18,	49-34A-2.1 [1] - 18:17	above-entitled [2] -	-
10 [2] - 2:5, 25:20	16:24, 16:25, 17:6,	49-34B [2] - 4:1, 11:20	2:2, 133:10	adjudicate [1] -
100 [5] - 22:1, 25:5,	41:20, 67:16, 98:20,		abruptiy [1] - 44:2	114:18
27:6, 77:7, 123:9	103:2, 103:8, 118:9,	5	absolutely [5] - 21:23,	Administrative [1] -
10:00 [1] - 3:5	118:23, 126:12,		28:11, 78:2, 114:20,	129:21
11-001 [1] - 118:9	126:23		122:25	admitted [1] - 128:12
14 (3] - 1:8, 3:5,	2012 [1] - 73:5	5 [6] - 51:24, 51:25,	accept [1] - 91:13	adopted [1] - 99:6
108:18	2014 [5] - 14:6, 14:15,	52:3, 59:14, 61:13,	access [3] - 7:12,	adopting (1) - 104:11
14th [2] - 2:4, 133:10	15:11, 23:10, 113:25	104:18	49:2, 98:10	advance [1] - 18:22
160 (1) - 46:7		50 [6] - 21:25, 22:1,	accomplish [1] -	advisor [1] - 13:5
192.16 [3] - 74:3, 74:7,	2015[1] - 30:25	32:7, 34:6, 37:3,	86:15	Advisor [1] - 1:14
	2016 [8] - 1:8, 2:4, 3:6,	44:2	according [3] - 23:12,	advisors [1] - 29:14
74:20	3:13, 15:24, 30:25,	523 [1] - 2:3	92:15, 94:22	affairs [2] - 6:12,
1930 [2] - 38:20, 53:1	108:18, 133:11		accounting [1] - 35:1	118:20
195 (9) - 15:15, 30:21,	2017 [35] - 7:10, 9:19,	6		affect [1] - 93:3
40:20, 44:1, 64:12,	9:22, 9:23, 10:19,		accurate [16] - 5:6,	affected [1] - 126:2
64:15, 76:14,	10:21, 16:22, 17:20,		13:22, 13:23, 20:21,	Affidavit [1] - 53:17
130:21, 131:8	30:23, 31:20, 33:7,	6 [8] - 17:25, 18:1,	23:1, 45:22, 47:7,	affidavit [2] - 87:5,
1950s [4] - 48:13,	33:11, 35:18, 37:20,	25:19, 71:18, 72:9,	48:10, 57:4, 57:5,	87:6
54:7, 98:5, 100:23	40:16, 41:5, 41:17,	77:3, 103:22	61:16, 62:9, 73:25,	affiliate [2] - 52:6,
1 97 [3] - 10:10, 112:1,	44:1, 59:16, 59:17,	60 [9] - 32:7, 34:7,	74:1, 102:6, 114:23	52:19
112:6	59:21, 60:3, 62:17,	37:3, 40:23, 44:2,	accurately [1] - 22:16	1
1 975 [1] - 13:25	67:16, 68:20, 69:19,	49:6, 129:23,	acknowledged [1] -	affiliates [2] - 38:19,
1976 [1] - 13:25	89:12, 98:19, 99:5	130:22, 131:10	61:14	53:1
1980s (1) - 124:2	103:6, 103:9,	60104 [1] - 43:7	acknowledges [1] -	affirm [t] - 117:2
1 985 [35] - 9:5, 9:8,	103:18, 103:24,	636 [2] - 10:3, 17:5	61:11	afternoon [2] - 71:13,
35:22, 35:24, 36:5,	118:1, 133:14		acquire [2] - 99:10,	91:6
36:8, 38:5, 38:23,	2018 [1] - 18:20	8	107:18	aggressive [2] - 73:1,
39:2, 44:14, 44:18,	206 [1] - 64:14	U	acquired [4] - 68:7,	73:2
54:3, 57:11, 61:4,	23 [9] - 71:20, 76:2,	[98:15, 98:21, 117:7	ago [2] - 49:6, 72:20
63:1, 63:10, 63:12,	76:3, 76:17, 76:22,	8 [2] - 16:18, 103:2	acquisition [3] -	agree [19] - 29:10,
	83:4, 83:6, 126:19	800 [2] - 25:19, 25:21	95:22, 99:2, 99:9	39:22, 41:25, 45:5,
63:13, 66:12, 86:22,		86,000 [1] - 40:23	act [4] - 5:22, 7:11,	46:9, 47:15, 48:11,
87:8, 87:9, 88:14,	26 [1] - 73:9	00,000 [i] - 40,20	43:7, 78:12	48:13, 49:5, 78:9,
88:18, 89:16, 95:21,	2nd [1] - 133:13		43.7, 76;12 Act [3] - 70:25, 78:17,	85:23, 86:7, 88:23,
100:14, 100:17,			AUL 01- 70.20, 70.17,	88:25, 104:1, 104:2,
		1		······
		L	L	

				1}
104:13, 111:15,	18:24, 30:17, 36:23,	appreciate [22] -	asset [2] - 34:25,	11:17, 13:19, 13:22, 2
123:9	96:11	11:12, 17:23, 27:12,	54:16	59:7, 110:6, 114:17,
agreed [4] - 39:1,	aliows [2] - 34:4,	27:14, 30:12, 39:10,	assets [34] - 9:10,	116:6, 130:25
41:15, 49:25, 101:9	63:18	43:18, 53:23, 54:24,	35:22, 36:4, 36:6,	automatically [1] -
agreeing [1] - 97:17	almost [2] - 38:15,	55:8, 57:9, 58:19,	36:7, 36:15, 38:7,	12:17
Agreement [29] - 39:2,	45:13	59:4, 75:15, 102:7,	38:15, 39:3, 52:22,	available (8) - 10:4,
41:7, 54:3, 57:11,	alone [1] - 66:3	104:17, 114:6,	54:14, 54:18, 58:3,	12:25, 13:8, 35:19,
59:13, 60:7, 61:4,	altered [2] - 125:5,	114:10, 117:9,	58:5, 58:6, 58:10,	48:15, 50:1, 51:4,
62:23, 63:13, 63:18,	125:8	119:14, 127:13,	58:12, 58:16, 68:7,	113:24
66:11, 66:12, 86:23,	amazed [1] - 62:15	130:13	73:8, 73:15, 74:10,	Avenue [1] - 2:3
88:11, 89:17, 89:20,	amazing [1] - 57:18	appropriate [5] - 5:15,	74:12, 78:14, 95:22,	aware [22] - 11:14,
93:1, 93:2, 95:19,	amended [1] - 125:9	82:24, 84:25, 85:9,	96:1, 99:9, 99:10,	25:24, 26:12, 52:24,
99:19, 100:14,	amount [5] - 19:3,	116:9	104:7, 104:8, 104:9,	53:9, 53:12, 65:24,
100:18, 100:23,	32:25, 44:10, 77:20,	approval [3] - 8:11,	107:19, 107:21,	66:5, 80:12, 85:5,
100:24, 107:20,	126:18	42:6, 55:15	107:22	88:21, 89:7, 89:13,
111:10, 111:11,	amplifying [1] - 5:2	approve [3] - 95:14,	assigned [6] - 9:14,	90:13, 118:13,
117:1, 117:2	amply [1] - 101:4	95:19, 123:19	9:15, 18:15, 41:8,	119:12, 119:17,
agreement [70] - 9:4,	anal [1] - 80:8	approved [7] - 9:17,	102:23, 107:20	120:5, 120:7, 120:9,
18:14, 33:21, 33:22,	analyst [2] - 6:5, 6:6	18:23, 88:8, 96:5,	assignment [8] -	123:22
35:17, 37:19, 38:6,	Analyst [2] - 1:14,	103:3, 104:10,	41:16, 42:2, 42:4,	awareness [1] - 32:4
38:12, 38:13, 38:17,	1:15	123:14	89:3, 95:18, 95:19,	aye [4] - 91:21, 91:24,
38:25, 39:2, 40:12,	analysts [2] - 7:3,	April [1] - 73:9	99:20, 126:12	92:1, 92:2
54:16, 57:19, 59:14,	113:14	Aquila [14] - 9:7, 9:10,	assistance [1] - 98:23	
5 9 :16, 59:23, 60:15,	announcements [1] -	36:14, 36:15, 36:23,	assistant [1] - 6:10	B
60:19, 60:20, 61:6,	4:14	37:10, 37:11, 93:14,	assume [3] - 38:10,	
61:9, 61:10, 61:23,	answer [23] - 8:9,	94:3, 94:4, 94:16,	56:10, 93:20	
62:20, 63:4, 63:17,	8:21, 8:24, 11:24,	95:7, 96:3	assumed [2] - 12:16,	background [1] - 74:2
64:1, 66:11, 87:16,	13:1, 13:8, 21:21,	arbiter [1] - 130:1	93:3	baffled [1] - 62:19
87:17, 87:19, 87:20,	22:12, 24:14, 39:21,	area (8) - 13:14, 13:22,	assumes [1] - 29:5	balanced [1] - 121:8
88:8, 88:17, 88:22,	40:9, 42:9, 42:19,	23:11, 65:4, 112:1,	assuming [3] - 24:24,	balancing [1] - 7:11
89:1, 89:4, 89:7,	44:6, 63:23, 68:15,	112:2, 112:10,	34:8, 57:13	bar [2] - 5:8
89:15, 89:21, 90:20,	89:25, 102:13,	115:25	assumption [6] -	barred [1] - 43:5
90:22, 92:20, 93:9,	104:3, 121:3,	areas [3] - 65:17,	10:23, 17:9, 27:12,	barring [1] - 29:9
93:21, 95:20, 96:1,	121:19, 126:14	79:16, 112:25	27:13, 28:14, 29:9	BARUTH [2] - 106:20,
98:24, 98:25,	answered [8] - 23:23,	argue [2] - 18:10,	assurance [1] - 21:1	107:6
100:19, 101:23,	26:9, 54:1, 79:1,	73:24	assured [2] - 17:19,	Baruth [1] - 6:15
104:22, 110:14,	83:19, 92:24, 96:8,	argues [1] - 41:15	35:7	based [6] - 10:15,
114:13, 116:14,	102:17	argument [15] - 6:24,	attached [5] - 7:16,	10:23, 40:25, 99:25,
116:17, 116:18,	answering [3] ~ 11:22,	18:21, 18:23, 28:2,	10:24, 11:7, 42:17,	116:3, 126:18
118:25, 126:10,	54:1, 57:10	28:3, 30:8, 66:18,	133:11	Basin [1] - 109:12
127:23, 128:1,	answers [1] - 12:24	91:11, 92:6, 95:3,	attachment [4] - 14:8,	basis [5] - 44:2, 60:11,
128:2, 128:7, 131:8	anyway (1] - 60:13	95:5, 109:4, 111:3,	14:23, 44:22	71:5, 99:22, 99:24
agreements [15] -	apologize [3] - 18:1,	128:5, 128:21	attempt [6] - 43:2,	became [1] - 36:14
31:24, 31:25, 32:1,	34:12, 84:18	argumentative (2) -	53:23, 101:22,	BEFORE [1] - 1:10
38:5, 46:12, 62:16,	appealed [2] - 4:10,	28:19, 29:5	105:6, 112:13,	began [1] - 98:20
62:18, 92:15, 95:14,	10:3	arguments [2] - 32:20,	112:14	begin [7] - 3:2, 6:1,
95:15, 98:8, 98:10,	appear [4] - 73:23,	66:15	attend [1] - 124:13	6:2, 7:25, 8:8, 33:16,
116:8, 127:16,	94:21, 112:8, 112:9	arise [1] - 46:20	attending [1] - 128:25	111:7
127:22	appearance [1] - 6:2	arouse [1] - 86:11	attention (3) - 43:17,	beginning [6] - 6:24,
agrees [1] - 46:14	APPEARANCES [1] -	arrangement [8] -	79:13, 81:16	51:14, 85:19, 111:4,
ahead [3] - 14:25,	1:16	12:15, 34:3, 34:16,	attest [1] - 11:18	125:18, 127:2
25:16, 58:2	appeared [1] - 87:20	35:4, 36:17, 37:25,	attitude [1] - 72:24	begins [1] - 107:24
alarming [2] - 83:20,	appearing [4] - 1:17,	57:7, 102:22	attorney [3] - 4:3,	behalf [10] - 1:17,
84:1	1:18, 1:20, 1:21	arrangements [2] -	5:21, 88:20	1:18, 1:20, 1.21,
alleges [1] - 126:7	apples [4] - 67:20,	5:15, 49:2	Attorney [2] - 1:13,	6:14, 84:18, 97:25,
Alliant [1] - 112:22	123:1, 123:2	aside [1] - 41:6	1:13	126:11, 126:13,
allow [7] - 8:2, 11:2,	applies [1] - 18:17	aspect [2] - 21:14,	audience [1] - 4:15	126:17
32:8, 32:11, 34:18,	apply [2] - 12:17,	82:14	audit [1] - 26:2	behind [2] - 7:15, 17:2
43:19, 83:9	18:19	aspects [2] - 8:16,	audits [1] - 79:24	belief [4] - 27:18,
allowing [5] - 12:20,	appointed [1] - 133:8	78:19	authority [10] - 8:16,	27:19, 82:22, 103:12
	apparting (00:0			

	,	1		1
believes [3] - 28:17,	25:14, 53:6	130:21, 130:23	cetera [4] - 62:6,	Chapter [1] - 11:20
33:5, 122:1	bottom [3] - 34:5,	buy [1] - 50:3	62:10, 66:19, 107:16	characterize [2] -
belongs [2] - 106:8,	35:15, 75:3	buying [3] - 41:19,	CFR [3] - 74:3, 74:7,	29:23, 79:8
124:17	bought [3] - 67:12,	113:9, 113:12	74:20	charge [1] - 77:25
beneficial [2] - 32:24,	67:21, 68:17	·	CHAIRMAN [99] -	check [3] - 15:12,
46:17	bound [1] - 28:12	C	1:10, 1:11, 3:1, 13:6,	74:9, 116:24
benefit [1] - 122:24	breach [1] - 110:10		13:11, 14:3, 14:15,	checking [1] - 25:15
Beresford [4] - 121:3,	breached [1] - 110:11		14:20, 14:24, 15:15,	CHERI [1] - 133:5
121:5, 121:16,	break [1] - 91:5	cancel [1] - 60:3	15:18, 15:22, 16:7,	Cheri [4] - 1:24, 5:12,
124:10	breaks [1] - 5:11	candor [1] - 104:17	16:12, 17:12, 17:16,	5:14, 133:18
best [7] - 34:14, 37:24,	Brett [3] - 1:21, 6:20,	cannot [7] - 28:5,	18:16, 18:19, 19:2,	choice [2] - 36:22,
38:23, 75:5, 75:19,	109:5	35:16, 100:6, 102:8,	20:14, 21:5, 21:13,	37:23
77:13, 81:18	Brief (15) - 7:17, 9:4,	104:8	21:23, 22:8, 22:19,	choices [1] - 37:17
better [7] - 19:23,	10:14, 10:15, 10:23,	Capitol [2] - 2:3, 4:20	22:23, 23:6, 44:8,	chooses [1] - 48:8
22:12, 23:23, 85:22,	11:3, 17:25, 18:1,	care [8] - 5:19, 19:11,	45:9, 46:1, 46:11,	Chris [2] - 3:9, 91:14
86:4, 86:6, 86:8	19:18, 36:11, 39:1,	19:15, 19:20, 20:13,	47:9, 47:22, 48:6,	CHRIS [1] - 1:10
between [25] - 7:8,	51:24, 94:15,	41:23, 91:12, 105:19	48:12, 49:4, 49:13,	Circuit (11) - 4:11,
9:13, 10:13, 11:5,	103:21, 103:22	carefully [3] - 10:17,	50:4, 50:21, 51:5,	10:3, 62:12, 110:6,
20:9, 31:5, 33:20,	brief [23] - 9:15, 10:25,	78:9, 126:24	51:12, 51:23, 52:3,	110:9, 122:6,
38:6, 38:13, 38:18,	14:5, 19:2, 19:8,	carries [2] ~ 54:22,	52:14, 53:20, 53:23,	122:13, 124:17,
40:12, 42:6, 44:17,	36:1, 36:2, 38:3,	92:3	54:9, 54:24, 56:2,	127:16, 128:8,
44:20, 57:7, 73:3,	42:18, 44:10, 44:23,	carry [1] - 21:17	56:6, 56:13, 56:16,	131:23
73:4, 74:24, 89:2,	51:23, 67:17, 69:10,	carrying [1] - 124:23	56:19, 57:2, 57:9,	circumstance [2] -
89:15, 94:3, 94:4,	91:14, 91:16, 91:17,	case [15] - 11:4, 12:9,	57:23, 58:1, 58:9,	22:2, 37:9
94:5, 114:13, 126:25	104:18, 109:18,	17:11, 22:17, 28:15,	58:19, 58:23, 59:9,	circumstances [3] -
beware [1] - 5:10	110:16, 127:13,	28:16, 29:8, 34:25,	59:13, 59:25, 60:23,	24:4, 50:2, 122:21
beyond [2] - 53:25,	130:4, 130:7	49:23, 50:10, 77:25,	61:9, 61:18, 62:1,	cite [2] - 69:10, 73:22
113:21	briefing [4] - 37:19,	78:7, 101:7, 105:2,	86:19, 87:10, 91:15,	citing (1) - 41:7
	39:9, 39:21, 93:22	113:8	91:20, 91:25, 92:2,	City [1] - 79:17
big [1] - 75:13 bill [2] - 23:4, 99:21	briefly [1] - 12:12	categorically [1] -	102:15, 103:1,	claim [1] - 57:3
	briefs [8] - 10:16,	97:17	103:14, 103:17,	claiming [1] - 108:4
billing [1] - 81:6	16:16, 31:1, 33:1,	category [1] - 29:21	103:20, 104:16,	
bills [1] - 104:23		caused [1] - 127:21	105:22, 105:25,	clarification [4] - 10:5,
binders [1] - 54:11	44:14, 66:13, 78:15, 129:8	cease [1] - 51:17	106:10, 106:13,	11:11, 17:23, 111:13
birthday [2] - 64:3,		ceiling [1] - 5:1	107:3, 107:24,	clarified (3) - 92:25,
64:4	bring [4] - 28:16,	Center [2] - 2:2, 3:7	108:7, 108:12,	96:18, 97:21
bit [10] - 4:21, 24:13,	31:15, 53:20, 81:15	cents [1] - 110:15	108:16, 108:20,	clarify [6] - 7:22, 27:5,
31:1, 45:16, 50:20,	Brittany [2] - 1:15, 6:6	certain [7] - 9:8,	110:24, 114:4,	92:18, 111:10,
62:25, 106:5, 116:7,	broad [1] - 109:9	19:21, 63:14, 74:10,	114:24, 124:8,	115:9, 115:16
117:15, 123:11	broader (2) - 109:15,	85:21, 87:22, 111:19	124:15, 129:5,	clarifying [1] - 92:9
Black [13] - 41:9,	110:18	certainly [25] - 27:4,	129:13, 129:24,	clause [2] - 57:12,
68:10, 68:14, 68:16,	broke [1] - 42:6	28:1, 28:13, 37:14,	130:8, 130:10	61:14
68:23, 69:11, 69:17,	brought [7] - 9:19,	54:9, 62:5, 62:7,	chairman [3] - 5:25,	clear [17] - 17:20,
112:23, 112:24,	32:4, 73:10, 85:18,	63:7, 64:6, 65:23,	29:13, 33:12	27:9, 28:3, 31:18,
113:6, 113:12,	119:21, 122:17,	66:8, 68:6, 86:13,	Chairman [5] - 3:10,	33:14, 42:5, 56:2,
113:15, 113:17	122:18	86:15, 101:17,	58:14, 72:7, 90:6,	59:5, 67:6, 102:18,
blanket [1] - 55:14	Brouwer [1] - 101:2	118:21, 118:22,	130.6	103:8, 107:25,
bloodline [1] - 65:7	Browers [1] - 101:10	119:13, 120:13,	challenges [5] - 25:6,	113:17, 115:8,
blowing (1) - 25:21	bucks [1] - 46:7	120:14, 122:1,	25:24, 25:25, 26:6,	116:4, 126:14,
blue [5] - 14:16, 47:6,	Building [2] - 2:3, 3:7	128:14, 128:21,	26:8	127:18
55:3, 55:12, 105:9	building [4] - 44:17,	131:15, 131:17	chance [1] - 111:5	clearly [7] - 16:20,
Board (7) - 68:23,	97:14, 106:25, 107:8	certainty[1] - 37:14	change (9] - 19:19,	39:22, 42:9, 78:25,
69:9, 69:11, 69:12,	buildings [1] - 46:21	certificate [1] - 55:14	28:6, 36:15, 61:23,	103:4, 103:15,
113:5, 113:10, 120:1	builds [1] - 84:11	CERTIFICATE (1) -	89:21, 93:13,	114:14
board [2] - 53:15, 69:6	built [1] - 52:5		100:23, 102:9, 117:8	close [3] - 18:9, 65:20,
Boice [3] - 7:4, 11:18,	bulk [2] - 99:13, 99:17	133:2 certification [1] -	changed [4] - 10:13,	104:22
	burden [4] - 18:22,	55:13	49:15, 70:20, 111:13	closer [1] - 64:23
21:12			10.10, 10.20, 111.10	1 -1t (0) 400.00
	19:1, 20:25, 124:23		changing m - 117.1	closing [2] - 100:20,
book [1] - 26:4	19:1, 20:25, 124:23 bury [1] - 46:15	Certified [2] - 133:6,	changing [1] - 117:1	100:22
21:12 book [1] - 26:4 books [2] - 55:13, 107:21			changing [1] - 117:1 chapter [2] - 3:22, 40:4	-

	·····			
Codified [1] - 27:20	131:18	130:9, 131:14, 132:1	111:14	117:6 4
colors [2] - 108:8	Commission's (12) -	Commissioners [9] -	concerns (2) - 25:13,	continuation [1] -
combination [1] -	3:12, 4:10, 5:23,	3:10, 30:25, 88:1,	122:8	82:25
115:12	8:16, 17:18, 36:22,	92:7, 98:1, 111:1,	conclude [2] - 41:4,	continue [24] - 8:18,
comfortable [2] -	37:12, 39:23, 43:21,	111:9, 129:2, 129:7	43:22	16:21, 17:20, 28:23,
129:10, 129:15	82:23, 99:7, 118:8	commitment [3] -	concluded [2] - 109:3,	29:2, 29:11, 34:5,
coming [7] - 23:20,	Commissioner [22] -	41:18, 46:3, 46:8	132:4	34:6, 35:6, 37:8,
23:23, 24:17, 25:18,	14:19, 15:20, 16:25,	common [3] - 30:19,	concluding [1] - 111:6	37:20, 41:13, 59:14,
47:14, 62:5, 130:13	23:19, 26:10, 27:2,	31:10, 53:8	conclusion [1] - 9:4	62:8, 80:17, 81:5,
commencing [1] - 2:5	48:17, 70:23, 71:11,	commonly [1] - 38:19	concrete [1] - 54:25	81:18, 101:14,
commend (1) - 12:18	81:24, 86:21, 91:23,	communicate [1] -	condemn [1] - 80:9	102:2, 103:6,
comment [3] - 19:13,	91:25, 103:4,	120:23	condition [1] - 98:22	107:13, 124:25,
19:17, 116:25	108:23, 109:1,	communication [4] -	conditional [1] - 88:3	128:25, 131:20
comments [7] - 32:22,	117:13, 120:13,	84:19, 84:20, 85:8,	conduct [2] - 5:22,	continued [2] - 49:10,
101:1, 101:3, 115:5,	122:4, 129:16,	121:8	11:15	101:10
129:1, 130:17,	131:19, 131:25	communications [2] -	conducting [1] -	continues [1] - 30:19
131:16	COMMISSIONER [122]	42:5, 111:20	124:10	continuing [1] - 33:8
commerce [3] - 42:23,	- 1:11, 23:8, 23:15,	communities [3] -	confused [2] - 64:18,	continuity [2] - 35:10,
42:24, 78:22	23:18, 24:10, 24:20,	40:23, 96:21, 112:5	70:15	81:16
commercial [1] -	24:21, 24:24, 25:2,	community [1] - 64:25	confusing [3] - 9:2,	continuous [1] - 44:2
117:24	25:6, 25:16, 25:23,	companies [9] -	70:19, 88:5	contract [20] - 7:8,
COMMISSION [4] -	26:9, 26:20, 26:25,	11:11, 36:4, 52:19,	confusion [1] - 124:2	9:8, 9:12, 9:14,
1:1, 1:4, 1:10, 1:12	27:4, 27:11, 28:4,	62:16, 64:19, 67:21,	consent [1] - 89:3	10:19, 40:22, 61:3,
Commission (103] -	28:18, 29:12, 62:4,	68:9, 112:16, 131:6	consenting [1] -	77:15, 101:8,
1:13, 1:13, 1:17, 3:3,	63:6, 63:12, 63:20, 63:24, 64:2, 64:6,	Company [3] - 3:18,	126:12	101:15, 101:19,
3:9, 3:15, 3:19, 4:6,	64:21, 65:5, 65:9,	3:21, 91:17	consider [6] - 4:6, 8:2,	101:20, 102:23, 102:24, 110:10,
4:7, 4:8, 5:21, 6:24,	65:11, 65:14, 66:6,	company [23] - 3:20,	51:15, 101:10,	110:11, 122:11,
7:23, 7:25, 8:1, 8:7,	66:17, 67:10, 67:15,	8:8, 8:10, 8:22, 8:23,	102:19, 120:19	122:13
8:10, 8:13, 9:17,	68:16, 68:19, 69:21,	8:24, 10:8, 11:1, 17:4, 57:19, 62:20,	considerable [3] -	contracts [1] - 18:12
9:20, 11:14, 11:20, 12:10, 12:24, 13:4,	70:5, 70:14, 70:17,	64:24, 65:12, 65:17,	19:3, 19:10, 44:10	contractual [1] - 98:18
13:13, 16:17, 16:19,	71:7, 71:12, 71:16,	66:21, 67:1, 69:25,	consideration [2] - 43:24, 46:13	contradiction [1] -
18:23, 27:23, 28:11,	71:25, 72:3, 72:15,	81:22, 84:18, 93:13,	considered [2] -	17:4
28:14, 28:17, 28:20,	72:19, 73:17, 75:14,	94:25, 111:16,	23:11, 81:8	control [4] ~ 10:19,
31:16, 32:21, 32:24,	75:23, 76:2, 76:10,	124:25	consistent [2] - 79:21,	16:4, 18:10, 113:13
33:9, 33:25, 34:2,	76:16, 76:21, 76:24,	company's [1] - 53:11	80:1	controlling [3] - 11:9,
34:4, 34:11, 35:7,	77:2, 77:10, 77:19,	compare [2] - 61:13,	Constitution [1] - 43:6	18:8, 116:13
35:15, 35:19, 36:13,	78:4, 79:3, 79:10,	123:2	construct (3) - 45:2,	controls [1] - 40:1
36:19, 36:22, 37:5,	80:6, 80:15, 80:25,	comparison [2] -	55:14, 59:7	convenience [1] -
37:7, 37:23, 39:14,	81:11, 81:20, 82:3,	122:19, 123:2	constructed [2] -	32:6
39:19, 40:5, 41:3,	82:11, 82:18, 83:2,	compensate [1] -	47:1, 126:21	conversation [3] - 5:9,
41:17, 42:8, 43:3,	85:12; 85:16, 86:10,	46:24	constructing [1] -	51:8, 119:24
43:8, 62:8, 62:12,	91:19, 91:24, 92:1,	compensation [2] -	45:18	conversations [2] -
62:13, 73:7, 73:14,	92:9, 92:24, 93:11,	46:6, 46:12	construction [3] -	5:8, 117:24
75:1, 78:10, 81:15,	94:6, 94:11, 94:20, 95:13, 95:17, 96:6,	complete [1] - 127:24	46:22, 106:17,	conveyed [1] - 103:15
82:20, 82:21, 82:24,	96:7, 96:17, 97:12,	completely [1] - 9:12	115:14	convoluted [1] - 9:3
83:8, 83:12, 83:16,	97:20, 108:24,	complexities [2] -	construe [1] - 85:22	copy [8] - 72:11,
84:8, 84:22, 95:9,	109:2, 115:1, 115:2,	31:3, 32:23	consumer [4] - 20:5,	73:21, 76:6, 76:13,
98:16, 102:14,	117:14, 117:18,	complied [1] - 116:1	22:13, 29:1, 29:2	120:11, 121:22,
103:15, 104:15,	117:21, 118:3,	comply [2] - 107:8,	consumers (6) -	127:4, 127:7
105:5, 107:17,	118:7, 118:11,	130:5	20:13, 83:10, 84:4,	corner [2] - 65:4,
110:5, 111:25, 112:22, 114:3,	118:14, 118:19,	components [1] -	84:13, 112:8, 112:9	105:10
114:17, 115:20,	118:22, 119:9,	107:15	consuming [2] -	corporate [7] - 31:17,
115:24, 116:5,	119:12, 120:5,	comprehensive [1] -	35:20, 37:13	61:7, 63:10, 124:21,
119:13, 119:14,	120:11, 120:21,	14:10	contact [4] - 5:14,	124:23, 125:2, 126:8
119:15, 119:21,	120:24, 121:5,	concern [3] - 12:7,	24:12, 24:13, 105:20	corporation [1] - 3:20 correct [39] - 15:25,
119:22, 122:2,	121:7, 121:11,	32:3, 69:24	contacts [1] - 112:7	16:8, 16:11, 18:5,
123:14, 123:19,	121:15, 121:20,	concerned [3] - 24:25,	contemplated [1] -	23:13, 25:1, 27:16,
128:17, 129:22,	121:24, 129:10,	81:16, 85:15 concerning [1] -	14:2	27:24, 45:7, 45:8,
	129:11, 130:6,	concerning[i] -	context [2] - 74:17,	
1	1	1	1	1

			T	
45:24, 45:25, 47:8,	106:11, 106:14,	38:11, 40:2, 40:4,	Deanna [1] - 101:2	depictions (1) - 10:24 5
47:19, 49:8, 50:14,	106:23, 113:13,	40:24, 41:2, 43:2,	dearly [1] - 130:25	depreciating [1] -
56:4, 56:8, 58:22,	119:1, 119:7	44:4, 48:5, 53:4,	decades [1] - 84:10	107:22
59:21, 60:4, 60:25,	customer's [6] - 12:2,	58:8, 65:16, 67:18,	December [19] - 1:8,	deprive [1] - 37:1
76:18, 80:23, 80:24,	22:20, 25:22, 100:7,	67:25, 68:12, 73:22,	2:4, 3:5, 9:19, 30:22,	depth [2] - 46:16, 98:9
86:25, 87:3, 90:20,	100:8, 106:25	75:20, 77:6, 77:11,	31:20, 33:7, 33:11,	describe [2] - 34:13,
103:10, 103:11,	customer-owned [1] -	80:13, 82:23, 83:8,	35:18, 37:20, 40:15,	79:8
1	1	83:15, 93:17, 122:5,	41:5, 41:16, 43:25,	described [3] - 45:4,
103:15, 103:16,	105:18	122:20, 123:2,		47:2, 52:25
105:23, 107:4,	customers [102] - 3:4,		69:19, 118:1, 121:2,	1
108:9, 114:16,	3:16, 3:23, 7:7, 8:4,	123:4, 123:8,	127:5, 133:11	describes [1] - 87:14
118:20, 120:24,	10:10, 12:22, 16:22,	123:10, 124:12,	decide [1] - 36:19	descriptive [1] - 61:19
133:12	19:11, 19:13, 21:8,	133:7, 133:13	decides [1] - 37:7	designated [2] -
correctly [2] - 25:11,	28:22, 30:21, 31:12,	DAKOTA [2] - 1:2,	decision [10] - 10:4,	52:20, 56:6
50:16	31:13, 32:5, 32:6,	133:1	28:15, 33:2, 36:21,	desk [1] - 98:3
correspondence [1] -	32:14, 34:18, 35:6,	Dakotans [2] - 130:21,	36:22, 37:24,	detail [1] - 58:17
73:6	37:1, 37:7, 40:9,	131:9	129:18, 129:20,	detailed [4] - 7:16,
cost [3] - 69:6, 113:9,	40:20, 40:22, 40:24,	damage [1] - 46:23	131:23, 131:24	9:15, 32:25, 112:4
122:23	41:13, 41:14, 42:11,	damages (1) - 46:20	decisions [5] - 4:9,	detect [1] - 22:25
		data [1] - 17:1		
costs [2] - 34:19,	44:1, 52:8, 63:3, 63:16, 64:7, 64:11,	date [7] - 3:5, 9:18,	10:6, 28:12, 82:24, 130:21	determination [2] -
34:21		1		11:10, 82:22
counsel [1] - 6:4	64:12, 65:16, 68:12,	18:24, 59:15, 63:15,	declaratory [5] - 3:4,	determine [5] - 8:7,
Counsel [3] - 6:9,	73:22, 74:10, 74:16,	87:22, 128:7	4:7, 4:10, 28:16,	8:23, 8:25, 20:8,
6:10, 119:25	76:8, 76:14, 76:20,	Dated [1] - 133:13	33:2	100:4
counsel's [1] - 32:9	76:22, 76:25, 77:6,	dated [3] - 72:6,	DECLARATORY [1] -	determined [1] - 9:11
COUNTY [1] - 133:3	77:8, 77:11, 77:14,	76:16, 121:2	1:4	developed (1) -
couple [8] - 4:14,	81:6, 81:17, 81:23,	David [1] - 101:2	deep [1] - 87:23	125:17
17:17, 62:16, 72:17,	83:17, 84:24, 85:14,	day-to-day [1] - 71:5	default [1] - 31:21	development [2] -
88:10, 109:19,	93:6, 95:10, 96:10,	days [4] - 10:17,	defer [2] - 80:5,	6:16, 6:17
114:4, 119:20	96:12, 96:19, 96:20,	17:17, 22:25, 129:23	129:16	deviate [1] - 4:13
	98:4, 98:18, 98:19,	DC [1] - 10:3		
course [2] - 63:7,	98:24, 99:1, 99:11,		define [2] - 61:21,	diagram [3] - 36:2,
94:24	99:22, 100:3, 101:1,	DE [37] - 5:25, 6:7,	101:6	105:9, 105:12
court [2] - 10:6,		6:13, 6:18, 6:22,	defined [1] ~ 3:22	differ [1] - 94:25
110:13	101:13, 102:9,	13:3, 29:14, 29:17,	defines [3] - 11:8,	dífference [3] - 21:10,
Court [12] - 4:11, 10:3,	103:6, 104:6,	30:3, 30:7, 71:11,	57:16, 106:23	21:24, 31:5
62:13, 110:7, 110:9,	104:12, 106:19,	87:11, 90:3, 90:5,	definition [5] - 18:7,	different [15] - 8:12,
122:6, 122:13,	107:8, 107:11,	90:17, 90:22, 91:2,	40:3, 40:25, 87:15,	33:23, 36:4, 50:20,
124:17, 127:16,	108:4, 108:14,	91:6, 92:5, 97:23,	109:21	68:9, 75:25, 79:16,
128:8, 131:23	111:16, 111:17,	108:23, 109:1,	definitions [1] -	79:19, 79:20, 83:18,
cover [1] - 129:3	111:24, 112:1,	109:3, 110:22,	128:19	88:2, 92:17, 119:15,
covered [4] - 29:25,	113:6, 113:9,	111:1, 114:3,	deliberate [1] - 43:24	122:22, 122:23
1	115:21, 120:12,	114:25, 115:3,	deliberative [1] -	1
36:1, 60:14	120:16, 120:20,	117:11, 122:16,		differently [1] - 88:16
crafted [1] - 126:24	120:23, 121:2,	1	43:21	differs [2] - 11:16,
created [2] - 71:21	121:9, 121:18,	124:16, 125:23,	delivery [2] - 49:21	21:6
Cremer [1] - 1:13	122:4, 122:8,	127:9, 128:23,	DEMMAN [17] - 71:24,	difficult [6] - 7:11,
crops [1] - 46:20		131:13, 131:25,	75:25, 76:7, 76:12,	18:10, 20:23, 32:14,
crossing [1] - 46:6	122:14, 122:22,	132:2	76:19, 76:23, 77:1,	37:10, 104:3
CRR [1] - 1:24	124:4, 124:20,	de [12] - 1:13, 5:21,	80:24, 81:2, 81:14,	dilute [3] - 88:17
cultivation [1] - 46:17	128:20	5:24, 7:1, 71:9,	121:1, 121:6, 121:9,	90:19, 90:22
curiosity [2] - 77:2,	CUSTOMERS [1] - 1:5	86:18, 91:8, 92:4,	121:14, 121:17,	dilutes [1] - 91:1
	customers' [2] - 7:12,	92:10, 111:8, 126:1,	121:22, 124:14	direct [3] - 85:8,
80:7	119:3	127:12	Demman [a] - 6:11,	
curious [4] - 26:11,	cutting [1] - 25:20	deal [15] - 31:9, 34:8,	1	100:12, 105:4
72:16, 97:1, 127:22		34:11, 36:18, 41:21,	30:11, 71:24, 72:1,	directly [4] - 5:14,
current [3] - 31:19,	D	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	72:8, 75:23, 76:5,	86:2, 98:11, 102:8
101:13, 101:19		41:24, 41:25, 66:19,	80:16	disagree [3] - 33:14,
custody [1] - 77:16		67:13, 67:23,	demonstrated [2] -	56:23, 104:14
customer [17] - 12:3,	Dakota (46) - 1:21,	105:20, 114:12,	35:21, 78:20	disagreement [2] -
19:9, 20:25, 22:15,	1:24, 2:4, 3:8, 7:14,	122:11, 131:11	denigrated [1] - 19:8	11:5, 39:4
22:24, 35:9, 60:24,		dealing [2] - 22:13,	department [4] - 6:16,	discontinuance [1] -
	12:10, 12:13, 25:24,	66:2	73:12, 77:24, 118:20	83:9
99:24, 105:13,	27:20, 31:10, 31:11,	dealt [2] - 31:6, 78:11	depicted [1] - 108:11	
105:18, 106:8,	32:2, 36:1, 36:5,			discontinuation [2] -
1			I	

Page 5 to 5 of 19

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
32:10, 82:25	118:12, 118:23,	72:17, 73:1, 73:9,	effort [3] - 37:14,	engage [1] - 78:5
discontinue [5] - 8:3,	120:12	73:11	53:13, 80:22	enjoyed [2] - 32:6,
8:11, 8:20, 18:25,	Docket [8] - 3:2, 8:2,	e-mails [2] - 72:21,	efforts (1) - 114:7	131:9
84:9	8:6, 9:19, 33:9, 99:7,	73:5	egress [1] - 45:17	enlighten [1] - 105:2
			+	
discontinued [3] -	111:18	early [1] - 31:9	eight [1] - 58:7	enlightens (1) -
32:8, 32:11, 36:24	dockets [1] - 114:22	earn [1] - 34:19	either [9] - 12:4,	131:17
discontinuing [3] -	document [19] -	easement (50) - 44:20,	47:15, 56:25, 98:11,	ensure [3] - 28:16,
7:24, 8:5, 36:25	52:14, 52:16, 52:19,	44:25, 45:2, 45:10,	100:7, 111:21,	30:19, 131:20
discord [1] - 73:3	52:24, 53:9, 53:19,	45:23, 47:24, 48:19,	115:11, 123:23,	ensuring [2] - 7:13,
discourse [2] - 73:3,	54:12, 54:21, 57:16,	49:8, 49:9, 49:24,	131:6	125:5
73:14	86:5, 106:15, 107:4,	50:8, 51:9, 51:19,	elaborate [1] - 30:3	enter [2] - 99:16,
	107:5, 107:6, 107:7,	51:22, 52:4, 52:10,	electric [3] - 40:19,	126:22
discover [1] - 100:5	1			
discovery [1] - 119:6	107:9, 108:3, 110:3,	52:13, 52:21, 60:16,	64:17, 112:3	entered [8] - 36:17,
discuss [2] - 12:1,	115:13	85:1, 90:7, 90:9,	element [1] - 11:10	38:14, 89:15, 89:19,
112:5	documentation [4] -	90:23, 91:1, 97:3,	eliminate [1] - 88:17	102:22, 107:18,
discussed [8] - 31:4,	54:20, 58:24, 58:25,	97:4, 97:13, 101:3,	eliminates [1] -	125:12, 125:14
33:10, 40:10, 96:18,	59:8	102:20, 110:3,	116:14	entering [1] - 126:10
98:8, 99:19, 99:23,	documented [1] - 99:5	114:12, 114:19,	emanate (1) - 114:9	enters [1] - 99:16
125:13	documents [11] -	116:11, 117:1,	emergencies [2] -	entire [3] - 57:19,
	54:13, 57:22, 58:15,	117:5, 117:8,		1
Discussion [3] - 6:25,	71:17, 94:2, 94:15,	120:18, 122:11,	83:24, 83:25	73:19, 84:11
71:10, 72:2			employee [2] - 53:16,	entirely (4) - 9:8,
discussion [16] - 14:5,	95:12, 110:6,	122:12, 124:11,	123:24	111:19, 122:22,
15:23, 16:16, 64:7,	115:14, 128:12	125:1, 125:4, 125:5,	encourage [2] - 28:13,	122:23
69:14, 77:20, 80:21,	dollars [1] - 19:14	125:7, 125:8,	88:15	entities [3] - 101:7,
90:6, 91:18, 91:20,	domestic [1] - 7:21	125:22, 126:2,	encouraged [1] -	116:1, 119:16
100:11, 108:1,	done [8] - 45:1, 60:5,	127:16	121:9	entitled [2] - 2:2,
116:7, 118:4, 118:8,	67:6, 80:10, 83:14,	easements (17) -		133:10
124:1	85:17, 86:4, 101:14	48:13, 48:20, 54:14,	encouraging [1] -	
		97:19, 98:6, 98:7,	85:13	entity (5) - 10:10,
discussions [14] -	DOT [1] - 6:16		end [25] - 7:9, 7:21,	39:16, 40:7, 93:14,
65:24, 66:10, 66:16,	dotted [1] - 80:9	100:24, 101:8,	9:18, 9:23, 10:8,	125:12
112:23, 113:15,	doubt [3] - 15:13,	102:2, 102:10,	10:11, 10:20, 18:11,	environment [1] - 4:20
114:1, 117:16,	37:15, 78:3	114:18, 116:10,	18:24, 26:24, 30:5,	equipment [2] - 40:1,
117:20, 117:25,	down [14] - 25:20,	125:11, 125:13,	30:22, 32:10, 43:16,	99:12
118:2, 119:17,	34:2, 38:17, 38:24,	125:14, 126:15	43:20, 48:4, 55:11,	escape (1) - 127:15
119:20, 119:21,	42:6, 55:18, 58:17,	East [1] - 2:3		
120:4		easy [1] - 35:2	57:1, 74:8, 75:21,	essentially [2] - 8:6,
	64:14, 65:3, 104:25,	economically [1] -	80:16, 98:19, 99:5,	47:6
disposal [1] - 20:8	112:9, 115:12, 130:2	• • •	101:24, 128:7	established [4] -
lispute [2] - 62:25,	downstream [8] -	35:5	endeavored [1] - 9:2	47:12, 50:17, 50:24,
109:17	22:2, 55:24, 70:8,	Edwards [15] - 1:17,	ended [1] - 72:4	51:2
tisrespectful (1) -	70:9, 74:10, 74:12,	6:4, 7:2, 13:3, 13:7,	ends [5] - 24:8, 28:25,	establishes [1] - 30:1
30:15	74:16, 74:21	16:15, 27:15, 29:18,	33:19, 47:9	establishing [1] -
disservice [1] - 37:4	drawn [1] - 31:8	30:13, 114:11,	enduring [1] - 130:14	
listinction [4] - 33:20,	driven [1] - 32:3	119:14, 119:20,		69:17
		120:8, 122:18,	Energy [29] - 3:21,	estate [1] - 110:7
48:3, 100:10, 123:21	driver [1] - 26:23	129:19	18:3, 18:17, 18:20,	estimate [1] - 99:25
listinguish [1] - 33:19	due [3] - 4:4, 74:25,		28:21, 36:11, 36:19,	et [4] - 62:6, 62:10,
listribute [1] - 81:22	101:21	EDWARDS [26] - 6:4,	37:18, 37:25, 39:25,	66:19, 107:16
listribution [17] -	duly [1] - 133:8	7:1, 13:10, 13:23,	40:8, 40:10, 40:14,	evaluate [1] - 7:23
10:8, 11:1, 62:16,	duly-appointed [1] -	16:24, 17:14, 18:6,	41:7, 42:1, 43:10,	evaluating [1] - 84:8
62:20, 63:16, 64:19,	133:8	18:18, 18:21, 19:21,	43:11, 61:24, 78:9,	
64:24, 65:16, 66:21,	duration [1] - 98:23	20:22, 21:11, 22:11,	83:22, 84:23,	evasive [1] - 55:10
		22:22, 23:2, 27:2,		events [1] - 9:12
67:1, 70:2, 70:5,	during [5] - 5:11,	27:5, 28:1, 28:11,	102:19, 108:18,	evidence [3] - 87:4,
70:6, 70:12, 70:18,	54:11, 80:3, 80:21,	29:4, 29:24, 30:5,	112:22, 113:12,	87:5, 116:16
80:19, 94:25	124:2		113:17, 119:1,	evidently (1) - 126:3
listributor [1] - 81:20	duty [2] - 57:14, 125:2	111:8, 114:20,	126:19	exact [1] - 25:13
)O [1] - 133:8		129:21, 130:3	energy [1] - 113:6	exactly [4] - 17:1,
	E	effect (2) - 63:10	Energy's [5] - 33:18,	
locket (14) - 8:12		effective [4] - 31:20,		48:1, 66:24, 124:2
locket [14] - 8:12, 9:16, 12:16, 28:9,		enective [4] * 01.20,	1 3373 AT 7 AU TU	Farmerster and E. CO.
9:16, 12:16, 28:9,	<u></u>		33:23, 41:2, 49:19,	Examiner [2] - 5:22,
9:16, 12:16, 28:9, 99:11, 108:18,		59:15, 59:17, 64:1	115:6	91:8
9:16, 12:16, 28:9,	e-mail [8] - 72:10, 72:11, 72:12, 72:16,		1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>
example [1] - 76:9	F	37:21, 37:22, 38:11,	24:13, 26:17, 42:25,	filling [1] - 101:5
excellent [2] - 19:22,	·	39:15, 39:17, 39:20,	43:13, 50:6, 55:13,	final [3] - 129:6, 129:8,
19:25		40:9, 40:20, 40:21,	67:4, 70:1, 71:1,	130:1
exchange [4] - 46:2,	facilities [44] - 10:19,	41:11, 41:12, 41:13,	77:15, 77:22, 77:25,	financial [3] - 122:5,
67:12, 98:7, 101:8	11:7, 11:9, 11:22,	41:16, 42:2, 42:4,	78:24, 79:5, 79:6	122:10, 122:14
exclusive [6] - 39:24,	19:22, 19:23, 19:24,	42:11, 42:12, 42:14,	few [4] - 71:14,	fingers [1] - 62:10
43:1, 43:12, 78:10,	42:16, 42:19, 42:20,	43:9, 48:21, 49:17,	103:21, 115:5,	finished [1] - 111:2
78:13, 79:12	42:22, 42:25, 43:3,	52:7, 57:1, 57:7,	115:18	first [38] - 8:13, 11:23,
	43:4, 43:14, 49:17,	57:15, 59:21, 60:16,	Fiegen (6) - 3:10,	27:16, 30:13, 31:5,
excuse [8] - 25:16,	49:18, 53:7, 55:12,	62:7, 63:3, 64:7,	26:10, 91:25, 92:1,	34:10, 39:1, 39:19,
28:24, 39:12, 57:21,	55:16, 55:24, 67:4,	64:10, 65:15, 65:18,	108:23, 117:13	43:16, 44:9, 44:25,
95:18, 96:7, 98:20,	68:10, 68:11, 69:1,	66:9, 66:18, 67:3,	FIEGEN [66] - 1:11,	46:5, 57:12, 59:15,
125:10	69:2, 70:8, 70:9,	67:18, 68:12, 69:1,	23:8, 23:15, 23:18,	62:5, 72:9, 73:18,
exercise [1] - 62:20	70:11, 71:1, 71:2,	69:2, 69:13, 75:5,	24:10, 24:20, 62:4,	74:25, 77:3, 77:21,
exercised (6) - 4:4,	74:5, 74:18, 78:22,	75:7, 75:21, 77:17,	63:6, 63:12, 63:20,	80:9, 81:25, 84:7,
60:2, 69:12, 113:11,	78:24, 79:7, 79:14,	78:23, 79:4, 79:11,	63:24, 64:2, 64:6,	84:17, 86:16, 88:11,
115:24, 116:5	79:25, 97:10, 97:11,	79:14, 79:24, 80:4,	64:21, 65:5, 65:9,	
exhaustively [1] -	99:12, 99:14, 99:16,	80:11, 80:18, 81:17,		98:3, 100:2, 103:23,
112:20	115:7	· · ·	65:11, 65:14, 66:6, 66:17, 67:10, 67:15,	104:18, 109:4,
Exhibit [1] - 71:18		83:17, 83:22, 84:9,		109:25, 111:2,
exhibit [3] - 14:18,	facility [2] - 14:16,	93:6, 93:24, 95:10,	68:16, 68:19, 69:21,	114:4, 118:17,
14:21, 42:17	55:15	97:3, 97:18, 98:10,	70:5, 70:14, 70:17,	120:18, 126:21,
existing [5] - 32:12,	fact [14] - 13:13, 14:6,	98:24, 98:25, 99:10,	71:7, 92:1, 92:9,	130:13
34:23, 35:10, 97:13	15:23, 61:22, 72:22,	99:15, 99:22, 99:23,	92:24, 93:11, 94:6,	fit (1) - 123:9
expansive [1] - 87:16	78:21, 79:24, 79:25,	100:2, 100:7, 100:9,	94:11, 94:20, 95:13,	fits [1] - 40:3
expect [1] - 54:15	80:2, 100:24,	101:9, 101:13,	95:17, 96:6, 108:24,	five [3] - 67:22, 67:23,
expectation [3] -	103:14, 107:10,	103:25, 104:6,	115:1, 117:14,	83:18
22:20, 45:22, 48:14	119:22	105:6, 105:8,	117:18, 117:21,	five-year [2] - 67:22,
expected [1] - 32:14	facts [3] - 7:15, 31:14,	105:15, 106:18,	118:3, 118:7,	67:23
expensive [2] - 35:20,	33:15	107:15, 108:14,	118:11, 118:14,	fix [2] - 100:6, 104:8
37:13	factual [2] - 39:4, 39:6	109:10, 109:11,	118:19, 118:22,	flack [1] - 126:18
	failure [1] - 105:14	109:20, 109:25,	119:9, 119:12,	floor [3] - 4:20, 5:24,
experiences [1] - 77:23	fair [8] - 34:19, 35:14,	112:6, 115:15,	120:5, 120:11,	115:3
•	49:4, 85:4, 93:1,	115:21, 121:18,	120:21, 120:24,	fiying (1) - 6:21
experimenting [1] -	105:22, 126:18	122:4, 122:8,	121:5, 121:7,	focus [2] - 55:3, 116:9
4:21	fairer (1) - 35:4	122:14, 123:16,	121:11, 121:15,	folks [6] - 34:6, 83:19,
expire (2) - 7:9,	fairly [1] - 32:24	124:3, 124:20,	121:20, 121:24,	104:25, 130:2, 131:2
101:23	fall [1] - 29:19	126:20, 128:17,	129:11, 130:6,	follow [6] ~ 86:19,
explain [2] - 49:13,	familiar [1] - 68:24	131:16	130:9, 131:14	86:20, 110:13,
88:6	familiarity [1] - 80:7	FARM [1] - 1:5	Fiegen's [1] - 86:21	124:8, 124:16,
explained [2] - 83:19,	far [13] - 15:14, 17:1,	farmer [3] - 19:9,	field [2] - 22:4, 38:20	
124:18	21:19, 27:25, 31:4,	21:15, 47:23	fields [1] - 105:16	128:16
explaining [1] -	59:22, 66:5, 70:23,	farmer-owned [1] -	figure (5) - 21:18,	followed [1] - 104:24
119:14		21:15	24:7, 24:10, 58:25,	following [3] - 16:22,
explanation [4] -	72:18, 85:22, 94:17,	farmers [2] - 19:19,	62:11	45:4, 90:18
13:12, 75:13, 75:17,	115:7, 129:9	96:21	file [10] - 70:12, 89:18,	follows [1] - 46:14
88:1	Farm [1] - 3:4	farming [1] - 21:3)	foot [2] - 22:1
explicit (2] - 99:3,	farm [148] - 3:16, 3:23,	fauit m - 131:10	91:16, 109:18, 110:16, 115:20,	footage [1] - 22:5
103:12	3:24, 7:7, 7:15, 7:20,	1 77		footings [1] - 84:12
explored [1] - 112:20	8:3, 8:15, 11:7, 12:8,	favor [1] - 91:21	115:23, 116:1,	FOR [1] - 1:4
explosion [1] - 20:11	12:11, 12:21, 13:23,	Fed (1) - 77:24	123:18, 123:20	force [1] - 29:11
express (3) - 43:6,	14:6, 15:4, 16:22,	Federal [2] - 12:4,	filed [10] - 69:25,	forcing [1] - 111:17
90:6, 90:23	18:4, 19:4, 22:3,	78:9	71:17, 76:4, 78:16,	forever [3] - 45:16,
expressly [2] - 38:9,	22:4, 23:10, 23:21,	federal [3] - 9:24,	95:9, 101:1, 111:17,	46:3, 46:8
78:17	24:16, 24:18, 24:25,	10:2, 78:12	111:23, 112:8,	forfeited [1] - 4:4
	25:2, 25:7, 25:8,	feed [1] - 4:23	123:25	forgive [2] - 19:6, 96:8
extensive [1] - 112:23	25:25, 26:11, 26:12,	feedback [1] - 85:10	filing [6] - 10:14, 69:5,	forgot [1] - 109:5
extent [10] - 21:4,	26:16, 27:6, 29:19,	fellow [2] - 12:25,	69:23, 111:18,	form [1] - 70:12
34:21, 35:16, 41:2,	30:21, 31:12, 32:2,	129:7	111:21, 111:22	
86:7, 93:5, 94:18,	32:4, 32:6, 32:8,	felt [1] - 109:13	filings [1] - 27:22	formed [1] - 101:16
95:8, 97:3, 119:19	32:11, 32:14, 34:18,	fences [1] - 46:21	fill [4] - 44:16, 44:18,	forth [4] - 4:9, 74:3,
extremely [1] - 80:8	35:5, 35:25, 37:7,	FERC [17] - 10:2, 17:5,	55:1, 99:20	74:24, 128:21
				forthright [2] - 55:23,
	1		1	1

	100.0.100.0.100.5		405:45	74:40
114:21	102:3, 102:9, 103:6,	H	125:15	74:19
forum [2] - 70:24, 83:5	109:21, 118:9,		help (8) - 21:2, 21:4,	housekeeping (2) -
forward [5] - 9:1,	128:18	hair [1] - 34:1	21:5, 21:21, 23:18,	4:14, 91:11 Hueck [12] - 1:13,
12:19, 17:10, 34:15,	Gas [22] - 1:19, 3:18,	half [1] - 22:3	54:25, 62:18, 70:2	-
111:16	3:21, 6:9, 32:19,	halimarks [2] - 104:4,	helped [1] - 128:11	5:21, 5:24, 7:1, 71:9,
Foss [2] - 2:3, 3:7	35:23, 38:14, 39:3,	104:5	heipful [9] - 14:8,	86:18, 91:8, 92:4,
foundation (2) -	56:10, 56:25, 64:8,	hand [4] - 6:23, 104:9,	31:2, 33:4, 43:20,	92:10, 111:8, 126:1,
75:17, 84:12	68:3, 75:12, 77:1,		53:25, 55:2, 69:22,	
four [3] - 54:10,	91:17, 106:17,	105:10, 111:17	104:16, 128:9	HUECK [37] - 5:25,
130:13, 130:16	117:12, 124:19,	handed [1] - 106:18	helping [1] - 14:24	6:7, 6:13, 6:18, 6:22,
four-inch [1] - 54:10	124:22, 125:18,	handle [2] - 69:19,	HEREBY [1] - 133:8	13:3, 29:14, 29:17,
fourth [2] - 4:20, 83:21	126:21	70:11	herein [1] - 46:14	30:3, 30:7, 71:11,
framed [1] - 110:19	Gas's [1] - 54:18	handled [2] - 117:4,	herself (1) - 113:24	87:11, 90:3, 90:5,
frankly [1] - 55:21	Gayville [1] - 112:10	123:24	high [1] - 120:2	90:17, 90:22, 91:2,
free [1] - 50:21	General [3] - 6:9, 6:10,	hands [1] - 111:13	higher [1] - 25:17	91:6, 92:5, 97:23,
frequency [1] - 80:12	119:25	hang [2] - 14:20,	highly [1] - 15:13	108:23, 109:1,
frequently [1] - 13:16	general [4] - 30:2,	16:13	highway [1] - 82:1	109:3, 110:22,
front [6] - 68:22, 69:9,	97:18, 109:9, 109:23	Hanson [6] - 3:10,	Hilimer [6] - 7:4, 13:8,	111:1, 114:3,
73:9, 83:10, 98:16,	generally [1] - 97:16	71:11, 91:23, 109:1,	14:4, 14:9, 14:25,	114:25, 115:3,
130:15	given [8] - 27:24,	120:13, 131:25	24:22	117:11, 122:16,
fuel [1] - 106:23	34:13, 42:9, 65:25,	HANSON [67] - 1:11,	HILLMER [20] - 14:14,	124:16, 125:23,
fulfilling [1] - 117:6	85:10, 102:1,	24:21, 24:24, 25:2,	15:1, 15:17, 15:20,	127:9, 128:23,
fully [1] - 31:7	106:21, 107:6	25:6, 25:16, 25:23,	16:6, 16:9, 21:21,	131:13, 131:25,
functions (1) - 54:23	glad (1) - 109:14	26:9, 26:20, 26:25,	21:24, 23:13, 23:17,	132:2
fundamentally [1] -	goal [3] - 30:18, 85:13,	27:4, 27:11, 28:4,	23:22, 24:12, 24:23,	husband [1] - 64:5
33:14	86:16	28:18, 29:12, 71:12,	25:1, 25:4, 25:9,	husband's [1] - 64:2
furnish [3] - 47:21,	Government (3) -	71:16, 71:25, 72:3,	25:17, 26:1, 26:14,	
50:1, 97:6	6:12, 12:5, 118:19	72:15, 72:19, 73:17,	26:22	
furnished (1) - 47:11	grant [3] - 46:14,	75:14, 75:23, 76:2,	Hills (13) - 41:9, 68:10,	
furnishing [1] - 98:11	91:15, 115:15	76:10, 76:16, 76:21,	68:14, 68:16, 68:23,	idea [5] - 88:22, 88:24,
future [2] - 28:9,	granted [4] - 8:20,	76:24, 77:2, 77:10,	69:11, 69:17,	94:7, 94:9, 112:17
131:21	47:23, 52:5, 92:3	77:19, 78:4, 79:3,	112:23, 112:24,	ideas [1] - 112:25
101121	grantee [12] - 45:19,	79:10, 80:6, 80:15,	113:6, 113:12,	identified (1) - 60:6
G	46:14, 46:25, 47:1,	80:25, 81:11, 81:20,	113:15, 113:17	identify [6] - 38:24,
	47:12, 47:13, 50:17,	82:3, 82:11, 82:18,	hindsight's [1] -	
	50:18, 98:11, 98:12,	83:2, 85:12, 85:16,	128:13	54:14, 54:15, 55:16, 55:20
gaps [2] - 44:16, 44:18	98:13, 126:4	86:10, 91:19, 91:24,	historical [4] - 31:14,	
GARY [1] - 1:11	grantor [6] - 46:19,	96:7, 96:17, 97:12,	53:18, 60:9, 125:17	illuminating [1] -
gas [72] - 3:16, 3:17,	46:20, 47:3, 47:11,	97:20, 109:2, 115:2,	history [15] - 7:15,	114:7
7:7, 7:12, 7:13, 7:19,	47:17, 97:3	129:10, 132:1	12:15, 25:25, 31:16,	imagine [2] - 106:3,
7:20, 8:14, 10:7,	grantors [1] - 124:11	happy [4] - 44:6, 64:4,	32:2, 44:11, 44:14,	127:5
11:2, 11:21, 11:22,	grateful [1] - 20:12	66:2, 102:13	44:15, 44:17, 45:10	immediately [1] -
16:21, 18:7, 18:9,	great [3] - 20:13,	hard [1] - 95:3	51:15, 67:18, 96:25,	77:17
18:11, 20:8, 23:4,	36:25, 114:12	head [1] - 79:19	114:14, 116:3	impact [3] - 88:12,
26:22, 29:20, 29:21,	greatly [2] - 11:12,	hear [2] - 5:5, 5:10	hit [5] - 20:3, 38:3,	122:22, 125:21
29:22, 29:23, 29:24,	11:16	heard [4] - 19:12,	85:11, 85:12, 85:13	impediment [2] -
30:5, 31:6, 32:7,	Greg [3] - 1:14, 6:8,	92:14, 92:17, 130:24	hold [1] - 45:13	80:17, 81:1
35:6, 39:23, 40:1,	66:23	hearing [24] - 3:2, 3:6,	holders [5] - 85:1,	imperative [1] - 8:23
40:18, 40:19, 42:23,	Gregory [1] - 1:18	3:11, 3:14, 4:5, 4:6,	120:19, 125:1,	impertinences [2] -
44:1, 47:1, 47:3,	ground [4] - 99:16,	4:8, 5:13, 5:14, 5:22,	125:4, 125:7	45:3, 45:15
47:10, 47:17, 47:21,	99:17, 107:12, 110:1	13:20, 16:17, 16:20,	hole [1] - 47:5	implement [1] -
47:25, 48:3, 48:4,		17:13, 91:7, 91:21,	home [3] - 12:2,	112:25
48:15, 48:22, 49:3,	groups [1] - 117:24	103:2, 103:3, 118:9,		import [1] - 38:25
49:10, 49:17, 49:20,	growing [1] - 46:20	119:10, 129:4,	130:23, 131:5	importance [1] - 32:1
50:1, 50:13, 52:7,	guess [10] - 22:7,	132:2, 132:4	homeowner [1] - 67:2	important [10] - 11:8,
58:4, 60:24, 64:19,	26:23, 29:4, 51:16,	Hearing [3] - 3:13,	honest [1] - 15:8	31:7, 31:15, 38:2,
	65:3, 71:13, 94:3,	5:22, 91:8	honestly [1] - 123:23	38:5, 41:18, 45:10,
			hopefully [3] - 13:1,	
74:11, 74:12, 77:16,	127:18, 129:5,			48:4, 62:8, 120:22
74:11, 74:12, 77:16, 78:11, 78:21, 78:22,	130:12	hedge [1] - 48:17	33:3, 43:20	48:4, 62:8, 120:22 importantly [1] - 8:18
74:11, 74:12, 77:16,				48:4, 62:8, 120:22 importantly [1] - 8:18 impression [2] - 12:8,

19:7	inspect [17] - 11:18,	106:6	J	121:10 9
IN [1] - 1:4	12:20, 14:16, 15:8,	interstate [21] - 23:11,		- knows [2] - 55:11,
inaccurate [3] - 27:17,	15:15, 16:3, 20:16,	23:16, 23:19, 23:24,		65:23
108:10, 126:22	20:18, 20:20, 20:23,	24:2, 27:8, 38:22,	James [1] - 1:18	Koenecke [6] - 1:21,
inappropriate [1] -	21:15, 23:25, 25:3,	42:23, 42:24, 49:16,	January (4) - 129:18,	6:20, 110:23,
83:17	27:6, 68:25, 69:4,	53:2, 53:3, 53:11,	129:20, 130:4,	124:18, 127:9,
Inbox [1] - 120:15	80:4	68:6, 70:18, 74:4,	133:14	127:11
Inc (2) - 58:3, 58:5	inspectable [1] -	78:19, 78:20, 78:22,	Jim [2] - 6:10, 30:11	KOENECKE [4] - 6:20,
inch [1] - 54:10	26:19	79:1, 79:4	job [4] - 19:25, 49:23,	14:18, 109:7, 127:12
incident [1] - 110:18	inspected [12] - 12:6,	intervene [4] - 118:11,	64:3, 104:19	Kristen [3] - 1:17, 6:4,
incite [4] - 84:13, 85:5,	14:6, 15:11, 15:19,	118:16, 119:2, 119:5	Joe [1] - 54:21	7:2
85:7, 86:12	21:8, 22:6, 23:10,	intervened [2] -	July [2] - 63:21, 64:1	KRISTIE [1] ~ 1:11
incited [1] - 86:12	26:13, 74:11, 74:13,	118:18, 118:23	jurisdiction [51] -	
Inciting [1] - 84:4	74:22, 79:25	Intervenor [1] - 12:12	3:15, 3:19, 3:25,	L
include [2] - 34:17,	inspecting [4] - 12:8,	intimate (1) - 127:14	7:25, 8:7, 8:14, 8:15,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
97:18	12:11, 26:16, 45:18	intrastate [4] - 11:21,	11:14, 11:15, 11:19,	L L
included [2] - 53:17,	inspection [10] -	27:7, 27:8, 70:18	11:21, 11:23, 13:14,	lacking [1] - 86:17
107:14	12:14, 15:9, 15:14,	invested [1] - 19:14	13:25, 14:2, 15:3,	laid [2] - 46:15, 56:22
including [5] - 41:12,	15:24, 42:21, 43:15,	investigate [1] - 83:23	15:4, 24:7, 26:18,	land [4] - 46:15, 57:3,
55:16, 59:15, 59:20,	68:25, 79:14, 80:3,	invitation [1] - 121:18	31:24, 37:12, 39:14,	101:2, 101:8
107:15	113:25	invite [2] - 119:4,	39:18, 39:20, 39:24,	landed [1] - 98:3
inclusive [1] - 26:25	Inspections [1] -	128:24	42:15, 43:1, 43:8,	landowner [6] - 46:3,
inconsistent [2] -	11:16	invited [3] - 121:2,	43:12, 69:12, 69:15,	46:4, 46:7, 48:12,
	inspectors [3] - 79:19,	121:12, 121:21	73:7, 73:15, 75:1,	50:14, 60:16
79:14, 115:10	79:25, 80:3	Involve [1] - 42:24	78:10, 78:13, 79:9,	landowner's [2] -
incorporated [1] -	install [1] - 58:21	involved [5] - 50:2,	79:13, 80:5, 82:23,	48:25, 52:5
53:1	installed [4] - 55:6,	85:15, 89:2, 89:5,	85:20, 90:15, 93:15,	landowners [5] -
Increase [1] - 23:4	56:3, 56:8, 59:2	98:10	113:11, 115:25,	44:21, 45:6, 114:13,
indicate [2] - 56:12,	instance [4] - 35:21,	lowa [21] - 41:9, 53:4,	121:25, 122:2,	114:21, 121:19
116:16	69:10, 83:21, 85:18	58:8, 66:19, 68:1,	122:7, 123:13,	lands [1] - 45:4
indicated [1] - 123:13	instances [1] - 20:2	68:10, 68:13, 68:17,	124:3, 128:17	language [19] - 47:15,
indirect [1] - 100:13	instead [4] - 62:13,	68:23, 69:9, 69:11,	jurisdictional [13] -	50:8, 50:15, 51:3,
indirectly [1] - 98:12	83:20, 86:11, 108:7	69:12, 113:5,	11:24, 12:4, 21:11,	51:8, 51:13, 51:19,
individuals [1] -	instrument (1) - 72:6	113:10, 113:17,	24:17, 24:18, 27:8,	52:10, 52:12, 52:21,
128:24	intending [1] - 56:21	119:23, 120:1,	31:7, 67:4, 69:1,	54:17, 88:20, 89:6,
inflammatory [2] -	intent [4] - 84:19,	122:20, 123:2,	71:1, 113:16,	89:10, 90:23, 91:1,
83:6, 86:15	84:20, 86:10, 86:13	123:4, 123:8	115:18, 116:4	102:20, 117:4, 117:8
inform [1] - 86:17	intention [1] - 85:4	ironic [1] - 127:1	jurisdictions [2] -	large [4] - 23:2, 40:18,
Information [15] -	interaction [2] - 78:6,	issue [22] - 4:7, 7:6,	20:1, 112:16	58:6, 111:12
10:15, 10:17, 12:14,	120:3	8:5, 9:3, 11:13, 12:1,		largely [1] - 10:15
27:17, 31:1, 32:25,	interest [7] - 37:5,	24:25, 27:8, 33:16,	K	last [13] - 17:17, 26:1,
33:1, 43:19, 60:11,	43:25, 62:7, 109:11,	34:1, 65:23, 66:1,		39:11, 44:23, 45:23,
60:13, 62:9, 62:15,	125:8, 131:19	67:1, 67:7, 73:6,	Kampan m F0.F	46:11, 47:14, 49:7,
76:5, 120:3, 129:22	interested [2] - 85:15,	73:16, 76:1, 90:10,	Kansas [5] - 53:5,	51:24, 52:3, 71:22,
informational [1] -	96:22	119:16, 129:17,	58:7, 79:17, 112:21,	121:25, 130:16
123:25		131:11	113:18	Laura (5) - 6:11,
informing [1] - 85:16	interesting [5] - 41:6,	issued [1] - 3:13	Karen [1] - 1:13	30:11, 84:15, 86:2,
infrastructure [1] -	83:3, 90:7, 111:23,	issues [25] - 3:14, 4:9,	Katlyn [1] - 5:17	120:25
32:13	115:17	20:5, 22:13, 25:7,	keep [3] - 26:4, 41:18,	law [9] - 4:12, 9:24,
ingress [1] - 45:17	Interests [1] - 130:19	25:9, 30:18, 31:3,	106:6	10:2, 13:18, 13:21,
Inherently [1] - 113:8	interfere [1] - 46:16	31:4, 31:6, 32:4,	keeps [1] - 131:8	33:15, 49:15, 61:21,
initial (7) - 10:13, 19:2,	InterNorth [8] - 35:22,	32:23, 38:2, 66:2,	Keith [1] - 53:17	114:18
19:8, 19:18, 36:10,	38:6, 38:9, 54:12,	66:10, 84:1, 84:22,	key [1] - 44:11	Law [2] - 27:20, 82:24
44:19, 51:24	58:3, 93:7, 94:13,	1	kind [5] - 23:22, 26:14,	lawyer [1] - 6:20
initiated [1] - 43:19	96:5	85:6, 85:18, 88:10,	54:20, 70:19, 114:6	lay [1] - 73:14
initiation [1] - 44:17	interpret [1] - 111:7	104:8, 114:18,	knowing [4] - 32:24,	laying [2] - 53:13,
initiative [1] - 12:19	interpretation [1] -	115:18, 122:8	33:2, 47:20, 86:8	104:19
inlet [3] - 15:4, 104:23,	89:13	items [1] - 85:24	knowledge [5] -	layperson [1] - 87:24
105:8	interpreted [1] - 17:3	itself [2] - 19:5, 102:19	37:11, 75:19, 75:25,	lays [1] - 53:9
inquiry [1] - 77:14	Interpreting [1] - 19:6		76:24, 77:13	LDC [2] - 55:21, 67:1
insight [1] - 104:21	interruption [1] -		known [2] - 9:7,	

leak [7] - 20:6, 21:1,	lies [1] - 94:8	64:10, 70:20, 110:2	McComsey (2] - 1:24,	111:10
21:2, 22:23, 23:2,	life [2] - 43:23, 110:24	lose [4] - 42:11, 44:3,	133:18	merge [2] - 76:8,
23:4, 100:5	likely [2] - 12:23,	60:23, 61:2	McKee (1) - 6:16	76:14
leaks [2] - 83:23,	35:17	losing [1] - 20:8	MDU [5] - 6:19, 6:21,	met [2] - 64:9, 64:14
83:24	limitation [1] - 99:5	lost [1] - 20:2	12:17, 109:11,	meter [7] - 12:2, 60:8,
least [7] - 36:10, 65:7,	limited [1] - 98:23	loud [1] - 5:4	109:13	60:10, 99:22,
68:2, 72:21, 76:3,	line [35] - 3:17, 12:2,	louder [1] - 76:11	MDU's [1] - 12:21	106:24, 106:25,
110:20, 131:3	19:4, 19:9, 19:11,	love [1] - 21:3	mean [24] - 15:2, 15:7,	107:2
leave [2] - 91:16,	20:3, 20:4, 20:17,	lower [1] - 105:9	20:19, 21:14, 24:11,	meters [1] - 22:9
131:4	20:18, 20:21, 21:2,	lunch [1] - 91:5	25:13, 25:15, 26:2,	Michigan [2] - 58:7,
leaves [2] - 48:7,	21:19, 22:2, 23:24,		34:12, 36:12, 48:2,	68:1
50:12	24:2, 25:18, 34:5,	M	48:17, 52:18, 54:13,	microphone [1] -
led [1] - 8:4	35:15, 41:22, 55:19,		- 54:19, 57:18, 63:9,	109:19
eft [5] - 12:23, 60:3,	64:10, 69:3, 74:18,		65:6, 67:17, 88:25,	microphones [2] -
85:25, 100:16,	74:21, 75:3, 96:10,	ma'am [1] - 119:11	89:15, 113:13,	5:1, 5:6
105:10	96:16, 97:14, 100:8,	Madison [4] - 121:3,	119:1, 123:3	MidAmerican [9] -
eft-hand [1] - 105:10	104:25, 106:23,	121:5, 121:16,	means [8] - 33:23,	41:12, 64:15, 65:4,
egal [7] - 39:4, 39:6,	113:12, 113:13,	124:11	47:21, 47:23, 47:25,	65:6, 65:8, 65:15,
63:10, 70:25, 82:14,	130:2	magic (1) - 131:1	87:15, 87:25, 109:3,	65:21, 112:13, 120:6
84:3, 94:11	lines [14] - 7:19, 7:20,	mail (10) - 72:10,	117:23	MidAmerican's [4] -
egalities [1] - 87:24	12:6, 19:15, 19:20,	72:11, 72:12, 72:16,	meant [1] - 88:21	64:11, 112:1, 112:2,
egally [3] - 17:4,	20:13, 20:23, 21:7,	72:17, 73:1, 73:9,	measured [1] - 47:11	112:11
81:12, 94:21	21:16, 21:18, 27:7,	73:11, 76:8, 76:14	meet [2] - 69:4, 109:20	middle [1] - 22:4
egislature [2] - 14:1,	31:8, 68:17	mails [2] - 72:21, 73:5	meeting [8] - 62:6,	might [21] - 11:10,
-	link [1] - 126:25	main (1) - 12:7	79:23, 84:5, 85:19,	13:1, 17:2, 25:17,
28:5	listen [3] - 17:12,	maintain [3] - 19:9,	85:20, 121:17,	32:16, 35:12, 62:12,
ess [3] - 22:10, 22:25,	17:15, 119:9	21:16, 45:2	129:18, 129:20	64:23, 65:17, 66:4,
45:16	listened [2] - 17:13,	maintained [4] -	meetings [3] - 121:2,	76:10, 105:19,
est [1] - 5:9	17:16	45:15, 74:11, 74:13,	124:9, 124:13	109:18, 110:16,
etter (52) - 71:18,	listening [2] - 13:15,	100:25	Mehlhaff [3] - 1:15,	112:17, 113:15,
71:20, 72:4, 72:9,	128:24	maintaining [2] -	6:6, 113:14	115:15, 127:6,
73:16, 73:20, 73:24,	litigate [1] - 122:6	19:22, 45:19	Melissa (1) - 6:15	128:24
73:25, 74:6, 74:7,		maintains [2] - 39:25,		Milbank [11] - 36:17,
74:14, 74:15, 74:22,	litigated [2] - 90:11, 90:14	45:24	members [1] - 12:25	41:20, 41:22, 41:23,
75:2, 75:6, 75:9,		maintenance [1] -	memorandum [2] -	42:6, 67:11, 67:12,
75:16, 75:17, 75:18,	live [3] - 4:19, 5:10,	46:22	7:16, 9:3	
75:20, 76:2, 76:3,	122:12	man's [1] - 57:3	memorialize [1] -	98:15, 98:21, 99:3, 99:9
76:6, 76:9, 76:13,	lives [1] - 20:2	manage [1] - 119:8	89:20	
76:25, 77:4, 77:5,	local [4] - 10:7, 11:1,	manager (3) - 53:16,	mention (2) - 12:12,	mile [2] - 22:3
78:16, 80:15, 83:3,	53:4, 67:1	69:24, 113:23	124:9	mind [9] - 29:17,
83:6, 83:7, 84:23,	locatable [1] - 21:2	manner [1] - 34:20	mentioned [9] - 33:12,	41:18, 48:19, 48:25, 49:6, 70:20, 70:23,
85:1, 85:21, 85:23,	located [1] - 45:20		37:2, 38:6, 39:2,	
85:24, 86:3, 86:14,	location [2] - 3:6,	manual [1] - 106:17 March [2] - 16:18,	40:15, 50:7, 68:2,	104:20, 107:25
108:12, 108:19,	12:14		68:13, 123:12	minimize [1] ~ 88:17
120:12, 120:15,	longstanding (2) -	103:2	MERC [40] - 9:9, 9:10,	Minnesota [8] - 36:5,
120:17, 121:1,	67:17, 83:16	mark [3] - 85:11,	36:6, 36:14, 36:16,	41:9, 53:5, 58:7,
126:19, 127:3,	look [20] - 8:21, 14:22,	85:12, 85:16	36:23, 37:9, 37:11,	66:9, 68:1, 68:11,
127:5, 127:6	15:2, 34:8, 36:13,	Mary [8] - 15:11,	40:22, 41:8, 41:16,	93:17
etters [4] - 76:8,	57:11, 64:9, 67:17,	24:12, 54:21, 71:19,	41:21, 41:23, 41:25,	minutes [2] - 71:14,
76:12, 111:20,	69:3, 69:18, 70:7,	72:11, 73:20, 77:14,	42:6, 61:25, 66:7,	109:19
120:16	84:7, 88:15, 100:13,	113:23	66:9, 67:23, 68:10,	miscommunication
evel [3] - 25:17,	106:2, 106:3,	MATTER [1] - 1:4	75:12, 87:21, 89:2,	[1] - 42:10
58:17, 120:2	109:22, 113:2,	matter [9] - 2:2, 3:3,	93:14, 93:17, 94:5,	misinterpret [1] -
abilities [15] - 35:23,	127:21, 131:18	4:7, 6:23, 91:11,	94:16, 94:17, 95:7,	72:24
36:16, 38:7, 38:15,	looked [6] - 18:12,	101:6, 110:7,	95:8, 104:11,	misinterpreted [1] -
52:17, 54:18, 57:14,	64:13, 86:1, 86:3,	130:18, 133:10	106:20, 106:21,	72:22
58:4, 58:5, 58:16,	115:14, 123:7	matters [3] - 78:11,	107:7, 115:19	mislead [1] - 54:19
63:11, 68:7, 93:3,	looking (7) - 49:1,	119:3	MERC's [1] - 123:15	misleading [3] - 83:7,
95:23, 96:2	58:15, 66:12, 75:14,	Matthews [2] - 2:2, 3:6	mercaptan [2] - 55:19,	84:4, 86:14
			1 50.40	
ability [ȝ] - 34:25, 39:5, 127:15	109:8, 129:7, 129:19	MCCOMSEY [1] - 133:5	58:18 merely [2] - 38:17,	missed [1] - 72:4

				
Missouri [1] - 58:8	56:14, 56:18, 56:21,	124:7, 124:16,	106:3	130:10 1
misunderstanding [1]	57:5, 57:21, 57:25,	125:7, 125:23,	Nebraska [2] - 58:8,	network [3] - 4:16,
- 42:13	58:3, 58:13, 58:22,	126:1, 127:9,	113:18	4:17
mixture [1] - 55:22	59:4, 59:10, 59:22,	127:12, 128:23,	necessarily [4] -	never [10] - 28:12,
moment [1] - 108:21	60:5, 61:1, 61:17,	131:13, 131:25,	11:24, 32:9, 74:13,	48:4, 48:22, 48:23,
monetary [1] - 46:6	61:19, 62:23, 63:9,	132:2	79:21	51:10, 52:11, 66:25,
money [1] - 111:12	63:18, 63:22, 63:25,	MS [45] - 6:4, 7:1,	need [12] - 8:21,	67:7, 115:13, 125:20
monitored [1] - 20:11	64:4, 64:16, 65:1,	13:10, 13:23, 16:24,	33:19, 35:1, 60:13,	new [2] - 66:21, 96:16
Montana [2] - 1:21,	65:8, 65:10, 65:13,	17:14, 18:6, 18:18,	60:21, 62:11, 67:3,	next [2] - 34:24,
12:13	65:22, 66:8, 66:24,	18:21, 19:21, 20:22,	92:25, 98:9, 119:8,	101:24
Montana-Dakota [2] -	67:14, 67:25, 68:18,	21:11, 22:11, 22:22,	129:3, 130:7	NG11-001 [7] - 9:17,
1:21, 12:13	68:21, 70:4, 70:7,	23:2, 27:2, 27:5,	needed [3] - 60:18,	16:17, 27:24, 28:9,
monthly [6] - 22:9,	70:16, 70:22, 71:11,	28:1, 28:11, 29:4,	107:11, 130:2	33:9, 99:7, 103:3
	71:14, 71:23, 72:13,	29:24, 30:5, 71:24,	needs [2] - 5:18, 33:3	NG16-014 [4] - 1:4,
22:20, 22:21, 60:11,	72:17, 73:2, 74:1,	75:25, 76:7, 76:12,	negotiate [1] - 117:16	3:2, 91:7, 132:3
99:22, 99:24	75:19, 77:9, 77:12,	76:19, 76:23, 77:1,	negotlated [1] - 99:2	nice [3] - 104:19,
months [2] - 7:5,	78:2, 78:8, 79:6,	80:24, 81:2, 81:14,	negotiation [1] -	106:2, 106:3
84:21	79:12, 80:14, 81:24,	106:20, 107:6,	101:25	NNG [1] - 39:22
months' [1] - 59:18	82:4, 82:17, 82:19,	111:8, 114:20,	negotiations [3] -	nobody [1] - 57:3
moral [5] - 81:14,	84:15, 85:13, 86:1,	121:1, 121:6, 121:9,	103:12, 118:3, 118:6	nominate [2] - 49:20,
82:16, 82:20, 84:2,	87:4, 87:11, 87:13,	121:14, 121:17,	Nelson [6] - 3:9,	50:3
111:15	87:17, 87:19, 88:10,	121:22, 124:14,	15:21, 72:7, 90:6,	nominates [2] - 82:8,
moraily (1) - 81:12	88:19, 88:24, 89:5,	129:21, 130:3	92:2, 131:19	82:9
Mork [4] - 72:1, 72:5,	89:8, 89:10, 89:14,	muddled [1] - 107:25	NELSON [98] - 1:10,	none (3) - 12:15,
76:4, 76:15	89:23, 89:25, 90:2,	muddy [1] - 26:14	3:1, 13:6, 13:11,	82:18, 91:21
morning [11] - 3:1,	90:3, 90:4, 90:5,	must [6] - 26:12,	14:3, 14:15, 14:20,	nonjurisdictional (2) -
6:1, 6:14, 18:3,	90:12, 90:17, 90:21,	27:21, 50:13, 64:14,	14:24, 15:15, 15:18,	23:14, 115:22
30:10, 30:18, 32:18,	90:22, 90:24, 91:2,	128:3	15:22, 16:7, 16:12,	nonpayment [1] -
33:10, 71:13, 71:15,	91:6, 92:5, 92:22,	12010	- 17:12, 17:16, 18:16,	104:23
122:18	93:1, 93:12, 94:9,	N	18:19, 19:2, 20:14,	normal [3] - 4:20,
most [5] - 32:24,	94:12, 95:2, 95:16,		21:5, 21:13, 21:23,	51:8, 54:17
34:14, 44:13, 81:5,	95:18, 96:15, 97:2,		22:8, 22:19, 22:23,	Northern [161] - 1:19,
99:13	97:16, 97:23, 97:25,	name [6] - 3:9, 30:10,	23:6, 44:8, 45:9,	
Motion [6] - 91:13,	102:21, 103:11,	36:15, 71:22, 91:8,	46:1, 46:11, 47:9,	3:18, 3:21, 6:9, 7:9,
91:16, 91:18, 91:20,	103:16, 103:19,	93:13	47:22, 48:6, 48:12,	7:18, 9:6, 9:13, 9:25, 10:6, 10:24, 14:7,
92:2, 92:3	104:2, 105:4,	narrow [1] - 109:17	49:4, 49:13, 50:4,	15:24, 16:4, 16:10,
move [3] - 91:15,	105:24, 106:9,	narrowly [1] - 41:18	50:21, 51:5, 51:12,	23:12, 23:23, 24:7,
125:25, 130:2	106:12, 106:15,	natural [15] - 3:16,	51:23, 52:3, 52:14,	30:8, 30:24, 31:21,
moves [1] - 67:2	106:22, 107:5,	3:17, 7:7, 7:13, 7:18,	53:20, 53:23, 54:9,	32:19, 33:5, 37:16,
moving [2] - 92:5,	107:13, 108:6,	7:20, 8:14, 11:2,	54:24, 56:2, 56:6,	38:13, 39:7, 39:16,
104:18	108:10, 108:15,	32:7, 42:23, 52:7,	56:13, 56:16, 56:19,	39:22, 40:8, 40:11,
MR [227] - 5:25, 6:7,	108:17, 108:23,	78:11, 82:1, 101:9,	57:2, 57:9, 57:23,	40:12, 40:13, 41:20,
6:8, 6:13, 6:14, 6:18,	109:1, 109:3, 109:7,	118:9	58:1, 58:9, 58:19,	40.12, 40.13, 41.20, 41:24, 42:16, 42:19,
6:20, 6:22, 13:3,	110:22, 111:1,	Natural [32] - 1:19,	58:23, 59:9, 59:13,	
14:14, 14:18, 14:23,	114:3, 114:25,	3:18, 3:21, 6:9, 7:9,	59:25, 60:23, 61:9,	42:20, 42:22, 42:25,
15:1, 15:17, 15:20,	115:3, 115:5,	7:18, 24:7, 32:19,	61:18, 62:1, 86:19,	43:3, 43:4, 43:11, 43:12, 44:20, 45:6,
16:6, 16:9, 21:21,	117:11, 117:17,	35:23, 38:14, 39:3,	87:10, 91:15, 91:20,	
21:24, 23:13, 23:17,	117:19, 117:23,	51:20, 54:18, 56:10,		45:11, 45:23, 47:16,
23:22, 24:12, 24:23,	118:5, 118:10,	56:25, 58:4, 64:8,	91:25, 92:2, 102:15,	48:2, 48:8, 48:20,
25:1, 25:4, 25:9,	118:13, 118:15,	68:3, 75:12, 77:1,	103:1, 103:14,	49:9, 50:5, 50:9,
25:17, 26:1, 26:14,	118:21, 118:24,	90:12, 91:17,	103:17, 103:20,	50:11, 50:13, 51:20,
26:22, 29:14, 29:16,	119:11, 119:19,	106:17, 117:12,	104:16, 105:22,	52:6, 52:18, 52:20,
29:17, 30:3, 30:7,	120:7, 120:18,	124:19, 124:22,	105:25, 106:10,	53:2, 53:11, 54:5,
30:9, 45:8, 45:25,	120:22, 120:25,	125:14, 125:15,	106:13, 107:3,	54:22, 55:9, 55:11,
46:10, 47:8, 47:20,	121:23, 122:16,	125:18, 125:19,	107:24, 108:7,	56:6, 56:9, 56:25,
47:25, 48:11, 48:17,	122:17, 122:25,	126:21	108:12, 108:16,	57:6, 58:21, 59:6,
49:11, 49:14, 50:15,	123:1, 123:3,	nature [2] - 34:16,	108:20, 110:24,	59:18, 59:20, 59:25,
50:22, 51:7, 51:20,		85:2	114:4, 114:24,	60:1, 60:3, 61:11,
52:1, 52:11, 52:24,	123:11, 123:16,	nay [1] - 91:22	124:8, 124:15,	61:14, 62:15, 62:18,
53:22, 54:8, 54:10,	123:17, 123:18,	near [1] - 108:17	129:5, 129:13,	62:21, 63:18, 63:25,
55:7, 56:5, 56:9,	123:19, 123:20,	1	129:24, 130:8,	64:8, 73:4, 73:8,
	123:23, 124:5,	nearly [3] - 7:7, 30:21,		
	1	1	1	

	<u>-,.</u>	······································		
73:13, 73:21, 75:2,	36:16, 36:19, 37:18,	objection [1] - 130:3	84:18	operating [1] - 34:21 1:
75:6, 75:21, 77:1,	37:25, 39:16, 39:23,	obligated [2] - 37:5,	offer [1] - 110:20	operation [2] - 46:22,
77:5, 77:11, 78:7,	39:25, 40:2, 40:8,	94:24	offered [1] - 116:10	78:13
78:10, 79:7, 79:18,	40:9, 40:13, 40:14,	obligation [71] - 29:7,	office [2] - 79:17,	operational [3] - 15:7,
79:20, 80:22, 82:12,	41:2, 41:4, 41:7,	31:20, 33:18, 33:21,	79:18	47:18, 48:15
89:16, 90:8, 90:12,	41:9, 41:15, 41:19,	35:24, 36:11, 36:20,	often [3] - 22:10,	operations [1] - 53:16
90:16, 91:13, 91:17,	42:1, 42:3, 42:7,	37:21, 41:8, 42:4,	80:12	operator [2] - 15:5,
92:8, 92:10, 94:12,	43:10, 43:11, 49:19,	44:4, 49:15, 49:16,	oftentimes [1] - 77:23	80:23
94:24, 95:19, 96:4,	51:5, 61:24, 64:8,	51:4, 51:21, 60:10,	Olson [5] - 1:20, 6:14,	operator's [1] - 19:23
97:9, 97:10, 97:16,	66:11, 68:13, 80:19,	60:14, 61:3, 61:7,	97:25, 115:10,	operators [1] - 26:17
98:7, 98:11, 98:23,	81:3, 81:18, 83:22,	63:2, 63:5, 66:3,	115:13	-
98:25, 100:15,	84:23, 87:20, 88:7,	69:15, 81:9, 81:12,		opinion (6) - 18:16,
100:18, 101:4,	88:20, 89:2, 93:19,	81:13, 81:14, 82:12,	OLSON [20] - 6:14,	19:19, 63:6, 63:7,
101:8, 101:11,	93:25, 94:5, 94:18,	1	97:25, 102:21,	78:3, 116:10
101:16, 101:20,	96:9, 96:13, 96:19,	82:19, 82:20, 83:4,	103:11, 103:16,	opportunity [9] -
	97:23, 98:1, 98:13,	84:2, 84:3, 86:23,	103:19, 104:2,	30:12, 30:17, 39:9,
101:22, 101:25,	1 · · · ·	87:2, 88:18, 89:22,	105:4, 105:24,	39:10, 66:7, 68:20,
102:8, 102:25,	99:9, 101:4, 101:19,	90:8, 92:11, 92:16,	106:9, 106:12,	98:2, 113:4, 130:17
103:10, 103:18,	102:5, 102:19,	92:18, 92:19, 92:21,	106:15, 106:22,	opposed [2] - 91:22,
105:20, 108:12,	103:4, 103:24,	93:3, 93:5, 93:7,	107:5, 107:13,	97:14
111:25, 112:12,	105:10, 108:13,	93:23, 94:7, 94:18,	108:6, 108:10,	opposite [1] - 129:11
112:16, 114:1,	108:18, 112:18,	94:21, 95:1, 95:6,	108:15, 108:17,	option [5] - 37:9,
114:13, 116:4,	115:6, 115:19,	95:11, 95:24, 96:3,	126:1	37:24, 50:12, 60:2,
117:12, 117:15,	117:14, 119:1,	97:5, 98:17, 98:18,	once [6] - 22:14,	101:18
121:4, 122:12,	121:12, 125:25,	103:18, 104:24,	22:18, 39:5, 99:23,	options [2] - 35:19,
124:19, 124:22,	126:19, 126:22,	110:2, 110:4,	101:18, 119:5	36:25
125:14, 125:15,	126:25, 127:10	111:15, 116:11,	one [61] - 3:14, 4:17,	oral [7] - 6:23, 30:8,
125:19, 126:4,	NorthWestern's [11] -	118:1, 118:2,	14:10, 14:11, 14:12,	66:18, 91:10, 92:6,
126:7, 126:21,	19:1, 22:14, 30:1,	124:19, 124:24,	15:11, 20:10, 21:10,	109:4, 111:3
127:4, 127:14	41:17, 50:25, 92:6,	126:3, 127:19	22:12, 24:14, 24:21,	Order [5] - 3:12, 10:3,
northern [1] - 6:7	101:10, 101:14,	obligations [27] - 9:5,	26:4, 28:6, 30:20,	17:5, 104:9, 119:10
Northern's [37] -	103:8, 103:17, 113:2	9:21, 33:8, 33:24,	33:6, 37:17, 38:5,	order [11] - 10:6,
16:21, 17:22, 31:18,	Notary [2] - 133:7,	38:8, 38:10, 38:24,	43:23, 44:21, 46:14,	16:18, 33:17, 41:20,
33:13, 41:4, 43:14,	133:18	52:17, 52:22, 57:14,	47:18, 50:9, 53:12,	50:6, 87:3, 91:7,
47:16, 49:10, 49:15,	note (3] - 10:22, 41:6,	63:11, 68:12, 88:13,	53:19, 55:25, 56:24,	103:3, 110:13,
49:16, 49:22, 49:24,	111:9	89:19, 89:20, 93:23,	62:25, 69:10, 76:7,	118:8, 130:5
51:4, 56:15, 57:15,	notes [1] - 116:24	99:4, 102:2, 116:15,	76:9, 76:12, 76:15,	orders [2] - 26:20,
59:5, 66:3, 68:5,	nothing [3] - 66:5,	116:19, 116:21,	76:25, 77:24, 83:25,	26:24
69:1, 73:15, 78:14,	118:5, 132:1	117:3, 117:7, 126:8,	84:25, 85:21, 86:19,	ordinary [1] - 88:19
79:15, 79:22, 82:1,	Notice [1] - 3:12	126:15, 126:17	86:21, 87:13, 90:3,	organized [1] - 102:8
91:16, 96:10, 98:24,	notice [5] - 23:3,	oblige [1] - 71:6	96:7, 101:1, 105:16,	original (1) - 93:23
99:21, 100:9,	30:13, 30:22, 59:18,	obscured [1] - 127:3	106:1, 110:13,	originally (4) - 17:6,
100:20, 100:21,	60:17	obtained [1] - 98:7	111:9, 113:25,	36:6, 109:8, 109:17
101:12, 102:19,	noticed [1] ~ 3:12	obviously [13] - 5:2,	115:6, 116:5,	ought [5] - 4:22, 34:6,
103:5, 104:23,	notified [1] - 81:21	15:3, 24:3, 46:5,	116:22, 118:17,	
115:4, 127:2	notify [1] - 74:16	46:18, 51:12, 52:18,	122:4, 123:8, 124:8,	34:11, 116:9, 123:7
northwest [1] - 78:23	November [14] - 3:13,	53:24, 58:20, 59:3,	125:9, 128:19,	outdated [1] - 83:17
Northwest [1] - 75:12	71:20, 72:6, 72:7,	69:6, 82:13, 106:1	129:16, 131:4	outermost [1] - 106:24
Northwestern [108] -	76:2, 76:3, 76:17,	occurred [1] - 101:7	ongoing [6] - 66:10,	outlet [3] - 15:6,
1:20, 3:20, 3:21,	76:22, 80:15, 83:4,	odd [2] - 111:11,	68:22, 69:8, 85:2,	106:24, 106:25
6:13, 6:15, 7:8, 9:16,	83:6, 108:18, 126:19	115:22	119:22, 119:23	outilned [2] - 39:21,
9:21, 9:23, 10:13,	null [1] - 116:18	odorant [2] - 99:21,	Onida [2] - 1:24,	78:15
10:18, 10:25, 11:6,	number [12] - 3:14,	115:8	133:13	outset [1] - 102:18
18:3, 18:15, 18:17,	3:19, 3:24, 5:16,	odorizer [6] - 10:25,	online [1] - 10:4	overlap [1] - 88:16
18:20, 18:22, 22:12,		19:4, 56:4, 56:20,	open [1] - 48:7	oversee [1] - 13:19
22:17, 24:8, 27:19,	14:21, 44:20, 46:14,			oversight [1] - 5:23
28:13, 28:20, 31:19,	46:25, 73:5, 73:6,	58:11, 107:16	operate [4] - 45:3,	own [17] - 4:22, 5:4,
33:6, 33:7, 33:18,	96:19, 99:18	odorizing [1] - 55:5	61:11, 61:20, 99:12	19:9, 19:11, 19:20,
33:23, 34:2, 34:4,		OF [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:1,	operated [2] - 3:17,	24:2, 34:21, 66:2,
34:11, 34:17, 34:18,	0	133:1, 133:3	38:21	68:11, 101:2,
35:5, 35:16, 36:11,		offend [1] - 85:7	operates [4] - 7:18,	101:16, 104:7,
	o'clock [1] - 2:5	offensive [2] - 84:13,	39:25, 45:24, 59:6	106:11, 107:23,

113:19, 115:11,	particular (3) - 14:10,	perhaps [2] - 8:17,	11:13, 11:15, 11:22,	57:5, 57:21, 57:25, 13
131:10	48:24, 70:24	26:9	11:25, 12:5, 12:20,	58:3, 58:13, 58:22,
owned [11] - 3:17,	particularly [1] - 50:6	period [1] - 33:1	23:9, 26:22, 39:18,	59:4, 59:10, 59:22,
10:25, 12:3, 21:15,	parties (15] - 4:2, 4:11,	permanent (1] - 45:14	41:20, 41:24, 42:15,	60:5, 61:1, 61:17,
35:24, 36:8, 38:19,	6:2, 7:2, 10:16, 11:5,	permission [3] -	42:20, 42:21, 43:7,	61:19, 62:23, 63:9,
49:18, 105:18,	17:10, 18:13, 43:19,	27:21, 27:24, 28:10	43:13, 43:15, 44:18,	63:18, 63:22, 63:25,
125:12	46:17, 47:18, 60:15,	permitting [1] - 52:4	45:24, 47:1, 47:17,	64:4, 64:16, 65:1,
owner [4] - 53:8, 57:1,	110:13, 111:15,	perplexed [1] - 126:6	48:15, 49:2, 49:17,	65:8, 65:10, 65:13,
57:8, 65:23	130:13	persistence [1] - 32:3	49:20, 52:4, 57:15,	65:22, 66:8, 66:24,
owner's [1] - 69:2	parts [1] - 79:20	person [3] - 53:10,	67:12, 67:21, 68:6,	67:14, 67:25, 68:18,
owners [1] - 115:15	party (3) - 102:11,	75:11	69:23, 78:21, 79:1,	68:21, 70:4, 70:7,
ownership [5] - 11:6,	111:21, 127:19	person's [2] - 48:19,	79:4, 79:15, 79:22,	70:16, 70:22, 71:14,
12:15, 57:3, 106:10,	passed [1] - 9:9	49:6	98:16, 98:21, 99:3,	81:24, 82:4, 82:17,
106:13	past [6] - 7:5, 20:5,	personally [3] - 95:4,	99:9, 113:23	82:19, 84:15, 85:13,
owning [1] - 11:9	22:13, 28:12,	104:3, 129:24	pipelines [6] - 11:18,	86:1, 87:4, 87:17,
owns [7] - 56:16, 59:1,	101:16, 129:25		45:3, 45:14, 46:15,	88:10, 88:24, 89:8,
59:6, 68:10, 68:11,	path [3] - 32:10,	personnel [2] - 7:3,	46:23, 78:19	89:14, 89:25, 90:4,
105:13, 115:12		79:23	piping [1] - 106:23	90:12, 90:21, 90:24,
100.10, 110.12	34:14, 35:12	perspective [6] - 35:9,	pivotal (1) - 11:10	92:22, 93:1, 93:12,
D	patience [1] - 57:9	39:5, 64:17, 70:25,	place [4] - 13:24,	94:9, 94:12, 95:2,
P	Patrick [2] - 1:14, 6:5	116:21, 119:7	31:17, 85:17, 109:25	95:16, 95:18, 96:15,
	pay [4] - 46:19, 56:11,	pertaining [1] - 77:21	placed [2] - 75:17,	97:2, 97:16, 115:5,
page [11] - 17:25,	58:21, 105:14	Peterson [2] - 53:17,	115:25	117:17, 117:19,
18:1, 51:24, 51:25,	people [12] - 13:17,	53:21	places [2] - 22:6,	117:23, 118:5,
52:3, 57:18, 83:7,	74:20, 75:11, 86:12,	PETITION [1] - 1:4	92:17	118:10, 118:13,
84:7, 103:22, 104:18	86:17, 109:10,	Petition (2) - 3:3, 7:16		118:15, 118:21,
paid (5) - 55:5, 56:3,	109:24, 121:8,	Petitioner [1] - 6:3	placing [1] - 83:10	118:24, 119:11,
56:8, 56:15, 108:2	126:16, 130:17,	PHMSA [32] - 12:5,	planning [1] - 49:1	119:19, 120:7,
painted [1] - 106:2	130:24, 131:20	12:9, 24:11, 24:13,	plans [1] - 80:20	120:18, 120:22,
paper [3] - 38:18,	peoples [1] - 17:6	24:17, 26:12, 26:16,	plant [1] - 34;22	120:25, 121:23,
38:24, 59:2	Peoples [49] - 9:6,	26:19, 26:23, 43:1,	play [1] - 113:18	122:25, 123:3,
paragraph [14] - 18:2,	9:14, 18:14, 35:23,	43:13, 70:1, 70:2,	plenty [2] - 11:18, 66:2	123:16, 123:18,
44:25, 45:12, 46:5,	35:24, 36:8, 38:8,	70:10, 70:19, 71:1,	plus [1] - 77:7	123:20, 124:5, 125:7
47:9, 61:20, 80:16,	38:14, 39:3, 52:6,	71:4, 78:1, 78:6,	point [34] - 4:13, 5:15,	Porter [10] - 1:18, 6:8,
80:17, 84:8, 84:11,	52:9, 52:17, 52:18,	78:12, 79:2, 79:4,	6:22, 7:22, 10:10,	30:11, 81:2, 86:22,
100:19, 103:23,	52:20, 53:1, 53:3,	79:9, 79:10, 79:16,	12:10, 12:23, 14:3,	87:14, 90:5, 95:13,
104:19, 110:4	53:5, 53:10, 54:4,	79:19, 79:25, 80:2,	17:18, 17:21, 17:24,	122:1, 122:17
paragraphs [1] - 46:11	54:6, 54:17, 54:21,	80:7, 80:8	23:7, 23:24, 24:6,	portion [8] - 16:3,
parallel [1] - 9:11	56:6, 56:10, 58:4,	PHMSA's [2] - 70:23,	31:22, 32:9, 35:4,	16:5, 19:3, 46:2,
	58:10, 59:10, 59:16,	77:22	36:18, 39:7, 39:8,	47:6, 72:3, 99:20,
paraphrasing [1] - 77:13	59:20, 60:2, 61:11,	phone [2] - 113:23,	49:21, 52:17, 62:2,	107:20
	68:3, 75:12, 86:23,	128:25	77:16, 85:6, 87:6,	
parent [1] - 65:11	87:2, 93:13, 100:14,	phrase [4] - 47:10,	90:25, 94:3, 96:18,	portrayed [1] - 111:11
part [26] - 3:25, 7:24,	104:22, 106:14,	47:15, 48:7	99:8, 101:24,	pose [2] - 43:23, 85:3
32:1, 42:3, 44:13,	106:17, 107:4,	pick [1] - 5:7	108:25, 112:2,	posed [3] - 11:23,
45:21, 46:3, 57:12,	107:5, 107:9,	picking [1] - 5:1	128:23	24:16, 39:13
57:13, 58:11, 67:11,	107:10, 108:3,	picture [7] - 47:6,	pointed [1] - 17:19	position [16] - 10:12,
67:13, 72:14, 99:5,	115:14, 125:18,	55:2, 105:5, 107:1,	pointing [1] - 62:10	16:16, 16:23, 18:5,
99:6, 99:11, 99:13,	125:20	107:18, 108:7,	points [1] - 98:5	19:7, 20:19, 21:19,
100:9, 100:15,	Peoples' [3] - 57:13,	126:23	poof [1] - 116:14	28:25, 30:6, 50:5,
101:10, 103:12,	58:5, 58:11	pictures [4] - 14:7,	popping [1] - 26:7	73:14, 81:18, 96:11,
106:16, 109:14,	per [4] - 47:15, 52:9,	14:10, 55:20, 56:23	PORTER [117] - 6:8,	103:18, 104:13,
117:16, 130:23	52:20, 102:20	pieces [2] - 56:17,	30:9, 45:8, 45:25,	131:9
partially (1) - 41:8	percent [2] - 72:21,	59:1	46:10, 47:8, 47:20,	positions [3] - 10:14,
participants [2] -	123:9	Pierre [3] - 2:3, 3:7,	47:25, 48:11, 48:17,	12:16, 130:15
105:5, 131:16	perfect (1) - 108:20	6:21	49:11, 49:14, 50:15,	possibility [1] - 48:7
participate [4] - 121:8,	perfectly [2] - 68:24,	pipe [3] - 22:5, 47:5,	50:22, 51:7, 51:20,	possible [2] - 83:23,
121:10, 121:13,	80:10	110:1 pipe [3] - 22:5, 47:5,	52:1, 52:11, 52:24,	130:2
121:16	perform [1] - 126:16		53:22, 54:8, 54:10,	possibly [6] - 25:22,
participating [1] -	performance [2] -	Pipeline [4] - 27:9,	55:7, 56:5, 56:9,	77:25, 122:6, 122:7,
121:14	61:10, 110:12	70:25, 78:17, 78:25	56:14, 56:18, 56:21,	122:11, 122:12
		pipeline [44] - 4:1, 7:3,		
	1		1	

Page 13 to 13 of 19

post [2] - 33:7, 69:19 post-December [2] -33:7, 69:19 potential [1] - 123:6 potentially [1] -113:17 pounds [3] - 25:19, 25:20, 25:21 practical (1) - 34:14 practice [2] - 38:18, 119:2 practices [3] - 53:18, 60:9, 125:17 pre-'85 [1] - 57:11 precedent [1] - 28:12 Precision [2] - 1:24, 5:12 predecessors [2] -126:20, 126:25 preference [1] - 30:14 premise [2] - 27:25, 45:17 premises [2] - 27:16, 47:2 preparation (1) -79:23 prepare [1] - 74:3 prepared [2] - 72:5, 74:4 preparing [2] - 32:22, 130:3 present [6] - 4:2, 25:3, 27:9, 28:8, 28:21 presentation [1] -20:14 presented [2] - 88:7, 113:5 presently [3] - 96:13, 96:17, 96:20 presents (1) - 7:11 president [2] - 6:8, 6:11 presiding [1] - 3:11 presumably [1] -104:24 presumption [1] -129:17 presumptuous [2] -34:10, 35:12 pretty [5] - 17:18, 53:24, 66:20, 105:16, 106:1 previous [2] - 28:7, 86:6 price [1] - 51:1 private [2] - 21:6, 21:17 privilege [1] - 45:2 problem [5] - 90:23, 100:3, 100:5, 131:1

proceed [2] - 91:10, 97:24 proceeding (13) -31:2, 35:22, 39:13, 40:17, 43:18, 52:15, 66:13, 68:22, 69:8, 87:2, 90:13, 93:16, 114:9 proceedings 15) -5:20, 101:2, 119:23, 133:9, 133:12 PROCEEDINGS [1] -2:1 Proceedings [1] - 1:7 process [9] - 4:4, 35:3, 37:10, 41:19, 42:6, 43:21, 54:11, 69:17, 126:7 product [3] - 81:21, 81:22, 81:25 Professional [2] -133:6, 133:19 program [2] - 68:25, 69:18 prohibit [1] - 29:1 prohibited [2] - 10:7, 28:22 promises [1] - 102:10 prong [1] - 78:24 pronounce [1] - 71:22 propane [5] - 21:7, 21:12, 21:18, 21:25 properly [2] - 25:12, 26:3 properties [1] - 93:18 property [2] - 45:19, 52:5 proposed (2) - 68:24, 68:25 proposing [1] - 41:10 proposition [1] - 42:3 protect [2] - 7:6, 7:12 provide [53] - 7:20, 8:19, 16:21, 17:5, 31:20, 33:21, 35:25, 37:21, 38:1, 43:19, 47:5, 47:17, 49:10, 50:13, 63:2, 67:9, 67:15, 67:23, 72:17, 73:25, 80:19, 81:9, 82:5, 82:6, 82:7, 82:9, 88:4, 90:8, 93:6, 95:9, 96:12, 96:14, 96:24, 97:5, 97:7, 98:22, 99:18, 101:9, 101:12, 101:15, 101:17, 102:2, 102:8, 102:11, 104:21, 115:20, 116:15,

126:4, 126:11, 126:13, 127:4, 127:7 provided [25] - 4:12, 31:1, 35:8, 38:21, 38:22, 42:9, 42:18, 51:2, 52:7, 53:2, 53:3, 54:5, 73:23, 87:6, 87:7, 87:9, 96:22, 116:15, 116:16, 116:17, 125:3, 125:18, 125:19, 125:20, 126:20 provider [2] - 35:11, 96:23 provides [3] - 30:20, 60:24, 109:11 providing [20] - 3:16, 8:8, 8:14, 10:7, 17:20, 34:17, 39:15, 39:20, 40:1, 43:9, 59:17, 65:15, 75:11, 81:4, 81:5, 81:6, 96:19, 98:10, 109:10, 117:6 provision [7] - 47:10, 48:21, 50:19, 59:24, 60:16, 97:4, 110:11 provisions [4] - 43:6, 49:9, 60:20, 97:18 prudent (1) - 130:20 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 Public [11] - 12:10, 27:23, 43:2, 75:12, 83:8, 83:11, 83:15, 119:13, 122:1, 133:7, 133:18 public [48] - 3:22. 4:16, 8:22, 9:22, 9:23, 10:1, 10:11, 10:20, 11:9, 13:15, 18:4, 18:14, 19:12, 19:17, 28:25, 29:3, 33:6, 33:18, 33:20, 35:7.37:4.39:16. 40:2, 40:3, 40:6, 40:8, 40:10, 40:13, 40:14, 40:21, 40:25, 41:4, 43:11, 43:25, 61:12, 61:15, 61:20, 61:22, 62:7, 69:15, 81:3, 103:24, 104:4, 104:5, 109:21, 109:24, 128:18, 131:18 publicly (1) - 98:17 PUC [9] - 13:16, 16:20, 25:3, 27:21, 28:5, 73:4, 73:12, 78:4, 124:12

pull [2] - 63:15, 103:20 purchase [4] - 41:23, 49:19, 54:16, 61:8 purchased [4] - 9:6, 9:10, 54:18, 82:5 purchasing [1] - 58:10 purpose [12] - 3:25, 40:1, 40:20, 40:23, 42:18, 47:2, 73:13, 74:9, 74:20, 84:5, 84:19, 84:20 purposes [5] - 11:25, 40:21, 45:18, 85:19, 123:25 pursuant [10] - 3:12, 4:1, 7:8, 11:20, 50:24, 89:16, 99:18, 102:22, 107:19, 115:13 pursue [2] - 37:9, 82:13 pursued [1] - 123:8 pursuing [2] - 36:23, 123:8 push [1] - 129:25 put 171 - 13:24, 38:24, 44:21, 77:12, 88:19, 107:11, 128:21 putting [2] - 20:4, 130:14 Q gualified [1] - 55:25 quandary [1] - 104:20 quarter [2] - 22:3, 46:7 questioning [1] -103.4questions [49] - 12:24, 13:1, 13:5, 13:6, 13:7, 13:9, 13:16, 14:4, 16:13, 16:19, 17:18, 23:7, 27:15, 29:15, 32:20, 39:12, 39:14, 43:18, 44:7, 44:8, 44:19, 57:10, 62:2, 71:9, 71:17, 85:3, 85:4, 86:22, 87:12, 92:7, 102:13, 102:15, 103:21, 108:21, 108:25, 110:22, 113:24, 114:3, 114:25, 117:11, 119:6, 120:14, 121:4, 121:19, 127:10, 128:8, 128:14, 130:14 quick [2] - 90:3,

124:16 1.4 quickly [3] - 33:3, 72:23, 90:17 quiet [1] - 109:6 quite [5] - 11:4, 24:13, 31:1, 109:7, 116:7 quote [1] - 101:6 quotes [1] - 77:12 **R** raise [4] - 81:15, 82:19, 82:21, 83:5 raised [1] - 32:20

raised [1] - 32:20 ranchers [1] - 96:21 rarely [1] - 118:16 rate [8] - 11:17, 11:19, 30:2, 34:25, 79:6, 104:10, 104:11, 113:1 ratepayers [1] - 113:3 rates [7] - 8:16, 34:22, 34:23, 34:24, 47:12, 50:16, 50:23 rather [2] - 119:7, 119:8 reach [1] - 35:17 reached [6] - 41:24, 101:22, 112:12, 112:15, 112:21, 112:22 reaching [1] - 84:21 read [18] - 22:9, 50:19, 60:10, 62:14, 72:15, 72:20, 73:19, 84:10, 85:23, 86:4, 86:5, 87:24, 99:22, 99:24, 117:5, 119:10, 130:5, 130:17 reading [6] - 22:16, 22:20, 50:16, 60:8, 72:22, 110:4 real [3] - 24:8, 43:23, 110:7 realize [2] - 122:20, 122:25 realized (1] - 31:9 really [9] - 4:15, 19:8, 44:17, 53:25, 94:7. 94:23. 110:17. 129:13, 130:18 Realtime [2] - 133:6, 133:19 reason [3] - 9:9, 102:21, 118:25 reasonable [2] - 39:6,

41:3

rebuttal [1] - 111:5

recant [1] - 130:6

				······································
receipt [1] - 49:20	77:7, 78:6, 78:11,	relying [1] - 4:25	residential (1) - 25:22	109:9, 114:19, 128:5 1,5
receive [2] - 27:21,	122:23, 124:3	remain [1] - 33:6	resisted [1] - 15:24	ripe [1] - 110:9
37:8	REGARDING [1] - 1:5	remarks [1] - 111:6	resolve [2] - 114:8,	risk [1] - 25:18
received [7] - 10:16,	regarding [13] - 3:4,	remedy [2] - 110:13,	128:9	RISLOV [16] - 14:23,
19:18, 30:21, 32:25,	11:13, 31:11, 59:23,	128:20	resolved [2] - 128:14,	29:16, 87:13, 87:19,
44:1, 55:13, 85:11	73:22, 74:3, 82:25,	remember [6] - 63:13,	128:15	88:19, 89:5, 89:10,
receiving [6] ~ 7:7,	85:1, 85:20, 90:15,	72:13, 74:2, 118:17,	resolves [1] - 130:10	89:23, 90:2, 122:17
20:9, 37:2, 37:3,	116:25, 117:25,	120:9	resources [5] - 20:22,	123:1, 123:11,
48:22, 85:10	120.3	remembering [1] -	109:11, 122:5,	123:17, 123:19,
recently [2] - 106:2,	regardless [1] - 93:8	66:24	122:11, 122:14	123:23, 124:7
121:1	regards [9] - 59:24,	remind [2] - 95:13,	respect [10] - 3:23,	Rislov [3] - 1:14,
receptacle [1] - 99:21	60:6, 66:9, 77:22,	107:17	10:12, 74:25, 75:3,	87:11, 122:16
recess [1] - 91:3	84:17, 93:20, 95:6,	removal (1] - 45:20	75:6, 86:17, 104:5,	r ole [1] - 98:20
recognize [2] - 10:12,	115:6, 123:16	remove [1] - 55:15	104:8, 104:11, 129:3	roles (1) - 101:4
106:16	region [1] - 79:18	renegotiate [1] -	respectfully [1] -	rolled [1] - 34:24
recognizing [1] -	regional (2) - 79:17	101:23	37:16	room [1] - 5:5
28:20	Registered [2] -	renegotiated [1] -	respond [5] - 83:23,	roughly [1] - 13:25
recollection [2] - 74:6,	133:5, 133:19	101:21	84:6, 84:14, 86:2,	round [2] - 109:4,
74:19	regret [1] - 58:1	renegotiation [1] -	130:20	111:3
recommend [3] -	regrettable [1] - 21:4	101:14	responder [1] - 100:2	routine [1] - 80:3
32:18, 33:25, 34:1	regrettably [1] - 12:23	repairing [1] - 45:18	response [7] - 16:19,	RPR [1] - 1:24
recommendation [2] -	regs [1] - 25:11	repeatedly [2] - 31:18	17:21, 72:10, 72:25,	rule [3] - 28:9, 28:21,
33:4, 35:13	regulate [8] - 8:16,	replace [1] ~ 69:5	73:18, 73:24, 86:21	97:18
reconvene [1] - 91:3	13:17, 13:19, 40:6,	replaced [1] - 123:21	responsibilities [14] -	Rule [1] - 129:22
record [17] - 6:25,	43:3, 69:16, 78:18,	replacement [1] -	9:22, 9:25, 52:16,	RULING [1] - 1:5
12:14, 42:5, 71:10,	110:6	51:18	52:22, 68:4, 78:1,	ruling [7] - 3:4, 4:8,
72:2, 72:14, 87:1,	regulated [11] - 8:2,	replacing [1] - 45:19	100:14, 100:16,	4:10, 24:18, 28:16,
94:17, 94:19,	32:12, 34:19, 42:25,	Reply (11] - 7:17, 9:3,	100:20, 100:25,	28:23, 33:2
106:16, 106:20,	57:1, 78:24, 79:2,	10:14, 10:15, 10:22,	102:24, 109:10,	run [1] - 25:8
106:21, 108:14,	79:4, 89:18, 109:12,	11:3, 18:1, 39:1,	128:3, 128:6	rural [1] - 44:1
111:23, 115:8,	116:1	94:14, 103:21,	responsibility [29] -	Rushmore [1] - 4:16
129:1, 129:9	regulating [2] - 67:7,	103:22	8:10, 11:15, 16:21,	
recording [1] - 17:13	77:22	report [4] - 70:2, 70:4,	17:2, 17:3, 17:22,	S
records [4] - 55:13,	regulation [12] - 7:24,	70:6	21:9, 31:11, 31:12,	
56:11, 59:5, 59:6	74:7, 74:9, 74:15,	Reported [1] - 1:24	35:25, 47:16, 48:9,	
recover [1] - 34:19	74:23, 75:10, 75:22,	Reporter [4] - 133:6,	49:19, 49:22, 49:24,	safe [2] - 12:21, 21:16
recovery [1] - 69:7	78:1, 78:6, 79:6,	133:19, 133:19	51:18, 82:16, 95:21,	safely [1] - 35:8
red [6] - 14:16, 16:3,	79:7, 84:9	reporter [1] - 133:9	100:7, 100:8, 100:9,	Safety [4] - 27:9,
16:4, 55:4, 108:9,	regulatory [6] - 6:11,	reporting [1] - 22:21	100:12, 100:13,	70:25, 78:17, 78:25
113:19	11:16, 11:19, 13:24,	Reporting [2] - 1:24,	100:21, 101:12,	safety [41] - 4:1, 7:3,
Reed [1] - 6:16	34:25, 122:21	5:12	103:5, 103:9, 127:17	7:13, 11:13, 11:16,
refer [5] - 14:9, 36:2.	Regulatory [1] - 78:9	representative [1] -	result [3] - 4:8, 61:7,	11:21, 11:25, 12:5,
48:21, 51:7, 108:16	reiterated [1] - 18:3	44:24	75:21	12:20, 20:18, 20:24,
reference [6] - 33:12,	relates [4] - 18:4,	represented [1] - 4:3	retall [10] - 7:21, 10:8,	21:13, 21:20, 23:9,
39:11, 39:12, 42:17,	20:15, 50:5, 103:25	request [4] - 8:12,	29:20, 29:24, 30:4,	24:25, 25:7, 25:9,
103:2	relation [1] - 107:19	8:19, 15:23, 129:8	31:5, 42:24, 53:4,	26:22, 26:23, 39:18,
referenced [1] - 41:1	relations [1] - 119:7	requested [2] - 73:21,	80:19	42:15, 42:21, 43:1,
referred [7] - 38:12,	relationship [2] - 54:6,	77:4	retained [1] - 100:18	43:7, 43:13, 43:15,
43:4, 50:25, 51:10,	65:7	requests [3] - 17:1,	return [2] - 34:19, 46:4	69:23, 69:24, 73:4,
73:20, 77:5, 108:12	relatively [2] - 65:17,	117:18, 117:21	reverts [1] - 39:7	73:7, 73:12, 73:15,
referring [6] - 10:2,	65:20	require [4] - 8:18,	review [1] - 55:21	74:24, 74:25, 78:13,
50:15, 50:23, 57:24,	relevant [1] - 93:16	40:5, 75:1	reviewed [1] - 99:6	78:18, 79:7, 79:8,
66:25, 87:17	reliability [1] - 8:17	required [7] - 38:10,	reviewing [1] - 10:17	79:23, 113:23
refers [2] - 8:15, 72:10	reliably [1] - 82:7	74:14, 75:10, 78:5,	revolve [1] - 44:19	sale [14] - 29:20,
refuse [1] - 49:23	reliance [1] - 127:23	99:24, 115:25	revolving [1] - 114:18	29:21, 29:22, 29:23,
	• • • •		rhetorically [1] - 43:24	29:24, 30:4, 30:5,
refused (11 - 102:1	relied [1] - 130:22	requirement (1) -	Theremonia Til Hours	24.E 20.47 00.0
refused (1) - 102:1 reg (1) - 25:21	relied [1] - 130:22 relief [2] - 15:12, 26:7	requirement [1] - 26:11	Rick [2] - 30:11, 76:4	31:5, 36:17, 38:9,
reg (1) - 25:21	relief [2] - 15:12, 26:7	26:11	-	38:23, 54:12, 57:13,
reg [1] - 25:21 regard [12] - 21:19,	relief [2] - 15:12, 26:7 reliefs (1) - 25:11	26:11 requires [1] - 74:8	Rick [2] - 30:11, 76:4	38:23, 54:12, 57:13, 87:7
reg (1) - 25:21	relief [2] - 15:12, 26:7	26:11	Rick [2] - 30:11, 76:4 Rickie [2] - 72:1, 72:5	38:23, 54:12, 57:13,

sat [1] - 110:20	120:17, 121:1,	93:24, 94:7, 94:21,	sided (1) - 84:25	3:8, 7:14, 12:10, 16
satisfactory [2] - 34:3,	121:18, 131:16	95:9, 96:22, 97:8,	sides [1] - 85:6	25:24, 27:20, 31:10,
34:4	sentence [5] - 51:24,	98:4, 99:4, 100:4,	sign [1] - 96:1	31:11, 32:2, 36:1
saw [1] - 69:23	52:3, 73:19, 77:3	101:5, 101:13,	signed [9] - 9:5,	36:5, 38:11, 40:2,
scattered [1] - 21:7	separate [2] - 9:12,	101:16, 101:17,	48:13, 59:20, 62:15,	40:4, 40:24, 41:2,
scene [2] - 17:2, 80:9	52:6	102:5, 102:12,	62:18, 62:21, 63:13,	43:2, 44:4, 48:5,
	series [1] - 107:14	102:22, 107:8,	88:8, 92:16	53:4, 58:8, 65:16,
scheduled [1] - 121:3	serve [20] - 18:14,	109:10, 109:23,	significant [3] - 19:12,	67:18, 67:25, 68:12,
SD [2] - 73:4, 73:12	36:11, 41:12, 41:13,	110:11, 112:1,	77:20, 125:6	73:22, 75:20, 77:6,
SDCL [4] - 3:22, 4:1,	44:5, 63:5, 65:17,	112:2, 115:20,	signing (1] - 48:19	77:11, 80:13, 82:23,
8:17, 18:17	81:23, 86:24, 88:13,	115:22, 124:25,	similar (1) - 28:5	83:8, 83:15, 93:17,
SDIP [1] - 27:7	93:23, 96:9, 96:12,	125:3, 125:16,	simply [4] - 20:7,	122:5, 122:20,
searching [t] - 4:17	98:17, 98:19,	125:19, 125:20,	104:10, 123:25,	123:2, 123:4, 123:8,
second [13] - 14:20,	100:12, 100:13,	126:20, 130:22,	127:15	123:10, 124:12,
38:12, 40:7, 45:9,	103:6, 110:3, 112:5	131:20	sit [4] - 30:14, 30:16,	130:21, 131:9,
45:12, 46:19, 71:20,	served [3] - 40:22,	servicers (2) - 127:1	56:9, 120:9	133:7, 133:13
80:16, 84:6, 84:7,	43:25, 68:3	services [18] - 9:13,	siting [1] - 114:22	SOUTH (2) - 1:2,
91:19, 100:18, 107:1	serves [1] - 83:22	41:11, 60:6, 61:10,	sits [2] - 34:2, 98:13	133:1
Section [5] - 18:2,	Service [1] - 75:12	69:13, 81:7, 87:7,	••	southeast [1] - 65:4
43:7, 58:9, 103:23,	service [159] - 7:8,	87:8, 88:4, 96:13,	sitting [3] - 34:9,	speaking (2) - 5:4,
112:4	7:12, 7:19, 7:21, 8:3,	96:14, 96:20, 99:18,	83:12, 84:2	82:13
section [7] - 29:25,	8:5, 8:8, 8:11, 8:19,	99:20, 105:15,	situation [6] - 62:13,	specific (3) - 110:12,
39:24, 46:7, 50:25,		116:15, 126:11,	97:13, 101:11,	110:17, 116:15
59:14, 61:10, 61:13	8:20, 10:7, 11:2,	126:13	126:5, 128:10	specifically [3] -
secure [1] - 124:19	13:17, 13:18, 13:19, 17:5, 17:20, 18:7,	serving [9] - 10:10,	situations [2] -	55:15, 100:24,
see [15] - 13:8, 32:10,	1	22:4, 25:19, 40:20,	105:17, 105:20	118:15
33:17, 34:14, 54:15,	18:8, 18:9, 18:11, 18:25, 25:22, 29:19,	40:21, 40:23, 64:24,	six [2] - 58:6, 59:17	specifications [2] -
55:21, 59:2, 66:3,	30:20, 30:22, 31:11,	83:25, 96:18	sizable [1] ~ 32:25	107:12, 107:14
83:13, 85:1, 86:3,	31:12, 31:19, 31:21,	set [10] - 4:9, 4:22,	size [1] - 41:1	specified [1] - 112:10
94:2, 95:4, 110:19,	32:5, 32:8, 32:11,	7:9, 25:11, 26:2,	slightly [1] - 10:13	spells [1] - 45:12
111:24	33:8, 33:22, 34:5,	26:3, 26:4, 26:5,	small [1] - 23:4	spend [1] - 122:5
seek [1] - 8:10	34:6, 34:17, 35:6,	46:11, 82:6	smallest [1] - 5:7	spent [2] - 44:10,
seeking [2] - 45:6,	35:8, 35:9, 35:10,	setting (1) - 11:17	smidge [1] - 76:11	114:11
45:11	35:17, 35:25, 36:23,	settings [1] - 15:13	soil [1] - 46:17	spread [1] - 113:9
seeks [1] - 44:25	37:1, 37:2, 37:3,	settled [1] - 38:18	sold [6] - 36:15, 48:4,	spring [1] - 21:3
seem [1] - 111:15	37:8, 37:21, 37:22,	seven (1) - 58:7	68:8, 100:15, 125:2	squarely [1] - 40:3
self [2] - 22:9, 22:21	38:1, 38:21, 38:22,	several [4] - 7:5,	sole [1] - 114:11	SS [1] - 133:2
self-read [1] - 22:9	39:15, 39:17, 39:21,	66:20, 112:15	solo [1] - 6:21	STAFF [1] - 1:12
self-reporting [1] -	40:2, 41:2, 41:10,	shall [5] - 45:15,	solution (1) - 112:19	staff [4] - 6:5, 6:6,
22:21	41:21, 41:25, 42:4,	47:11, 59:14, 61:11,	solutions [1] - 123:7	1 1
sell [4] - 57:19, 58:12,	42:11, 42:12, 43:9,	100:21	solve [1] - 131:1	12:20, 27:10
96:1, 96:2	44:2, 44:3, 49:1,	shareholders [1] -	someone [2] - 12:7,	Staff [55] - 1:14, 1:14,
selling [4] - 48:2, 58:3,	52:7, 53:3, 53:4,	130:20	73:11	1:15, 1:17, 5:16, 6:3,
58:4, 124:24	55:19, 59:21, 60:17,	shift [1] - 103:10	sometimes [2] -	6:5, 6:24, 7:2, 7:3,
send [3] - 74:14, 75:2,	60:18, 61:15, 62:9,	shippers [1] - 77:15	72:23, 105:17	7:5, 7:22, 8:12, 9:11, 12:25, 16:20, 17:8,
84:25	62:17, 62:22, 63:2,	shoes [2] - 98:12,	somewhat [2] -	
sending [1] - 74:14	63:3, 64:20, 64:22,	98:13	127:23, 129:23	17:18, 17:21, 23:7,
sends [2] - 74:22, 75:6	65:15, 65:19, 67:9,		somewhere [1] -	23:9, 30:25, 32:21,
sense [5] - 8:15,	67:16, 67:18, 67:24,	short [2] - 33:1, 114:8	72:20	33:10, 33:15, 36:10,
46:23, 60:12, 81:5,	68:4, 68:20, 74:18,	shorthand [2] - 133:9	soon [1] - 131:24	39:1, 39:22, 40:12,
120:22	74:21, 75:11, 80:18,	show [1] - 109:13	sooner [1] - 44:15	44:21, 50:7, 73:4,
sent [31] - 66:13,	80:19, 81:4, 81:5,	shown [1] - 71:18	sophisticated [1] -	73:8, 74:24, 74:25, 84:22, 94:14, 103:1,
71:19, 71:20, 71:22,	81:17, 82:6, 82:10,	shows [1] - 52:16	35:8	1 1
71:25, 72:5, 72:7,	83:1, 83:9, 83:16,	shrubbery [1] - 46:21	sorry [6] - 14:25,	103:22, 103:23, 104:19, 111:4,
75:10, 75:16, 75:18,	84:9, 85:2, 87:15,	shut [8] - 5:11, 11:2,	16:24, 56:18, 109:5,	1
75:20, 76:3, 76:8,	87:21, 87:25, 88:9,	18:7, 18:8, 18:9,	121:17, 127:10	111:14, 111:17, 112:13, 112:18,
76:13, 76:17, 76:19,	88:21, 89:11, 92:11,	29:1, 29:6, 105:23	sort [1] - 110:10	114:7, 119:13,
76:21, 76:25, 77:5,	92:12, 92:13, 92:15,	shutting [2] - 28:22,	sound [1] - 4:22	119:15, 119:18,
83:4, 83:6, 84:23,	92:16, 92:18, 92:19,	29:2	sounds (3) - 5:7,	119:15, 119:18,
108:13, 111:21,	92:20, 92:21, 93:6,	side [6] - 5:7, 5:8,	45:14, 122:1	121:20, 121:22,
120:12, 120:16,		53:6, 105:9, 105:12	South [46] - 1:24, 2:4,	121.20, 121.221
		4		

124:12	statutory [2] - 33:23,	54:13, 102:4, 126:25	32:8, 32:11, 32:14,	115:23, 115:25 1
Staff's [11] - 3:3, 14:5,	40:25	suggested [2] - 36:10,	34:18, 35:5, 35:25,	technology [1] - 20:7
16:23, 17:25, 18:1,	stay [1] - 130:24	112:17	37:7, 37:22, 39:15,	teed [1] - 128:9
19:2, 19:7, 20:19,	Steffensen [2] - 1:14,	suggesting [1] - 35:2	39:17, 39:20, 40:9,	tenor [1] - 73:11
103:20, 104:13,	6:5	SULLY [1] - 133:3	40:20, 40:21, 41:11,	tens [1] - 21:6
105:1	stepped [3] - 69:16,	sum [1] - 111:12	41:13, 42:2, 42:4,	term [2] - 69:20, 90:14
STAFF'S [1] - 1:4	80:18, 111:16	summarize [1] - 38:4	42:11, 42:12, 43:9,	terminate [19] - 41:10,
staffing [1] - 5:17	steps [1] - 8:25	summarized [1] -	47:1, 47:4, 48:21,	59:16, 59:21, 61:6,
stake [1] - 125:5	still [9] - 16:23, 61:5,	101:4	48:23, 49:17, 49:18,	61:15, 62:17, 62:22,
stand [1] - 30:14	71:13, 86:25, 88:4,	summary [3] - 7:18,	50:1, 52:7, 57:1,	62:24, 63:4, 63:16,
	92:16, 102:10,	37:16, 43:8	57:7, 59:21, 60:16,	63:20, 63:25, 66:22,
standards [2] - 69:5, 111:12	103:17, 126:3	supplement [1] -	63:3, 64:7, 64:10,	68:20, 88:12, 89:11,
-		53:15	65:15, 67:3, 68:12,	92:14, 92:20
standpoint [4] - 20:22,	stood [1] - 30:13		69:1, 69:2, 69:13,	terminated [2] - 35:18,
20:24, 83:3, 96:11	straight [1] - 24:14	supplemental [3] -	75:21, 77:17, 79:14,	60:21
start [4] - 13:11,	straightforward [1] -	91:14, 91:16, 91:17	79:24, 80:18, 81:17,	terminates [3] - 31:19,
32:18, 110:19, 111:4	35:3	supplying [1] - 47:3	83:17, 83:22, 84:9,	
started [2] - 31:9,	strategic [1] - 6:16	support [2] - 33:15,	93:6, 95:10, 97:3,	41:8, 89:21
109:8	string (1) - 9:12	53:18	97:4, 97:5, 97:6,	termination [14] -
starting [3] - 33:3,	strings [1] - 72:18	supposed [2] - 22:24,		36:12, 59:24, 61:14,
33:5, 111:4	struck [1] - 44:13	26:7	97:18, 98:10, 98:24, 98:25, 99:10, 99:15,	87:15, 87:21, 87:25,
starts [1] - 44:14	structure (2] - 31:17,	Supreme [1] - 4:11	98:25, 99:10, 99:13, 99:22, 99:24, 100:3,	88:3, 88:11, 88:16,
state [23] - 3:25, 7:19,	106:25	surprise [4] - 80:11,		88:21, 90:19, 92:12,
10:19, 13:17, 21:7,	structured [1] - 113:7	124:4, 129:12	100:7, 100:9, 101:9,	92:13
21:12, 23:20, 39:18,	structures [1] - 113:1	surprised [3] - 120:14,	101:13, 104:6,	terminology [1] -
42:15, 42:20, 42:21,	struggling [3] - 7:6,	124:1, 124:5	105:6, 105:8,	64:18
43:15, 46:13, 73:20,	58:20, 86:25	suspect (1) - 96:25	105:15, 106:18,	terms (11) - 47:12,
77:10, 80:5, 80:9,	stuff [1] - 15:13	sworn [1] - 87:5	107:15, 108:14,	50:17, 50:23, 51:1,
80:16, 83:7, 83:15,	subcontractor [4] -	system [10] - 4:22,	109:10, 109:25,	51:21, 63:4, 88:20,
105:8, 114:17	101:11, 101:15,	4:23, 53:7, 57:15,	115:15, 115:21,	90:6, 90:9, 101:23
STATE [2] - 1:2, 133:1	101:17, 102:11	79:15, 79:20, 80:1,	121:18, 122:4,	territories [2] - 64:20,
State [6] - 36:1, 40:24,	subject [18] - 3:25,	82:9, 106:24, 113:9	122:8, 122:14,	64:22
48:5, 67:25, 75:20,		systems [1] - 97:15	124:3, 124:20,	territory [6] - 41:3,
133:7	5:23, 37:12, 39:18,	ayatema [i] - ort. io	126:21, 131:16	64:11, 64:15, 65:19,
statement [13] - 18:2,	39:23, 42:14, 42:19,	T	TAP [1] - 1:5	112:3
18:13, 29:10, 83:21,	42:20, 43:1, 43:12,	T	taps [50] - 3:24, 7:15,	testimony [3] - 94:22,
86:7, 103:23, 104:1,	43:14, 47:20, 71:1,		7:20, 12:8, 12:11,	128:10, 128:11
	74:9, 101:3, 115:23,	table [3] - 101:25,	12:21, 13:23, 14:6,	Texas [1] - 79:18
104:2, 106:7, 114:5,	119:5, 119:6	117:15, 117:22	18:4, 22:3, 23:11,	thankful [2] - 131:14,
114:23, 129:6,	submit [2] - 37:17,	tackle [1] - 9:2	24:17, 24:18, 24:25,	131:15
130:12	42:10	takeaway [1] - 38:2	25:2, 25:7, 25:8,	thanking [1] - 43:16
statements (5) -	submitted [5] - 10:22,	Talcott [8] - 1:18,	25:25, 26:11, 26:12,	THE [4] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4,
53:24, 83:2, 83:18,	10:24, 11:3, 14:8,	6:10, 30:11, 71:19,	26:17, 27:6, 29:19,	1:10
86:14, 86:15	18:12	71:23, 72:20, 76:1,	32:2, 38:11, 39:18,	
States [1] - 43:6	submitting [1] -	77:3	41:11, 41:16, 42:14,	them's [1] - 26:4
states [17] - 53:5,	128:25	TALCOTT [13] - 71:23,	57:15, 62:7, 66:18,	themselves [2] - 21:8,
58:7, 66:19, 66:20,	subsequent [4] - 10:6,	1	66:9, 66:18, 67:3,	131:11
67:19, 68:2, 68:5,	28:5, 78:16, 111:22	72:13, 72:17, 73:2,	67:18, 75:5, 75:7,	therefore (3) - 10:20,
68:8, 75:4, 78:18,	subsidiary [2] - 17:3,	74:1, 75:19, 77:9,	78:23, 79:4, 79:11,	12:15, 26:18
89:17, 89:18,	17:5	77:12, 78:2, 78:8,	80:4, 80:11, 93:24,	thereof [1] - 45:20
112:19, 113:20,	subsidizing [1] -	79:6, 79:12, 80:14	103:25, 109:11,	thereon [1] - 45:20
122:20, 122:21	113:4	talks [3] - 45:1, 46:5,	109:20, 112:6,	thereto (2) - 45:3,
station [3] - 25:10,	substance [1] - 120:4	58:9	123:16, 128:17	45:15
25:14, 25:21	substantlal [1] - 23:3	tank [2] - 55:19, 115:8	tariff [11] - 9:16, 18:23,	they've [11] - 24:1,
stations [1] - 53:7	successful [1] -	tank's [1] - 21:25	29:25, 30:1, 50:25,	26:3, 36:5, 36:6,
status [2] - 61:24,	112:14	tanks [1] - 58:18	77:16, 112:4,	37:3, 48:22, 65:25,
85:2	Successors [6] -	Tap (1) - 3:4	112:11, 123:12,	68:8, 105:16, 131:9
statute [6] - 11:8,	36:13, 93:8, 93:11,	tap [106] - 3:16, 3:23,	123:15	thinking [1] - 127:21
33:3, 61:21, 61:25,	93:12, 94:3, 116:23	7:7, 8:3, 8:15, 11:7,		third [5] - 42:14, 46:2,
78:12, 78:25	suffice [1] ~ 5:5	15:4, 16:22, 20:9,	tariffing [1] - 123:12	72:6, 72:21, 127:19
statutes [2] - 40:4,	sufficient [1] - 46:16	20:10, 23:21, 30:21,	tariffs [5] - 89:17,	thousands [2] - 19:13,
109:22		31:12, 32:5, 32:6,	95:9, 115:20,	21:6
	suggest [4] - 34:10,			
	4	1	1	1

	F			
threatening [1] -	took [9] - 10:14,	transports [1] - 82:2	32:16	35:23, 35:24, 36:3, <u>1</u>
73:12	16:17, 28:6, 28:7,	trees [1] - 46:21	under [34] - 8:17,	36:9, 36:14, 38:7,
three [36] - 3:24,	61:7, 87:20, 93:17,	tried [8] - 31:2, 31:15,	11:17, 13:21, 17:8,	38:8, 38:9, 38:10,
10:17, 11:1, 15:6,	126:18, 133:9	32:22, 33:13, 53:15,	27:20, 27:24, 37:9,	39:6, 54:12, 57:13,
43:5, 46:25, 54:10,	top [2] - 79:19, 108:17	85:3, 85:6, 119:15	39:24, 47:10, 49:24,	58:5, 60:10, 63:11,
55:4, 55:17, 55:18,	touch [2] - 105:11,	trucks [2] - 64:22,	50:1, 51:8, 51:18,	68:7, 89:6, 89:7,
56:3, 56:19, 57:21,	105;19	64:23	51:21, 52:12, 55:14,	89:10, 89:16, 89:24,
57:23, 57:25, 58:11,	town [2] - 25:14, 53:6	true [6] - 16:2, 16:6,	60:7, 61:2, 61:4,	89:25, 93:4, 93:7,
58:15, 58:18, 68:8,	trail [1] - 59:2	16:10, 22:15, 122:3,	61:10, 63:4, 77:15,	93:8, 93:12, 94:13,
70:8, 71:3, 71:17,			79:5, 79:8, 82:23,	94:14, 94:16, 95:25,
• • •	Training [2] - 2:2, 3:7	133:11		96:3, 116:22, 117:4
71:18, 73:6, 74:19,	transaction [14] -	true-up [1] - 22:15	90:8, 102:24,	
77:17, 85:18,	58:6, 61:24, 89:1,	trueing [1] - 22:17	114:17, 116:11,	UtiliCorp's [1] -
105:12, 106:8,	89:3, 94:4, 98:22,	truly [1] - 5:8	126:15, 127:16,	116:23
107:15, 108:2,	99:6, 103:13, 110:7,	try [6] - 4:22, 44:16,	128:18, 129:21	utilities [10] - 12:10,
108:8, 115:7,	111:13, 124:22,	44:18, 54:8, 114:8,	understood [5] - 9:18,	23:25, 24:1, 33:21,
119:21, 130:16	124:24, 125:2, 126:8	127:13	12:3, 12:6, 18:24,	34:20, 36:7, 59:11,
hree-way [19] - 11:1,	transactional [1] -	trying [18] - 7:11,	60:2	69:6, 93:15, 119:8
15:6, 43:5, 55:4,	116:20	21:18, 24:6, 31:22,	undertake [1] - 99:4	UTILITIES [2] - 1:1,
55:17, 55:18, 56:3,	transcribing [1] - 5:13	31:23, 39:8, 55:1,	unequivocally [1] -	1:10
56:19, 58:11, 58:18,	-		42:15	Utilities [16] - 1:21,
70:8, 71:3, 74:19,	Transcript [1] - 1:7	55:10, 55:22, 58:25,	unfair (1) - 113:8	12:13, 27:23, 43:2,
	transcript (1) - 5:13	59:1, 71:4, 84:12,	unfortunately [6] -	68:23, 69:9, 69:11,
77:17, 105:12,	TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1	84:22, 85:7, 126:16,		
106:8, 107:15,	transcription [1] -	127:14	10:9, 12:4, 20:15,	69:12, 83:8, 83:11,
108:2, 115:7	133:12	turn [6] - 6:23, 29:6,	20:17, 62:12, 113:1	83:16, 113:5,
hroughout [1] - 126:6	transfer [13] - 54:4,	30:7, 91:14, 92:4,	unhelpful (1) ~ 104:14	113:10, 119:13,
['hurber [1] - 113:14	63:2, 63:11, 68:13,	105:14	United [1] - 43:6	120:1, 122:2
ight [1] - 16:14	77:16, 86:23, 87:3,	turning [1] - 5:20	universal [2] - 75:4,	utility [96] - 3:15, 3:22,
ile [1] - 20:4	95:25, 106:14,	two [29] - 3:19, 5:18,	75:9	8:3, 8:14, 8:18, 8:22,
illing [1] - 20:4	116:19, 116:21,	11:5, 31:1, 31:24,	unless [4] - 8:19, 93:9,	8:24, 9:13, 9:22,
fim [2] - 6:14, 97:25	126:3	31:25, 36:12, 38:2,	95:25, 119:3	9:23, 10:1, 10:11,
ime-consuming [2] -			unlike [2] - 112:3,	10:20, 11:9, 13:18,
••••	transferred [34] - 9:5,	38:4, 38:15, 38:18,		17:9, 18:4, 18:15,
35:20, 37:13	9:25, 35:22, 36:4,	47:18, 53:1, 56:16,	112:11	27:19, 28:21, 28:25,
iming [2] - 129:17,	36:5, 36:6, 36:7,	57:18, 59:1, 60:5,	unrelated [1] - 98:21	29:3, 30:20, 30:22,
129:19	38:7, 38:16, 39:2,	60:20, 60:21, 78:24,	unresolved [1] - 60:21	
"imothy [1] - 1:20	39:5, 54:3, 58:16,	87:13, 88:13, 88:15,	up [33] - 4:20, 4:22,	31:12, 31:19, 31:21,
fina [1] - 5:17	60:9, 88:13, 88:18,	108:8, 110:15,	5:1, 5:7, 14:22,	32:5, 32:12, 33:6,
oday [46] - 4:15, 5:15,	93:7, 93:10, 93:24,	119:20, 125:9, 128:1	22:15, 22:18, 25:21,	33:18, 34:17, 35:6,
5:17, 6:15, 6:21,	94:13, 94:19, 95:21,	two-page [1] - 57:18	30:24, 40:16, 55:11,	35:7, 35:9, 36:20,
6:23, 12:19, 13:12,	95:22, 116:22,	two-prong [1] - 78:24	55:16, 69:16, 70:10,	37:2, 37:8, 37:18,
18:4, 18:17, 20:14,	117:2, 117:4,	type [6] - 4:14, 13:18,	82:6, 85:18, 86:19,	37:22, 38:21, 39:15,
27:18, 31:4, 40:14,	125:10, 125:11,	19:15, 29:19, 86:14,	86:20, 96:18,	39:16, 39:20, 39:23,
	• •		107:25, 109:13,	40:3, 40:6, 40:8,
43:10, 43:23, 49:19,	125:16, 125:21,	118:3		40:10, 40:13, 40:14,
51:5, 51:15, 53:21,	127:24, 127:25,	typically [1] - 21:25	110:19, 110:21,	40:19, 40:21, 41:1,
56:9, 56:17, 59:3,	128:4, 128:6		115:18, 119:21,	41:5, 41:10, 42:12,
62:19, 67:13, 73:6,	transferring [1] -	U	122:12, 122:17,	
74:4, 88:23, 88:25,	128:2		- 122:18, 124:8,	43:9, 43:10, 43:11,
91:9, 94:23, 98:14,	transfers (1) - 36:3	1	124:16, 126:7,	44:1, 44:4, 49:23,
98:17, 100:11,	transition [1] - 69:20	U.S.C [1] - 43:7	128:9, 128:16	52:7, 57:1, 57:7,
102:8, 105:8,	transmission [8] -	ultimate [2] - 51:16,	upgrading [1] - 19:14	61:12, 61:15, 61:21,
119:14, 122:18,	3:17, 7:19, 25:18,	53:8	uphold [1] - 37:6	61:22, 63:2, 67:7,
125:15, 126:9,	27:7, 53:3, 53:11,	ultimately [4] - 9:15,	upstream [2] - 43:4,	69:15, 80:18, 81:4,
128:11, 131:1,		54:2, 101:12, 108:2	71:3	81:9, 83:9, 93:6,
	70:18, 97:14	unaffected [1] -		93:23, 93:24, 97:7,
			usage [2] - 99:25,	
131:2, 131:3,	transpired [1] - 111:20		_	103:24 104-4
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23,	125:22	100:1	103:24, 104:4,
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24 oday's (1] - 111:12	transpired [1] - 111:20	125:22 unbalanced [1] -	100:1 user [5] - 10:8, 18:11,	104:5, 109:13,
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24 oday's (1] - 111:12	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23,	125:22 unbalanced [1] - 84:24	100:1	104:5, 109:13, 109:21, 125:16,
131:2, 131:3,	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23, 74:11, 74:12, 77:16,	125:22 unbalanced [1] - 84:24 unclear [1] - 10:9	100:1 user [5] - 10:8, 18:11,	104:5, 109:13, 109:21, 125:16, 125:19, 126:20,
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24 oday's (1] - 111:12 ogether [3] - 45:16,	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23, 74:11, 74:12, 77:16, 78:21, 82:5 transportation [1] -	125:22 unbalanced [1] - 84:24	100:1 user [5] - 10:8, 18:11, 30:6, 48:4, 57:1 users [6] - 7:13, 7:21,	104:5, 109:13, 109:21, 125:16, 125:19, 126:20, 128:18
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24 oday's (1] - 111:12 ogether [3] - 45:16, 53:2, 131:7 oken [1] - 78:12	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23, 74:11, 74:12, 77:16, 78:21, 82:5 transportation [1] - 11:21	125:22 unbalanced [1] - 84:24 unclear [1] - 10:9	100:1 user [5] - 10:8, 18:11, 30:6, 48:4, 57:1 users [6] - 7:13, 7:21, 8:3, 8:15, 74:8,	104:5, 109:13, 109:21, 125:16, 125:19, 126:20,
131:2, 131:3, 131:11, 131:24 oday's (1] - 111:12 ogether [3] - 45:16, 53:2, 131:7	transpired [1] - 111:20 transport [6] - 42:23, 74:11, 74:12, 77:16, 78:21, 82:5 transportation [1] -	125:22 unbalanced [1] - 84:24 unclear [1] - 10:9 uncomfortable [1] -	100:1 user [5] - 10:8, 18:11, 30:6, 48:4, 57:1 users [6] - 7:13, 7:21,	104:5, 109:13, 109:21, 125:16, 125:19, 126:20, 128:18

V	w	worth [2] - 66:4, - 110:15
		worthwhile [1] - 35:5
vague [1] - 53:24	walk [2] - 105:6, 131:6	wrestle [1] - 131:5
value [1] - 42:3	walked [1] - 67:8	write [1] - 38:17
valve [26] - 11:1, 15:6,	walking [1] - 102:5	writing [2] - 72:23,
18:9, 29:6, 43:5,	wall [1] - 106:24	
55:4, 55:17, 55:18,	wand [1] - 131:1	77:21
		written [6] - 59:15,
56:4, 56:19, 58:11,	wants [2] - 57:3, 62:20	59:18, 59:23, 60:17,
70:8, 71:3, 74:19,	warm [1] - 130:24	85:22, 129:1
77:18, 104:23,	warn [1] - 111:16	
105:9, 105:13,	watched [1] - 20:11	Y
105:14, 105:21,	water [3] - 13:17,	·
106:8, 106:14,	13:19, 26:14	
107:15, 108:2, 115:7	wave [1] - 131:1	Yankton [1] - 112:10
valves (5) - 23:25,	ways [2] - 56:1,	year [11] - 10:11, 20:6,
24:2, 58:18, 105:18	122:23	22:14, 22:18, 26:1,
vendee [33] - 47:13,	weaving [1] - 100:11	67:22, 67:23, 84:21,
47:16, 48:9, 49:10,	+ · ·	99:21, 99:23, 101:24
50:9, 50:13, 50:18,	webcast [4] - 4:23,	years [12] - 32:7, 34:7,
50:24, 51:2, 51:6,	5:2, 5:9, 128:25	37:3, 38:15, 44:2,
	webcasting [1] - 4:19	49:6, 72:20, 88:13,
51:7, 51:11, 51:15,	weeks [1] - 130:16	
51:17, 51:18, 52:9,	welcome [2] - 3:1,	105:17, 128:1,
52:13, 52:20, 56:7,	124:12	130:22, 131:10
60:4, 60:8, 60:24,	whatsoever [2] -	yellow [4] - 14:17,
61:2, 90:8, 90:14,	82:18, 84:3	19:3, 108:9, 113:19
98:13, 100:16,	whereas [1] - 57:12	yesterday [1] - 78:16
102:3, 102:11,	whole [3] - 3:24,	
102:20, 124:19,	45:20, 73:13	Z
126:4		
vendor [2] - 82:13,	wholesale [2] - 29:21,	
95:1	31:5	Zanter [5] - 71:19,
vendorship [1] - 63:15	wick [1] - 107:16	72:11, 73:20, 77:4,
-	wider [1] - 14:13	113:23
verify [3] - 56:14,	WiFi [1] - 4:16	
56:15, 56:24	willing [7] - 17:10,	
versa (1) - 123:5	96:23, 96:24, 99:4,	
versus [2] - 74:12,	104:21, 127:4, 127:6	
122:23	Williston [1] - 109:12	
via [2] - 98:10, 101:9	wish [5] - 20:20,	
vice [3] - 6:8, 6:11,		
123:4	53:18, 59:11, 130:5,	
VICE [1] - 1:11	130:25	
view [8] - 14:13,	wished [1] - 21:15	l I
31:10, 37:4, 41:4,	wishes [1] - 5:13	1
	withdraw [1] - 27:21	1
41:17, 81:3, 95:2,	witnesses [1] - 128:12	
115:11	Wittler [3] - 1:24, 5:12,	
views [1] - 121:10	133:18	
violate [1] - 49:9	WITTLER [1] - 133:5	
virtue [2] - 78:17,	wondering [2] - 89:24,	
78:21	104:20	
visited [1] - 120:6		
visual [2] - 15:9, 15:14	word [5] - 20:15,	
void [1] - 116:18	58:24, 67:13, 86:11,	
volumes [3] - 57:22,	125:21	
•••	wording [1] - 52:12	
57:25, 58:15	words [3] - 28:8,	
vote [1] - 91:21	62:23, 126:24	
votes [2] - 92:1, 92:2	workable [1] - 112:18	
	works [4] - 34:2,	
	1	l
	54:21, 54:22, 131:8	
	54:21, 54:22, 131:8 world [2] - 5:9, 83:11	

Page 19 to 19 of 19

19