1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	=======================================
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT EL11-006 BY OAK TREE ENERGY LLC AGAINST
5	NORTHWESTERN ENERGY FOR REFUSING TO ENTER INTO A PURCHASE POWER
6	AGREEMENT
7	=======================================
8	Transcript of Proceedings July 30, 2013
9	
10	DEFORE THE DURING HELLTELES COMMISSION
11	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, GARY HANSON, CHAIRMAN
12	CHRIS NELSON, VICE CHAIRMAN KRISTIE FIEGEN, COMMISSIONER
13	COMMISSION STAFF
14	Rolayne Ailts Wiest John Smith
15	Karen Cremer Kristen Edwards
16	Greg Rislov Brian Rounds
17	Patrick Steffensen Darren Kearney
18	Deb Gregg Sherry Dickerson
19	blicity blekerson
20	
21	
22	
23	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
24	
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 30th day of July, 2013, commencing at 9:30 a.m. 

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Our first docket, EL11-006, in the matter of the Complaint by Oak Tree Energy, LLC against NorthWestern Energy for refusing to enter into a purchase power agreement. The reason I mentioned that there's a potential for moving this to the end of the agenda is the potential for having confidential discussions and having to go off the web and go through all of that process and going into an executive session so to speak.

2.3

The power purchase and sale agreements and exhibits were filed as confidential. However, both NorthWestern Energy and Oak Tree included language from the purchase power agreements in their motions and their responses which were not confidential. So I'm curious to hear from the parties whether or not they're -- I don't see anything outside of that arena that we're not likely to be discussing, formulas and things of that nature.

So if the parties would like to let me know, let us know, do you think we need to go into confidential session?

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Chairman, this is Al Brogan on behalf of NorthWestern. I can say that I do not believe I will be going beyond in my comments anything other than what has already been made public. I do not see any reason for a confidential session.

1 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. And Oak Tree?

MS. LAFRENTZ: At this point, Chairman, I would agree with Mr. Brogan. I haven't had a chance to touch base with Mr. Uda yet this morning. I was under the impression he was going to be on the call, but I have somebody checking on him right now.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.

Mike, have you gotten on the phone yet?

Thank you. Was that Yvette?

MS. LAFRENTZ: Yes.

2.3

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Then we'll proceed with the questions without any objection at this juncture. The question before the Commission is how shall the Commission rule on the following issues? There are three questions.

The first is what is the appropriate contractual language to govern Oak Tree's responsibility for ancillary service charges that NorthWestern Energy may potentially incur as a result of Oak Tree's integration into NorthWestern Energy's, WAPA's, and possibility a regional transmission organization's systems.

The second question is what is the appropriate contractual language to govern curtailment of Oak Tree's energy deliveries to the system.

The third question is is a default provision

appropriate for NorthWestern Energy if it fails to accept delivery of energy from Oak Tree except under the contracts allowed curtailment provisions. And if so, what is the appropriate contractual language to be

included in such provisions?

2.3

It's difficult to take all of these at the same time. But I recognize in some respects you will have to be discussing each of them as you discuss different items.

I believe I'll start with Question No. 1 with NorthWestern Energy.

MR. BROGAN: Good morning again, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Again, I'm Al Brogan. You have already met myself, Bleau LaFave, and Phil Hanser of The Brattle Group are on the phone. I would also like to alert you that Pam Bonrud and Jon Oostra are also on the phone in our Sioux Falls office.

I, of course, am in Helena. Jon is an attorney admitted in South Dakota and as Commission Staff is aware, our normal attorney, our normal South Dakota attorney for this, Tim Olson, had a conflict and is not available today. Jon is filling in to make sure that I don't do anything wrong and to supervise me as a pro hac vice admittant to the bar.

I'd like to have a brief discussion -- and I

really -- I know that at times when I've appeared before the Commission I've been strident and hopefully persuasive but I really don't want to be that today. I'd like to have a brief discussion with the Commission about how we got here and what really are the issues.

2.3

As the Commission recalled it issued an order requiring the parties to negotiate a contract.

NorthWestern and Oak Tree engaged in those negotiations and generally the parties could come to agreements.

Oak Tree in its brief highlighted an area or areas on which it compromised. I do want to make sure that the Commission's not left with the impression that Oak Tree was the only party that moved from its initial position.

NorthWestern moved on several issues also and clearly security provisions, calculation of mechanical availability, provision of engineering certificates, compensations for PTCs and recs, reduced liquidated damages and many other terms and provisions to accommodate some of Oak Tree's demands. In other words, what the parties did was a true negotiation.

Unfortunately, NorthWestern and Oak Tree could not reach agreement on two issues that really involved three clauses, and they agreed to bring these issues back to you.

There are really -- the issues today are whether two clauses should be included and one clause should be excluded but they break down into two issues. The first issue is wind integration and ancillary services, and the second issue deals with curtailment and related breach.

2.3

I'd like to deal with each of these issues sequentially starting with the wind integration and ancillary services. And what we're really talking about here is Section -- or proposed Section 5.5.3. But before I begin talking about it I want to provide a little bit of background to make sure that everybody knows exactly what I'm referring to and what everybody's role is in terms of this particular provision.

I'm going to use a bunch of acronyms so let me define them up front and make sure that the Commission and the court reporter are on board with them. I'm going to be talking about FERC, F-E-R-C, that's the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I'm going to be talking about WAPA, W-A-P-A, the Western Area Power Administration, and I'm going to be talking about OATT, O-A-T-T, which is the open access transmission tariff. Actually I should say tariffs because I'll be referring to more than one of them.

And with respect to this particular provision of the contract, there are basically three roles. There's

the role of transmission customer. The transmission customer is the generator, the Oak Tree project. There's the role of the transmission provider. That's NorthWestern. But it's also important to remember that NorthWestern, while it's a transmission provider, is not a balancing area authority.

2.3

The balancing authority is WAPA. And both the transmission customer and the transmission provider have to do business and comply with WAPA's tariffs and also with NorthWestern's tariffs.

Now the positions of the parties -- and I'll try to describe both Oak Tree's and Staff's position. Please keep in mind I'm not trying to put words into their mouth. I'm not trying to make their argument for them.

I'm just explaining their arguments as I understand them.

NorthWestern is requesting that the contract provide for the pass through to Oak Tree of charges that the balancing authority imposes on NorthWestern for ancillary services that are associated with generation, delivery, and integration of energy and are directly allocable and attributable to the Oak Tree project.

In other words, if there's charges that are imposed by the balancing authority that aren't attributable to Oak Tree but are attributable to NorthWestern's service as a whole, that isn't part of

what would be passed through. It's only those that are directly allocable and attributable.

2.3

Oak Tree, as I understand it, opposes the inclusion of these costs. They argue that they're somehow incorporated into NorthWestern's avoided cost, that the Commission has determined the avoided cost rate, and NorthWestern cannot effectively change that determination by charging these costs to Oak Tree.

Staff's memorandum quotes WAPA's OATT definition of ancillary services, specifically those provided for in schedules 3, 5, 6, and 9. It argues that to have terms different from those in the Titan Wind contract is blatant discrimination. And that's Staff's words. And asserts that other wind PPAs apply ancillary services to load.

I would assert to the Commission that Oak Tree and Staff are wrong for at least three reasons. First, Section 5.5.3 is essentially mandated by NorthWestern's OATT and WAPA's OATT. Both of which are based on FERC's pro forma OATT and both of which have been filed with and approved by FERC.

At least from my reading it appeared that neither Oak Tree nor Staff considered the specific language of these tariffs.

In Schedule 3 of the WAPA tariff and Schedule 3

deals with one of the ancillary services known as regulation and frequency response. In the tariff -- and I'm not going to read the entire Schedule 3. But there's three or four sentences in it that I think are pertinent to us and I would like the Commission to be aware of.

2.3

In the tariff it says, "The transmission customer must either purchase this service from the transmission provider or make comparable arrangements to satisfy its regulation and frequency response service obligation." And then it goes on to say, "To the extent that the control area operator performs this service for the transmission provider, charges to the transmission customer are to reflect only a pass through of the cost charged to the transmission provider by that control area operator."

Another important part is the fact that these change. And the tariff provides any change to the charges to the transmission customer for regulation and frequency response service shall be as set forth in a subsequent rate schedule promulgated pursuant to applicable federal laws, regulations, and policies attached to and made part of the applicable service agreement.

The transmission providers shall charge the transmission customer in accordance with the rate then in

effect.

2.3

So while it's true that WAPA today does not charge either NorthWestern or to the best of NorthWestern's knowledge any of its other transmission providers for this, it is provided for in the tariff. It was provided for in the tariff clear back as of 2010. It was filed in 2009.

It was there before the date of the LEO that's been at so much issue in this.

All right. That's WAPA's tariff. NorthWestern has its own tariff for Schedule 3. And it pretty much follows the WAPA tariff. And Schedule 3 of NorthWestern's South Dakota OATT. I want to make sure I'm talking about the South Dakota OATT because NorthWestern does have two, there are two really important parts.

The first one is, again, just like in the WAPA tariff it says the transmission customer must either purchase this service -- again, I'm talking about regulation and frequency response -- or make alternative comparable arrangements to satisfy its regulation and frequency response service obligation.

And then a little lower it says, "NorthWestern corporation will provide this service indirectly. By making arrangements with Western Area Power

Administration, Western, NorthWestern Corporation will pass through western's tariff, terms, conditions, and rates."

2.3

There is very similar language with respect to -- I'd say identical language. The same language is in both NorthWestern and WAPA's tariffs with respect to Schedules 4, 5, and 6. There are other ancillary services. There are the very comparable provisions with respect to both WAPA's and NorthWestern's Schedules 9, which have to do with energy and generator imbalance.

Now I can quote all of those provisions if you desire. I guess at this point I'd ask that you give me credit for it. But if you would like, I do have them available, and I can quote that same language.

So the first reason that I think both Staff and Oak Tree are wrong is that they didn't consider the tariff, and the tariff mandates this charge.

The second reason that I believe Oak Tree and to some extent Staff are wrong is that ancillary service costs are not part of avoided costs. Avoided costs are defined as the costs which NorthWestern would pay but for taking power from Oak Tree. We've talked about the avoided cost a great deal over a long period of time. I don't want to go into it, other than to say it does not include all costs involved in doing business when you're

producing and selling electricity, when you're transmitting electricity, when you're delivering electricity.

2.3

Avoided cost isn't expected to do that. And in reality it can't in part because of the functional separation between transmission and people who deal with supply that's required by FERC rules.

Then finally, and I have to -- I'll try to tone myself down here, but I was really somewhat, I guess, put off by Staff's assertion that it would be blatantly -- it would be blatant discrimination to not have provisions that match those in the Titan contract.

The Titan contract provisions are irrelevant.

First, circumstances have changed. Discrimination has to do with treating similarly-situated people differently.

Titan and Oak Tree are not similarly situated.

One of the biggest changes since the Titan contract was negotiated in 2008 was that WAPA filed -- you know, created, filed, and agreed to an OATT that governs us all. That was done in 2009, after

NorthWestern had agreed to the Titan contract. So clearly that's a major change that shows that the circumstances have changed.

Secondly, NorthWestern and the industry have learned a lot about the integration of wind, about trying

to bring wind into our system, and the practices evolved.

You have before you the Affidavit and presentation of

Mr. Hanser that talks about how some of those processes

have evolved.

2.3

NorthWestern has certainly said that the Titan contract is not its current practice. Mr. LaFave has repeatedly testified that NorthWestern would not agree to the terms in the Titan contract today with anybody. And, in fact, as the Commission is probably well aware, NorthWestern has signed at least one new QF agreement without the Titan terms and with the terms pretty much that NorthWestern is asking for with respect to the wind integration issue in this docket.

Finally, there are more changes in the works and it's more likely that WAPA, while it has the authority now and while NorthWestern has the requirement now to pass through any charges WAPA's imposed, at least in NorthWestern's view it's more likely that WAPA will be imposing those charges in the future. Although it doesn't appear WAPA has made any public announcements, it does appear that they're looking towards and working towards joining SPP.

I note in this brief that Oak Tree indicates it seems more likely that WAPA would join MISO which is larger and closer. I think that's wrong for two points.

1 First off, Oak Tree hasn't recognized the breadth and scope of WAPA operations. I think they're only thinking 2 3 about the Upper Midwest part of WAPA when they say it's 4 closer to MISO. And, secondly, it ignores the public 5 filing made by Basin Electric resource -- by Basin 6 Electric in its resource plan that was filed in Minnesota 7 where Basin says that they have been granted the authority to work with WAPA for -- in WAPA's efforts to 8 join SPP.

So in addition to it already being there, it's certainly more critical going forward.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

The final thing I'd like to say about this provision is that NorthWestern simply cannot omit Section 5.5.3 and cannot not charge Oak Tree without violating its FERC-approved OATT, exposing itself for penalties for violating that, and it would be very, very difficult.

Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to go on and also talk about the curtailment issue, but if you'd like me to stop at the end of this one, I'm willing to do that too.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Let's deal with one at a time. I appreciate your comments.

Oak Tree, you are up.

MS. LAFRENTZ: This is Yvette Lafrentz,

- 1 Chairman. I'm going to ask if Mike Uda is on the line 2 with us at this point. I've been trying to get ahold of him. 3 4 CHAIRMAN HANSON: Mike, are you on the line? 5 Apparently he is not. 6 MS. LAFRENTZ: He had a family emergency. 7 almost lost his father Sunday so he may be dealing with 8 some of those issues, and I haven't been able to get ahold of him in the meantime. What I did also do, 10 Mr. Paulson, are you on the line with us? 11 MR. PAULSON: I am. 12 MS. LAFRENTZ: Jeff Paulson, he is an attorney 13 that has been actively working with NorthWestern Energy 14 in this negotiation process. I would like to defer to
  - MS. LAFRENTZ: Jeff Paulson, he is an attorney that has been actively working with NorthWestern Energy in this negotiation process. I would like to defer to Mr. Paulson in this matter since I was not actively involved in all of the negotiation process. And so if Mr. Paulson can go ahead and discuss -- answer Mr. Brogan's comments.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- CHAIRMAN HANSON: Mr. Paulson, would you give us an idea of who you are, et cetera.
- MR. PAULSON: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, I'm an attorney practicing in Minneapolis, Minnesota. My practice focuses on renewable energy projects and the representation of owners and developers of such projects.
- 25 I was engaged by Oak Tree to assist them specifically

with the negotiation of the power purchase agreements
because I do a lot of that.

2.3

As a preliminary matter I should note I am not admitted to practice in South Dakota. If that is an issue for the Commission or the parties, we should probably get that on the table as a first procedural matter. And I would request that I be allowed to, for the purposes of this hearing given that Mr. Uda is unavailable, participate pro hac vice. As I said, I'm admitted in Minnesota and Illinois but not in South Dakota.

So, Mr. Chair, Commissioners, I would put that issue on the -- on the table first for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: Appreciate that. I was going to ask that. Yvette, I understand you are an attorney and you are licensed in South Dakota --

MS. LAFRENTZ: I am, Mr. Chairman. And as this issue came up rather quickly I haven't had the opportunity to move for the admission of Mr. Paulson pro hac vice. That is something that I can do after this hearing if the Commission would want me to do that.

CHAIRMAN HANSON: I don't know that the Commission's going to have an objection, but I'm going to ask NorthWestern if they have an objection.

```
1
              MR. BROGAN: Mr. Chairman, as the Commission's
2
     well aware, I'm admitted pro hac vice. I do not have my
 3
     sponsoring attorney available today and Mr. Smith, the
 4
     Commission's counsel, indicated that that would probably
     be comfortable for today.
 6
              With the Commission having made accommodations
7
     for NorthWestern, I think it would be inappropriate and
8
     in bad faith for us not to be willing to make some
     similar accommodations for Oak Tree.
10
              CHAIRMAN HANSON: Understood.
11
              Mr. Smith, did you have anything?
12
              MR. SMITH: Yvette, could we have your
13
     commitment then to do a pro hac filing so we can at least
14
     have the record straightened out, even though it will be
15
     a tiny bit late?
16
              MS. LAFRENTZ: Yes, Mr. Smith, I will go ahead
17
     and get that filed after the meeting today.
18
              MR. SMITH: Okay. I think we're all right then.
19
     He has a sponsoring South Dakota lawyer on the phone.
20
     think we can proceed.
21
              CHAIRMAN HANSON:
                                Thank you. And with that
     being dispensed, Mr. Paulson, we will admit you on a pro
22
2.3
     hac vice basis.
24
              MR. PAULSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
25
     Commissioners.
```

Given that this was an unexpected appearance on my part, I clearly have not prepared any prolonged commentary, but I also don't believe it's really necessary.

2.3

I've had the opportunity to review the materials that were presented in our brief and in the Staff's presentation as well. I think they fairly and adequately cover the issues before you with respect to the question that Mr. Brogan was just discussing on ancillary services and generator imbalance charges.

The briefs talk about the legalities of whether or not those types of charges and passing them through or seeking reimbursement for those charges are permissible under PURPA. And I think I will rely on the brief with respect to the legal arguments. We obviously don't believe that PURPA allows NorthWestern to pass those charges through, especially since at the time the LEO was established here no such charges were being charged to NorthWestern.

From a practical perspective, the issue is one of extreme importance to the project and its viability. As we discussed in our written materials, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to finance a renewable energy project if that project is subject to uncertain and potentially very large additional expenses and

charges going forward in the future if it does not have a set of relatively fixed obligations on which it can rely to go forward in the financing market.

2.3

And anyone in the room or on the phone who has undertaken any degree of financing, whether it's a renewable project or any other kind of project, will understand that lenders and investors are highly skeptical of putting their money into a project where there is a degree of substantial uncertainty about what the expenses are going to be and whether or not the project is going to be able to make debt service payments.

This is partly why FERC has made its decisions on LEO and similar obligations, in order to provide renewable energy projects, QFs with an LEO or a contract the certainty that they need to go out and get financed. It makes no sense to have PURPA obligations if they can be undermined by PPA provisions that don't allow them to get financed.

You know, that is why this has been such an important issue and why the issue has been presented to you, because the parties have been unable to find a way to bridge that gap. As you have seen in our materials, Oak Tree has been willing to make a partial compromise on this issue simply for the purpose of getting it done, of

reaching an agreement that might be able to accommodate both parties, but still providing for a cap on our ultimate exposure, which would allow us to actually hopefully finance the project. And that cap was based on other PPAs that we're familiar with in the market and what the project could afford.

2.3

The new arguments such as they are that were raised by Mr. Brogan, you know, it's fairly common in these types of hearings to hear a parade of horribles from the utility about how the world will fall apart if they aren't entitled to pass through everything to a third party.

Quite frankly, like I say, I will rely on the obligations of PURPA here, which you have as the Commission has seen and applied to this project and this type of situation already in this proceeding several times. Those obligations supersede any of the other types of horribles that we've heard discussed here.

NorthWestern simply has an obligation under PURPA to do what it has to do, which is to buy the power on this project, on terms that are consistent with the LEO obligation. And we think that in the first instance that is that it is not allowed to pass these types of potential future unknown costs through

```
to the project. And, secondly, if the Commission decides
1
2
     that it wishes to instruct the parties to adopt a
 3
     compromise position we'd propose that compromise position
 4
    as well to you.
 5
              I don't think I have anything further on this
 6
     issue to say. As I said, we'll rely a lot on our written
7
    materials and allow you to continue with your
8
    deliberations. I appreciate your consideration and
     allowing me to speak.
10
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you for your
11
    comments.
12
              Mr. Rounds.
13
              MR. ROUNDS: I think Staff's just going to rely
14
    on our memo and be available for questions.
15
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you.
16
     Does counsel have any remarks that they wish to make?
17
              MR. SMITH: I don't. I don't. Can I ask you
18
    one question here, Mr. Brogan?
19
              On the confidentiality thing, if the
20
     Commissioners were to have any questions regarding the
     formula for compensation -- and I'm not saying they do
21
22
    but if -- and that was not included in the publicly filed
2.3
    motion or response documents, is that an issue for you
24
     guys? It didn't look like it would be to me but --
25
              MR. BROGAN: Mr. Smith, I apologize.
                                                     I'm not
```

- sure that I understand what you mean by the formula for compensation. But --
- 3 MR. SMITH: Well, I guess we're not quite there 4 yet because that's on curtailment so I'll shut up now.
  - MR. BROGAN: Okay. But really I don't believe -- with that in mind, I don't believe that NorthWestern would have a real problem.
- 8 MR. SMITH: Okay. I mean, it seemed pretty 9 straightforward to me, the formula. So okay. Thanks.
- 10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Any questions
  11 by the Commissioners?
- 12 Commissioner Nelson.

5

6

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- 13 COMMISSIONER NELSON: Mr. Paulson, in listening
  14 to Mr. Brogan, he made a very short, succinct statement
  15 that I think is an important one here when he said that
  16 "ancillary costs are not avoided costs."
  - Apparently you're taking a different view of that, and I'd like you to explain that as to why you think they are part of avoided costs.
  - MR. PAULSON: Commissioner, Mr. Chair, I think how we would characterize it is that avoided costs are set at the time the LEO takes effect, which if I recall correctly without having it in front of me was 2011 in this case.
- 25 And avoided costs include any kind of offsetting

- increases in costs such as ancillary services that may
  exist at the time. When you calculate avoided costs you
  take into account what the utility will save and what
  they -- incremental charges might also be and you
  determine that at that point in time.
  - Here that was determined and was to be determined as of a date in 2011, at which point there were no such charges for ancillary services. So there was no offset to reduce the avoided cost that the Commission has determined here.

Does that make sense?

6

7

8

10

11

14

22

2.3

24

on.

- 12 COMMISSIONER NELSON: I heard what you said.

  13 Whether it makes sense is something I'll reserve judgment
- MR. PAULSON: I'm not asking whether you agree.

  I'm wondering if you understood.
- 17 COMMISSIONER NELSON: Yes. I certainly did.
- 18 Mr. Brogan, would you care to respond to that?
- MR. BROGAN: I would, Commissioner Nelson.
- 20 And I try to make it fairly short and hopefully succinct.
  - Avoided cost, I think one of the things that really shows they're not the same thing is who's responsible for determining and regulating them.
- 25 Avoided costs are costs within the

jurisdiction and ambit of the State Commission. It's the State Commission that determines what a utility's avoided cost is and what the proper avoided cost rate for QFs is.

2.3

Ancillary services, on the other hand, are all FERC jurisdictional. FERC has put out a pro forma OATT. It requires utilities to file and have approved open access transmission tariffs that conform to that OATT.

The ancillary service charges are governed by FERC tariffs, not by state action. And I think if we look back at this matter, certainly we all knew at the time of the hearings, and I said hearings plural because we have had several. I think we all knew at all of those times what the provisions to the various OATTs were. And we couldn't sit there and say these are the costs today because clearly WAPA wasn't imposing them.

But we could say there was a tariff obligation for NorthWestern to collect them if they're ever imposed by WAPA. And I would also say that's why this is different from the carbon issue. But because of the separate jurisdiction, because of the separate services that are included, avoided costs again go back to costs that the -- that the company can avoid, the utilities can avoid.

The costs that we're talking about here in terms of ancillary services, if NorthWestern were to buy from any generator, that generator is supposed to be under the open access tariff. That generator is obligated for those costs under NorthWestern's OATT which passes through the cost that it incurs under WAPA's OATT.

Does that explain why I believe they're different?

2.3

COMMISSIONER NELSON: It does. If I could just ask one follow-up question. And so essentially what you're saying is Oak Tree knew that tariff was in place at the time that they first approached NorthWestern said we want to make a deal. And since that tariff was in place, Oak Tree knew about it. For them at this point to say, no, we need a different kind of deal is not proper.

Is that what you're saying?

MR. BROGAN: With one nuance, Commissioner Nelson. I'm saying that Oak Tree knew or should have known about this publicly filed tariff, yes.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. No further questions on this question.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Could I piggyback on that, please, because of the three issues, that's something I was wrestling with, and I was just curious if Mr. Rounds

has any comment on that. I do appreciate you fleshing
that out, though.

2.3

MR. ROUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Brian Rounds for Staff. I would just point out that during at least one of the hearings -- I think it was the March hearing, ancillary services did come up in the discussion of what the avoided costs would be. And I believe if I remember right it was Mr. Wagner said that there were no charges at the time.

So I'm sort of looking at that as the reason ancillary services should be included as an avoided cost.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: The fact that they're not -- that we don't have any at this time but when and if we do have -- or those costs do exist, would you think that they should be included at that time?

MR. ROUNDS: I think to the extent that they are a avoided cost similar to what could potentially be a carbon tax or a cap and trade type of cost that might put something on carbon --

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't know if that's you holding your mic or if that's someone breathing in from elsewhere. Someone should place their phone on mute. There's a lot of noise coming through here from papers and such.

```
1
              MR. ROUNDS: So to me to the extent that this is
2
     an in-avoided cost or a negative avoided cost similar to
    what carbon price would be, only opposite for
 3
 4
    NorthWestern, I don't see how there's any distinction
    between this, and a carbon tax or something like that as
 6
     far as being a potential cost down the road that as of
7
     right now is set at zero. Or as of the LEO was set at
8
     zero.
              I think saying that this is not an avoided cost
10
    would be inconsistent with that decision.
11
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
12
              Commissioner Fiegen, do you have a question?
13
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes. For Staff when you
14
    wrote your recommendation and you did your comparison
15
    with Titan were you aware of WAPA's tariff that they
16
    wrote?
17
              I don't know if it was in 2009 or was in effect
18
    in 2010. Were you aware of that?
19
              MR. ROUNDS:
                          Yes.
20
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Did you take that into
21
    consideration in your --
22
              MR. ROUNDS: We did. My understanding is that a
2.3
    transmission customer must accept those services unless
24
    they get the services elsewhere. So in this instance
25
     they would be basically getting those services at the
```

```
cost of NorthWestern.
2
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I might have to go reread
     all of that.
 3
 4
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Thank you.
 5
              Commissioners, do you wish to proceed with
 6
     hearing the discussion on each one of these questions or
7
     do you wish to dispose of questions as they come up?
8
              Frankly, I think I'm comfortable in taking care
     of them as we have a question before us.
10
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: However you want to do it
11
     is fine.
12
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Do you have a preference,
13
     Commissioner Fiegen? Yes? No? I'll rule that we will
14
     dispense with them one at a time unless -- I know 2 and 3
15
     may create some challenge for us, but the first one I
16
     think that we can dispose of at this juncture.
17
              Is there a discussion at this point, or would
18
     you prefer to have a motion before us?
19
              I will make a motion then in -- well, let me
20
     discuss it first because I'm still wrestling with a
21
     portion of it.
22
              It's never good to argue with yourself in
2.3
              Then I will make a motion, and then I may or may
     public.
     not support it.
24
```

In EL11-006 in regards to the question, I will

25

1 move that the appropriate contractual language to govern Oak Tree's responsibility for ancillary service charges 2 3 and NorthWestern Energy may potentially incur as a result 4 of Oak Tree's integration into NorthWestern Energy, 5 WAPA's, and possibly an RTO system that we should permit 6 NorthWestern Energy to charge for those ancillary 7 services. 8 That may be a provocative motion at this 9 juncture. But Mr. Smith, was that -- in listening to 10 that motion, does succinctly take care of that, or do I 11 need to --12 MR. SMITH: No. I think it does. I think it's 13 clear what you meant. I'm understanding you to say that 14 you would adopt the NorthWestern proposed language. 15 COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's correct. 16 MR. SMITH: Okay. There you go. Can I ask one 17 question of Mr. Brogan before? 18 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes, you may. MR. SMITH: Al, on the OATT pass through 19 20 provisions by WAPA and/or you -- and, again, I don't have 21 it sitting in front of me and that's why I'm asking, 22 because you do, I think, do those pass throughs 2.3 explicitly state that the pass through is to the 24 transmission customer in the sense of that being the end

point of it or the generator for generator imbalance?

25

does that allow the pass through to load?

2.3

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Smith, the tariff says that the transmission customer must either purchase this service from the transmission provider or make alternative comparable arrangements to satisfy it. And I think that's Schedule 3, but I can go to a different schedule if you'd like. To satisfy its regulation and frequency response service obligation.

And then it says NorthWestern Corporation will provide this service indirectly by making arrangements with WAPA. NorthWestern Corporation will pass through Western's tariff terms, conditions, and rates.

I think when that's read in conjunction with the WAPA OATT that says the transmission provider -- excuse me. To the extent the control area operator performs this service for the transmission provider, charges to the transmission customer are to reflect only a pass through of the cost charged to the transmission provider by that control area operator. I think it's clear that it has to be passed through -- that NorthWestern has to charge the transmission customer.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Does that answer your question?

MR. BROGAN: One other sentence I think is important is the sentence that says -- and this is back

in NorthWestern's OATT. It says, "To the extent the control area operator performs his service for the transmission provider, charges to the transmission customer are to reflect only a pass through of the cost charged to the transmission provider by that control area operator."

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

2.3

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I'd like to first comment on my motion and then hear what -- just so that the other fellow Commissioners and Staff and folks know why I went the direction I did and then I'm eager to hear what your comments are.

In looking at the three arguments that were made by NorthWestern Energy, the third one, Titan contracts are irrelevant, I agree with that. But that certainly does not -- I disregard that at the same time. I don't think that's conclusive in any way in making a decision on this.

The first argument that Staff and perhaps Oak

Tree did not consider the tariffs, I'm not giving a lot

of weight to that. I think that certainly PURPA

obligations are extremely important. And I can see the

argument and perhaps agree with it.

The second argument, ancillary costs are not part of the avoided costs, that's an interesting

argument. I'm still trying to wrap around that completely, whether or not that's decision-making for me or not.

2.3

I fully agree with Staff's comment that if
NorthWestern Energy is concerned about the magnitude of
the costs, it's troubling that they were never brought up
during the proceeding when we examined the avoided cost
discussions. I think that's an unfortunate challenge,
and I wish they would have.

They certainly should have brought it up, I think, during the avoided cost process. Regardless of whether one considers the ancillary cost to be part of the avoided cost, I think that it's appropriate to have discussed them at that juncture.

So it sounds like I'm arguing against my motion. At the same time, I do believe that if and when ancillary service charges are assessed, the market value of those costs should be reflected. As it's an imposition to NorthWestern Energy, it should be reflected in the cost.

The fact that they don't necessarily occur now, potentially would occur, the fact is that if Oak Tree's existence creates a cost for NorthWestern Energy, that cost should be borne by Oak Tree. It would need to be passed on to others. And that's -- it's not fair to pass

it on certainly to other consumers. So that is how I arrived at the decision that I did, that I felt that a cost that is borne by NorthWestern Energy as a result of Oak Tree's existence and integration into NorthWestern Energy, that that cost should be borne by Oak Tree.

So I'm eager to hear what your thoughts are and if you can convince me to vote for or against my own motion.

Commissioner Nelson.

2.3

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to support your motion, and hopefully I can convince you to support your motion also.

Let me say that my first gut reaction as I read through this was the same as yours, why didn't we address this as we were going through the avoided cost hearings. And we certainly talked about everything else and why didn't we deal with this.

I think at the end of the day Mr. Brogan really hit it on the head this morning with his very simple phrase that ancillary costs are not avoided costs and, if that is true, and I believe it is -- as I have looked at the definition of avoided cost, I don't see how you can shoehorn ancillary costs in there, particularly when they are provided for in these federal tariffs that were already on file at the time that Oak Tree approached

NorthWestern. And because of this, it really seems to me that ancillary costs are a different animal. They don't fit within the definition of avoided cost and, therefore, need to be treated separately from that.

I do want to take exception with one statement that Mr. Rounds made. And I always do that with trepidation. But when you say that there's no difference between this and carbon costs, I think there is. Carbon is a political issue, period. This is not a political issue. And so in my mind they're two very, very separate issues because of that.

And so with that, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to joining you in passing your motion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Any further discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Fiegen.

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fellow Commissioners, it has been an interesting docket over the last few years and when we look at the LEO in February it appears to me that that tariff was written in WAPA. This morning I'd sure like to go read that sometime to make sure. And I'm sure it's right. That was in effect, that they would pass those charges along if that ever came to be.

I also appreciate Oak Tree when they tried to compromise and I appreciate your compromise. The thing

that was bothersome today is that you came up with a formula and used other people's ideas, but the bottom line you said was also a portion that we could afford.

And sometimes as Commissioners we need to look at rate payers and what they can afford and what's passed along to them. So I will be supporting the Chairman's motion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Good comments, good thoughts. Having no further discussion then, the question is on the motion. Those in favor vote yes, those opposed, no.

Commissioner Fiegen.

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Nelson.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Hanson votes aye. Motion carries.

The second question before us is what is the appropriate contractual language to govern curtailment of Oak Tree's energy deliveries to the system. And since the questions 2 and 3 deal with curtailment, I will also read question 3 and if -- I don't see there's an opportunity to discuss one without somewhat discussing the other one.

The third question is is a default provision

- appropriate for NorthWestern Energy if it fails to accept delivery of energy from Oak Tree except under the contract's allowed curtailment provisions. And, if so, what is the appropriate contractual language to be
  - I was planning to start with Oak Tree on this item. Oak Tree, would you like to go first? Excuse me. Or NorthWestern Energy?
  - MR. UDA: Mr. Chairman, this is Mike Uda. I was late this morning. My father was taken to the hospital. And he is in serious condition. And so I broke away as soon as I could to join the meeting and I apologize for my tardiness.
  - COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mike, we appreciate that. Yvette shared that with us and we certainly hope and pray that your father pulls through here and is well and gets to celebrate some more birthdays with you.

Please proceed.

included in such a provision?

2.3

MR. UDA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I assume -I haven't seen the memo, the Order that you're referring
to. But I assume you're referring to the question of the
curtailment language for Oak Tree; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: That's correct. But if you're just getting up to speed here real quick on a couple of items, we can certainly have NorthWestern go

```
first if that would give you an opportunity --
              MR. UDA: That might be a good idea,
2
 3
     Mr. Chairman.
                    I always like listening to Mr. Brogan.
 4
              MR. BROGAN: I'll be glad to go first.
 5
     Mike, we'll have to discuss whether I was supposed to
 6
     pick up sarcasm in that last statement.
7
              MR. UDA: Not at all, Al. Not at all.
8
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Please go ahead,
9
     Mr. Brogan. Mr. Brogan, if you're speaking, you're on
10
     mute.
11
              MR. BROGAN: No, I'm not on mute. I was trying
12
     to gather my thoughts a little bit and trying to make
13
     this as succinct as possible.
14
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Great.
                                             Thank you.
15
              MR. BROGAN: Basically NorthWestern is asking
16
     for right to curtail and except in cases of system
17
     emergencies if it curtails for anything other than that,
18
     it is agreeing to be bound to pay Oak Tree, not only the
     amount that is due under the contract for the curtailed
19
20
     energy and capacity but also for production tax credits
21
     and for recs.
22
              So in NorthWestern's view there should -- it
2.3
     doesn't even really understand entirely why we're
24
     discussing this because in NorthWestern's view
25
     NorthWestern is making Oak Tree and arguably its
```

investors and lenders completely whole with respect to its proposed curtailment language.

2.3

And I guess the first thing that I would point out is that there are no rules or decisions by FERC that prohibit the parties from agreeing to this type of language.

I would direct the Commission to FERC Rule 18 CFR, Section 292.301, Sub B that says, "Nothing in this subpart," referring to Subpart 292, "limits the authority of any electric utility or any qualifying facility to agree to a rate for any purchase or terms or conditions relating to any purchase which differ from the rate or terms or conditions which would otherwise be required by this subpart or affects the validity of any contract entered into."

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Sir, when you're reading if you would speak just a little slower for the court reporter. Appreciate it.

MR. BROGAN: And I shouldn't be reading. I apologize for that. But in any case, 292.301 really allows the terms that the parties want and it's really -- states your authority when the parties can't agree to set what those terms are.

There's lots of discussion in Oak Tree's brief about the Idaho Wind Partners case. It's neither

- 1 controlling nor even applicable. Unlike Idaho wind
- 2 | power -- or Idaho Wind Power Partners case,
- 3 NorthWestern's not asking the Commission to unilaterally
- 4 adopt some sort of schedule that would change an existing
- 5 contract or even an existing LEO.
- The whole concept of an LEO is a right to sell
- 7 at any price. It doesn't concern -- does not include
- 8 terms and conditions.
- 9 Secondly, unlike Idaho Wind, there's nothing
- 10 that NorthWestern's trying to do to lower the economic
- 11 benefits to Oak Tree. Even in that case FERC talked a
- 12 lot about the fact that QFs were entitled to essentially
- 13 the benefit of their bargain, to use a term of art.
- 14 There's nothing in this proposal that denies Oak
- 15 Tree the benefit of the bargain because of how
- 16 | NorthWestern would compensate Oak Tree for any
- 17 | curtailment.
- 18 And, finally, NorthWestern is merely trying to
- 19 preserve the right that will be rarely used. I think if
- 20 | we think about it from a rational point of view, only
- 21 when the alternative is more than \$70 less than -- or
- 22 approximately \$70 less than what NorthWestern has to pay
- 23 Oak Tree would NorthWestern curtail for any reasons other
- 24 than the emergency reasons.
- NorthWestern's not going to curtail if it's

going to cost customers money. When you add the cost of the avoided cost rate plus the PTC amount, which is currently \$22, and you add those together, it's only if -- because of the circumstances there's something out there that's less than -- you know, more than that, less than Oak Tree.

2.3

Because under any circumstances NorthWestern's going to have to pay that. And I -- I think that this provision is needed to protect NorthWestern Energy's customers.

We stated repeatedly NorthWestern doesn't really have a lot of interest or economic interest in this matter. Because these are pass through costs. And we're stepping up to the plate to protect our customers' interests the best we can. And we really believe that this is an important provision. It doesn't harm Oak Tree in any manner.

And we believe that Staff correctly analyzed the issue of curtailment and we would ask the Commission to include Section 6.5.1, the curtailment language, and to eliminate then the language that would make imposing this curtailment a breach of the contract. They kind of go hand in hand.

And, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I thank you for your attention.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Uda, are you ready?

2.3

MR. UDA: Mr. Chairman, I'm in a location outside the hospital that does not appear to have terrific cell phone reception. So if I cut out or you're not able to hear me, please let me know and I will try to speak up to make sure that everyone can hear me.

I understand and am in some sense happy that

NorthWestern has adopted the approach that they've

adopted with respect to curtailment in the sense that,

you know, it's nice that we get reimbursed. There are a

couple of issues -- I want to make clear that from this

perspective we aren't saying we think what NorthWestern's

attempting to do is evil or wrong.

We have a significant problem with it. And the reason it's a significant problem is, is that we get production tax credits based on production. And we have -- and I'm sure you're aware tax equity investors who are using these tax credits to offset taxes. They're not interested so much in the revenue that the project produces. They're much more interested in making sure they can offset their tax obligations. And this is one of the reasons they shop these things to people who have these taxes -- to offset taxes.

And we don't, you know, have a problem with I think the revenue side of it. I think it's the production tax portion of it that's problematic. And this is, I think, where the negotiations broke down.

2.3

And I think the concern is we have to go out and find people to finance this project and we have people working on that, and we're trying to. We're not making up the fact that when we talk to these people they're saying -- and I'm not arguing about the curtailment -- about the -- about the ancillary services issue because I know that's already been decided.

But on both fronts we talk to the investors, they say, well, you know, how is this going to work in practice? And how are we going to make sure that we get tax credits when we need them? And that's really an unclear question and it creates uncertainty and uncertainty is bad for investment. So that's general trust.

And I believe Mr. Brogan's correct. I think under PURPA a QF and the utilities can agree to pretty much anything. You can even agree to a contract that's above avoided cost. The utilities can agree to that. But this is different. This isn't where we're sitting around and we're saying, okay, we've agreed to this, now can we do that, can we agree to something different than

PURPA.

2.3

This is a situation where we have a disagreement, and we're asking the state's authority now to implement the law. And that is the state's obligation under PURPA and what we're asking you to do is we're saying, look, this is creating a significant problem for us with investors.

And if you read Order 69, which is the preamble to the FERC regulations, it talks about the need for certainty investment in these technologies. And when we hear from investors that, you know, they're less than thrilled about this particular provision, and I don't know if they've said no but they've definitely said this creates great concern. We have to listen to that because in order for this project to be successful to be built we have to gain their confidence that they want to invest in this project and it's a good deal.

And there's a lot of discretion that is built into this curtailment in a way that, you know, could be problematic. I'm not saying NorthWestern would abuse it. I take Mr. Brogan at his word that it would be rarely used. My question, though, is if it's rarely used, then why is it so important?

I mean, I hear two things going on here. On the one hand I hear Mr. Brogan saying, well, this is really

not a big deal but at the same time saying, well, this is really important. And I understand that this is revenue neutral to them. I certainly understand that. I also know that, you know, in the course of business there are times when things don't go as smoothly as you would like them to go.

2.3

And, for example, you have situations where, you know, payments are delayed or whatever. Creating, you know, a dispute and any kind of a dispute for a project this small that we have to come back in front of the Commission to litigate is an expensive proposition and a daunting proposition and we would rather not do that.

And let me talk a little bit about the Idaho Wind Partners case and the reason why I think it's relevant and important for the Commission's consideration.

What happened in Idaho Wind Partners, and I was personally involved in that case. I represented a company out of Idaho in that case. And what was going on was -- and there were a number of different parties at different stages of this. There were some that were just prospective QFs. There were some that had legally enforceable obligations but didn't yet have contracts and there were some that had executed contracts and some that

had executed contracts for a number of years.

2.3

And what Idaho power was proposing with Schedule 74 was to apply this to everybody across the board. And, you know, there was argument amongst the parties about whether it was an economic curtailment or noneconomic curtailment and there was a dispute about implementation. But the Idaho Wind Partners had a contract. They went to FERC to remove this uncertainty about the revenues they were getting because of the curtailment.

And I recognize what Mr. Brogan is saying, this is a different case because they are talking about compensation. But the point that FERC made in discussing the Idaho Wind Partners case and Schedule 74 was this point about certainty and investment. And they said, you know, when you enter into an LEO the idea is you're fixing the obligation of both the utility and the QF at the same time. And so everybody knows what they're dealing with.

And Mr. Brogan even used the term the benefit of the bargain. And I understand his point that, well, you're going to be reimbursed so, you know, what's the problem? The problem is that because the investors don't know about the stream, particularly the production tax credit situation, it creates uncertainty in

investment.

2.3

We think that that kind of uncertainty doesn't interfere or impede in any way with getting the investment that we need and preserve the benefit of the bargain that we thought we had with respect to the revenue stream that we're going to get so that when we go to the bank, get the financing and support this project.

So I think in that way it is relevant and it is important, and I think if, for example, and Mr. Brogan has linked these two things, you know, if, for example, you know, this curtail -- kind of curtailment is implemented, you know, to our mind because we're not getting what we were supposed to get, it is a breach of contract.

So anyway, that's -- I think I've said enough about this, and I thank the Commission for its time. And hopefully I came through okay.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Yes, you did.

Mr. Rounds.

MR. ROUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, this is Brian Rounds for Staff. I don't know that there's a lot that we can add that hasn't been said. We mostly agree with NorthWestern's position. I think additionally we

would actually prefer slightly more broad language as far as allowing NorthWestern to curtail whenever they might need to. But any of those more broad or undefined reasons just be listed under those for which they are reimbursing Oak Tree.

I don't know that PURPA requires the Commission to -- or PURPA requires us to ensure that Oak Tree has the right mix of investors, but I will say that I think given the price that we're at in today's economics of building wind farms I'd be pretty surprised if they are unable to finance this project.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Questions by the Commission.

Commissioner Nelson.

2.3

2.4

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Question for Mr. Uda. You know, Mr. Brogan has said that with the payment of energy and PTC and recs that all is equal. But is there a tax difference for Oak Tree?

It would seem to me that if NorthWestern is paying compensation for curtailment, that the amount that they've included for the PTC is going to be taxable income for Oak Tree. Whereas, if Oak Tree is producing and you've got these tax credits, that's not taxable income.

So is there some tax implication here that

1 hasn't been talked about? 2 MR. UDA: That's a really good question, Sheriff Nelson. Commissioner Nelson. And I hadn't even really 3 4 thought about it until now. I think that that may be an issue. 6 I'm not a tax attorney, and I'm not an expert. But it seems to me that there's a difference between a 7 8 tax credit where you're taking, you know, it off your taxes over time as opposed to, you know, getting a 10 payment from someone, which might be treated as ordinary 11 income. And I'm not really qualified to say that, but 12 that could potentially be an issue, yes. 13 COMMISSIONER NELSON: No further questions. 14 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen, do 15 you have any questions? 16 Yes. 17 MR. RISLOV: Mr. Uda, this is Greg Rislov, 18 Commission advisor. I want to go back to that issue of 19 compensation. I guess I'm a little confused. Since 20 dollars are a common denominator, if NorthWestern can 21 ensure the investors that they're equally as well off 22 with a tax credit or a cash payment, I don't understand 2.3 where the sticking point is for Oak Tree. If you could clarify that. 24 25 (Inaudible.) MR. UDA:

1 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Uda, every syllable is 2 breaking up at this juncture. Perhaps you may have moved 3 to another spot. 4 MR. UDA: Is this better, Mr. Chairman? 5 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Yes, it is. 6 MR. UDA: Thank you, Mr. Rislov, for the 7 question. I think the issue is that these tax equity 8 investors -- and I appreciate Staff's comment about it is a practical consideration. (Inaudible.) 10 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Sir, it started out great, 11 and then it became garbled. I'll let Cheri tell you 12 where it started being garbled. 13 MR. UDA: I was just going to say I appreciate 14 Staff's comment that it's not the Commission's obligation 15 to ensure -- to ensure there is -- (Inaudible). 16 I think it is the Commission's obligation to 17 ensure that, you know -- that the obligations that are 18 fixed at the outset enable the project to obtain 19 financing because that's -- which without that there 20 isn't any real point to the law. But I do think that the issue is this: 21 22 tax equity investors are not interested in revenue. 2.3 They're interested in getting just the tax offset. They 24 have tax obligations they're trying to offset. 25 getting them a check is just adding to their tax problem

instead of helping to solve it.

2.3

MR. RISLOV: Mr. Uda, but, again, dollars are the common denominator. If I give them enough money, I don't think they really care if they get a tax credit as long as the bottom line ends up the same, as long as the bottom line is the same. I mean, we talk about a tax credit. It does have a value, let's say 35 percent of an obligation but I can give them dollars that are going to get them to the same place, can't I?

MR. UDA: I think that that's possible that that could happen. That was not my understanding of the way in which that mechanism was going to work, adding to the value of the tax credit was going to be paid in a cash payment and not an additional balance to compensate the fact that, you know -- you're not really offsetting the taxes at that point, you're just adding revenue instead.

So, yeah, would it be possible to have a mechanism to do that? It was not my understanding that it did that.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Nelson, do you have a follow-up?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Mr. Uda, here's what I'm understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, what I'm understanding is that your investors in their annual tax

```
1
     planning are looking for some certainty in the amount of
2
     PTC credits that they can count on in their tax planning.
 3
     And that if we go with NorthWestern's language, that
 4
     you're not going to be able to assure them of the -- the
 5
     stream of credits that they are planning on for their tax
 6
     planning; is that correct?
7
                        That is correct, Mr. Nelson.
              MR. UDA:
8
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                    No further questions.
 9
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Thank you. Any further
10
     questions from the Commission?
11
              Commissioner Fiegen?
12
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Just a quick question for
13
     NorthWestern. Is it my understanding that this will be a
14
     very rare circumstance? And this is a circumstance that
15
     would increase costs to NorthWestern customers?
16
              MR. BROGAN: Commissioner Fiegen, it's
     NorthWestern's belief that this would be an extremely
17
18
     rare circumstance, only at a time when -- when the total
19
     cost to NorthWestern's customers is lowered by curtailing
20
     Oak Tree and paying for the power and paying for the PTCs
21
     and taking care of the -- the income tax consideration
22
     that's shown in Exhibit E of the agreement.
2.3
              We don't expect that it will happen very often,
24
     but it will happen sometimes when we get to extremely
```

negative prices and maybe extremely light loads.

25

think it would be very rare, but we think it's extremely
important to protect customers.

And if I might, Commissioner Fiegen and Mr. Chairman, I spoke a little earlier, and I'd like to clear up a statement that I made, if I might.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Please.

2.3

2.4

MR. BROGAN: This is relative to the second section that we were talking about, which has to do with whether or not the curtailment was a breach. I think I -- I believe I said that we didn't want it to be a breach. That's not true. We agree that failing to take energy is a breach. And that's taken care of by the next section.

What I should have said is we don't believe that failing to take energy out of the curtailment is a default that allows Oak Tree to immediately terminate the contract. That's how come these work together. And I apologize for misspeaking.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. So it's my understanding that the investors still will get production tax credits, and we never know what those tax credits will be until production, but in a very rare circumstance they wouldn't get those and would get revenue instead?

MR. BROGAN: That is NorthWestern's belief. And

we agree that we -- you know, we don't know what any given wind farm will produce during a year. And our experience, not in South Dakota but elsewhere, has been that it's pretty variable year to year for the same wind farm.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Any further questions?

Mr. Smith.

2.3

MR. SMITH: Maybe, Mr. Brogan, you know, in your definition of the value for PTC that fits into the compensation equation, talking Section 6.5.4, it states, "PTC means an amount which would result in the seller receiving an amount equal to the value of the PTC's loss based on lost production on an after-tax basis calculated in accordance with Exhibit E."

Could you explain that, particularly the last phrase?

MR. BROGAN: First off, I was beginning to talk with my mute button on. I apologize.

Secondly, I do not have a printed out version of the whole contract in front of me. But as I recall Exhibit E -- and so I'm saying I'd like to make this subject to check. But as I recall Exhibit E, it shows how the value of the production tax credit would be

```
1
     grossed up to account for the income tax effect that
 2
     Commissioner Nelson was asking about.
 3
                          Thank you.
              MR. SMITH:
 4
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Are there any further
 5
     questions? If not, is there a motion?
 6
              Seeing none, did you -- in EL11-006, I will move
7
     that we approve NorthWestern Energy's Section 6.5.1 and
8
     remove Section 8.2.3 in its entirety.
              Discussion on the motion. I think it's clear.
10
              Commissioner Nelson, did you have any comment?
11
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: Could we split these
12
     two?
13
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right.
14
              COMMISSIONER NELSON: At this point -- and let
15
     me just speak to the first of the two. Because I'm in
16
     agreement with you that 8.2.3 does need to be removed.
17
     No question about that in my mind.
18
              But on the first issue I am sympathetic to Oak
19
     Tree's argument. I understand the importance of tax
20
     planning. I understand the importance of certainty as
21
     you're dealing with business investments, at least making
22
     things as certain as possible. And because of that, I
2.3
     am sympathetic to Oak Tree's argument on the first
2.4
     issue.
```

And so I think I will probably not support you

25

- on the first motion but certainly will on the second.

  Because 8.2.3 I think is covered elsewhere and needs to come out.

  COMMISSIONER HANSON: I think I'll reverse those on you, though. I will divide the question then so that
  - on you, though. I will divide the question then so that the first issue will be NorthWestern Energy's Section 6.5.1, and the second question will be removing Section 8.2.3 in its entirety.
  - So with the first motion being approving

    NorthWestern Energy Section 6.5.1, did you have further discussion on that that you wanted to make?
- 12 COMMISSIONER NELSON: No, thanks.

2.3

- 13 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Fiegen, did
  14 you have something?
  - COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes. I am going to support the Chairman's motion. Because anytime that our rate payers need to pay for negative energy and pay money to put energy on the line or to curtail it or whatever is -- you know, it costs a lot of money, and I think NorthWestern has been fair with Oak Tree in their compensation for when they would have to do that they would get paid, all of it, including the production tax credit.
  - Also, production tax credit's tricky because of the variable output of wind energy farms. So you

```
1
     never know as an investor how much production tax credit
2
     you're going to get. And if you put a fixed amount in
 3
     your budgeting, it can change because that's very
 4
     variable.
 5
              So I appreciate NorthWestern bringing this to
 6
     our attention and making sure that rate payers aren't
7
     paying for negative energy.
8
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Thank you for comments.
     In light of that, do you have anything further?
10
              Then in EL11-006 the question before us is
11
     approving NorthWestern Energy's Section 6.5.1.
12
              Commissioner Fiegen.
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN:
13
                                     Fiegen votes aye.
14
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                    Commissioner Nelson.
15
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                     Nay.
16
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Hanson votes
17
     aye. The motion carries.
18
              The next question before us in EL11-006 is the
19
     motion to remove Section 8.2.3 in its entirety.
     further discussion on that motion?
20
21
              Seeing none, Commissioner Fiegen.
22
              COMMISSIONER FIEGEN:
                                     Fiegen votes aye.
2.3
              COMMISSIONER HANSON: Commissioner Nelson.
2.4
              COMMISSIONER NELSON:
                                     Aye.
25
              COMMISSIONER HANSON:
                                     Hanson votes aye.
                                                        The
```

1 motion carries.

2.3

That will conclude the discussion and votes on EL11-006, and we appreciate all of the participation from those testifying over the telephones and the challenges that they had.

And Mr. Uda, we hope that things go well with you today.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: If I could just make one comment to Mr. Uda, I greatly appreciate your willingness to file your brief early so that we could move this along and get it resolved today, and I do wish you the very best with your family situation.

MR. UDA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Nelson. It's a touch-and-go situation and it's been --

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Uda, our prayers are with you. We hope everything works out for you and your family.

MR. UDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Take care.

MR. BROGAN: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of NorthWestern, thank you for the hearing today and the opportunity to be heard. We appreciate all the effort that the Commission and Commission Staff has put into this matter.

```
1
               COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you. Thank you for
 2
     your participation.
 3
                    (The proceeding is concluded.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF SULLY )
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
7	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings
10	had in the above-entitled matter on the 30th day of
11	July, 2013, and that the attached is a true and correct
12	transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 22nd day of
14	August, 2013.
15	
16	
17	
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter
20	CCICILICA NCALCIMO NEPOLCCI
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

_	_	20.44 40.4	24:20 24:22 25:2	40.0 44.04 44.05 1
\$	7	30:14, 40:4 adopted [2] - 42:10,	34:20, 34:23, 35:2, 43:10	10:8, 11:21, 11:25, 1 31:5, 31:10
		42:11	animal [1] - 35:2	arrived [1] - 34:2
<b>\$22</b> [1] - 41:3	<b>74</b> [2] - 46:3, 46:14	advisor [1] - 49:18	announcements [1] -	art [1] - 40:13
<b>\$70</b> [2] - 40:21, 40:22		affects [1] - 39:14	14:20	assert [1] - 9:16
	8	Affidavit [1] - 14:2	annual [1] - 51:25	assertion [1] - 13:10
1		<b>afford</b> [3] - 21:6, 36:3,	answer [2] - 16:17,	asserts [1] - 9:14
	┥	36:5	31:22	assessed [1] - 33:17
4 540	<b>8.2.3</b> [5] - 55:8, 55:16,	after-tax [1] - 54:15	anytime [1] - 56:16	assist [1] - 16:25
<b>1</b> [1] - 5:10	56:2, 56:8, 57:19	AGAINST [1] - 1:4	anyway [1] - 47:16	associated [1] - 8:19
<b>18</b> [1] - 39:7		agenda [1] - 3:6	apart [1] - 21:10	assume [2] - 37:19,
	<b>⊣</b> 9	agree [15] - 4:3, 14:7,	apologize [5] - 22:25,	37:21
2		24:15, 32:15, 32:23,	37:12, 39:20, 53:18,	assure [1] - 52:4
	<b>9</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 9:11, 12:9	33:4, 39:11, 39:22,	54:20	attached [2] - 10:22,
<b>2</b> [2] - 29:14, 36:21	9:30 [1] - 2:4	43:20, 43:21, 43:22,	appear [3] - 14:20,	60:11
<b>2008</b> [1] - 13:18		43:25, 47:24, 53:11,	14:21, 42:5	attempting [1] - 42:15
<b>2009</b> [3] - 11:7, 13:20,	Α	54:1	appearance [1] - 19:1	attention [2] - 41:25,
28:17		agreed [4] - 6:24,	appeared [2] - 6:1,	57:6
<b>2010</b> [2] - 11:6, 28:18		13:19, 13:21, 43:24	9:22	attorney [8] - 5:18,
<b>2011</b> [2] - 23:23, 24:7	a.m [1] - 2:4	agreeing [2] - 38:18,	applicable [3] - 10:21,	5:20, 5:21, 16:12,
<b>2013</b> [4] - 1:8, 2:4,	<b>able</b> [5] - 16:8, 20:11,	39:5	10:22, 40:1	16:22, 17:16, 18:3,
60:11, 60:14	21:1, 42:7, 52:4	<b>AGREEMENT</b> [1] - 1:6	applied [1] - 21:15	49:6
<b>22nd</b> [1] - 60:13	above-entitled [2] -	agreement [7] - 3:4,	apply [2] - 9:14, 46:3	attributable [4] - 8:21,
<b>292</b> [1] - 39:9	2:2, 60:10	6:23, 10:23, 14:10,	appointed [1] - 60:8	8:24, 9:2
<b>292.301</b> [2] - 39:8,	abuse [1] - 44:20	21:1, 52:22, 55:16	appreciate [14] -	August [1] - 60:14
39:20	accept [3] - 5:1, 28:23,	agreements [4] - 3:10,	15:23, 17:15, 22:8,	authority [9] - 8:6, 8:7,
	37:1	3:13, 6:9, 17:1	27:1, 35:24, 35:25,	8:18, 8:23, 14:15,
3	access [3] - 7:21, 25:8, 26:4	ahead [3] - 16:17,	37:14, 39:18, 50:8,	15:8, 39:9, 39:22,
	accommodate [2] -	18:16, 38:8	50:13, 57:5, 58:3,	44:3
3 raoz 0:11 0:25	6:20, 21:1	ahold [2] - 16:2, 16:9	58:9, 58:23	availability [1] - 6:17
<b>3</b> [10] - 9:11, 9:25, 10:3, 11:11, 11:12,	accommodations [2]	<b>Ailts</b> [1] - 1:13	approach [1] - 42:10	available [4] - 5:22,
29:14, 31:6, 36:21,	- 18:6, 18:9	<b>Al</b> [4] - 3:21, 5:13,	approached [2] -	12:14, 18:3, 22:14
36:22	accordance [2] -	30:19, 38:7	26:12, 34:25	Avenue [1] - 2:3
<b>30</b> [1] - 1:8	10:25, 54:16	alert [1] - 5:16	appropriate [9] - 4:16,	avoid [2] - 25:24,
<b>30th</b> [2] - 2:4, 60:10	account [2] - 24:3,	allocable [2] - 8:21,	4:22, 5:1, 5:4, 30:1,	25:25
<b>35</b> [1] - 51:7	55:1	9:2	33:13, 36:19, 37:1,	avoided [33] - 9:5, 9:6,
00[1] 0	acronyms [1] - 7:14	<b>allow</b> [4] - 20:18, 21:3,	37:4	12:20, 12:23, 13:4,
4	action [1] - 25:11	22:7, 31:1	approve [1] - 55:7 approved [3] - 9:21,	23:16, 23:19, 23:21,
<b>-</b>	actively [2] - 16:13,	<b>allowed</b> [4] - 5:3, 17:7, 21:24, 37:3	15:15, 25:7	23:25, 24:2, 24:9, 24:22, 24:25, 25:3,
	16:15	allowing [2] - 22:9,	approving [2] - 56:9,	25:23, 27:7, 27:11,
<b>4</b> [1] - 12:7	add [3] - 41:1, 41:3,	48:2	57:11	27:18, 28:2, 28:9,
_	47:24	allows [3] - 19:16,	area [8] - 6:10, 8:6,	32:25, 33:7, 33:11,
5	adding [3] - 50:25,	39:21, 53:16	10:11, 10:14, 31:15,	33:13, 34:15, 34:20,
	51:12, 51:16	almost [1] - 16:7	31:19, 32:2, 32:5	34:22, 35:3, 41:2,
<b>5</b> <sub>[2]</sub> - 9:11, 12:7	addition [1] - 15:10	alternative [3] - 11:20,	Area [2] - 7:19, 11:25	43:22
<b>5.5.3</b> [3] - 7:9, 9:18,	additional [2] - 19:25,	31:4, 40:21	areas [1] - 6:11	aware [7] - 5:20, 10:5,
15:14	51:14	ambit [1] - 25:1	arena [1] - 3:16	14:9, 18:2, 28:15,
<b>500</b> [1] - 2:3	additionally [1] -	amount [7] - 38:19,	arguably [1] - 38:25	28:18, 42:19
	47:25	41:2, 48:20, 52:1,	argue [2] - 9:4, 29:22	aye [8] - 36:13, 36:15,
6	address [1] - 34:14	54:13, 54:14, 57:2	argues [1] - 9:11	36:16, 57:13, 57:17,
	adequately [1] - 19:7	analyzed [1] - 41:18	arguing [2] - 33:15,	57:22, 57:24, 57:25
	Administration [2] -	ancillary [27] - 4:18,	43:9	
<b>6</b> [2] - 9:11, 12:7	7:20, 12:1	7:4, 7:8, 8:19, 9:10,	argument [8] - 8:14,	В
<b>6.5.1</b> [5] - 41:20, 55:7,	admission [1] - 17:20	9:14, 10:1, 12:7,	32:19, 32:23, 32:24,	
56:7, 56:10, 57:11	admit [1] - 18:22	12:19, 19:9, 23:16,	33:1, 46:4, 55:19,	beekensender 7:44
<b>6.5.4</b> [1] - 54:12	admittant [1] - 5:24	24:1, 24:8, 25:5,	55:23	background [1] - 7:11
<b>69</b> [1] - 44:8	admitted [4] - 5:19,	25:10, 26:2, 27:6,	arguments [4] - 8:15,	bad [2] - 18:8, 43:17
	17:4, 17:10, 18:2	27:11, 30:2, 30:6,	19:15, 21:7, 32:13	balance [1] - 51:14
	adopt [3] - 22:2,	32:24, 33:12, 33:17,	arrangements [5] -	<b>balancing</b> [4] - 8:6,

8:7, 8:18, 8:23 briefs [1] - 19:11 27:9, 30:2, 31:16, 52:16, 53:3, 55:2, celebrate [1] - 37:17 bank [1] - 47:7 bring [2] - 6:24, 14:1 cell [1] - 42:6 32:3, 33:17, 35:23 55:10, 56:13, 57:12, bar[1] - 5:24 certain [1] - 55:22 charging [1] - 9:8 57:14, 57:16, 57:21, **bringing** [1] - 57:5 check [2] - 50:25, 57:23, 58:14 bargain [4] - 40:13, broad [2] - 48:1, 48:3 certainly [13] - 14:5, 40:15, 46:21, 47:5 15:11, 24:17, 25:12, 54:24 COMMISSIONER [75] **BROGAN** [18] - 3:21, 32:15, 32:21, 33:10, **checking** [1] - 4:6 - 1:12, 22:10, 22:15, base [1] - 4:4 5:12, 18:1, 22:25, 23:10. 23:13. 24:12. based [4] - 9:19, 21:4, 23:5, 24:19, 26:18, 34:1, 34:16, 37:15, CHERI [1] - 60:5 24:17, 26:9, 26:21, 42:18, 54:15 31:2, 31:24, 38:4, 37:25, 45:3, 56:1 Cheri [3] - 1:23, 50:11, 26:23, 27:13, 27:21, Basin [3] - 15:5, 15:7 38:11, 38:15, 39:19, certainty [5] - 20:16, 60:18 28:11, 28:13, 28:20, basis [2] - 18:23, 52:16, 53:7, 53:25, 44:10, 46:15, 52:1, CHRIS [1] - 1:11 29:2, 29:4, 29:10, 54:19, 58:21 circumstance [4] -54.15 29:12, 30:15, 30:18, Brogan [20] - 3:21, CERTIFICATE [1] became [1] - 50:11 52:14, 52:18, 53:23 31:22, 32:8, 34:10, 4:3, 5:13, 19:9, 21:8, **BEFORE** [1] - 1:10 circumstances [4] -35:14, 35:17, 36:8, 22:18, 23:14, 24:18, certificates [1] - 6:17 13:14, 13:23, 41:4, begin [1] - 7:10 36:13, 36:14, 36:15, 30:17, 34:18, 38:3, Certified [2] - 60:6, 41:7 **beginning** [1] - 54:19 36:16, 37:14, 37:23, clarify [1] - 49:24 38:9, 44:21, 44:25, 60:19 behalf [2] - 3:22, 38:8, 38:14, 39:16, 46:11, 46:20, 47:10, **CERTIFY** [1] - 60:8 clause [1] - 7:2 58:21 42:1, 47:19, 48:12, 48:16, 54:10 cetera [1] - 16:20 clauses [2] - 6:24, 7:2 belief [2] - 52:17, 48:15, 49:13, 49:14, Brogan's [2] - 16:18, CFR [1] - 39:8 53:25 clear [6] - 11:6, 30:13, 50:1, 50:5, 50:10, 43:19 benefit [4] - 40:13, chair [4] - 16:21, 31:19, 42:13, 53:5, 51:21, 51:23, 52:8, broke [2] - 37:11, 43:4 40:15, 46:20, 47:4 17:12, 18:24, 23:20 55:9 52:9, 52:12, 53:6, brought [2] - 33:6, CHAIRMAN [13] clearly [4] - 6:16, benefits [1] - 40:11 53:19, 54:6, 54:7, 33:10 best [3] - 11:3, 41:15, 1:11, 1:11, 3:1, 4:1, 13:22, 19:2, 25:17 55:4, 55:11, 55:13, **budgeting** [1] - 57:3 4:7, 4:11, 15:22, 58:12 closer [2] - 14:25, 55:14, 56:4, 56:12, **Building** [1] - 2:3 16:4, 16:19, 17:15, 15:4 better [1] - 50:4 56:13, 56:15, 57:8, building [1] - 48:10 17:23, 18:10, 18:21 collect [1] - 25:19 between [4] - 13:6, 57:13, 57:14, 57:15, built [2] - 44:15, 44:18 Chairman [21] - 3:21, comfortable [2] -28:5, 35:8, 49:7 57:16, 57:22, 57:23, bunch [1] - 7:14 4:2, 5:12, 15:18, 18:5, 29:8 beyond [1] - 3:23 57:24, 57:25, 58:8, business [4] - 8:9, 16:1, 17:18, 18:1, coming [1] - 27:24 big [1] - 45:1 58:16, 58:20, 59:1 12:25, 45:4, 55:21 27:3, 34:10, 35:12, biggest [1] - 13:17 commencing [1] - 2:4 Commissioners [11] -37:9, 37:19, 38:3, birthdays [1] - 37:17 **button** [1] - 54:20 comment [7] - 27:1, 5:13, 16:21, 17:12, 41:24, 42:4, 47:22. buy [2] - 21:21, 26:2 bit [4] - 7:10, 18:15, 32:9, 33:4, 50:8, 18:25, 22:20, 23:11, 50:4. 53:4. 58:13. **BY** [1] - 1:4 50:14, 55:10, 58:9 38:12, 45:14 29:5, 32:10, 35:17, 58:19, 58:21 commentary [1] - 19:3 blatant [2] - 9:13, 36:4, 41:24 Chairman's [2] - 36:7, C comments [8] - 3:23, 13.11 commitment [1] -56:16 15:23, 16:18, 22:11, blatantly [1] - 13:10 18:13 **challenge** [2] - 29:15, 32:12, 36:8, 42:2, Bleau [1] - 5:14 calculate [1] - 24:2 common [3] - 21:8, 33.8 57:8 board [2] - 7:16, 46:4 49:20, 51:3 calculated [1] - 54:15 **challenges** [1] - 58:4 COMMISSION [3] -Bonrud [1] - 5:16 company [2] - 25:24, calculation [1] - 6:16 **chance** [1] - 4:3 1:1, 1:10, 1:13 borne [3] - 33:24, 45:20 cannot [3] - 9:7, change [6] - 9:7, Commission [31] -34:3, 34:5 comparable [4] - 10:8, 15:13, 15:14 10:17, 13:22, 40:4, 4:13, 4:14, 5:19, 6:2, bothersome [1] - 36:1 11:21, 12:8, 31:5 cap [3] - 21:2, 21:4, 57:3 6:4, 6:6, 7:15, 7:18, bottom [3] - 36:2, comparison [1] -27:19 changed [2] - 13:14, 9:6, 9:16, 10:5, 14:9, 51:5. 51:6 capacity [1] - 38:20 28:14 13:23 17:5, 17:22, 18:6, bound [1] - 38:18 compensate [2] -Capitol [2] - 2:2, 2:3 changes [2] - 13:17, 21:15, 22:1, 24:10, **Brattle** [1] - 5:15 40:16, 51:14 carbon [7] - 25:21, 14:14 25:1, 25:2, 39:7, breach [6] - 7:5, compensation [7] -27:19, 27:20, 28:3, characterize [1] -40:3, 41:19, 45:11, 41:22, 47:14, 53:9, 22:21, 23:2, 46:13, 28:5, 35:8 47:17, 48:6, 48:13, 23:21 53:11, 53:12 48:20, 49:19, 54:12, care [7] - 24:18, 29:8, charge [6] - 10:24, 49:18, 52:10, 58:24 breadth [1] - 15:1 56:21 30:10, 51:4, 52:21, 11:3, 12:17, 15:14, Commission's [7] break [1] - 7:3 compensations [1] -53:12, 58:20 30:6, 31:21 6:12, 17:24, 18:1, breaking [1] - 50:2 6:18 carries [3] - 36:17, charged [4] - 10:14, 18:4, 45:16, 50:14, breathing [1] - 27:22 Complaint [1] - 3:2 57:17, 58:1 19:18, 31:18, 32:5 50:16 Brian [3] - 1:16, 27:4, **COMPLAINT** [1] - 1:4 case [10] - 23:24, charges [22] - 4:18, Commissioner [26] -47.23 **completely** [2] - 33:2, 39:20, 39:25, 40:2, 8:17, 8:22, 10:12, 23:12, 23:20, 24:19, **bridge** [1] - 20:23 39:1 40:11, 45:15, 45:19, 10:18, 14:17, 14:19, 26:18, 28:12, 29:13, **brief** [8] - 5:25, 6:4, 45:20, 46:12, 46:14 comply [1] - 8:9 19:10, 19:12, 19:13, 34:9, 35:16, 36:12, 6:10, 14:23, 19:6, cases [1] - 38:16 compromise [5] -19:17, 19:18, 20:1, 36:14, 48:14, 49:3, 19:14, 39:24, 58:10 cash [2] - 49:22, 51:14 20:24, 22:3, 35:25 24:4, 24:8, 25:10, 49:14, 51:21, 52:11,

compromised [1] -6:11 concept [1] - 40:6 concern [3] - 40:7, 43:5, 44:14 concerned [1] - 33:5 conclude [1] - 58:2 concluded [1] - 59:3 conclusive [1] - 32:17 condition [1] - 37:11 conditions [5] - 12:2, 31:12, 39:11, 39:13, 40:8 confidence [1] - 44:16 confidential [5] - 3:6, 3:11, 3:14, 3:19, 3:25 confidentiality [1] -22:19 conflict [1] - 5:21 conform [1] - 25:8 confused [1] - 49:19 conjunction [1] -31:13 consider [2] - 12:16, 32:20 consideration [6] -17:14, 22:8, 28:21, 45:17, 50:9, 52:21 considered [1] - 9:23 considers [1] - 33:12 consistent [1] - 21:22 consumers [1] - 34:1 continue [1] - 22:7 contract [20] - 6:7, 7:25, 8:16, 9:12, 13:12, 13:13, 13:18, 13:21, 14:6, 14:8, 20:15, 38:19, 39:14, 40:5, 41:22, 43:21, 46:8, 47:15, 53:17, 54:22 contract's [1] - 37:3 contracts [5] - 5:3, 32:14, 45:24, 45:25, 46:1 contractual [6] - 4:16, 4:23, 5:4, 30:1, 36:19, 37:4 control [6] - 10:11, 10:14, 31:15, 31:19, 32:2, 32:5 controlling [1] - 40:1 convince [2] - 34:7, 34:11 corporation [1] -11.24 Corporation [3] -12:1, 31:9, 31:11 correct [8] - 30:15,

37:22, 37:23, 43:19, 51:24, 52:6, 52:7, 60.11 correctly [2] - 23:23, 41.18 cost [37] - 9:5, 9:6, 10:13, 12:23, 13:4, 24:9, 24:22, 25:3, 26:6, 27:12, 27:18, 27:19, 28:2, 28:6, 28:9, 29:1, 31:18, 32:4, 33:7, 33:11, 33:12, 33:13, 33:20, 33:23, 33:24, 34:3, 34:5, 34:15, 34:22, 35:3, 41:1, 41:2, 43:22, 52:19 costs [36] - 9:4, 9:8, 12:20, 12:21, 12:25, 21:25, 23:16, 23:19, 23:21, 23:25, 24:1, 24:2, 24:25, 25:16, 25:23, 26:1, 26:5, 27:7, 27:15, 32:24, 32:25, 33:6, 33:18, 34:20, 34:23, 35:2, 35:8, 41:13, 52:15, 56:19 counsel [2] - 18:4, 22:16 count [1] - 52:2 COUNTY [1] - 60:3 couple [2] - 37:25, 42.13 course [2] - 5:18, 45:4 court [2] - 7:16, 39:17 cover[1] - 19:8 covered [1] - 56:2 create [1] - 29:15 created [1] - 13:19 creates [4] - 33:23, 43:16, 44:14, 46:25 creating [2] - 44:6, 45.8 credit [10] - 12:13, 46:25, 49:8, 49:22, 51:4, 51:7, 51:13, 54:25, 56:23, 57:1 credit's [1] - 56:24 credits [9] - 38:20, 42:18, 42:20, 43:15,

48:23, 52:2, 52:5,

53:21, 53:22

Cremer [1] - 1:14

critical [1] - 15:11

curious [2] - 3:14,

current [1] - 14:6

curtail [6] - 38:16,

CRR [1] - 1:23

26:25

40:23, 40:25, 47:12, 48:2, 56:18 curtailed [1] - 38:19 curtailing [1] - 52:19 curtailment [24] -4:23, 5:3, 7:5, 15:19, 23:4, 36:19, 36:21, 37:3, 37:22, 39:2, 40:17, 41:19, 41:20, 41:22, 42:11, 43:9, 44:19, 46:5, 46:6, 46:10, 47:12, 48:20, 53:9, 53:15 curtails [1] - 38:17 customer [14] - 8:1, 8:2, 8:8, 10:7, 10:13, 10:18, 10:25, 11:18, 28:23, 30:24, 31:3, 31:17, 31:21, 32:4 customers [5] - 41:1, 41:10, 52:15, 52:19, customers' [1] - 41:14 cut [1] - 42:6

## D

9:8

24:24 **DAKOTA** [2] - 1:2, 60.1 Dakota [13] - 2:2, 2:3, differ [1] - 39:12 5:19, 5:20, 11:13, difference [3] - 35:7, 11:14, 17:4, 17:11, 48:18, 49:7 17:17, 18:19, 54:3, different [13] - 5:8, 60:7, 60:13 9:12, 23:17, 25:21, damages [1] - 6:19 26:8, 26:15, 31:6, Darren [1] - 1:17 35:2, 43:23, 43:25, date [2] - 11:8, 24:7 45:21, 45:22, 46:12 Dated [1] - 60:13 differently [1] - 13:15 daunting [1] - 45:12 difficult [3] - 5:6, deal [10] - 7:6, 12:23, 15:17, 19:23 13:6, 15:22, 26:13, direct [1] - 39:7 26:15, 34:17, 36:21, direction [1] - 32:11 44:17, 45:1 directly [2] - 8:20, 9:2 dealing [3] - 16:7, disagreement [1] -46:19, 55:21 44:3 deals [2] - 7:5, 10:1 discretion [1] - 44:18 **Deb** [1] - 1:17 discrimination [3] debt [1] - 20:11 9:13, 13:11, 13:14 decided [1] - 43:11 discuss [5] - 5:8, decides [1] - 22:1 16:17, 29:20, 36:23, decision [4] - 28:10, 38:5 32:17, 33:2, 34:2 discussed [3] - 19:22, decision-making [1] -21:18, 33:14 33.2 discussing [6] - 3:17, decisions [2] - 20:13, 5:8, 19:9, 36:23, 39:4 38:24, 46:13 default [3] - 4:25, discussion [12] - 5:25, 36:25, 53:16 6:4, 27:7, 29:6, **defer** [1] - 16:14

define [1] - 7:15 39:24, 55:9, 56:11, 57:20, 58:2 defined [1] - 12:21 discussions [2] - 3:7, definitely [1] - 44:13 33:8 definition [4] - 9:9, dispense [1] - 29:14 34:22, 35:3, 54:11 dispensed [1] - 18:22 degree [2] - 20:5, 20:9 delayed [1] - 45:8 dispose [2] - 29:7, deliberations [1] -29:16 dispute [3] - 45:9, 22.8 deliveries [2] - 4:24, 46:6 disregard [1] - 32:16 36:20 **distinction** [1] - 28:4 delivering [1] - 13:2 divide [1] - 56:5 **delivery** [3] - 5:2, 8:20, **DO**[1] - 60:8 37:2 docket [3] - 3:1, demands [1] - 6:20 14:13, 35:18 denies [1] - 40:14 denominator [2] documents [1] - 22:23 49:20, 51:3 dollars [3] - 49:20, describe [1] - 8:12 51:2, 51:8 done [2] - 13:20, desire [1] - 12:12 20:25 determination [1] down [4] - 7:3, 13:9, 28:6, 43:4 determine [1] - 24:5 due [1] - 38:19 **determined** [4] - 9:6, duly [1] - 60:8 24:6, 24:7, 24:10 duly-appointed [1] **determines** [1] - 25:2 determining [1] -60:8 during [4] - 27:5, 33:7, 33:11, 54:2 developers [1] - 16:24 Dickerson [1] - 1:18

## Ε

eager [2] - 32:12, 34:6 early [1] - 58:10 East [1] - 2:3 economic [3] - 40:10, 41:12, 46:5 economics [1] - 48:9 Edwards [1] - 1:15 effect [5] - 11:1, 23:22, 28:17, 35:22, 55.1 effectively [1] - 9:7 effort [1] - 58:23 efforts [1] - 15:8 either [4] - 10:7, 11:3, 11:18, 31:3 EL11-006 [7] - 1:4, 3:1, 29:25, 55:6, 57:10, 57:18, 58:3 electric [1] - 39:10 Electric [2] - 15:5, 15:6 electricity [3] - 13:1, 13:2, 13:3 eliminate [1] - 41:21 elsewhere [4] - 27:23, 28:24, 54:3, 56:2

emergencies [1] -

29:17, 35:14, 36:9,

38:17 emergency [2] - 16:6, 40:24 enable [1] - 50:18 end [4] - 3:5, 15:20, 30:24, 34:18 ends [1] - 51:5 **ENERGY** [2] - 1:4, 1:5 energy [17] - 4:24, 5:2, 8:20, 12:10, 16:23, 19:24, 20:15, 36:20, 37:2, 38:20, 48:16, 53:12, 53:15, 56:17, 56:18, 56:25, 57:7 Energy [20] - 3:2, 3:3, 3:12, 4:18, 5:1, 5:11, 7:18, 16:13, 30:3, 30:4, 30:6, 32:14, 33:5, 33:19, 33:23, 34:3, 34:5, 37:1, 37:8, 56:10 Energy's [5] - 4:20, 41:9, 55:7, 56:6, 57:11 enforceable [1] -45:24 engaged [2] - 6:8, 16:25 engineering [1] - 6:17 ensure [5] - 48:7, 49:21, 50:15, 50:17 **ENTER** [1] - 1:5 enter [2] - 3:3, 46:16 entered [1] - 39:15 entire [1] - 10:3 entirely [1] - 38:23 entirety [3] - 55:8, 56:8, 57:19 entitled [4] - 2:2, 21:11, 40:12, 60:10 equal [2] - 48:17, 54:14 equally [1] - 49:21 equation [1] - 54:12 equity [3] - 42:19, 50:7, 50:22 especially [1] - 19:17 essentially [3] - 9:18, 26:10, 40:12 established [1] -19:18 et [1] - 16:20 evil [1] - 42:15 evolved [2] - 14:1, 14:4 exactly [1] - 7:11 examined [1] - 33:7 example [3] - 45:7, 47:10, 47:11

**except** [3] - 5:2, 37:2,

38:16 exception [1] - 35:5 **excluded** [1] - 7:3 excuse [2] - 31:14, 37:7 executed [2] - 45:25, 46.1 **executive** [1] - 3:8 Exhibit [4] - 52:22, 54:16, 54:23, 54:24 exhibits [1] - 3:11 exist [2] - 24:2, 27:15 existence [2] - 33:23, 34:4 existing [2] - 40:4, 40:5 expect [1] - 52:23 expected [1] - 13:4 expenses [2] - 19:25, 20:10 expensive [1] - 45:11 **experience** [1] - 54:3 expert [1] - 49:6 explain [3] - 23:18, 26:7, 54:17 explaining [1] - 8:15 explicitly [1] - 30:23 exposing [1] - 15:15 exposure [1] - 21:3 extent [6] - 10:10, 12:19, 27:17, 28:1, 31:15, 32:1 extreme [1] - 19:21 extremely [5] - 32:22, 52:17, 52:24, 52:25, 53:1

father [3] - 16:7,

37:10, 37:16

favor[1] - 36:10

34.24

35:17

felt [1] - 34:2

February [1] - 35:19

federal [2] - 10:21,

Federal [1] - 7:17

fellow [2] - 32:10,

FERC [15] - 7:17, 9:21,

13:7, 15:15, 20:13,

25:6, 25:11, 39:4,

39:7. 40:11. 44:9.

FERC-approved [1] -

Fiegen [14] - 28:12,

29:13, 35:16, 36:12,

36:13, 49:14, 52:11,

52:16, 53:3, 56:13,

FIEGEN [13] - 1:12,

28:13, 28:20, 29:2,

29:10, 35:17, 36:13,

52:12, 53:19, 54:6,

56:15, 57:13, 57:22

file [3] - 25:7, 34:25,

filed 191 - 3:11, 9:20.

11:7, 13:18, 13:19,

15:6, 18:17, 22:22,

filing [2] - 15:5, 18:13

filling [1] - 5:22

57:12, 57:13, 57:21,

46:8, 46:13

few [1] - 35:18

15:15

57:22

58:10

26:20

FERC's [1] - 9:19

# F

**final** [1] - 15:12 finally [3] - 13:8, facility [1] - 39:10 14:14, 40:18 fact [8] - 10:16, 14:9, finance [4] - 19:23, 27:13, 33:21, 33:22, 21:4, 43:6, 48:11 40:12, 43:8, 51:15 financed [2] - 20:16, failing [2] - 53:11, 20:19 53:15 financing [4] - 20:3, **fails** [2] - 5:1, 37:1 20:5, 47:7, 50:19 fair [2] - 33:25, 56:20 fine [1] - 29:11 fairly [3] - 19:7, 21:8, first [28] - 3:1, 4:16, 24:20 7:3, 9:17, 11:17, faith [1] - 18:8 12:15, 13:14, 15:1, fall [1] - 21:10 17:6, 17:13, 21:24, Falls [1] - 5:17 26:12, 29:15, 29:20, familiar [1] - 21:5 32:9, 32:19, 34:13, family [3] - 16:6, 37:7, 38:1, 38:4, 58:12, 58:18 39:3, 54:19, 55:15, far [2] - 28:6, 48:1 55:18, 55:23, 56:1, farm [2] - 54:2, 54:5 56:6, 56:9 farms [2] - 48:10, fit [1] - 35:3 fits [1] - 54:11 56:25

57:2 fixing [1] - 46:17 fleshing [1] - 27:1 focuses [1] - 16:23 folks [1] - 32:11 follow [2] - 26:10, 51:22 follow-up [2] - 26:10, 51.22 **following** [1] - 4:14 follows [1] - 11:12 FOR [1] - 1:5 forma [2] - 9:20, 25:6 formula [4] - 22:21, 23:1, 23:9, 36:2 formulas [1] - 3:17 forth [1] - 10:19 forward [4] - 15:11, 20:1, 20:3, 35:12 four [1] - 10:4 frankly [2] - 21:13, 29:8 frequency [6] - 10:2, 10:9, 10:19, 11:20, 11:22, 31:7 front [5] - 7:15, 23:23, 30:21, 45:10, 54:22 fronts [1] - 43:12 fully [1] - 33:4 functional [1] - 13:5 future [3] - 14:19, 20:1, 21:25

fixed [3] - 20:2, 50:18,

# G

gain [1] - 44:16 gap [1] - 20:23 garbled [2] - 50:11, 50:12 **GARY** [1] - 1:11 gather [1] - 38:12 general [1] - 43:17 generally [1] - 6:9 generation [1] - 8:19 generator [8] - 8:2, 12:10, 19:10, 26:3, 26:4, 30:25 given [4] - 17:8, 19:1, 48:9. 54:2 glad [1] - 38:4 govern [4] - 4:17, 4:23, 30:1, 36:19 governed [1] - 25:10 governs [1] - 13:20 granted [1] - 15:7 great [4] - 12:23, 38:14, 44:14, 50:10 greatly [1] - 58:9

Greg [2] - 1:15, 49:17

Gregg [1] - 1:17

grossed [1] - 55:1

Group [1] - 5:15

guess [5] - 12:12,

13:9, 23:3, 39:3,

49:19

gut [1] - 34:13

guys [1] - 22:24

#### н

hac [6] - 5:24, 17:9,

17:21, 18:2, 18:13, 18:23 hand [4] - 25:5, 41:23, 44:25 Hanser [2] - 5:14, 14:3 HANSON [57] - 1:11. 3:1, 4:1, 4:7, 4:11, 15:22, 16:4, 16:19, 17:15, 17:23, 18:10, 18:21, 22:10, 22:15, 23:10, 26:23, 27:13, 27:21, 28:11, 29:4, 29:12, 30:15, 30:18, 31:22, 32:8, 35:14, 36:8, 36:14, 36:16,  $37{:}14,\,37{:}23,\,38{:}8,$ 38:14, 39:16, 42:1, 47:19, 48:12, 49:14, 50:1, 50:5, 50:10, 51:21, 52:9, 53:6, 54:7, 55:4, 55:13, 56:4, 56:13, 57:8, 57:14, 57:16, 57:23, 57:25, 58:16, 58:20, 59.1 Hanson [3] - 36:16, 57:16, 57:25 happy [1] - 42:9 harm [1] - 41:16 head [1] - 34:19 hear [10] - 3:15, 21:9, 32:9, 32:12, 34:6, 42:7, 42:8, 44:11, 44:24, 44:25 heard [3] - 21:18, 24:12, 58:23 hearing [5] - 17:8, 17:22, 27:6, 29:6, 58:22 hearings [5] - 21:9, 25:13, 27:5, 34:15 held [1] - 2:1 Helena [1] - 5:18 helping [1] - 51:1

**HEREBY** [1] - 60:8

highlighted [1] - 6:10

highly [1] - 20:7 include [4] - 12:25, hit [1] - 34:19 23:25, 40:7, 41:20 included [9] - 3:12, holding [1] - 27:22 5:5, 7:2, 22:22, hope [3] - 37:15, 58:6, 25:23, 27:11, 27:16, 58:17 37:5, 48:21 hopefully [5] - 6:2, 21:4, 24:20, 34:11, including [1] - 56:22 inclusion [1] - 9:4 47:18 horribles [2] - 21:9, income [5] - 48:22, 21:18 48:24, 49:11, 52:21, hospital [2] - 37:10, 55:1 inconsistent [1] -42:5 28:10 ı incorporated [1] - 9:5 increase [1] - 52:15 increases [1] - 24:1 Idaho [10] - 39:25, incremental [1] - 24:4 40:1, 40:2, 40:9, incur [2] - 4:19, 30:3 45:14, 45:18, 45:20, incurs [1] - 26:6 46:2, 46:7, 46:14 indicated [1] - 18:4 idea [3] - 16:20, 38:2, indicates [1] - 14:23 46:16 indirectly [2] - 11:24, ideas [1] - 36:2 31:10 identical [1] - 12:5 industry [1] - 13:24 ignores [1] - 15:4 initial [1] - 6:13 Illinois [1] - 17:10 instance [2] - 21:24, imbalance [3] - 12:10, 28:24 19:10, 30:25 instead [3] - 51:1, immediately [1] -51:17, 53:24 53:16 instruct [1] - 22:2 impede [1] - 47:3 integration [8] - 4:19, implement [1] - 44:4 7:4, 7:7, 8:20, 13:25, implementation [1] -14:13, 30:4, 34:4 46:7 interest [2] - 41:12 implemented [1] interested [4] - 42:21, 47:13 42:22. 50:22. 50:23 implication [1] - 48:25 interesting [2] - 32:25, importance [3] -35:18 19:21, 55:19, 55:20 interests [1] - 41:15 important [13] - 8:4, **interfere** [1] - 47:3 10:16, 11:16, 20:21, **INTO** [1] - 1:5 23:15, 31:25, 32:22, invest [1] - 44:16 41:16, 44:23, 45:2, investment [5] -45:16, 47:10, 53:2 43:17, 44:10, 46:15, imposed [3] - 8:23, 47:1, 47:4 14:17, 25:19 investments [1] imposes [1] - 8:18 55:21 imposing [3] - 14:19, investor [1] - 57:1 25:17, 41:21 investors [13] - 20:7, **imposition** [1] - 33:19 39:1, 42:19, 43:12, impossible [1] - 19:23 44:7, 44:11, 46:23, impression [2] - 4:5, 48:8, 49:21, 50:8, 6:12 50:22, 51:25, 53:20 IN [1] - 1:4 involved [4] - 6:23, in-avoided [1] - 28:2 12:25, 16:16, 45:19 inappropriate [1] irrelevant [2] - 13:13, 18:7 32:15 Inaudible [2] - 49:25,

19:20, 20:21, 20:25, 22:6, 22:23, 25:21, 35:9, 35:10, 41:19, 43:10, 49:5, 49:12, 49:18, 50:7, 50:21, 55:18, 55:24, 56:6 issued [1] - 6:6 issues [13] - 4:14, 6:5, 6:15, 6:23, 6:24, 7:1, 7:3, 7:6, 16:8, 19:8, 26:24, 35:11, 42:13 item [1] - 37:7 items [2] - 5:9, 37:25 itself [1] - 15:15

J

**Jeff**[1] - 16:12 John [1] - 1:14 join [3] - 14:24, 15:9, 37:12 joining [2] - 14:22, 35:13 Jon [3] - 5:16, 5:18, 5:22 judgment [1] - 24:13 July [3] - 1:8, 2:4, 60.11 juncture [5] - 4:12, 29:16, 30:9, 33:14, 50.2 jurisdiction [2] - 25:1, 25:22 jurisdictional [1] -25:6

## K

Karen [1] - 1:14 Kearney [1] - 1:17 keep [1] - 8:13 kind [7] - 20:6, 23:25, 26:15, 41:22, 45:9, 47:2, 47:12 knowledge [1] - 11:4 known [2] - 10:1, 26:20 knows [2] - 7:11, 46:18 Kristen [1] - 1:15 KRISTIE [1] - 1:12

#### L

**LaFave** [2] - 5:14, 14:6 **LAFRENTZ** [7] - 4:2, 4:10, 15:25, 16:6, 16:12, 17:18, 18:16

issue [27] - 7:4, 7:5,

11:9, 14:13, 15:19,

17:5, 17:13, 17:19,

50.9

Inaudible) [1] - 50:15

4:17, 4:23, 5:4, 9:24, 12:4, 12:5, 12:14, 30:1, 30:14, 36:19, 37:4, 37:22, 39:2, 39:6, 41:20, 41:21, 48:1. 52:3 large [1] - 19:25 larger [1] - 14:25 last [3] - 35:18, 38:6, 54:17 late [2] - 18:15, 37:10 law [2] - 44:4, 50:20 laws [1] - 10:21 lawyer [1] - 18:19 learned [1] - 13:25 least [7] - 9:17, 9:22, 14:10, 14:17, 18:13, 27:5, 55:21 left [1] - 6:12 legal [1] - 19:15 legalities [1] - 19:11 legally [1] - 45:23 lenders [2] - 20:7, 39:1 **LEO** [11] - 11:8, 19:17, 20:14, 20:15, 21:23, 23:22, 28:7, 35:19, 40:5, 40:6, 46:16 less [5] - 40:21, 40:22, 41:5, 44:11 licensed [1] - 17:17 light [2] - 52:25, 57:9 likely [4] - 3:16, 14:15, 14:18, 14:24 limits [1] - 39:9 line [7] - 16:1, 16:4, 16:10. 36:3. 51:5. 51:6, 56:18 linked [1] - 47:11 liquidated [1] - 6:18 listed [1] - 48:4 listen [1] - 44:14 listening [3] - 23:13, 30:9, 38:3 litigate [1] - 45:11 **LLC** [2] - 1:4, 3:2 load [2] - 9:15, 31:1 loads [1] - 52:25 location [1] - 42:4 look [6] - 22:24, 25:12, 35:12, 35:19, 36:4, 44:6 looked [1] - 34:21 looking [4] - 14:21, 27:10, 32:13, 52:1 loss [1] - 54:14

lost [2] - 16:7, 54:15

lower [2] - 11:23,

Lafrentz [1] - 15:25

language [20] - 3:12,

40:10 lowered [1] - 52:19

#### М

magnitude [1] - 33:5 major [1] - 13:22 mandated [1] - 9:18 mandates [1] - 12:17 manner [1] - 41:17 March [1] - 27:6 market [3] - 20:3, 21:5, 33:17 match [1] - 13:12 materials [4] - 19:5, 19:22, 20:23, 22:7 matter [9] - 2:2, 3:2, 16:15. 17:3. 17:7. 25:12, 41:13, 58:25, 60:10 **MATTER** [1] - 1:4 MCCOMSEY [1] - 60:5 McComsey [2] - 1:23, 60.18 mean [4] - 23:1, 23:8, 44:24, 51:6 means [1] - 54:13 meant [1] - 30:13 meantime [1] - 16:9 mechanical [1] - 6:16 mechanism [2] -51:12, 51:19 meeting [2] - 18:17, 37:12 memo [2] - 22:14, 37:20 memorandum [1] -9:9 mentioned [1] - 3:4 merely [1] - 40:18 met [1] - 5:14 mic [1] - 27:22 Midwest [1] - 15:3 might [9] - 21:1, 24:4, 27:19, 29:2, 38:2, 48:2, 49:10, 53:3, 53:5 Mike [6] - 4:8, 16:1, 16:4, 37:9, 37:14, 38:5 mind [5] - 8:13, 23:6, 35:10, 47:13, 55:17 Minneapolis [1] -16:22 Minnesota [3] - 15:6, 16:22, 17:10 MISO [2] - 14:24, 15:4

misspeaking [1] -

53:18

mix [1] - 48:8 money [5] - 20:8, 41:1, 51:3, 56:17, 56:19 morning [5] - 4:4, 5:12, 34:19, 35:20, 37:10 mostly [1] - 47:24 motion [25] - 22:23, 29:18, 29:19, 29:23, 30:8, 30:10, 32:9, 33:15, 34:8, 34:11, 34:12, 35:13, 35:15, 36:7, 36:10, 36:16, 55:5, 55:9, 56:1, 56:9, 56:16, 57:17, 57:19, 57:20, 58:1 motions [1] - 3:13 mouth [1] - 8:14 move [4] - 17:20, 30:1, 55:6, 58:10 moved [3] - 6:13, 6:15, 50:2 **moving** [1] - 3:5 MR [57] - 3:21, 5:12, 16:11, 16:21, 18:1, 18:12, 18:18, 18:24, 22:13, 22:17, 22:25, 23:3, 23:5, 23:8, 23:20, 24:15, 24:19, 26:18, 27:3, 27:17, 28:1, 28:19, 28:22, 30:12, 30:16, 30:19, 31:2, 31:24, 32:7, 37:9, 37:19, 38:2, 38:4, 38:7, 38:11, 38:15, 39:19, 42:4, 47:22, 49:2, 49:17, 49:25, 50:4, 50:6, 50:13, 51:2, 51:10, 52:7, 52:16, 53:7, 53:25, 54:10, 54:19, 55:3, 58:13, 58:19, 58:21 **MS** [7] - 4:2, 4:10, 15:25, 16:6, 16:12, 17:18, 18:16 must [4] - 10:7, 11:18, 28:23, 31:3 mute [4] - 27:23, 38:10, 38:11, 54:20

#### Ν

nature [1] - 3:17 nay [1] - 57:15 necessarily [1] - 33:21 necessary [1] - 19:4 need [13] - 3:19, 20:16, 26:15, 30:11,

48:3, 55:16, 56:17 needed [1] - 41:9 needs [1] - 56:2 negative [4] - 28:2, 52:25, 56:17, 57:7 negotiate [1] - 6:7 negotiated [1] - 13:18 negotiation [4] - 6:21, 16:14, 16:16, 17:1 negotiations [2] - 6:8, Nelson [15] - 23:12, 24:19, 26:19, 34:9, 36:14, 48:14, 49:3, 51:21, 52:7, 55:2, 55:10, 57:14, 57:23, 58:14 **NELSON** [18] - 1:11, 23:13, 24:12, 24:17, 26:9, 26:21, 34:10, 36:15, 48:15, 49:13, 51:23, 52:8, 55:11, 55:14, 56:12, 57:15, 57:24, 58:8 neutral [1] - 45:3 never[4] - 29:22, 33:6, 53:21, 57:1 new [2] - 14:10, 21:7 next [2] - 53:12, 57:18 nice [1] - 42:12 noise [1] - 27:24 none [2] - 55:6, 57:21 noneconomic [1] -46:6 normal [2] - 5:20 NORTHWESTERN [1] NorthWestern [81] -3:3, 3:12, 3:22, 4:18, 4:20, 5:1, 5:11, 6:8, 6:15, 6:22, 8:4, 8:5, 8:16, 8:18, 9:7, 11:3, 11:10, 11:15, 11:23, 12:1, 12:6, 12:21, 13:21, 13:24, 14:5, 14:7, 14:10, 14:12, 14:16, 15:13, 16:13, 17:25, 18:7, 19:16, 19:19, 21:20, 23:7, 25:19, 26:2, 26:12, 28:4, 29:1, 30:3, 30:4, 30:6, 30:14, 31:9, 31:11, 31:20, 32:14, 33:5, 33:19, 33:23, 34:3, 34:4, 35:1, 37:1, 37:8,

37:25, 38:15, 38:25,

40:16, 40:18, 40:22,

33:24, 35:4, 36:4,

43:15, 44:9, 47:4,

40:23, 41:9, 41:11, 42:10, 44:20, 48:2, 48:19, 49:20, 52:13, 52:15, 55:7, 56:6, 56:10, 56:20, 57:5, 57:11, 58:22 NorthWestern's [22] -8:10, 8:25, 9:5, 9:18, 11:4, 11:13, 12:9, 14:18, 26:5, 32:1, 38:22, 38:24, 40:3, 40:10, 40:25, 41:7, 42:14, 47:25, 52:3, 52:17, 52:19, 53:25 **Notary** [2] - 60:7, 60:18 note [2] - 14:23, 17:3 Nothing [1] - 39:8 nothing [2] - 40:9, 40:14 nuance [1] - 26:18 number [2] - 45:21, 46:1

0

OAK [1] - 1:4 Oak [69] - 3:2, 3:12, 4:1. 4:17. 4:19. 4:23. 5:2, 6:8, 6:10, 6:13, 6:20, 6:22, 8:2, 8:12, 8:17, 8:21, 8:24, 9:3, 9:8, 9:16, 9:23, 12:16, 12:18, 12:22, 13:16, 14:23, 15:1, 15:14, 15:24, 16:25, 18:9, 20:24, 26:11, 26:14, 26:19, 30:2, 30:4, 32:19, 33:22, 33:24, 34:4, 34:5, 34:25, 35:24, 36:20, 37:2, 37:6, 37:7, 37:22, 38:18, 38:25, 39:24, 40:11, 40:14, 40:16, 40:23, 41:6, 41:16, 48:5, 48:7, 48:18, 48:22, 49:23, 52:20, 53:16, 55:18, 55:23, 56:20 **OATT** [17] - 7:20, 7:21, 9:9, 9:19, 9:20, 11:13, 11:14, 13:19, 15:15, 25:7, 25:9, 26:5, 26:6, 30:19, 31:14, 32:1 OATTs [1] - 25:15 objection [3] - 4:12, 17:24, 17:25 obligated [1] - 26:4 obligation [11] -

44:4, 46:17, 50:14, 50:16, 51:8 obligations [10] -20:2. 20:14. 20:17. 21:14, 21:17, 32:22, 42:23, 45:24, 50:17, 50:24 **obtain** [1] - 50:18 **obviously** [1] - 19:15 occur [2] - 33:21, 33:22 **OF** [6] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:1, 60:1, 60:3 office [1] - 5:17 offset [6] - 24:9, 42:20, 42:23, 42:25, 50:23, 50:24 offsetting [2] - 23:25, 51:15 often [1] - 52:23 Olson [1] - 5:21 omit [1] - 15:13 one [28] - 7:2, 7:23, 10:1, 11:17, 13:17, 14:10, 15:20, 15:23, 19:20, 22:18, 23:15, 24:22, 26:10, 26:18, 27:5, 29:6, 29:14, 29:15, 30:16, 31:24, 32:14, 33:12, 35:5, 36:23, 36:24, 42:23, 44:25, 58:8 Onida [1] - 60:13 Oostra [1] - 5:16 open [3] - 7:21, 25:8, 26:4 operations [1] - 15:2 operator [6] - 10:11, 10:15, 31:15, 31:19, 32:2, 32:6 opportunity [5] -17:20, 19:5, 36:23, 38:1, 58:23 opposed [2] - 36:11, 49:9 **opposes** [1] - 9:3 opposite [1] - 28:3 order [3] - 6:6, 20:14, 44:15 Order [2] - 37:20, 44:8 ordinary [1] - 49:10 organization's [1] -4:21 otherwise [1] - 39:13 output [1] - 56:25 outset [1] - 50:18

outside [2] - 3:16,

42:5

10:10, 11:22, 21:20,

21:23, 25:18, 31:8,

own [2] - 11:11, 34:7 owners [1] - 16:24

### Ρ

paid [2] - 51:13, 56:22 Pam [1] - 5:16 papers [1] - 27:24 parade [1] - 21:9 part [10] - 8:25, 10:16, 10:22, 12:20, 13:5, 15:3, 19:2, 23:19, 32:25, 33:12 partial [1] - 20:24 participate [1] - 17:9 participation [2] -58:3, 59:2 particular [3] - 7:13, 7:24, 44:12 particularly [3] -34:23, 46:24, 54:17 parties [15] - 3:15, 3:18, 6:7, 6:9, 6:21, 8:11, 17:5, 20:22, 21:2, 22:2, 39:5, 39:21, 39:22, 45:21, 46:5 partly [1] - 20:13 Partners [5] - 39:25, 45:15, 45:18, 46:7, 46:14 partners [1] - 40:2 parts [1] - 11:16 party [2] - 6:13, 21:12 pass [17] - 8:17, 10:13, 12:2, 14:17, 19:16, 21:11, 21:24, 30:19, 30:22, 30:23, 31:1, 31:11, 31:17, 32:4, 33:25, 35:23, 41:13 passed [4] - 9:1, 31:20, 33:25, 36:6 passes [1] - 26:5 passing [2] - 19:12, 35:13 Patrick [1] - 1:16 Paulson [8] - 16:10, 16:12, 16:15, 16:17, 16:19, 17:20, 18:22, 23:13 **PAULSON** [5] - 16:11, 16:21, 18:24, 23:20, 24:15 pay [6] - 12:21, 38:18, 40:22, 41:8, 56:17 payers [3] - 36:5,

56:17, 57:6

paying [4] - 48:20,

52:20, 57:7 payment [4] - 48:16, 49:10, 49:22, 51:14 payments [2] - 20:12, 45:8 penalties [1] - 15:16 people [6] - 13:6, 13:15, 42:24, 43:6, 43:8 people's [1] - 36:2 percent [1] - 51:7 performs [3] - 10:11, 31:15, 32:2 perhaps [3] - 32:19, 32:23, 50:2 period [2] - 12:23, 35:9 permissible [1] -19:13 permit [1] - 30:5 personally [1] - 45:19 perspective [2] -19:20, 42:14 persuasive [1] - 6:3 pertinent [1] - 10:4 **Phil** [1] - 5:14 phone [7] - 4:8, 5:15, 5:17, 18:19, 20:4, 27:23, 42:6 phrase [2] - 34:20, 54:18 pick [1] - 38:6 Pierre [1] - 2:3 piggyback [1] - 26:23 place [4] - 26:12, 26:14, 27:23, 51:9 plan [1] - 15:6 planning [6] - 37:6, 52:1, 52:2, 52:5, 52:6, 55:20 plate [1] - 41:14 plural [1] - 25:13 plus [1] - 41:2 point [18] - 4:2, 12:12, 16:2, 24:5, 24:7, 26:14, 27:4, 29:17, 30:25, 39:3, 40:20, 46:13, 46:15, 46:21, 49:23, 50:20, 51:16, 55:14 points [1] - 14:25 policies [1] - 10:21 political [2] - 35:9 portion [3] - 29:21, 36:3, 43:3 position [5] - 6:14, 8:12, 22:3, 47:25 positions [1] - 8:11 possibility [1] - 4:20 possible [4] - 38:13,

51:10, 51:18, 55:22 possibly [1] - 30:5 potential [4] - 3:5, 3:6, 21:25. 28:6 potentially [6] - 4:19, 19:25, 27:18, 30:3, 33:22, 49:12 power [10] - 3:4, 3:10, 3:13, 12:22, 17:1, 21:22, 40:2, 46:2, 52:20 **POWER** [1] - 1:5 Power [2] - 7:19, 11:25 **PPA** [1] - 20:18 **PPAs** [2] - 9:14, 21:5 practical [2] - 19:20, 50.9 practice [4] - 14:6, 16:23, 17:4, 43:14 practices [1] - 14:1 practicing [1] - 16:22 pray [1] - 37:15 prayers [1] - 58:16 preamble [1] - 44:8 prefer [2] - 29:18, 48:1 preference [1] - 29:12 preliminary [1] - 17:3 prepared [2] - 15:18, 19:2 presentation [2] -14:2, 19:7 presented [2] - 19:6, 20.21 preserve [2] - 40:19, 47:4 pretty [6] - 11:11, 14:11, 23:8, 43:20, 48:10. 54:4 price [3] - 28:3, 40:7, 48.9 prices [1] - 52:25 printed [1] - 54:21 pro [8] - 5:24, 9:20, 17:9, 17:20, 18:2, 18:13, 18:22, 25:6 problem [8] - 23:7, 42:16, 42:17, 43:1, 44:6, 46:23, 50:25 problematic [2] - 43:3, 44:20 procedural [1] - 17:6 proceed [4] - 4:11, 18:20, 29:5, 37:18

proceeding [3] -

21:16, 33:7, 59:3

PROCEEDINGS [1] -

proceedings [2] -

60:9, 60:12

2:1

Proceedings [1] - 1:8 process [4] - 3:8, 16:14, 16:16, 33:11 processes [1] - 14:3 produce [1] - 54:2 produces [1] - 42:22 producing [2] - 13:1, 48:22 production [12] -38:20, 42:18, 43:3, 46:24, 53:21, 53:22, 54:15, 54:25, 56:22, 56:24, 57:1 Professional [2] -60:6. 60:19 prohibit [1] - 39:5 project [22] - 8:2, 8:21, 19:21, 19:24, 20:6, 20:8, 20:11, 21:4, 21:6, 21:15, 21:22, 22:1, 42:21, 43:6, 44:15, 44:17, 45:10, 47:8, 48:11, 50:18 projects [3] - 16:23, 16:24, 20:15 prolonged [1] - 19:2 promulgated [1] -10:20 proper [2] - 25:3, 26:16 proposal [1] - 40:14 propose [1] - 22:3 proposed [3] - 7:9, 30:14, 39:2 proposing [1] - 46:2 proposition [2] -45:11, 45:12 prospective [1] -45:23 protect [3] - 41:9, 41:14, 53:2 provide [5] - 7:10, 8:17, 11:24, 20:14, 31:10 provided [4] - 9:10, 11:5, 11:6, 34:24 provider [12] - 8:3, 8:5, 8:8, 10:8, 10:12, 10:14, 31:4, 31:14, 31:16, 31:18, 32:3, 32:5 providers [2] - 10:24, 11:5 provides [1] - 10:17 **providing** [1] - 21:2 provision [10] - 4:25, 6:17, 7:13, 7:24, 15:13, 36:25, 37:5,

41:9, 41:16, 44:12

**provisions** [12] - 5:3,

5:5, 6:16, 6:19, 12:8, 12:11, 13:11, 13:13, 20:18, 25:15, 30:20, 37:3 provocative [1] - 30:8 PTC [6] - 41:2, 48:17, 48:21, 52:2, 54:11, 54.13 **PTC's** [1] - 54:14 PTCs [2] - 6:18, 52:20 public [4] - 3:24, 14:20, 15:4, 29:23 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:10 Public [2] - 60:7, 60:18 publicly [2] - 22:22, 26:20 pulls [1] - 37:16 purchase [9] - 3:4, 3:10, 3:13, 10:7, 11:19, 17:1, 31:3, 39:11, 39:12 **PURCHASE** [1] - 1:5 **PURPA**[11] - 19:14, 19:16, 20:17, 21:14, 21:21, 32:21, 43:20, 44:1, 44:5, 48:6, 48:7 purpose [1] - 20:25 purposes [1] - 17:8 pursuant [1] - 10:20 put [8] - 8:13, 13:9, 17:12, 25:6, 27:19, 56:18, 57:2, 58:24 **putting** [1] - 20:8

## Q

**QF** [3] - 14:10, 43:20, 46:17 **QFs** [4] - 20:15, 25:4, 40:12, 45:23 qualified [1] - 49:11 qualifying [1] - 39:10 questions [16] - 4:12, 4:15, 22:14, 22:20, 23:10, 26:22, 29:6, 29:7, 36:21, 48:12, 49:13, 49:15, 52:8, 52:10, 54:8, 55:5 quick [2] - 37:24, 52:12 quickly [1] - 17:19 quite [2] - 21:13, 23:3 quote [2] - 12:11, 12:14 quotes [1] - 9:9

raised [1] - 21:8 rare [4] - 52:14, 52:18, 53:1, 53:22 rarely [3] - 40:19, 44:21, 44:22 rate [10] - 9:6, 10:20, 10:25, 25:3, 36:5, 39:11, 39:12, 41:2, 56:17, 57:6 rates [2] - 12:3, 31:12 rather [2] - 17:19, 45:12 rational [1] - 40:20 reach [1] - 6:23 reaching [1] - 21:1 reaction [1] - 34:13 read [6] - 10:3, 31:13, 34:13, 35:21, 36:22, reading [3] - 9:22, 39:16, 39:19 ready [1] - 42:3 real [3] - 23:7, 37:24, 50:20 reality [1] - 13:5 really [26] - 6:1, 6:3, 6:5, 6:23, 7:1, 7:8, 11:15, 13:9, 19:3, 23:5, 24:23, 34:18, 35:1, 38:23, 39:20, 39:21, 41:11, 41:15, 43:15, 44:25, 45:2, 49:2, 49:3, 49:11, 51:4, 51:15 Realtime [2] - 60:6, 60:19 reason [7] - 3:4, 3:25, 12:15, 12:18, 27:10, 42:17, 45:15 reasons [5] - 9:17, 40:23, 40:24, 42:24, 48:4 recalled [1] - 6:6 receiving [1] - 54:14 reception [1] - 42:6 recognize [2] - 5:7, 46:11 recognized [1] - 15:1 recommendation [1] -28:14 record [1] - 18:14 recs [3] - 6:18, 38:21, 48.17 reduce [1] - 24:9 reduced [1] - 6:18

referring [5] - 7:12,

7:22, 37:20, 37:21,

00.0	40.0 40.7	04:0-40:4	0.05	ti 05:04
39:9	48:6, 48:7	31:6, 40:4	3:25	sometime [1] - 35:21 8
reflect [3] - 10:13,	requiring [1] - 6:7 reread [1] - 29:2	Schedule [8] - 9:25,	<b>set</b> [6] - 10:19, 20:2, 23:22, 28:7, 39:22	sometimes [2] - 36:4,
31:17, 32:4 reflected [2] - 33:18,	reserve [1] - 24:13	10:3, 11:11, 11:12, 31:6, 46:3, 46:14	several [3] - 6:15,	52:24 somewhat [2] - 13:9,
33:19	resolved [1] - 58:11	Schedules [2] - 12:7,	21:17, 25:14	36:23
<b>REFUSING</b> [1] - 1:5	resource [2] - 15:5,	12:9	<b>shall</b> [3] - 4:13, 10:19,	soon [1] - 37:12
refusing [1] - 3:3	15:6	schedules [1] - 9:11	10:24	sort [2] - 27:10, 40:4
regarding [1] - 22:20	respect [10] - 7:24,	scope [1] - 15:2	shared [1] - 37:15	sounds [1] - 33:15
regardless [1] - 33:11	12:4, 12:6, 12:9,	second [8] - 4:22, 7:5,	Sheriff [1] - 49:2	South [13] - 2:2, 2:3,
regards [1] - 29:25	14:12, 19:8, 19:15,	12:18, 32:24, 36:18,	Sherry [1] - 1:18	5:19, 5:20, 11:13,
regional [1] - 4:21	39:1, 42:11, 47:5	53:7, 56:1, 56:7	shoehorn [1] - 34:23	11:14, 17:4, 17:11,
Registered [2] - 60:5,	respects [1] - 5:7	secondly [5] - 13:24,	shop [1] - 42:24	17:17, 18:19, 54:3,
60:19	respond [1] - 24:18	15:4, 22:1, 40:9,	short [2] - 23:14,	60:7, 60:13
regulating [1] - 24:24	response [7] - 10:2,	54:21	24:20	<b>SOUTH</b> [2] - 1:2, 60:1
regulation [6] - 10:2,	10:9, 10:19, 11:20,	<b>Section</b> [14] - 7:9,	shorthand [2] - 60:9	<b>speaking</b> [1] - 38:9
10:9, 10:18, 11:20,	11:22, 22:23, 31:8	9:18, 15:14, 39:8,	<b>shown</b> [1] - 52:22	<b>specific</b> [1] - 9:23
11:21, 31:7	responses [1] - 3:14	41:20, 54:12, 55:7,	<b>shows</b> [3] - 13:22,	specifically [2] - 9:10,
regulations [2] -	responsibility [2] -	55:8, 56:6, 56:7,	24:23, 54:24	16:25
10:21, 44:9	4:17, 30:2	56:10, 57:11, 57:19	<b>shut</b> [1] - 23:4	speed [1] - 37:24
Regulatory [1] - 7:18	responsible [1] -	<b>section</b> [2] - 53:8, 53:13	side [1] - 43:2	<b>split</b> [1] - 55:11
reimbursed [2] -	24:24 result [4] - 4:19, 30:3,	security [1] - 6:16	signed [1] - 14:10	<b>sponsoring</b> [2] - 18:3,
42:12, 46:22 reimbursement [1] -	34:3, 54:13	see [6] - 3:16, 3:24,	significant [3] - 42:16,	18:19 spot [1] - 50:3
19:13	revenue [7] - 42:21,	28:4, 32:22, 34:22,	42:17, 44:6 similar [5] - 12:4,	<b>SPP</b> [2] - 14:22, 15:9
reimbursing [1] - 48:5	43:2, 45:2, 47:6,	36:22	18:9, 20:14, 27:18,	<b>SS</b> [1] - 60:2
related [1] - 7:5	50:22, 51:16, 53:24	seeing [2] - 55:6,	28:2	STAFF [1] - 1:13
relating [1] - 39:12	revenues [1] - 46:9	57:21	similarly [2] - 13:15,	Staff [12] - 5:19, 9:17,
relative [1] - 53:7	reverse [1] - 56:4	seeking [1] - 19:13	13:16	9:23, 12:15, 12:19,
relatively [1] - 20:2	review [1] - 19:5	seem [1] - 48:19	similarly-situated [1] -	27:4, 28:13, 32:10,
relevant [2] - 45:16,	<b>RISLOV</b> [2] - 49:17,	<b>sell</b> [1] - 40:6	13:15	32:19, 41:18, 47:23,
47:9	51:2	<b>seller</b> [1] - 54:13	<b>simple</b> [1] - 34:19	58:24
rely [5] - 19:14, 20:2,	<b>Rislov</b> [3] - 1:15,	selling [1] - 13:1	simply [3] - 15:13,	<b>Staff's</b> [9] - 8:12, 9:9,
21:13, 22:6, 22:13	49:17, 50:6	sense [6] - 20:17,	20:25, 21:20	9:13, 13:10, 19:6,
remarks [1] - 22:16	road [1] - 28:6	24:11, 24:13, 30:24,	Sioux [1] - 5:17	22:13, 33:4, 50:8,
remember [2] - 8:4,	Rolayne [1] - 1:13	42:9, 42:11	sit [1] - 25:16	50:14
27:8	role [3] - 7:12, 8:1, 8:3	sentence [2] - 31:24, 31:25	sitting [2] - 30:21,	stages [1] - 45:22
remove [3] - 46:8,	roles [1] - 7:25	sentences [1] - 10:4	43:23	start [2] - 5:10, 37:6
55:8, 57:19	room [1] - 20:4	separate [3] - 25:22,	situated [2] - 13:15, 13:16	<b>started</b> [2] - 50:10, 50:12
removed [1] - 55:16 removing [1] - 56:7	rounds [4] - 22:12, 26:25, 35:6, 47:21	35:10	situation [5] - 21:16,	starting [1] - 7:7
renewable [4] - 16:23,	Rounds [3] - 1:16,	separately [1] - 35:4	44:2, 46:25, 58:12,	state [2] - 25:11, 30:23
19:23, 20:6, 20:15	27:4, 47:23	separation [1] - 13:6	58:14	STATE [2] - 1:2, 60:1
repeatedly [2] - 14:7,	<b>ROUNDS</b> [7] - 22:13,	sequentially [1] - 7:7	situations [1] - 45:7	State [4] - 2:2, 25:1,
41:11	27:3, 27:17, 28:1,	serious [1] - 37:11	skeptical [1] - 20:8	25:2, 60:7
Reported [1] - 1:23	28:19, 28:22, 47:22	service [20] - 4:18,	slightly [1] - 48:1	state's [2] - 44:3, 44:4
reporter [3] - 7:16,	<b>RPR</b> [1] - 1:23	8:25, 10:7, 10:9,	slower[1] - 39:17	statement [4] - 23:14,
39:18, 60:9	RTO [1] - 30:5	10:11, 10:19, 10:22,	<b>small</b> [1] - 45:10	35:5, 38:6, 53:5
Reporter [4] - 60:6,	Rule [1] - 39:7	11:19, 11:22, 11:24,	<b>Smith</b> [9] - 1:14, 18:3,	states [2] - 39:22,
60:19, 60:19	rule [2] - 4:14, 29:13	12:19, 20:11, 25:10,	18:11, 18:16, 22:25,	54:12
representation [1] -	rules [2] - 13:7, 39:4	30:2, 31:3, 31:8,	30:9, 31:2, 32:8,	Steffensen [1] - 1:16
16:24		31:10, 31:16, 32:2, 33:17	54:9	stepping [1] - 41:14
represented [1] -	S	services [20] - 7:4,	<b>SMITH</b> [11] - 18:12,	sticking [1] - 49:23
45:19		7:8, 8:19, 9:10, 9:14,	18:18, 22:17, 23:3,	still [4] - 21:2, 29:20,
request [1] - 17:7	sale [1] - 3:10	10:1, 12:8, 19:9,	23:8, 30:12, 30:16, 30:19, 32:7, 54:10,	33:1, 53:20 stop (4) = 15:20
requesting [1] - 8:16	sarcasm [1] - 38:6	24:1, 24:8, 25:5,	55:3	stop [1] - 15:20 straightened [1] -
required [2] - 13:7, 39:13	satisfy [4] - 10:9,	25:22, 26:2, 27:6,	smoothly [1] - 45:5	18:14
requirement [1] -	11:21, 31:5, 31:7	27:11, 28:23, 28:24,	solve [1] - 51:1	straightforward [1] -
14:16	<b>save</b> [1] - 24:3	28:25, 30:7, 43:10	someone [3] - 27:22,	23:9
requires [3] - 25:7,	schedule [3] - 10:20,	session [3] - 3:8, 3:20,	27:23, 49:10	stream [3] - 46:24,
			.,	-34 [o] 10.2-T,

47:6, 52:5 strident [1] - 6:2 **sub** [1] - 39:8 subject [2] - 19:24, 54:24 subpart [3] - 39:9, 39:14 subsequent [1] -10:20 substantial [1] - 20:9 successful [1] - 44:15 succinct [3] - 23:14, 24:21, 38:13 **succinctly** [1] - 30:10 **SULLY** [1] - 60:3 Sunday [1] - 16:7 **supersede** [1] - 21:17 supervise [1] - 5:23 **supply** [1] - 13:7 support [6] - 29:24, 34:11, 34:12, 47:7, 55:25, 56:16 **supporting** [1] - 36:6 supposed [3] - 26:3, 38:5. 47:14 surprised [1] - 48:10 **syllable** [1] - 50:1 sympathetic [2] -55:18, 55:23 system [5] - 4:24, 14:1, 30:5, 36:20, 38:16 systems [1] - 4:21

## Т

table [2] - 17:6, 17:13 talks [2] - 14:3, 44:9 tardiness [1] - 37:13 tariff [23] - 7:21, 9:25, 10:2, 10:6, 10:17, 11:5, 11:6, 11:10, 11:11, 11:12, 11:18, 12:2, 12:17, 25:18, 26:4, 26:11, 26:13, 26:20, 28:15, 31:2, 31:12, 35:20 tariffs [9] - 7:22, 8:9, 8:10, 9:24, 12:6, 25:8, 25:11, 32:20, 34:24 tax [37] - 27:19, 28:5, 38:20, 42:18, 42:19, 42:20, 42:23, 43:3, 43:15, 46:25, 48:17, 48:23, 48:25, 49:6, 49:8, 49:22, 50:7, 50:22, 50:23, 50:24, 50:25, 51:4, 51:6,

52:5, 52:21, 53:21, trade [1] - 27:19 54:15, 54:25, 55:1, 55:19, 56:22, 56:24, 57:1 taxable [2] - 48:21, 48:23 taxes [5] - 42:20, 42:25, 49:9, 51:16 technologies [1] -44:10 **telephones** [1] - 58:4 term [2] - 40:13, 46:20 terminate [1] - 53:16 terms [15] - 6:19, 7:13, 9:11, 12:2, 14:8, 14:11, 21:22, 26:1, 31:12, 39:11, 39:13, 39:21, 39:23, 40:8 terrific [1] - 42:6 testified [1] - 14:7 testifying [1] - 58:4 **THE** [5] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:10 therefore [1] - 35:3 they've [4] - 42:10, 44:13, 48:21 thinking [1] - 15:2 third [4] - 4:25, 21:12, 32:14, 36:25 thoughts [3] - 34:6, 36:9. 38:12 three [7] - 4:14, 6:24, 7:25, 9:17, 10:4, 26:24, 32:13 thrilled [1] - 44:12 throughs [1] - 30:22 Tim [1] - 5:21 tiny [1] - 18:15 Titan [11] - 9:12, 13:12, 13:13, 13:16, 13:17, 13:21, 14:5, 14:8, 14:11, 28:15, 32:14 **TO** [1] - 1:5 today [13] - 5:22, 6:3, 7:1, 11:2, 14:8, 18:3, 18:5, 18:17, 25:16, 36:1, 58:7, 58:11, 58:22 today's [1] - 48:9 together [2] - 41:3, 53:17 tone [1] - 13:8 took [1] - 60:9 total [1] - 52:18 touch [2] - 4:3, 58:14

touch-and-go [1] -

towards [2] - 14:21,

58:14

51:13, 51:25, 52:2,

14:22

TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1 Transcript [1] - 1:8 transcription [1] -60:12 transmission [32] -4:21, 7:21, 8:1, 8:3, 8:5, 8:8, 10:6, 10:8, 10:12, 10:14, 10:18, 10:24, 10:25, 11:4, 11:18, 13:6, 25:8, 28:23, 30:24, 31:3, 31:4, 31:14, 31:16, 31:17, 31:18, 31:21, 32:3, 32:5 transmitting [1] - 13:2 treated [2] - 35:4, 49:10 treating [1] - 13:15 TREE [1] - 1:4 Tree [56] - 3:2, 3:12, 4:1, 5:2, 6:8, 6:10, 6:13, 6:22, 8:2, 8:17, 8:21, 8:24, 9:3, 9:8, 9:16, 9:23, 12:16, 12:18, 12:22, 13:16, 14:23, 15:1, 15:14, 15:24, 16:25, 18:9, 20:24, 26:11, 26:14, 26:19, 32:20, 33:24, 34:5, 34:25, 35:24, 37:2, 37:6, 37:7, 37:22, 38:18, 38:25, 40:11, 40:15, 40:16, 40:23, 41:6, 41:16, 48:5, 48:7, 48:18, 48:22, 49:23, 52:20, 53:16, 56:20 Tree's [13] - 4:17, 4:19, 4:23, 6:20, 8:12, 30:2, 30:4, 33:22, 34:4, 36:20, 39:24, 55:19, 55:23 trepidation [1] - 35:7 tricky [1] - 56:24 tried [1] - 35:24 troubling [1] - 33:6 true [5] - 6:21, 11:2, 34:21, 53:11, 60:11 trust [1] - 43:18 try [4] - 8:11, 13:8, 24:20, 42:7 trying [11] - 8:13, 8:14, 13:25, 16:2, 33:1, 38:11, 38:12, 40:10, 40:18, 43:7, 50:24 two [11] - 6:23, 7:2, 7:3 11:15 14:25 35:10, 44:24, 47:11,

55:12, 55:15 type [3] - 21:16, 27:19, 39:5 types [4] - 19:12, 21:9, 21:18, 21:25 U Uda [13] - 4:4, 16:1, 17:8, 37:9, 42:3, 48:15, 49:17, 50:1, 51:2, 51:23, 58:6, 58:9. 58:16 **UDA** [14] - 37:9, 37:19, 38:2, 38:7, 42:4, 49:2, 49:25, 50:4, 50:6, 50:13, 51:10, 52:7, 58:13, 58:19 ultimate [1] - 21:3 unable [2] - 20:22, 48:11 unavailable [1] - 17:9 uncertain [1] - 19:24 uncertainty [6] - 20:9, 43:16, 43:17, 46:8, 46:25, 47:2 unclear [1] - 43:16 undefined [1] - 48:3 under [13] - 4:4, 5:2, 19:14, 21:20, 26:3, 26:5, 26:6, 37:2, 38:19, 41:7, 43:20, 44:5, 48:4 undermined [1] -20:18 understood [2] -18:10, 24:16 undertaken [1] - 20:5 unexpected [1] - 19:1 unfortunate [1] - 33:8 unfortunately [1] -6:22 unilaterally [1] - 40:3 unknown [1] - 21:25 unless [2] - 28:23, 29:14 unlike [2] - 40:1, 40:9 **up** [20] - 7:15, 15:24, 17:19, 23:4, 26:10, 27:6, 29:7, 33:6, 33:10, 36:1, 37:24, 38:6, 41:14, 42:8, 43:8, 50:2, 51:5, 51:22, 53:5, 55:1

**Upper** [1] - 15:3

utilities [4] - 25:7,

**UTILITIES** [2] - 1:1,

1:10

25:24, 43:20, 43:22

utility [4] - 21:10, 24:3, 39:10, 46:17 utility's [1] - 25:2

#### V

validity [1] - 39:14 value [6] - 33:17, 51:7, 51:13, 54:11, 54:14, 54.25 variable [3] - 54:4, 56:25, 57:4 various [1] - 25:15 version [1] - 54:21 viability [1] - 19:21 VICE [1] - 1:11 vice [5] - 5:24, 17:9, 17:21, 18:2, 18:23 view [5] - 14:18, 23:17, 38:22, 38:24, 40:20 violating [2] - 15:15, 15:16 vote [2] - 34:7, 36:10 votes [7] - 36:13, 36:16, 57:13, 57:16, 57:22, 57:25, 58:2

### W

Wagner [1] - 27:8 **WAPA** [21] - 7:19, 8:7, 9:25, 11:2, 11:12, 11:17, 13:18, 14:15, 14:18, 14:20, 14:24, 15:2, 15:3, 15:8, 25:17, 25:20, 30:20, 31:11, 31:14, 35:20 WAPA's [12] - 4:20, 8:9, 9:9, 9:19, 11:10, 12:6, 12:9, 14:17, 15:8, 26:6, 28:15, 30:5 web [1] - 3:7 weight [1] - 32:21 Western [3] - 7:19, 11:25, 12:1 western's [1] - 12:2 Western's [1] - 31:12 whereas [1] - 48:22 whole [4] - 8:25, 39:1, 40:6, 54:22 Wiest [1] - 1:13 willing [3] - 15:20, 18:8, 20:24 willingness [1] - 58:9 Wind [7] - 9:12, 39:25, 40:9, 45:15, 45:18, 46:7, 46:14

wind [12] - 7:4, 7:7, 9:14, 13:25, 14:1, 14:12, 40:1, 40:2, 48:10, 54:2, 54:4, 56:25 wish [5] - 22:16, 29:5, 29:7, 33:9, 58:11 wishes [1] - 22:2 Wittler [2] - 1:23, 60:18 **WITTLER** [1] - 60:5 wondering [1] - 24:16 word [1] - 44:21 words [4] - 6:20, 8:13, 8:22, 9:13 works [2] - 14:14, 58:17 world [1] - 21:10 wrap [1] - 33:1 wrestling [2] - 26:25, 29:20 written [3] - 19:22, 22:6, 35:20 wrote [2] - 28:14, 28:16

### Υ

year [3] - 54:2, 54:4 years [2] - 35:18, 46:1 yourself [1] - 29:22 Yvette [5] - 4:9, 15:25, 17:16, 18:12, 37:15

## Ζ

**zero** [2] - 28:7, 28:8