

STATE OF IOWA  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
UTILITIES BOARD

---

<p>IN RE:</p> <p>MIDWEST RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS LLC,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>	<p>DOCKET NOS. AEP-05-2 AEP-05-3 AEP-05-4</p>
--	---

---

**ORDER**

(Issued June 25, 2008)

On May 5, 2008, the Consumer Advocate Division of the Department of Justice (Consumer Advocate) filed a document entitled "Official Notice Documents." The Consumer Advocate stated it would request the undersigned administrative law judge to take official notice of several documents, including two sets of testimony and the Joint Motion for Approval of the Settlement Agreement from Utilities Board (Board) Docket No. RPU-07-5, Interstate Power and Light Company's (IPL) Application for Ratemaking Principles.

In their prefiled testimony, exhibits, and briefs filed in this case, Interstate Power and Light Company (IPL) and Midwest Renewable Energy Projects II (MREP) frequently refer to evidence in Docket No. RPU-07-5.

Rather than take official notice of certain documents in Docket No. RPU-07-5, the undersigned administrative law judge proposes to take official notice of the entire record in Docket No. RPU-07-5, thus making all underlying information related to the conclusions available in this docket. If a party objects to this proposal, an objection with supporting reasons should be filed with the Board prior to the hearing.

At the hearing, IPL must be prepared to answer the following questions:

1. On page 10 of his direct testimony, lines 9-11, MREP witness Stephen F. Dryden testifies that in Docket No. RPU-07-5, IPL identified building its own wind generation as its least-cost option for acquiring power.
  - a. Does IPL agree that this is what was shown in Docket No. RPU-07-5? If not, how would IPL characterize what was shown in the docket with regard to the IPL Wind Project?
  - b. Was this shown based on the multi-step iterative process described in the Docket No. RPU-07-5 direct testimony of IPL witness Kim Zuhlke, starting at page 9, line 9, and ending on page 11, line 16?
  - c. In Step 4 of this process, was the levelized cost for the IPL Wind Project, identified on page 7, line 20, of the direct testimony of IPL witness Richard E. Friedman in Docket No. RPU-07-5, input into IPL's 2007 Resource Plan and "picked" by the EGEAS model?
  - d. What was the maximum levelized cost per MWH for the IPL Wind Project that could have been input and still have been "picked" by the EGEAS model?

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. If any party objects to the taking of official notice of the entire record in Docket No. RPU-07-5, the party must file an objection with supporting reasons on or before July 1, 2008.

2. IPL must be prepared to answer the questions stated in the body of this order at the hearing in this case.

**UTILITIES BOARD**

/s/ Amy L. Christensen  
Amy L. Christensen  
Administrative Law Judge

ATTEST:

/s/ Margaret Munson  
Deputy Executive Secretary

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2008.