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I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name, business name and address, and role in this proceeding.

A. My name is David B. Posner. I am an independent consultant. My address is 1801 Wedemeyer Street Unit 621, San Francisco, CA 94129. I am testifying on behalf of the Environmental Law and Policy Center, the Iowa Environmental Council, and Sierra Club (collectively “Environmental Intervenors”).

Q. Are you the same David B. Posner who previously submitted direct testimony in this proceeding?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the purpose of your prepared reply testimony?

A. The purpose of my reply testimony is to address certain reply testimony submitted in this proceeding by MidAmerican Energy Company on January 7, 2021.

Q: Did you “evaluate the emission control technology already installed on MidAmerican Energy Company’s (“MidAmerican”) generating units, or that could feasibly be installed on MidAmerican’s generating units” as argued by MidAmerican witness William R. Whitney in his reply testimony?1

A: No. I conducted a financial analysis using publicly available data about the capital and operating costs of Neal Units 3 and 4, including the impacts of existing emission control technology. I compared the ratepayer costs of these units with alternative scenarios using

---

an emissions-free technology—wind turbines—that has experienced significant cost declines in recent years, is eligible for valuable federal tax credits, and can leverage Iowa’s extremely rich wind resource potential. I found that both Neal units could be retired, their capital recovered, and their energy output and additional services replaced at a lower levelized cost than continued operation of the Neal units with the installed controls. MidAmerican did not provide in discovery any data on future capital investments in the Neal units, but it is hard to conceive of any such investments that could lower the levelized costs imposed on ratepayers by these units.

Q. Does your testimony challenge the prudence of previously approved capital expenditures?

A. No. I offer no challenge to the prudence of capital expenditures that were previously approved. On the contrary, my modeling includes the recovery of the undepreciated capital balances associated with Neal Units 3 and 4 plus the deployment of new clean assets, all while still offering levelized cost savings for ratepayers.

Q: Does this conclude your testimony?

A: Yes.
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