

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

Cheri Meadows,)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. EC-2025-0136
)	
Grain Belt Express LLC,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

**GRAIN BELT EXPRESS LLC’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO STAFF’S LATE-
FILED EXHIBIT**

Grain Belt Express LLC (“Grain Belt Express”) hereby files this response in opposition to the late-filed exhibit filed by the Commission Staff on August 22, 2025. In support of its response, Grain Belt Express hereby states as follows:

1. On August 22, 2025, Staff filed a Motion to Late File Exhibit, referencing an attachment to Docket Item No. 8 in this proceeding, which is a map entitled “Proposed Alternative Route of Tiger Connector Line” (referred to herein as the “proposed alternative route”) and which was attached to Cheri Meadows’ November 26, 2024 Response to Grain Belt Express’ Response to Formal Complaint.

2. The map purports to show the Commission-approved route for the Tiger Connector in white and a “proposed alternative route” in blue. Grain Belt Express objects to the admission of this map as an exhibit in this proceeding for several reasons: (1) the map does not contain any parcel boundaries apart from Ms. Meadows’ parcel, thereby preventing any analysis of whether the map accurately depicts the Commission-approved route for the Tiger Connector; (2) the map on which Ms. Meadows’ proposed alternative route was drawn reflects an incorrect and outdated map of the current planned path of the Tiger Connector; and (3) no appropriate foundation was

laid for this exhibit and therefore it is inadmissible and cannot be relied upon in the Commission's decision-making. If the Commission elects to admit the late-filed exhibit, it should be viewed in light of the limitations and inaccuracies discussed below and given appropriate weight.

I. Lack of Parcel Boundaries

3. A line simply drawn on a map, without identifying any parcel boundaries apart from Ms. Meadows,' does not accurately depict which properties the line is crossing and whether the line is still solely on parcels originally crossed by the Commission-approved route. If parcel boundaries were displayed on Ms. Meadows' map, it would be abundantly clear that her proposed alternative route crosses a previously unimpacted property owner who did not receive notice and would not be feasible.

4. In Grain Belt Express' most recent CCN proceeding, File No. EA-2023-0017, Grain Belt Express provided two separate notices to landowners in accordance with 20 CSR 4240-20.045(K): (1) the July 12, 2022 letter to provide notice of the public meetings to be held in Audrain and Callaway Counties, Missouri (provided to all landowners within 1,000 feet of the centerline);¹ and (2) the August 18, 2022 letter to landowners either directly affected or within 300 feet of the centerline) notifying them of the Final Proposed Route of the Tiger Connector and Grain Belt Express' intent to file its application in MPSC Docket No. EA-2023-0017.²

5. This previously unimpacted landowner to the southwest of Ms. Meadows received the July 12, 2022 letter notifying them of the public meetings. This landowner was not sent the

¹ Docket No. EA-2024-0017, Schedule KC-2 at pp. 14-15, affixed to the Direct Testimony of Kevin Chandler (Exhibit 19). At the August 20, 2025 evidentiary hearing in this proceeding, the Commission took administrative notice of Exhibit 19.

² Docket No. EA-2024-0017, Schedule KC-3 at pp. 4-5, affixed to the Direct Testimony of Kevin Chandler (Exhibit 19).

August 18, 2022 letter to landowners directly affected by the Final Proposed Route or within 300 feet of the centerline because they were not directly affected by the Final Proposed Route or within 300 feet of the centerline.

6. Even in the absence of parcel boundaries, Ms. Meadows' proposed alternative route shown in Staff's proposed late-filed exhibit clearly impacts the landowner to the south, who did not receive notice and whose parcel is not on the approved Tiger Connector route.

7. Further, the north-south portion of the line appears to have been shifted slightly to the west on Ms. Meadows' proposed alternative route. Where the blue line departs from the white line and where it meets up again with the white line would therefore be different than as depicted on Ms. Meadows' rendering. It also does not show the route north of where the blue and white lines diverge. Accordingly, this rendering cannot be utilized to evaluate the impact on the routing constraints in the area, such as the barn, the residences, the road crossing, and the agricultural fields.

II. Ms. Meadows Utilized an Outdated Map for Her Proposed Alternative Route

8. In addition to the lack of parcel boundaries on the proposed alternative route map, the map used by Ms. Meadows for the proposed alternative route also depicts an outdated route for the Tiger Connector, which results in additional errors and omissions on the proposed exhibit.

9. Specifically, the proposed alternative route map: (1) does not accurately depict current structure locations; and (2) it does not reflect the shift of the centerline 94 feet to the south that Grain Belt Express made to move the line farther from Ms. Meadows' residence. As discussed in greater detail in Grain Belt Express' response to Staff Data Request 0015, (attached hereto) during the March 28, 2024 meeting at Ms. Meadows' home, either Ms. Connelly or Mr. Brown (both employees of Invenergy) hand drew "X" marks in black marker showing the approximate proposed locations of certain towers on a map. The locations of those marks were based upon

initial planning at the time and were marked on the map for purposes of explaining where poles might be placed relative to Ms. Meadows' property. As noted in Grain Belt Express' response to Meadows DR 19, tower locations shown to landowners during easement discussions are preliminary and could move based upon a variety of factors.

10. The current route for the Tiger Connector calls for a tower structure just south of Road 260. This change was made around July 2024 and was incidental to Grain Belt Express' discussions with Ms. Meadows. Roughly a half-mile south of Ms. Meadows' property, the line crosses Auxvasse Creek in an area with multiple cultural, wildlife, and aquatic resources. To lessen impacts to that area, the line and the location of the structures in that area was shifted. The change in the pole locations to the south staggered other pole locations to the north. This culminated in the shift of the position of the pole near Road 260 from being located north of the road, as shown on Meadows' proposed alternative route, to its present location, south of the road. Accordingly, the map used by Ms. Meadows to reflect a proposed alternative route does not accurately depict the current route of the Tiger Connector and thus cannot be relied upon with any accuracy.

III. The Late-Filed Exhibit Lacks Appropriate Foundation

11. Before a document may be received in evidence, it must meet a number of foundational requirements including relevancy, authentication, the best evidence rule, and hearsay.³ The authenticity of a document cannot be assumed, and what it purports to be must be

³ *Cach, LLC v. Askew*, 358 S.W. 3d 58, 63 (Mo banc. 2012).

established by proof.⁴ Before a writing can be admitted into evidence and considered by a trial court, its proponent must show that it is, in fact, what it is purported to be.⁵

12. Despite a brief discussion of Ms. Meadows' proposed alternative route at the August 20, 2025 evidentiary hearing, no party has attempted to lay a foundation for the map Ms. Meadows created depicting a proposed alternative route. Identifying an appropriate path for a transmission line route involves balancing environmental, engineering, social, and economic considerations and utilizes specialized spatial analysis software that comprehensively evaluates and compares constraints and opportunities amongst all transmission line routes under consideration. Ms. Meadows' proposed alternative route appears to be simply lines drawn on a page designed to avoid her property altogether. There is no evidence in the record to establish the appropriateness or admissibility of the map or the proposed alternative route it purports to show and it should therefore not be relied upon in any Commission decision.

WHEREFORE, Grain Belt Express respectfully requests that the Commission (1) admit Grain Belt Express' response to Staff DR 15 as a late-filed exhibit in support of this response; and (2) deny Staff's request to admit Ms. Meadows' proposed alternative route into evidence, or, if the Commission elects to admit the late-filed exhibit, that the proposed alternative route be viewed in light of the limitations and inaccuracies discussed herein and given appropriate weight.

⁴ *Robin Farms, Inc. v. Bartholome*, 989 S.W. 2d 238, 252 (Mo.App.W.D. 1999).

⁵ *Id.*

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI PC

/s/ Anne E. Callenbach

Anne E. Callenbach MBN 56028

Andrew O. Schulte MBN 62194

Sean Pluta MBN 70300

Polsinelli PC

900 West 48th Place, Suite 900

Kansas City, MO 64112

Telephone: (816) 572-4760

Facsimile: (816) 817-6496

acallenbach@polsinelli.com

aschulte@polsinelli.com

spluta@polsinelli.com

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon all parties of record by email or U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this 2nd day of September, 2025.

/s/ Anne E. Callenbach
Attorney for Respondents