

**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 TO APPLICATION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to 386.515 RSMo and 20 CSR 4240-2.160, Grain Belt Express LLC (“Grain Belt Express”) hereby files this Response to the Application for Rehearing (“Application”) filed by Cheri Meadows on November 27, 2025. In support of its Response, Grain Belt Express states as follows:

1. The Commission closed its day-long evidentiary hearing on Ms. Meadows’ Complaint on August 20, 2025. On October 29, 2025, the Commission issued its Report and Order denying the Complaint and on November 27, 2025, Ms. Meadows filed an application for rehearing.¹

2. Section 386.500.1 RSMo provides that an application for rehearing must set forth specifically the ground or grounds on which the applicant considers the order or decision to be unlawful, unjust, or unreasonable. That statute further provides that the Commission shall grant and hold a rehearing “if in its judgment sufficient reason therefor be made to appear.” Ms. Meadows makes a number of assertions in her Application as to why the Commission’s Report

¹ It is worth noting that Ms. Meadows filed her application for rehearing at 11:58 p.m. on a state holiday, two minutes prior to the Order’s effective date, so there remains some question as to whether the application for rehearing is timely.

and Order is unlawful, unjust, or unreasonable, but upon inspection, these assertions are merely a restatement of her previously raised arguments as to why she does not want the Tiger Connector on her property.

3. The Commission's Order is presumed valid, and the burden of showing the order is unlawful or unreasonable rests on the person or entity claiming otherwise.² An order is lawful if statutory authority for its issuance exists.³ An order is reasonable if it is supported by substantial, competent evidence on the whole record, it is not arbitrary or capricious, and it is not based on an abuse of discretion.⁴

4. Section 386.390 RSMo provides that a complaint may be filed against a public utility setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation of any provision of law subject to the Commission's authority, any utility tariff, or any order or decision of the Commission. Grain Belt Express is a regulated entity subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, and statutory authority for the Commission's order is clear.

5. After reviewing all the evidence in the record and making any necessary credibility determinations, the Commission found that Ms. Meadows has not met her burden to persuade the Commission that Grain Belt Express violated any provision of law subject to the Commission's authority, any rule promulgated by the Commission, any utility tariff, or any order or decision of the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission's order is both lawful and reasonable and rehearing is not warranted.

² *Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 555 S.W. 3d 469, 471 (Mo.banc. 2018).

³ *State ex rel. Praxair, Inc. v. Missouri Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 344 S.W. 3d 178, 186 (Mo. banc 2011).

⁴ *Mo. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Union Elec. Co.*, 552 S.W. 3d 532, 539 (Mo.banc 2018).

6. As a final matter, Ms. Meadows impermissibly attempts to raise new evidence concerning her overture to neighboring landowners about their openness to host the Grain Belt Express line on their property, instead of on Ms. Meadows' property. This attempt should be rejected for multiple reasons.

7. First, it is not relevant to this proceeding, which is limited to whether Grain Belt Express violated a Commission Order (as alleged by Ms. Meadows). If anything, it would have been relevant several years ago in the CCN Hearing regarding where the line could or should be placed. This is yet another attempted collateral attack on the Commission's Report and Order establishing the siting for the line. The record in that matter has been closed for some time, and the time to raise new evidence has long passed.⁵

8. Second, it is inadmissible hearsay.

9. Third, it does nothing to advance Ms. Meadow's desire to have the line moved off her property. Ms. Meadows spoke to one of three people with an ownership interest in a portion of the land impacted by her desired reroute and that person made no representation that she would agree to a reroute or that the other two people with interests would agree. The conversation also does nothing to resolve the myriad engineering and technical reasons for why the line should not be relocated, nor does it address the impacts to upstream and downstream landowners resulting from such relocation.

10. Fourth, the "discovery" of this new evidence does not meet the common law rules that would entitle Ms. Meadows to a rehearing. Consistent with the civil standard for motions for new trials, the movant must show that the newly discovered evidence "was not the result of a lack

⁵ 20 CSR 4240-2.150(1).

of due diligence” and is “so material that a new trial would produce a different outcome.”⁶ Ms. Meadows has had years to discuss a potential reroute of the Tiger Connector with her neighbors, just as she had the opportunity to participate in the line siting case that closed in 2023. She simply chose not to do either.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons provided above, Grain Belt Express respectfully requests that the Commission deny the Application for Rehearing, affirm its October 29, 2025 Report and Order in all respects, and for such further relief as the Commission may deem just and appropriate.

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

⁶ *Cent. Tr. & Inv. Co. v. Signalpoint Asset Mgmt., LLC*, 422 S.W.3d 312, 325 (Mo. 2014).

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 8th day of December, 2025.

/s/ Anne E. Callenbach

Attorney for Respondents