

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Grain Belt Express )  
Clean Line LLC for a Certificate of Convenience and )  
Necessity Authorizing it to Construct, Own, Operate, )  
Control, Manage, and Maintain a High Voltage, Direct ) Case No. EA-2014-0207  
Current Transmission Line and an Associated Converter )  
Station Providing an interconnection on the Maywood- )  
Montgomery 345 kV Transmission Line )

SHOW ME CONCERNED LANDOWNERS RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
RECOMMENDATION OF GRAIN BELT EXPRESS CLEAN LINE LLC

Show Me Concerned Landowners (Show Me) respectfully submits the following response in opposition to the “Recommendation of Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC” filed on June 10, 2015.

1. In paragraph 1 of its recommendation, Grain Belt Express alleges that “It was apparent during the [June 2, 2015] Agenda discussion that some Commissioners view the record as lacking with regard to certain factors required for the Commission to grant a CCN to Grain Belt Express.” No such thing was apparent during the discussion. In fact, the opposite is true.

2. During the case discussion, the Regulatory Law Judge presiding over the case set out three options for the Commissioners to consider. Option 1 was to decide the case now based on the existing record developed at the evidentiary hearings in November 2014. Option 2 was to establish a supplemental procedural schedule if the Commission decided that the additional information filed by Grain Belt Express on April 13, 2015, was critical to the decision. Option 3 was that if the commission needed even more additional information that Grain Belt Express had not provided and which was critical to

make a decision, the case could be put on hold. All five commissioners chose option 1—that they could decide the case now based on the information in the existing record, and that they did not need any additional information, even that additional information which Grain Belt Express had previously provided in its April 13 filing.

3. The Commission discussed the case, and three Commissioners said they would vote to deny the application. During the entire case discussion, not one Commissioner indicated that a lack of information was an issue in their decision or that they viewed the record as “lacking” in any way.

4. At paragraph 2 of its June 10 filing, Grain Belt Express states “While opponents of the Project have called for the Application to be denied, they have alternatively asked the Commission to hold the proceeding in abeyance until Grain Belt Express can provide the requested information. See Show Me Response at 16 (May 13, 2015) (“hold the case in abeyance until GBE provides all of the documentation and information requested in the February 11 Order”).” Show Me’s actual alternative recommendation was, “2. If the Commission does not Deny the Application Outright, It Should Hold the Case in Abeyance Until GBE Provides all of the Documentation and Information Requested in the February 11 Order.” Show Me Recommendations for Supplemental Procedural Schedule at 5 (emphasis added). What Show Me actually asked the Commission to do in the alternative, if the commission decided not to deny the application, was to require Grain Belt Express to at least provide all of the information it was directed to provide, which it did not do in its April 13 filing. This was Option 3 that the Regulatory Law Judge set out in the case discussion at the June 2 agenda meeting. All five Commissioners rejected that option. Furthermore, a majority of the Commission

indicated that it would deny the application and did not need additional information, making Show Me's second alternative irrelevant and moot. First and foremost, Show Me's position in this case has consistently been that the application should be denied.

5. What Grain Belt is really asking is for the three Commissioners who have decided to deny the application to change their vote from "no" to "maybe" and allow Grain Belt Express even more bites at the apple to provide information. Despite being given two opportunities to present information, one after the record was closed, and despite the fact that all of the Commissioners stated clearly that they needed no additional information to decide the case, Grain Belt Express still wants yet another chance to provide additional information. The evidence is clear that the Grain Belt Express project does not meet all of the five *Tartan*<sup>1</sup> criteria, and this Commission should deny the application.

Respectfully submitted,  
HEALY LAW OFFICES, LLC



---

Terry M. Jarrett      MO Bar 45663  
514 E. High St., Suite 22  
Jefferson City, MO 65101  
Telephone:    (573) 415-8379  
Facsimile:    (573) 415-8379  
Email: [terry@healylawoffices.com](mailto:terry@healylawoffices.com)

ATTORNEY FOR SHOW ME  
CONCERNED LANDOWNERS

June 15, 2015

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re Tartan Energy Company*, 3 Mo.P.S.C. 173, 177 (1994).

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed, emailed or hand-delivered to all parties on the official service list for this case on this 15<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015.

Handwritten signature of Terry M. Jarrett in black ink.

---

Terry M. Jarrett