Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025 Page 1 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI 2 3 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 4 PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE 5 6 Cheri Meadows, 7) Complainant,) 8)File No. EC-2025-0136 vs. 9) Grain Belt Express, LLC,) Respondent. 10) 11 12 13 14 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2025 2:00 p.m. 15 Jefferson City, MO 16 via WebEx 17 VOLUME 2 18 19 JOHN CLARK, Presiding 20 SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE 21 22 23 24 TRANSCRIBED BY: MELISSA EICKEN 25



1	Page 2 LAW JUDGE CLARK: It's now 2:00 o'clock.
2	Let's go on the record. We don't have a court
3	reporter present. For the procedural conferences,
4	what we've been doing now is, we've been recording
5	these, and then sending them out to be transcribed.
6	So this will be recorded, and it will be sent out to
7	be transcribed.
8	Today's date is February the 20th of 2025,
9	and as I said before, the current time is 2:00 p.m.
10	This procedural conference is being held via Webex for
11	the convenience of the parties. The Commission has
12	set aside this time today for a procedural conference
13	in the case captioned as Cheri Meadows, complainant,
14	versus Grain Belt Express, LLC, respondent, and that
15	is file number EC-2025-0136.
16	My name is John Clark. I'm the regulatory
17	law judge presiding over this matter, and I'll be
18	going to begin by asking the attorneys for the parties
19	and the pro se to enter their appearance for the
20	record, and I'll start with Ms. Meadows.
21	Ms. Meadows, are you on?
22	CHERI MEADOWS: I am.
23	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. And I am correct
24	that you are still representing yourself; is that
25	correct?



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 3 CHERI MEADOWS: Correct.
2	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. On behalf of Grain
3	Belt.
4	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. Good afternoon,
5	Judge. This is Anne Callenbach, and Andrew Schulte
6	and Sean Pluta of the law firm Polsinelli, PC, also
7	appear. I believe that Mr. Pluta is on the phone. I
8	see him there, and Mr. Schulte is in my office.
9	They're not directly on camera.
10	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you so
11	MS. CALLENBACH: Kevin Chandler also was
12	planning to join from the company.
13	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And I may have
14	MS. CALLENBACH: I don't know that he
15	has
16	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Go ahead.
17	MS. CALLENBACH: Sorry, Judge. He is he
18	has joined. I see him there. Thank you.
19	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you. On
20	behalf of the Commission staff.
21	MS. HANSEN: On behalf of Commission staff,
22	Andrea Hansen and Travis Pringle, and then we also
23	have two staff members, Cody sorry, Cody. Cody
24	King, and then Allen Bax (phonetic) is also in this
25	room as well.



February 20, 2025

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page4 LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you very
2	much. Anyone from the Office of the Public Counsel?
3	I know when I had sent out this before, that
4	Mr. Poston had indicated that this was an available
5	time for him, and did anybody hear from Mr. Poston in
6	regard to whether OPC was going to be participating or
7	not?
8	MR. PRINGLE: Let me just check my e-mail
9	real quick, Judge, but I do not recall any messages
10	from Mr. Poston about that. Nope.
11	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Just a second. Is OPC
12	they're now under DED; is that correct?
13	MR. PRINGLE: I don't
14	MS. HANSEN: I'm sorry?
15	MR. PRINGLE: I don't know, Judge.
16	LAW JUDGE CLARK: I know Mr. Poston has two
17	e-mail addresses that I am looking at, and I can't
18	I don't know which one is the old one or the new one.
19	MR. PRINGLE: When he was at the Division
20	of Energy at DED, so that's probably his old one.
21	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Thank you very much.
22	MR. POSTON: Hi. This is Marc Poston just
23	joining. I apologize for being late.
24	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well, that is fine. I
25	was just getting ready to reach out to you, so I'm



	Fiocedulai Contenence Vol II February 20, 2023
1	Page 5 glad you're here.
2	MR. POSTON: I thought that was me you guys
3	were talking about, so. Okay.
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well
5	MR. POSTON: Sorry about that.
б	LAW JUDGE CLARK: So do you want to enter
7	your appearance for Public Counsel?
8	MR. POSTON: Sure. Marc Poston appearing
9	for the Office of Public Counsel.
10	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. And I'm glad
11	you're here today because I I have some specific
12	questions for you. I've kind of gone through the
13	filings on this and what I believe to be the relevant
14	documents, and this procedural conference was called
15	to discuss Grain Belt's motion to dismiss for failure
16	to state a claim. And Grain Belt had filed in their
17	answer, I believe, originally, a motion to dismiss for
18	failure to state a claim, and I usually it's my
19	tendency to want to sit on those for a while and see
20	what becomes of them, and then staff submitted their
21	staff report, and that was followed by a renewed
22	motion from Grain Belt, and I'm going to ask this
23	question because you had Ms. Callenbach, you had
24	you had replied that Invenergy may or may not be
25	present for certain parts of this. Is Invenergy

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 6 because I don't see Invenergy as a listed party in
2	this, although, I realize that they're kind of
3	overseeing the Grain Belt project.
4	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. I should have said
5	Grain Belt Express, rather than Invenergy.
6	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. So I just
7	just it is just Grain Belt that's the respondent.
8	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. Thank you, Judge.
9	LAW JUDGE CLARK: All right. And to get
10	back to what I was saying, then Grain Belt filed a
11	renewed request to dismiss for failure to state a
12	claim, and then Public Counsel filed a response,
13	basically, asking the Commission not to dismiss it for
14	failure to state a claim, then there was a a reply
15	from Grain Belt Express, and then, finally, a
16	Ms. Meadows filed a reply to the Office of Public
17	Counsel and Grain Belt's motion.
18	And Ms. Meadows, did you do this, this
19	pleading?
20	CHERI MEADOWS: What do you mean by that?
21	I'm sorry.
22	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Did you did you write
23	the pleading, Cheri Meadows, reply to the Office of
24	Public Counsel's response in opposition of Grain Belt
25	Express, LLC's motion to dismiss and request for

1	
1	Page 7 hearing?
2	CHERI MEADOWS: Yes. I I am doing all
3	this on my own. Hopefully
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: You grappled that?
5	CHERI MEADOWS: Yes.
6	LAW JUDGE CLARK: It's quite good. Did a
7	very good job
8	CHERI MEADOWS: Okay.
9	LAW JUDGE CLARK: for for a pro se
10	CHERI MEADOWS: I may be an attorney by the
11	time this is all over with.
12	LAW JUDGE CLARK: All right. Well, I
13	guess, I'm going to start with Public Counsel, and
14	then I may move to staff and Grain Belt.
15	Now Public Counsel filed a basically
16	a a request to not dismiss and based on failure to
17	state a claim, and I believe they said yep. There
18	it is, that the public interest is best served by
19	allowing the Missouri public to file complaints as
20	they are lawfully entitled to do under section even
21	if a complainant does not cite to a particular law or
22	regulation, the public should still have their cases
23	heard when the complaint explains impracticable terms,
24	the basis for the complaint, and the law, rule, order
25	or tariff that may be implicated by allegations raised



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 8 in the complaint.
2	Mr. Poston, I believe I've seen at least
3	some of this language from you before in previous
4	complaints, and for the most part, in these kinds
5	of of proceedings, I generally tend to agree with
6	that notion, but this isn't really the same kind of
7	typical consumer complaints that we see where where
8	a pro se may get involved. They may have a billing
9	complaint. They may allege that they're being billed
10	wrong. They may not know what rule or or statute
11	they're alleging is being violated, but they're
12	they're very clearly alleging that they were
13	incorrectly billed, and then in the process of of
14	the staff's investigation, and the course of the
15	hearing, violations may actually be discovered that
16	are in some way related. That's not uncommon. This
17	is a little different, though. This is this is
18	more of a it seems like Ms. Meadows' concerns tend
19	to be of a general safety variety, which I believe
20	the somewhat the way Grain Belt framed it. Grain
21	Belt also, I believe, stated that that well,
22	this project hasn't been built yet, so that the
23	any any alleged harm hasn't occurred, and I'll
24	address that in a minute. That's less persuasive to
25	me. But when you're I guess, my question OPC

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 9 and I'm not putting this out as articulately as I
2	would like, but I guess, my question is, why shouldn't
3	Ms. Meadows be required to state with particularity a
4	violation given that the largeness of general safety
5	concerns seems like a little bit too deep and large of
6	a well to be digging in for violations?
7	MR. POSTON: I'm not sure I fully
8	understand the question. I mean, I think you know,
9	I think the Commission clearly has the authority if it
10	appears that, you know, a a utility is doing or
11	going to do something that could threaten the safety
12	of of the public, that the Commission has what I
13	would say would be the obligation to address that
14	issue and determine whether there's any merit to that
15	claim and and resolve it.
16	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Say that last part again,
17	please.
18	MR. POSTON: I would say that I think the
19	Commission has an obligation when there's potential
20	safety issues raised to look into them to give the
21	the complainant, you know, a day in court and to
22	resolve those issues. I mean, the you know, if
23	the if the alternate is, the case is dismissed, and
24	there truly is safety issues involved, and the
25	Commission does nothing, I don't think that's a



	Flocedulal Collielence Vol II February 20, 2023
1	Page 10 scenario that any of us want to have happen.
2	LAW JUDGE CLARK: I don't necessarily
3	disagree with you on that. Why however, ancillary
4	to that, as I said before, the safety is a big kind
5	of morphous thing, whereas, a billing complaint tends
6	to be a more narrowly focused. Why shouldn't
7	Ms. Meadows have to cite with at least some degree of
8	particularity, something that would appear to be a
9	violation?
10	MR. POSTON: My response really is, a pro
11	se complainant just does not have an attorneys' or
12	engineers' understanding of safety measures, and you
13	know, through, you know, the resources that have been
14	available to her to try to understand, you know, the
15	line and the implications to her, she has found things
16	that she questions and and raise those as points.
17	I just I don't see how, you know, when the
18	Commission has the authority to look at this stuff,
19	that I just don't know why why the Commission would
20	not do that.
21	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. And I'm not
22	it's not a matter I'm not questioning whether the
23	Commission has the authority to hold a hearing on
24	this. I certainly think we do.
25	Now, in regard to the safety allegations



	Procedulal Conletence Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 11 which let's see. I think I made some notes here.
2	And while the complainant's submitted at least into
3	the EFIS into EFIS numerous articles, the
4	complaints we're looking at largely kind of like
5	electromagnetic fields, toxicity, safety of line
6	placement, and landowner preferences, weren't those
7	all considered in the underlying case?
8	MR. POSTON: If you're asking me, I don't
9	know. I I doubt that, but I don't I don't know.
10	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. That's reasonable.
11	MR. POSTON: I'll say, too, I thought that
12	this was a procedural conference, so I apologize if
13	I'm not prepared to you know, to argue this a
14	little more in depth, so.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And I apologize,
16	Mr. Poston. I didn't intend this to be everybody
17	argues their motion. It is a procedural conference in
18	that I'm trying to decide kind of how I want to
19	proceed with this. I'm just trying to kind of feel
20	this out. I'm not asking for for a detailed
21	argument. I'm not I'm not going to be basing any
22	decision in regard to whether or not there's a failure
23	to state a claim off of arguments from this
24	conference.
25	MR. POSTON: Okay. I got it. Thank you.



1	Page 12 Sorry.
2	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. So I I'm not
3	my intent is not to put people on the spot. That's
4	not what I was going to do. If I was going to set
5	aside time to argue the motion, we'd do that more
6	formally. Give me just a second. I kind of went off
7	track just slightly.
8	Now, Ms. Meadows, you've submitted numerous
9	articles into EFIS so far. And you even referenced
10	that you had provided numerous articles. You
11	understand that at this point those aren't evidence
12	and that the Commission can't consider those at this
13	point?
14	CHERI MEADOWS: I did not know that.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well, the way the way
16	it generally works is, if there is a hearing, you have
17	an opportunity to present evidence, and the other
18	parties have an opportunity to object to that evidence
19	as you'll have an opportunity as you would have an
20	opportunity to object to their evidence and that
21	ultimately determines whether the the evidence is
22	accepted into the record for the Commission's
23	consideration. And stuff that's not accepted into the
24	record for the Commission's consideration is is not
25	something that we can consider. So I understand that

ſ	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 13 you are providing this informatively, but at this
2	point none of those items can be considered unless
3	there's a hearing, and you present those; did I
4	clarify?
5	CHERI MEADOWS: So if we do okay. So if
6	we do get to the point of having a hearing, I can just
7	resubmit those or submit those then and
8	LAW JUDGE CLARK: You would.
9	CHERI MEADOWS: whatever?
10	LAW JUDGE CLARK: You would submit them,
11	yes. You would submit them at the hearing. You
12	you would say, I have this piece of evidence to
13	introduce and then
14	CHERI MEADOWS: Okay.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: we'd go through it at
16	that point and people would be allowed to object for
17	various reasons, and then I would rule on those
18	objections.
19	CHERI MEADOWS: Great. Okay. Thank you.
20	LAW JUDGE CLARK: If everyone would just
21	bear with me for a second. And I guess, the reason
22	I'm having a hard time with this is, I'm kind of
23	sympathetic to both sides because, I think, you know,
24	obviously, under the law, I am to treat a pro se
25	exactly like I would an attorney, but it is it is

	Fiocedulai Conterence Vol II February 20, 2023
1	Page 14 fairly common to give a little bit of leeway to allow
2	them an opportunity to make their case against parties
3	who may have a better understanding of of legal
4	procedure. At the same time I'm also I'm also
5	sympathetic to Grain Belt in this regard given that
6	they're kind of I don't know what position they're
7	actually in because it doesn't appear that they know
8	exactly what it is, is being alleged because what
9	is what appears to be alleged at this point,
10	Ms. Meadows, appear to be mainly your preference that
11	the line not cross your property; is that correct?
12	CHERI MEADOWS: No. It's the possible
13	losing my cell phone coverage, the destruction to my
14	land, me having to walk under this line at least once
15	every day, even just to get my mail or if I'm coming
16	down my driveway is a quarter-mile long. So if I'm
17	coming down my driveway, and if someone is coming from
18	my house, and I want to call 911 or something, I'm
19	going to be underneath that line, and I don't even
20	know if I'll have cell phone coverage, and there's no
21	evidence saying you will or won't. I've seen online
22	that these high voltage transmission lines can cause
23	interference, and I'm already in an area where I don't
24	have overly strong cell coverage, so that's a big
25	concern. I can't not have cell phone coverage. I'm



Procedural Conference Vol II

February 20, 2025

1	Page 15 out here by myself most of the time. And the
2	destruction to my property, my property in that area
3	is only 400-foot wide, so then taking out 150-foot
4	wide loft is huge. I mean, it's going to be extremely
5	destructive when there's just a cow pasture a few
6	hundred feet south with no trees, no buildings, no
7	residences, nothing, so. Why why is my land being
8	destroyed, and my life and safety putting in jeopardy
9	for this line that is not going to help me in any way.
10	All it's going to do is destroy and and cause
11	safety issues on my side. And, yeah. No one knows
12	right now, but it'll be too late by the time a line is
13	built, and I discover, oh, I don't have cell phone
14	coverage anymore.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And I think I indicated
16	earlier that I did have an issue with Grain Belt's
17	idea that, that that the harm has not occurred

19 understanding of your complaint was that you believe

because the line hasn't been built, because my

20 it is dangerous as designed; is that correct?

18

21 CHERI MEADOWS: Well, part of it is, yeah, 22 but it's also going to be extremely destructive to my 23 property that I use every single day, Judge. This 24 isn't -- this isn't my back 40 that I never go on or 25 only go on once a year. This is part of my property



Procedural Conference Vol II

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 16 that I use every single day, so. It's I mean, they
2	couldn't be more destructive unless they went over my
3	house with this line, and I'm sorry, if I haven't
4	conveyed that well enough in in my testimonies or
5	whatever they are, but I have huge concerns about all
б	of the safety with this. This isn't just a I just
7	don't want this line because it's going to be ugly or
8	whatever. These are serious safety concerns, and no
9	one can no one can say for sure, you'll have cell
10	phone coverage with this line being so close to your
11	house and over your drive, so. I would rather they
12	just, please, move it. Don't don't jeopardize
13	let's not risk it. There's a risk. Please don't do
14	that. That's where I'm at.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you for
16	clarifying that. When I said preference, I think that
17	got mistook as as just you don't want it without
18	any real valid reason. Clearly, I think you have good
19	reasons for not wanting a line crossing your property.
20	CHERI MEADOWS: Well, if it was crossing
21	somewhere else, it would be different. Like, north of
22	my house, I never go back on that part of the
23	property, but that's not where it is. It's going
24	across where I use my property every day, so. It's
25	different. It would be different if it was north of

7

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 202
1	Page 17 my house. Like I said, I never go I never take my
2	animals I wouldn't like it because it would destroy
3	a lot of wildlife habitat that I planted, and I tried
4	to grow up, but at least it wouldn't endanger my life
5	or my animals' life, so. That's where we're at.
6	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you,
7	Ms. Meadows.
8	CHERI MEADOWS: Uh-huh.
9	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Grain Belt, I'm going to
10	give you an opportunity to say something. I don't
11	have any questions to you because you addressed most
12	of the things that I wanted to that I was curious
13	about in your in your second request or your
14	renewed request. Is there anything you wanted to say
15	at this point?
16	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. Thank you, Judge.
17	You had asked a question earlier, I believe, of OPC
18	whether some of these safety concerns were addressed
19	in the underlying CCN case, and all of these safety
20	questions were were very thoroughly discussed.
21	There were engineers that testified, and we're
22	governed by very sensitive safety obligations through
23	the NESC, NERC, and additional conditions that are
24	placed on the project, so. There are protections in

place, you know, to help alleviate some of these --25



1 2	Page 18 these safety concerns. And all of this evidence was considered by the Commission and is sort of baked into
2	considered by the Commission and is sort of baked into
_	
3	the the order approving the the CCN.
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And if I remember,
5	forgive me if I read this incorrectly, Ms. Meadows,
6	you attended a local public hearing on the on the
7	underlying CCN; is that correct?
8	CHERI MEADOWS: I attended the public
9	the public house meeting or whatever back in July '22,
10	if that's the one you're referencing. I did attend
11	that one.
12	LAW JUDGE CLARK: When you say house
13	meeting, what do you mean? Was it at the legislature?
14	CHERI MEADOWS: It was like an open house
15	for the local residents.
16	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. All right. I
17	think I understand that. All right. Well, let's move
18	on from that. That's all the information that I
19	needed on that. Let's talk about potential hearing
20	dates, which I wanted to discuss both. And here's
21	where we begin to run into some problems. Our
22	our as I'm sure staff is aware, our hearing
23	schedule right now is stacked. We have I have a
24	procedural schedule running right now.
25	MS. HANSEN: Judge, I'm sorry to interrupt,



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 19 but I do think staff does have something to say on the
2	issue of, you know, whether or not there is a hearing.
3	If you don't mind, if we just interject very quickly.
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: I do not. Please, go
5	ahead.
6	MS. HANSEN: Thank you. So you know, in
7	prepping a little bit for this hearing, staff looked
8	at the GBE's response to the OPC or the OPC's
9	pleading. And in sum, GBE states that the hearing
10	requirement under 386.390 is not triggered because it

1 does not contain an allegation that can be tied back 11 to a violation of a law, rule, tariff or Commission 12 13 Staff disagrees. So in staff's -- or in the order. 14 executive summary of staff's report, it states the 15 following. So it says in this complaint, and it's in 16 the executive summary, and this is going to be on 17 page 4 of the document, but it says, in this complaint, Ms. Meadows alleges Grain Belt has not 18 19 followed two points of the Missouri Public Service 20 Commission's report and order that granted the company 21 a certificate of convenience and necessity in case 22 number EA-2023-0017, specifically that the routing 23 team for the project tried to avoid built-up areas and 24 residences and that the project is designed to have a 25 minimal impact to land, and then Cody King, he's our



1	Page 20 staff our staff member who wrote this, and he said,
2	in support of her claim, Ms. Meadows notes uninhabited
3	land south of her property, the size and shape of her
4	parcel, and raises her concerns with safety, given the
5	existing electric lines on her property.
6	And, so going further into that, page 2 of
7	staff's report, staff cites the following passage from
8	page 68 of the report and order for EA-2023-0017. And
9	that states, if Grain Belt does not comply with the
10	conditions set out in this order including the
11	Missouri landowner protocol, code of conduct,
12	agricultural impact, mitigation protocol, and the
13	agreed to conditions, a complaint may be brought to
14	the Commission in accordance with Section 386.390
15	RSMO, and Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.070. And then
16	on page 4 of staff's report, staff specifically cites
17	to Section 7 and Section 6 of the conditions agreed to
18	by GBE in EA-2020 or yeah, 2023-0017 in analyzing
19	the points that were alleged by Ms. Meadows, and when
20	I say the points alleged by Ms. Meadows, I'm talking
21	about those two points, the routing team for the
22	project, and I'm just restating these points. So the
23	first one is the routing team for the project tried to
24	avoid built-up areas and residences, and the project
25	is designed to have a minimal impact to land.



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 21 So what staff is has been saying through
2	all of this is, we believed that there that she did
3	allege points that are covered under the orders from
4	EA-2023-0017 and thus, a hearing is proper under the
5	statute. So that's that's staff's take on this
6	issue.
7	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you,
8	Ms. Hansen.
9	MS. HANSEN: Uh-huh.
10	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, may I respond to
11	that, please?
12	LAW JUDGE CLARK: You may.
13	MS. CALLENBACH: The the points that
14	that Ms. Meadows refers to are findings of fact in the
15	Commission's order. They're not, in fact, conditions
16	placed on Grain Belt's certificate, and Grain Belt has
17	argued this in numerous pleadings that the findings of
18	fact do not contain any condition to which Grain Belt
19	Express must adhere, and beyond that, the findings of
20	fact are remain accurate. The routing team did try
21	to avoid built-up areas and residences to simply
22	not not possible to do that in every instance.
23	The other provision that she cites to is
24	designed to have a minimal impact on land. That
25	finding of fact also remains accurate. The project is

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 22 designed to have a minimal impact on land, but as you
2	know, it is it is well near impossible to have zero
3	impact to land. So we believe that those findings of
4	fact first are not conditions that that have been
5	violated or even could be violated as findings of
6	fact. And second, that they they remain accurate.
7	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And I I did read that
8	in your in your most recent reassertion of the
9	failure to state a claim where you indicated that
10	these were not that there's no allegation that it
11	denied the ordered paragraphs which would be the
12	ordered part of the Commission order is essentially
13	your argument; correct?
14	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes.
15	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you. All
16	right. I think enough on that. Let's get back to
17	discussing potential hearing dates.
18	MR. PRINGLE: And Judge, I just want to let
19	you know that I just got to step out for another thing
20	with as you said, there's so much going on, but
21	Ms Ms. Hansen, she has for staff the rest of the
22	way.
23	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you,
24	Mr. Pringle.
25	Like I said, right now our calendar is



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025
1	Page 23 stacked. I cannot, in recent memory, remember when
2	we've had so many rate cases within a single 12-month
3	period along with MEEIA cases which is Missouri Energy
4	Efficiency Initiative Act. So it's hard to find
5	space. I found there's it looks like most of May,
6	all of June, and about half of July are taken up with
7	hearings the last time I looked. March already has
8	a a larger rate case hearing scheduled for the
9	middle of it. And given what might to or need to, to
10	occur for a hearing, I don't really want to have one
11	in the early part of March, so. If if I'm going to
12	be scheduling a hearing, how does April look for the
13	parties at this point? And I'll start, again, with
14	you, Ms. Meadows, would April be a good time to have a
15	hearing if the Commission chooses to hold a hearing on
16	this?
17	CHERI MEADOWS: I believe so.
18	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And are there any
19	particular time in April that you would not be
20	available?
21	CHERI MEADOWS: It's honestly hard for me
22	to say because I have so many animals and something
23	could come up, but at this time I will try to try
24	my best to work around everyone's schedule, because
25	I I know just getting this hearing set up was

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025				
1	Page 24 pretty or this conference set up was pretty hard,				
2	so I'll try to work with whatever else works with				
3	everyone else.				
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well, okay. Usually, if				
5	there's a hearing, I send out a scheduling order				
6	beforehand, and if if there are dates that are				
7	difficult for the parties to make, they usually file				
8	something that says, hey, this date isn't going to				
9	work for this reason.				
10	CHERI MEADOWS: Yeah. I don't have				
11	anything on my calendar right now, so. I I'm free.				
12	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Grain Belt.				
13	MS. CALLENBACH: Yes. Thank you, Judge. I				
14	don't know that Grain Belt has any issues with holding				
15	a hearing in April. I think we do have some very				
16	some practical considerations about holding a hearing				
17	in this matter given that we are still unclear what				
18	violation of law, rule, order or tariff there has				
19	been, and it's very difficult to come up with a joint				
20	statement of issues or even to find who's the right				
21	witness, who should be prepared, if there's not been				
22	an articulated violation. It's very difficult to				
23	consider how to prepare for such a hearing.				
24	LAW JUDGE CLARK: I understand that.				
25	What's your availability for it, though?				

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 202					
1	Page 25 MS. CALLENBACH: I think we can be					
2	available whenever the Commission right. We do					
3	have to check with witnesses, and at this point we					
4	don't know who those witnesses would be.					
5	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Staff, any					
6	conflicts with April? I can't hear you. I believe					
7	you're still muted.					
8	MS. HANSEN: Sorry, Judge. So like you					
9	said, the Commission's calendar is stacked. So we do					
10	have some dates that we are available. And I have					
11	those right here. All right. So for for hearing,					
12	I think the staff's preferred dates would be April 3rd					
13	or 4th.					
14	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay.					
15	MS. HANSEN: We do have availability the					
16	first two weeks of May as well.					
17	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Now, when you say the					
18	preferred dates are the 3rd and the 4th, are there					
19	conflict dates that are not going to work in April?					
20	MS. HANSEN: There are conflict dates.					
21	Dates that are not going to work would be April 8th,					
22	April 9th, the 14th, the 16th, 21st, 22nd, and the					
23	24th.					
24	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And thank you very much					
25	for being prepared to answer that question quickly.					



February 20, 2025

1	Page 26 MS. HANSEN: You're welcome.				
2	LAW JUDGE CLARK: And then, finally, OPC, I				
3	don't know if you or Public Counsel I don't know if				
4	you want to be present at any hearing, but if you do,				
5	is April a workable date for you? Or is				
б	MR. POSTON: It is, yes. It's pretty open.				
7	April 2nd is really the only day where I will				
8	definitely be out, but the rest of the dates and the				
9	dates staff gave were all all work for me.				
10	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you. All				
11	right. Well, I'm not going to keep anyone on any				
12	longer than is necessary today. I will mull this				
13	over. I'm going to look at everybody's filings again,				
14	and I will try and get a an answer quickly as to				
15	whether the Commission is going to be dismissing this				
16	case for failure to state a claim or whether we're				
17	going to be setting an evidentiary hearing. But I				
18	will try and get that resolved within the next two				
19	weeks.				
20	MS. HANSEN: Thank you.				
21	MS. CALLENBACH: Judge, may I make one more				
22	statement regarding the evidentiary hearing, please?				
23	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Of course. Please go				
24	ahead.				
25	MS. CALLENBACH: I think our concern is				



1	Page 27 that we currently have a CCN to build the tiger
2	connector where the Commission's order granted us
3	authority to do so, and we are making financial
4	commitments and acquiring properties and negotiating
5	easements in those areas, and it if there is an
6	evidentiary hearing, it sounds as though that would
7	amount to a completely new routing process and that
8	that's a pretty big concern on the company's part.
9	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Why why would you say
10	that I mean, really, the only question before the
11	Commission is not whether something needs to be
12	rerouted or not. The only question before the
13	Commission is whether or not there's been a violation
14	of a Commission order, tariff or some law or rule of
15	which the Commission would have oversight.
16	MS. CALLENBACH: Correct. But Ms. Meadows'
17	prayer for relief is the line be moved completely off
18	of her property, and if it is moved off of her
19	property, that will have sort of a ripple effect on
20	all the neighboring properties. It will, in essence,
21	result in a reroute in that particular area of
22	multiple parcels and multiple structures that are
23	already already planned for.
24	LAW JUDGE CLARK: I understand that, but
25	that's her requested relief, and we're not there yet,



Procedural Conference vol II February 20, 2025				
Page 28				
MS. CALLENBACH: Yes.				
LAW JUDGE CLARK: Right now I'd like to				
keep this confined to the complaint process, rather				
than branching out to the larger CCN and seeing how it				
affects that.				
MS. CALLENBACH: Okay. Thank you.				
LAW JUDGE CLARK: All right. Is there				
anything else from anyone?				
MR. POSTON: Judge?				
LAW JUDGE CLARK: Yes.				
MR. POSTON: This is Marc Poston				
(inaudible) again. One of your first questions kind				
of was about how, typically, you know, you had seen my				
response before about giving complainants an				
opportunity to be heard, and mostly, it's about, you				
know, a bill complaint, and I would say on this one				
that, you know, the stakes are much higher, that				
and in a sense, I would think that we you know, as				
far as the impact on on the complainant are much				
higher than a you know, a a a bill adjustment				
kind of thing. So I would just throw that out there,				
that, that because of that, because the potential				
impact on her that that, you know, there is good				
reason to be lenient in how a pro se complainant files				

Procedural Conference Vol II



February 20, 2025

	Flocedulai Contenence Vol II February 20, 200
1	Page 29 a complaint.
2	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well, that's a good
3	point. Very well said. Thank you, Mr. Poston. And
4	the billing the billing thing was my example
5	because like I said, usually, I'm very I'm very
6	amenable to these kind of things. I understand that
7	pro se have a difficult time articulating law which
8	they may not be familiar with. And, so I'm
9	generally generally do take these kinds of motions
10	with the case and the smaller complaints, but for the
11	same reason that you indicated that you're right.
12	It is you know, if it's if it's a one-month
13	billing error and whether that whether that
14	resolves in the complainant's favor or not, the effect
15	is is is much more limited than what you're
16	indicating where if a line is put over Ms. Meadows'
17	property, obviously, she will be dealing with that for
18	as long as she resides there, as long as there's the
19	line overhead. So I certainly see your point.
20	MR. POSTON: Thank you.
21	LAW JUDGE CLARK: All right. Is there
22	anything else that the Commission needs to take up at
23	this time? Or anything else anybody wants to to
24	tell me at this point?
25	CHERI MEADOWS: Judge, I have a question.



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025			
1	Page 30 And I apologize if it's dumb, but is there something			
2	with your reply or whatever that I have a question			
3	about or whatever, can I contact you directly or no?			
4	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Well, let let me			
5	let me narrow that down a little bit. When you say			
б	you have a question, what kind of I I'm I			
7	cannot in any way, shape or form be your attorney. I			
8	can't advantage one side over the other. I can't give			
9	you			
10	CHERI MEADOWS: Sure.			
11	LAW JUDGE CLARK: legal advice or tell			
12	you what you should do. What I can do is			
13	CHERI MEADOWS: Sure.			
14	LAW JUDGE CLARK: if you have a			
15	procedural question that I can clarify, I'm always			
16	happy to do that. But I'd prefer that, that not be			
17	the kind of thing where you're where people are			
18	contacting me directly with with I I'd like to			
19	keep it within the case. So if there's a if there			
20	is a question you have procedurally, if it's at the			
21	hearing, you can just ask me at the hearing. If			
22	it's if it's prior to the hearing, I would suggest			
23	you either contact an attorney. I don't know if staff			
24	would be willing to answer your questions, but.			
25	Beyond clarifying			



	FIOCEDUIAI Configuration February 20, 2020
1	Page 31 CHERI MEADOWS: Well, let me tell you what
2	it is, so.
3	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Why don't we do
4	that. Go ahead.
5	CHERI MEADOWS: We'll it's not a legal
6	question. Like, for example, you're going to
7	determine if there's going to be a hearing, so I
8	didn't want to put the horse or the cart before the
9	horse, but. I wanted to ask if we do have a hearing,
10	will I be able to get a copy of that hearing? But I
11	didn't know if I could ask you that or if I have to
12	ask
13	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Those are exactly the
14	kind of questions you can ask me and I
15	CHERI MEADOWS: Okay.
16	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Those are exactly the
17	kind of things that I should clarify. You'll remember
18	at the beginning of this, I said we didn't have a
19	court reporter present because at these procedural
20	conferences we record them and send them out to be
21	transcribed. If there is a hearing, that will not be
22	the case. If there is a hearing, we hire a court
23	reporter for that. The court reporter takes down
24	everything everyone says. Evidence is entered into
25	the record and to the degree possible, attached to the

	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025				
1	Page 32 transcript or filed in EFIS. So, yes. There will be				
2	a record afterwards of everything that has happened				
3	that you can reference.				
4	CHERI MEADOWS: Okay. Thank you.				
5	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Did you have any other				
б	questions, Ms. Meadows?				
7	CHERI MEADOWS: No. That was it. Thank				
8	you.				
9	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Like I said				
10	CHERI MEADOWS: (Inaudible).				
11	LAW JUDGE CLARK: Like I said, I'll try and				
12	get an answer out to the parties within the next two				
13	weeks. This is a Commission decision. This is not my				
14	decision alone. I don't get to make this in a vacuum.				
15	And if no one has anything else, and I hear nothing,				
16	I'm going to adjourn this procedural conference.				
17	Thank you, everybody, for making time to be here				
18	today.				
19	MS. HANSEN: Thank you very much.				
20	MR. POSTON: Thank you, Judge.				
21	MS. CALLENBACH: Thank you, Judge.				
22	(Audio ended.)				
23					
24					
25					
	898 803 3767 Lovitas operatos in all 50 statos and is licensed where required Neveda Registration #1165				



	Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025				
1	Page 33 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER				
2					
3	I, Melissa J. Eicken, Certified Court				
4	Reporter of Missouri, Certified Shorthand Reporter of				
5	Illinois and Registered Professional Reporter, do				
6	hereby certify that I was asked to prepare a				
7	transcript of proceedings had in the above-mentioned				
8	case, which proceedings were held with no court				
9	reporter present utilizing an open microphone system				
10	of preserving the record.				
11	I further certify that the foregoing pages				
12	constitute a true and accurate reproduction of the				
13	proceedings as transcribed by me to the best of my				
14	ability and may include inaudible sections or				
15	misidentified speakers of said open microphone				
16	recording.				
17	Melisse Eicken,				
18					
19	Melissa J. Eicken, CCR, CSR, RPR				
20					
21					
22					
23					
24	Date:				
25					



Procedural Conference VolHebruary 20, 2025Index: 12-month..aware

		agree 8:5	appears 9:10 14:9
1	6	agreed 20:13,17	approving 18:3
12-month 23:2	6 20:17	agricultural 20:12	April 23:12,14,19
14th 25:22 150-foot 15:3	68 20:8	ahead 3:16 19:5 26:24 31:4	24:15 25:6,12,19, 21,22 26:5,7
16th 25:22	7	allegation 19:11 22:10	area 14:23 15:2 27:21
2	7 20:17	allegations 7:25 10:25	areas 19:23 20:24 21:21 27:5
2 20:6	8	allege 8:9 21:3	argue 11:13 12:5
20 20:15	8th 25:21	alleged 8:23 14:8,	argued 21:17
2023-0017 20:18		9 20:19,20	argues 11:17
2025 2:8	9	alleges 19:18	argument 11:21
20th 2:8	911 14:18	alleging 8:11,12	22:13
21st 25:22	9th 25:22	Allen 3:24	arguments 11:23
22 18:9		alleviate 17:25	articles 11:3 12:9, 10
22nd 25:22	Α	allowed 13:16	articulated 24:22
24th 25:23	accepted 12:22,23	allowing 7:19	articulately 9:1
2:00 2:1,9	accordance 20:14	alternate 9:23	articulating 29:7
2nd 26:7	accurate 21:20,25	amenable 29:6	attached 31:25
	22:6	amount 27:7	attend 18:10
3	acquiring 27:4	analyzing 20:18	attended 18:6,8
386.390 19:10	Act 23:4	ancillary 10:3	attorney 7:10
20:14	additional 17:23	Andrea 3:22	13:25 30:7,23
3rd 25:12,18	address 8:24 9:13	Andrew 3:5	attorneys 2:18
	addressed 17:11,	animals 17:2	attorneys' 10:11
4	18	23:22	audio 32:22
4 19:17 20:16	addresses 4:17	animals' 17:5	authority 9:9
40 15:24	adhere 21:19	Anne 3:5	10:18,23 27:3
400-foot 15:3	adjourn 32:16	anymore 15:14	availability 24:25 25:15
4240-2.070 20:15	adjustment 28:21	apologize 4:23 11:12,15 30:1	avoid 19:23 20:24
4th 25:13,18	advantage 30:8	appearance 2:19	21:21
	advice 30:11	5:7	aware 18:22
	affects 28:6	appearing 5:8	
	afternoon 3:4		



Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025Index: back..conflict

		,	20, 2025Index: backconflic
B	built 8:22 15:13,18	chooses 23:15	commitments
	built-up 19:23	cite 7:21 10:7	
back 6:10 15:24 16:22 18:9 19:11 22:16	20:24 21:21	cites 20:7,16 21:23 claim 5:16,18	common 14:1 company 3:12 19:20
baked 18:2		6:12,14 7:17 9:15	company's 27:8
based 7:16	calendar 22:25 24:11 25:9	11:23 20:2 22:9 26:16	complainant 2:13 7:21 9:21 10:11
basically 6:13 7:15	call 14:18	clarify 13:4 30:15	28:20,25
	called 5:14	31:17	complainant's
basing 11:21	Callenbach 3:4,5,	clarifying 16:16	11:2 29:14
basis 7:24	11,14,17 5:23 6:4, 8 17:16 21:10,13	30:25	complainants
Bax 3:24	22:14 24:13 25:1	Clark 2:1,16,23	28:15
bear 13:21	26:21,25 27:16	3:2,10,13,16,19 4:1,11,16,21,24	complaint 7:23,24
begin 2:18 18:21	28:2,7 32:21	5:4,6,10 6:6,9,22	8:1,9 10:5 15:19 19:15,18 20:13
beginning 31:18	camera 3:9	7:4,6,9,12 9:16	28:4,17 29:1
behalf 3:2,20,21	captioned 2:13	10:2,21 11:10,15 12:2,15 13:8,10,	complaints 7:19
believed 21:2	cart 31:8	15,20 15:15 16:15	8:4,7 11:4 29:10
Belt 2:14 3:3 5:16, 22 6:3,5,7,10,15, 24 7:14 8:20,21 14:5 17:9 19:18 20:9 21:16,18	<pre>case 2:13 9:23 11:7 14:2 17:19 19:21 23:8 26:16 29:10 30:19 31:22 cases 7:22 23:2,3</pre>	17:6,9 18:4,12,16 19:4 21:7,12 22:7, 15,23 23:18 24:4, 12,24 25:5,14,17, 24 26:2,10,23 27:9,24 28:3,8,11	completely 27:7, 17 comply 20:9 concern 14:25 26:25 27:8
24:12,14 Belt's 5:15 6:17 15:16 21:16	CCN 17:19 18:3,7 27:1 28:5 cell 14:13,20,24,	29:2,21 30:4,11, 14 31:3,13,16 32:5,9,11	concerns 8:18 9:5 16:5,8 17:18 18:1 20:4
big 10:4 14:24 27:8	25 15:13 16:9	close 16:10	condition 21:18
bill 28:17,21	certificate 19:21 21:16	code 20:11 Cody 3:23 19:25	conditions 17:23 20:10,13,17 21:15
billed 8:9,13	Chandler 3:11	Commission 2:11	22:4
billing 8:8 10:5	check 4:8 25:3	3:20,21 6:13 9:9,	conduct 20:11
29:4,13 bit 9:5 14:1 19:7 30:5 branching 28:5 brought 20:13	Cheri 2:13,22 3:1 6:20,23 7:2,5,8,10 12:14 13:5,9,14, 19 14:12 15:21 16:20 17:8 18:8, 14 23:17,21 24:10	12,19,25 10:18, 19,23 12:12 18:2 19:12 20:14,15 22:12 23:15 25:2 26:15 27:11,13, 14,15 29:22 32:13	conference 2:10, 12 5:14 11:12,17, 24 24:1 32:16 conferences 2:3 31:20
build 27:1	29:25 30:10,13	Commission's	confined 28:4
buildings 15:6	31:1,5,15 32:4,7, 10	12:22,24 19:20 21:15 25:9 27:2	conflict 25:19,20

888-893-3767 Lexitas operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116F. www.lexitaslegal.com California Firm Registration #179



Procedural Conference Vol IFebruary 20, 2025Index: conflicts..failure

			2025Index: conflictsfailure
conflicts 25:6		18	electric 20:5
connector 27:2	D	disagree 10:3	electromagnetic
consideration	dangerous 15:20	disagrees 19:13	11:5
12:23,24	date 2:8 24:8 26:5	discover 15:13	endanger 17:4
considerations 24:16	dates 18:20 22:17	discovered 8:15	ended 32:22
considered 11:7	24:6 25:10,12,18, 19,20,21 26:8,9	discuss 5:15	Energy 4:20 23:3
13:2 18:2	day 9:21 14:15	18:20	engineers 17:21
consumer 8:7	15:23 16:1,24	discussed 17:20	engineers' 10:12
contact 30:3,23	26:7	discussing 22:17	enter 2:19 5:6
contacting 30:18	dealing 29:17	dismiss 5:15,17 6:11,13,25 7:16	entered 31:24
convenience 2:11	decide 11:18	dismissed 9:23	entitled 7:20
19:21	decision 11:22		error 29:13
conveyed 16:4	32:13,14	dismissing 26:15 Division 4:19	essence 27:20
сору 31:10	DED 4:12,20		essentially 22:12
correct 2:23,25	deep 9:5	document 19:17	everybody's
3:1 4:12 14:11 15:20 18:7 22:13	degree 10:7 31:25	documents 5:14	26:13
27:16	denied 22:11	doubt 11:9	everyone's 23:24
Counsel 4:2 5:7,9	depth 11:14	drive 16:11	evidence 12:11, 17,18,20,21 13:12
6:12,17 7:13,15	designed 15:20	driveway 14:16,17	14:21 18:1 31:24
26:3	19:24 20:25 21:24 22:1	dumb 30:1	evidentiary 26:17,
Counsel's 6:24	destroy 15:10	E	22 27:6
court 2:2 9:21 31:19,22,23	17:2		executive 19:14,
coverage 14:13,	destroyed 15:8	e-mail 4:8,17	16
20,24,25 15:14	destruction 14:13	EA-2020 20:18	existing 20:5
16:10	15:2	EA-2023-0017	explains 7:23
covered 21:3	destructive 15:5, 22 16:2	19:22 20:8 21:4	Express 2:14 6:5, 15,25 21:19
cow 15:5		earlier 15:16 17:17	extremely 15:4,22
cross 14:11	detailed 11:20	early 23:11	
crossing 16:19,20	determine 9:14 31:7	easements 27:5	F
CSR 20:15	determines 12:21	EC-2025-0136 2:15	fact 21:14,15,18,
curious 17:12	difficult 24:7,19,	effect 27:19 29:14	20,25 22:4,6
current 2:9	22 29:7	Efficiency 23:4	failure 5:15,18
	digging 9:6	EFIS 11:3 12:9	6:11,14 7:16
	directly 3:9 30:3,	32:1	11:22 22:9 26:16

888-893-3767 Lexitas operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116F. www.lexitaslegal.com California Firm Registration #179

Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025Index: fairly...John

	Procedural Co	onference Vol II February	y 20, 2025Index: fairlyJohr
fairly 14:1	generally 8:5	24:1	impossible 22:2
familiar 29:8	12:16 29:9	harm 8:23 15:17	impracticable
favor 29:14	give 9:20 12:6	hear 4:5 25:6	7:23
February 2:8	14:1 17:10 30:8	32:15	inaudible 28:13 32:10
feel 11:19	giving 28:15	heard 7:23 28:16	
feet 15:6	glad 5:1,10	hearing 7:1 8:15	including 20:10
fields 11:5	good 3:4 7:6,7 16:18 23:14 28:24	10:23 12:16 13:3, 6,11 18:6,19,22	incorrectly 8:13 18:5
file 2:15 7:19 24:7	29:2	19:2,7,9 21:4	indicating 29:16
filed 5:16 6:10,12,	governed 17:22	22:17 23:8,10,12,	information 18:18
16 7:15 32:1	Grain 2:14 3:2	15,25 24:5,15,16, 23 25:11 26:4,17,	informatively 13:1
files 28:25	5:15,16,22 6:3,5,	22 27:6 30:21,22	
filings 5:13 26:13	7,10,15,17,24 7:14 8:20 14:5	31:7,9,10,21,22	Initiative 23:4
finally 6:15 26:2	15:16 17:9 19:18	hearings 23:7	instance 21:22
financial 27:3	20:9 21:16,18	held 2:10	intend 11:16
find 23:4 24:20	24:12,14	hey 24:8	intent 12:3
finding 21:25	granted 19:20 27:2	high 14:22	interest 7:18
findings 21:14,17,	grappled 7:4	higher 28:18,21	interference 14:23
19 22:3,5	Great 13:19	hire 31:22	interject 19:3
fine 4:24	grow 17:4	hold 10:23 23:15	interrupt 18:25
firm 3:6	guess 7:13 8:25	holding 24:14,16	introduce 13:13
focused 10:6	9:2 13:21	honestly 23:21	Invenergy 5:24,25 6:1,5
forgive 18:5	guys 5:2	horse 31:8,9	investigation 8:14
form 30:7		house 14:18 16:3,	involved 8:8 9:24
formally 12:6	Н	11,22 17:1 18:9, 12,14	issue 9:14 15:16
found 10:15 23:5	habitat 17:3	huge 15:4 16:5	19:2 21:6
framed 8:20	half 23:6	hundred 15:6	issues 9:20,22,24
free 24:11	Hansen 3:21,22		15:11 24:14,20
fully 9:7	4:14 18:25 19:6 21:8,9 22:21 25:8,	<u> </u>	items 13:2
G	15,20 26:1,20 32:19	idea 15:17	J
gave 26:9	happen 10:1	impact 19:25 20:12,25 21:24	jeopardize 16:12
GBE 19:9 20:18	happened 32:2	22:1,3 28:20,24	jeopardy 15:8
GBE's 19:8	happy 30:16	implicated 7:25	job 7:7
general 8:19 9:4	hard 13:22 23:4,21	implications 10:15	John 2:16
1	1	1	I



Procedural Conference Vol II	
------------------------------	--

February 20, 2025Index: join..north

Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025Index: joinnorth				
join 3:12	landowner 11:6	loft 15:4	memory 23:1	
joined 3:18	20:11	long 14:16 29:18	merit 9:14	
joining 4:23	language 8:3	longer 26:12	messages 4:9	
joint 24:19	large 9:5	looked 19:7 23:7	middle 23:9	
judge 2:1,17,23	largely 11:4	losing 14:13	mind 19:3	
3:2,5,10,13,16,17,	largeness 9:4	lot 17:3	minimal 19:25	
19 4:1,9,11,15,16, 21,24 5:4,6,10	larger 23:8 28:5		20:25 21:24 22:1	
6:6,8,9,22 7:4,6,9,	late 4:23 15:12	M	minute 8:24	
12 9:16 10:2,21	law 2:1,17,23 3:2,	made 11:1	Missouri 7:19	
11:10,15 12:2,15 13:8,10,15,20	6,10,13,16,19 4:1, 11,16,21,24 5:4,6,	mail 14:15	19:19 20:11 23:3	
15:15,23 16:15	10 6:6,9,22 7:4,6,	make 14:2 24:7	mistook 16:17	
17:6,9,16 18:4,12,	9,12,21,24 9:16	26:21 32:14	mitigation 20:12	
16,25 19:4 21:7, 10,12 22:7,15,18,	10:2,21 11:10,15 12:2,15 13:8,10,	making 27:3 32:17	morphous 10:5	
23 23:18 24:4,12,	15,20,24 15:15	Marc 4:22 5:8	motion 5:15,17,22	
13,24 25:5,8,14,	16:15 17:6,9 18:4,	28:12	6:17,25 11:17 12:5	
17,24 26:2,10,21, 23 27:9,24 28:3,8,	12,16 19:4,12 21:7,12 22:7,15,	March 23:7,11	motions 29:9	
10,11 29:2,21,25	23 23:18 24:4,12,	matter 2:17 10:22		
30:4,11,14 31:3,	18,24 25:5,14,17,	24:17	move 7:14 16:12 18:17	
13,16 32:5,9,11, 20,21	24 26:2,10,23 27:9,14,24 28:3,8,	Meadows 2:13,20,	moved 27:17,18	
July 18:9 23:6	11 29:2,7,21 30:4,	21,22 3:1 6:16,18, 20,23 7:2,5,8,10	mull 26:12	
June 23:6	11,14 31:3,13,16	9:3 10:7 12:8,14	multiple 27:22	
	32:5,9,11	13:5,9,14,19	•	
K	lawfully 7:20	14:10,12 15:21 16:20 17:7,8 18:5,	muted 25:7	
	leeway 14:1	8,14 19:18 20:2,	N	
Kevin 3:11	legal 14:3 30:11	19,20 21:14		
kind 5:12 6:2 8:6 10:4 11:4,18,19	31:5	23:14,17,21 24:10 29:25 30:10,13	narrow 30:5	
12:6 13:22 14:6	legislature 18:13	31:1,5,15 32:4,6,	narrowly 10:6	
28:13,22 29:6	lenient 28:25	7,10	necessarily 10:2	
30:6,17 31:14,17	life 15:8 17:4,5	Meadows' 8:18	necessity 19:21	
kinds 8:4 29:9	limited 29:15	27:16 29:16	needed 18:19	
King 3:24 19:25	lines 14:22 20:5	measures 10:12	negotiating 27:4	
	listed 6:1	MEEIA 23:3	neighboring 27:20	
L	LLC 2:14	meeting 18:9,13	NERC 17:23	
land 14:14 15:7	LLC's 6:25	member 20:1	NESC 17:23	
19:25 20:3,25 21:24 22:1,3	local 18:6,15	members 3:23	north 16:21,25	

888-893-3767 www.lexitaslegal.com Lexitas operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116F. California Firm Registration #179



Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025Index: notes..public

	Procedural Co	nterence vol II February 2	20, 2025Index: notespublic
notes 11:1 20:2	overly 14:24	planted 17:3	previous 8:3
notion 8:6	overseeing 6:3	pleading 6:19,23	Pringle 3:22 4:8,
number 2:15	oversight 27:15	19:9	13,15,19 22:18,24
19:22		pleadings 21:17	prior 30:22
numerous 11:3 12:8,10 21:17	P	Pluta 3:6,7	pro 2:19 7:9 8:8 10:10 13:24 28:25
	p.m. 2:9	point 12:11,13 13:2,6,16 14:9	29:7
0	paragraphs 22:11	17:15 23:13 25:3	problems 18:21
object 12:18,20	parcel 20:4	29:3,19,24	procedural 2:3,10,
13:16	parcels 27:22	points 10:16 19:19 20:19,20,21,22	12 5:14 11:12,17 18:24 30:15 31:19
objections 13:18	part 8:4 9:16	21:3,13	32:16
obligation 9:13,19	15:21,25 16:22 22:12 23:11 27:8	Polsinelli 3:6	procedurally
obligations 17:22	participating 4:6	position 14:6	30:20
occur 23:10	particularity 9:3	Poston 4:4,5,10,	procedure 14:4
occurred 8:23	10:8	16,22 5:2,5,8 8:2 9:7,18 10:10 11:8,	proceed 11:19
15:17	parties 2:11,18	11,16,25 26:6	proceedings 8:5
office 3:8 4:2 5:9 6:16,23	12:18 14:2 23:13 24:7 32:12	28:10,12 29:3,20 32:20	process 8:13 27:7 28:4
one-month 29:12	parts 5:25	potential 9:19	project 6:3 8:22
online 14:21	party 6:1	18:19 22:17 28:23	17:24 19:23,24 20:22,23,24 21:25
OPC 4:6,11 8:25	passage 20:7	practical 24:16	proper 21:4
17:17 19:8 26:2 OPC's 19:8	pasture 15:5	prayer 27:17	properties 27:4,20
	PC 3:6	prefer 30:16	property 14:11
open 18:14 26:6 opportunity	people 12:3 13:16 30:17	preference 14:10 16:16	15:2,23,25 16:19, 23,24 20:3,5
12:17,18,19,20 14:2 17:10 28:16	period 23:3	preferences 11:6	27:18,19 29:17
opposition 6:24	persuasive 8:24	preferred 25:12,18	protections 17:24
order 7:24 18:3	phone 3:7 14:13,	prepare 24:23	protocol 20:11,12
19:13,20 20:8,10	20,25 15:13 16:10	prepared 11:13	provided 12:10
21:15 22:12 24:5, 18 27:2,14	phonetic 3:24	24:21 25:25	providing 13:1
,	piece 13:12	prepping 19:7	provision 21:23
ordered 22:11,12 orders 21:3	place 17:25	present 2:3 5:25 12:17 13:3 26:4	public 4:2 5:7,9
originally 5:17	placement 11:6	31:19	6:12,16,24 7:13, 15,18,19,22 9:12
originally 5.17 overhead 29:19	planned 27:23	presiding 2:17	18:6,8,9 19:19
Uverneau 23.13	planning 3:12	pretty 24:1 26:6 27:8	26:3



	Procedural Co	nference Vol II Februar	y 20, 2025Index: putsouth
put 12:3 29:16	recall 4:9	requirement 19:10	
31:8	recent 22:8 23:1	reroute 27:21	8 17:18,19,22 18:1 20:4
putting 9:1 15:8	record 2:2,20 12:22,24 31:20,25	rerouted 27:12	scenario 10:1
Q	32:2	residences 15:7 19:24 20:24 21:21	schedule 18:23,24 23:24
quarter-mile 14:16	recorded 2:6	residents 18:15	scheduled 23:8
question 5:23	recording 2:4	resides 29:18	scheduling 23:12
8:25 9:2,8 17:17 25:25 27:10,12	reference 32:3	resolve 9:15,22	24:5
29:25 30:2,6,15,	referenced 12:9	resolved 26:18	Schulte 3:5,8
20 31:6	referencing 18:10	resolves 29:14	Sean 3:6
questioning 10:22	refers 21:14	resources 10:13	section 7:20
questions 5:12	regard 4:6 10:25 11:22 14:5	respond 21:10	20:14,17
10:16 17:11,20 28:13 30:24 31:14	regulation 7:22	respondent 2:14	send 24:5 31:20
32:6	regulatory 2:16	6:7	sending 2:5
quick 4:9	related 8:16	response 6:12,24 10:10 19:8 28:15	sense 28:19
quickly 19:3 25:25	relevant 5:13	rest 22:21 26:8	sensitive 17:22
26:14	relief 27:17,25	restating 20:22	served 7:18
R	remain 21:20 22:6	resubmit 13:7	Service 19:19
	remains 21:25	result 27:21	set 2:12 12:4
raise 10:16	remember 18:4	ripple 27:19	20:10 23:25 24:1
raised 7:25 9:20	23:1 31:17	risk 16:13	setting 26:17
raises 20:4	renewed 5:21 6:11	room 3:25	shape 20:3 30:7
rate 23:2,8	17:14		side 15:11 30:8
reach 4:25	replied 5:24	routing 19:22 20:21,23 21:20	sides 13:23
read 18:5 22:7	reply 6:14,16,23	27:7	simply 21:21
ready 4:25	30:2	RSMO 20:15	single 15:23 16:1 23:2
real 4:9 16:18	report 5:21 19:14, 20 20:7,8,16	rule 7:24 8:10	sit 5:19
realize 6:2	reporter 2:3 31:19,	13:17 19:12 20:15 24:18 27:14	size 20:3
reason 13:21	23	run 18:21	slightly 12:7
16:18 24:9 28:25 29:11	representing 2:24	running 18:24	singlify 12:7 smaller 29:10
	request 6:11,25		sort 18:2 27:19
reasonable 11:10			
reasonable 11:10 reasons 13:17	7:16 17:13,14	S	sounds 27.6
reasonable 11:10 reasons 13:17 16:19	7:16 17:13,14 requested 27:25		sounds 27:6
reasons 13:17		S safety 8:19 9:4,11, 20,24 10:4,12,25	sounds 27:6 south 15:6 20:3
reasons 13:17 16:19	requested 27:25	safety 8:19 9:4,11,	

888-893-3767 Lexitas operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116F. www.lexitaslegal.com California Firm Registration #179



Procedural Conference Vol II February 20, 2025Index: space..year

	Procedural Co	nference Vol II February	20, 2025Index: spaceyear
space 23:5	16	toxicity 11:5	variety 8:19
specific 5:11	support 20:2	track 12:7	versus 2:14
specifically 19:22 20:16	sympathetic 13:23 14:5	transcribed 2:5,7 31:21	violated 8:11 22:5 violation 9:4 10:9
spot 12:3		transcript 32:1	19:12 24:18,22
stacked 18:23	T	transmission	27:13
23:1 25:9	takes 31:23	14:22	violations 8:15 9:6
staff 3:20,21,23	taking 15:3	Travis 3:22	voltage 14:22
5:20,21 7:14 18:22 19:1,7,13	talk 18:19	treat 13:24	
20:1,7,16 21:1	talking 5:3 20:20	trees 15:6	
22:21 25:5 26:9 30:23	tariff 7:25 19:12	triggered 19:10	walk 14:14
staff's 8:14 19:13,	24:18 27:14	typical 8:7	wanted 17:12,14
14 20:7,16 21:5	team 19:23 20:21,	typically 28:14	18:20 31:9
25:12	23 21:20		wanting 16:19
stakes 28:18	tend 8:5,18	U	Webex 2:10
start 2:20 7:13 23:13	tendency 5:19	ugly 16:7	weeks 25:16 26:19 32:13
	terms 7:23	Uh-huh 17:8 21:9	wide 15:3,4
state 5:16,18 6:11, 14 7:17 9:3 11:23	testified 17:21	ultimately 12:21	wildlife 17:3
22:9 26:16	testimonies 16:4	unclear 24:17	witnesses 25:3,4
stated 8:21	thing 10:5 22:19 28:22 29:4 30:17	uncommon 8:16	work 23:24 24:2,9
statement 24:20	things 10:15 17:12	underlying 11:7	25:19,21 26:9
26:22	29:6 31:17	17:19 18:7	workable 26:5
states 19:9,14 20:9	thought 5:2 11:11	underneath 14:19	works 12:16 24:2
statute 8:10 21:5	threaten 9:11	understand 9:8 10:14 12:11,25	write 6:22
step 22:19	throw 28:22	18:17 24:24 27:24	wrong 8:10
strong 14:24	tied 19:11	29:6	wrote 20:1
structures 27:22	tiger 27:1	understanding 10:12 14:3 15:19	
stuff 10:18 12:23	time 2:9,12 4:5	uninhabited 20:2	Y
submit 13:7,10,11	7:11 12:5 13:22 14:4 15:1,12 23:7,	utility 9:10	year 15:25
submitted 5:20	14,19,23 29:7,23		
11:2 12:8	32:17	V	
suggest 30:22	today 2:12 5:11 26:12 32:18	vacuum 32:14	
sum 19:9	Today's 2:8	valid 16:18	
summary 19:14,			

888-893-3767 Lexitas operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116F. www.lexitaslegal.com California Firm Registration #179