	Audio Transcription
1	Page 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	In the Matter of the Application)
7	of Ameren Transmission Company) of Illinois for a Certificate of)
8	Convenience and Necessity Under)File No. EA-2024-0302 Section 393.170.1, RSMo.
9	Relating to Transmission) Investments in Northwest and)
10	Northeast Missouri)
11	
12	
13	
14	PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE
15	VOLUME 5 MONDAY, JUNE 9, 2025
16	1:00 p.m.
17	Jefferson City, MO 65101
18	via Webex
19	
20	
21	RILEY FEWELL, Presiding
22	REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
23	
24	TRANSCRIBED BY:
25	MELISSA EICKEN



1	Page2 LAW JUDGE FEWELL: The Commission sorry.
2	Today is June 9th. It is approximately 1:15 p.m. The
3	Commission has set this time for a procedural
4	conference in the case captioned as in the matter of
5	the application of Ameren Transmission Company of
6	Illinois for a certificate of convenience and
7	necessity under Section 393.170.1, Revised Statutes of
8	Missouri relating to transmission investments in
9	northwest and northeast Missouri. That is Case Number
10	EA-2024-0302.
11	My name is Riley Fewell. I'm the
12	regulatory law judge in this matter. We'll begin with
13	the attorneys making their entries of appearance.
14	There's not a court reporter with us this afternoon,
15	but the conference will be recorded for it to be
16	transcribed at a later date.
17	If we can start with ATXI.
18	MR. FOSCO: Thank you, Your Honor. Carmen
19	Fosco with the law firm of Whitt Sturtevant, LLP, 180
20	North LaSalle Street, Suite 2020, Chicago, Illinois
21	60601, and also appearing on behalf of ATXI is
22	Mr. Jason Kumar with Ameren Services Company, 1901
23	Chouteau Avenue, P.O. Box 6649, St. Louis, Missouri
24	63166.
25	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: All right. Thank you,



1	Page 3 counsel. For the Commission staff.
2	MR. VANDERGRIFF: Good afternoon, Your
3	Honor. I'm Eric Vandergriff joined with Travis
4	Pringle representing staff counsel. Our address is
5	200 Madison Street, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City,
6	65102.
7	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: For the Office of the
8	Public Counsel.
9	MS. MARTIN: Thank you so much, Judge. My
10	name is Anna Martin. I'm the associate counsel that
11	is currently representing the Office of the Public
12	Counsel in this matter. Our address is on file.
13	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. And getting
14	into the intervenors. Is anyone here for Clean Grid
15	Alliance?
16	MS. WHEELER: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
17	This is Elizabeth wheeler on behalf of Clean Grid
18	Alliance. Our address is 570 Asbury Street,
19	Suite 201, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55104.
20	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. And for
21	MISO.
22	MR. SMALL: Yes, Your Honor. My name is
23	Jeff Small. I'm joined by my co-counsel, inside
24	counsel, Max Meyer. I'm located at 720 City Center
25	Drive, Caramel, Indiana, and also, appearing and on
	888-803-3767 Levites operates in all 50 states and is licensed where required Nevada Registration #116E



1	Page4 this phone call is Bill Steinmeier, our outside
2	counsel. Thank you.
3	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. For MIEC.
4	MS. WHIPPLE: Your Honor, did you mean
5	Missouri Electric Commission?
6	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: You're correct.
7	MS. WHIPPLE: MEC.
8	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Sorry.
9	MS. WHIPPLE: That's all right.
10	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: MEC.
11	MS. WHIPPLE: Peggy Whipple and Doug Healy
12	of Healy Law Offices, 3010 East Battlefield, Suite A,
13	Springfield, Missouri 65804.
14	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. For Renew
15	Missouri.
16	MS. MERS: Nicole Mers on behalf of Renew
17	Missouri, and my information has been provided in the
18	record already. Thanks.
19	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. Sierra Club.
20	MS. STILTNER: Hi. Caitlin Stiltner
21	appearing for Sierra Club with Great Rivers
22	Environmental Law Center. Our address is 319 North
23	Street 4th Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63102.
24	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. Is Mark
25	Harding on? And if you're a call-in user, star 6 is

1	Page 5 how you unmute yourself. Okay.
2	MS. WILLIS: Your Honor?
3	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yes.
4	MS. WILLIS: I'm Judith Ann Willis. I'm
5	also here on behalf of Clean Grid Alliance.
6	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Sorry.
7	MS. WILLIS: You missed that. And my
8	information is P.O. Box 10688, Jefferson City,
9	Missouri 65110, the law office of Judith Ann Willis.
10	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you, counsel.
11	MARK HARDING: Mark Harding reporting.
12	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: You're here, Mark
13	Harding? All right. Thank you. F. Neil Matthews?
14	NEIL MATTHEWS: That's me. Neil Matthews
15	is here.
16	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. And I heard
17	earlier that Rochelle Hyatt isn't here. But is Kevin
18	Hyatt here? I believe they're married, so.
19	(Inaudible) neither. Okay. And then for
20	McGinley-Krawczyk Farms.
21	MS. BELL: Stephanie Bell with the Law Firm
22	of Ellinger Bell on behalf of McGinley Farms. My
23	information is on the record.
24	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Thank you. So we set
25	this procedural conference to discuss how we want to
	899, 902, 2767 Lovitop operator in all 50 states and in licensed where required Nevedo Registration #1165

1	Page6 move forward and scheduling. There was a response to
2	staff's request filed on June 2nd where many of the
3	parties had given specific dates for some of the
4	deadlines, but are there any objections to those
5	dates?
6	MR. VANDERGRIFF: Staff has objections to
7	the dates during this period of time. With everything
8	moving, I don't have approval for some of them.
9	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. Okay.
10	MR. SMALL: Your Honor, this is Jeff Small
11	for MISO. I I think
12	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Sure.
13	MR. SMALL: If you don't mind my
14	interjecting at this point, I think one of the
15	problems with setting a procedural schedule is that
16	there's not been much clarity about what the
17	hearing what the scope of the hearing is. So as an
18	example, the four property owners that have requested
19	a hearing are limited in their advocacy as indicated
20	by the granting of their, you know, partial
21	granting of their intervention requesting but limiting
22	their participation in this proceeding. They raise
23	they they are here to advocate siting issues.
24	MISO, for instance, while we haven't filed
25	our testimony, it's pretty well known the kind of

	Page 7
1	testimony that MISO files as I'm using MISO as an
2	example, but we don't address any siting issues at all
3	in our our advocacy, so. It's a little bit unclear
4	as to what and I do not speak for other parties,
5	but I think there are other parties that are similarly
6	situated to MISO, and as much as they are not focused
7	on the siting issues in this case, so, I think it
8	would be a little bit easier to come up with dates if
9	we had more clarity as far as what the scope of the
10	hearing was going to be because, for instance, we have
11	MISO's counsel has conflicts, but if we're not needed
12	for the hearing on on siting issues, then our
13	conflicts go away. So it might be easier to schedule
14	things if we had a clearer idea of what the scope of
15	the hearing is going to be.
16	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Sure. So as you
17	mentioned, the intervenors, they're only they're

1 I nors, тт у 18 we're granted intervention in a limited capacity to 19 that issue. I -- my understanding is that most of the 20 parties had at least discussed many of the 21 recommendations that staff had provided. I don't remember if staff's recommendation was filed in 22 23 December or at a later date. But I know that many of 24 the parties had -- had discussed or at least shown 25 their -- their sides on that.

1	Page8 Ms. Martin, what issues do you I guess,
2	you didn't file a request for a hearing, but what
3	issues do you anticipate your client, I guess, would
4	argue at the hearing? I believe that's that's
5	really where we're at is, we have the landowner
6	intervenors who will be addressing the routing issue.
7	I guess, what what concerns I I don't know
8	that a response was ever filed specifically addressing
9	the recommendation given by staff. So I'm going to
10	put you on the the stand to ask.
11	MS. MARTIN: Yeah. Give me one moment. I
12	am we are talking to our technical expert.
13	MR. PRINGLE: Just kind of looking at the
14	record, Judge, it looks like OPC did file a response
15	to the parties' revised conditions on May 2nd.
16	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: On May 2nd.
17	MR. PRINGLE: Yes.
18	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. I'll see if I can
19	find that.
20	MR. PRINGLE: Yeah. EFIS Item Number 99.
21	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. Ms. Martin, are
22	you there?
23	MS. MARTIN: Yes. So most of our issues
24	were procedural, as we've kind of spelled out both in
25	our response and and in our you know, my seventh



1	Page9 filing that we that we filed. And, so we were
2	planning on really kind of taking a step backwards,
3	reserving the right to make objections, things like
4	that, but from this point, we thought that it was more
5	of a landowner situation. Because they know what is
6	happening regarding the relationship between the
7	transmission line and their land better than we do.
8	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. I appreciate your
9	response there.
10	MS. MARTIN: Yep.
11	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Mr. Small, does that
12	answer I it would seem to me that the only issue
13	to be addressed is that siting routing issue that if
14	there's not a disagreement with the parties. I know
15	there's been a lot filed. I didn't look super closely
16	back into the recommendations and the responses there,
17	but I it seemed like the parties have either agreed
18	to or not objected to many of the recommendations that
19	staff had filed.
20	MR. SMALL: That was my understanding
21	Your Honor, since you addressed me, I that was my
22	understanding, that matters of could be simplified
23	considerably from the number of parties that have
24	actually intervened in the case if we focused on
25	the on the siting issues dealing with these four

1	Page 10 property owners. We can have a very limited
2	proceeding, if that's what we're dealing with. And
3	just have a hearing on that or we could have a hearing
4	where we people file their testimony, and it's
5	stipulated in because there's not cross examination
б	and still have the hearing having to do with the
7	with the property owners, you know, live cross
8	examination only on those limited issues, and the I
9	think the worst possible option is to have a
10	full-blown hearing when we actually don't have any
11	dispute on these matters, so. I was hoping that we
12	could simplify matters in this prehearing conference
13	by, you know, limiting the scope of the of the
14	hearing that we're that has been requested.
15	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Are there any objections
16	from either parties to handling it either of those
17	ways? I I I
18	MARK HARDING: Your Honor, if I could
19	speak, this is Mark Harding.
20	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Sure.
21	MARK HARDING: Just speaking to the
22	gentleman who just spoke, I'm in agreement that there
23	is a broader picture here that the intervenors such as
24	myself are not interested in, however, you can't
25	discuss the routing issues that exist, particularly,



1	Page 11 the rerouting issues without discussing the adherence
2	to the regulations by this applicant, so it I think
3	you can't limit the scope of the hearing too much
4	because it needs to be established some clarity
5	needs to be provided with the use of the regulations,
6	particularly as this applicant uses them. And, so I
7	would respectfully ask for that to be considered by
8	all parties.
9	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. Thank you for
10	your thoughts, Mr. Harding.
11	NEIL MATTHEWS: Your Honor.
12	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yes.
13	NEIL MATTHEWS: This is Neil Matthews
14	and
15	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Uh-huh.
16	NEIL MATTHEWS: some of us that became
17	intervenors really were late to this. I became aware
18	of this in January, February I forget exactly what
19	the date is because I was not notified. The previous
20	group NextEra about two years ago made a very clear
21	a goal of notifying all of us as landowners when they
22	attempted to basically put transmission lines through
23	the property that many of us in North County own
24	and own for many years, so. Because I'm late to
25	this discussion, the context and the other issues are



1	Page 12 oddly important for me to understand, if it has to do
2	with my I may have less concern once I learn the
3	larger context, so. I missed out on about eight
4	months worth of discussions and public hearings that
5	took place, and I guess, I could apologize for that,
6	but I'm not going to because there was no other
7	attempt other than a couple of letters that I
8	eventually got and primarily because of a wrong
9	address, but I'm not against a larger just to see
10	who the parties are. I know there were, in my case,
11	at least what I'm learning, there were several routes
12	that were reviewed, and I'm interested in how this
13	came about that all at once here more recently that
14	the route that goes through my farm was became a
15	transmission line routing, and there were some an
16	earlier one or two that I thought were going to be
17	discovered.

Matter of fact, I'd asked that question. 18 19 They said, oh, no, no, no. It's going to go to a 20 western route, and I forgot about it for a month or 21 So I just -- I'm weighing in and saying, I've got so. 22 context that's important to me in relationship to the 23 issues that I have with routing and maybe others who 24 contribute to my overall knowledge would be quite 25 interesting to me how that's chosen, and that's my two

1	Page 13 cents worth, if it's an evidentiary hearing for a
2	limited number of us with limited ability to intervene
3	or whether you want to hear it in the context of large
4	issues, I got larger issues associated with these
5	transmission lines coming across my farm, and I'm also
6	interested in that context, and I'm I know I'm
7	missing that context because I wasn't party to the
8	earlier conversations that took place probably in the
9	fall took place in the fall of '24.
10	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay.
11	MR. SMALL: Your Honor, again, Jeff Small.
12	I I've listened to Mr. Harding and Mr. Matthews and
13	the the the separation, the the clarity that
14	I was discussing earlier was largely really was
15	about distinguishing the need arguments from the
16	siting or routing issues. I did not hear Mr. Harding
17	or Mr. Matthews say anything about the need issues. I
18	just heard them say that they had additional concerns
19	having to do with the siting or the routing issue, so
20	I just want to make it clear. I don't think that
21	Mr. Harding or Mr. Matthews contradicted me.
22	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yeah. That was my
23	understanding as well. I think that, that will be
24	covered especially if, you know, the the parties,
25	if I order the parties to have, you know, written

1	Page 14 testimony or or again live is just as fine for me.
2	I know at least some parties have said that scheduling
3	may be problematic. To that point, July 29th was
4	mentioned as a day. I don't know that we can do that
5	day. I know of at least one commissioner that won't
6	be available. If not others, I think it's is it
7	(inaudible) has another thing, one of the two. Mark
8	conference. Hold up. I was looking at that wrong.
9	Sorry, his name is Marcus. The end of this month, so.
10	I don't know that, that day would work. I know
11	some a party, it was unnamed in the filing. I saw
12	had said September dates. I don't know that we need
13	to go that far, but looking at August, would that be a
14	doable time for the parties, and you all come up with
15	available dates in that time period?
16	MR. VANDERGRIFF: Your Honor
17	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yes, Mr
18	MR. VANDERGRIFF: I just want to speak
19	out for Ms. Hyatt who sent an e-mail before. She
20	wrote an e-mail saying that she is looking for
21	counsel. She's not been able to obtain counsel
22	because of available conflicts, so on and so forth,
23	so. That landowner requested for at least a September
24	hearing just to look for counsel. Preferably going
25	all the way out until November to obtain counsel. I



1	Page 15 said I put this before the Commission so. That's
2	what's going on.
3	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay.
4	NEIL MATTHEWS: Your Honor, again, this is
5	Neil Matthews.
б	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Uh-huh.
7	NEIL MATTHEWS: I was the party that,
8	basically, put it out in September, essentially,
9	because there seemed to be a confusion on July, July,
10	August, and I'm doing it for a couple of reasons. One
11	is that I've been in the process of of considering
12	the an application or an an application of being
13	in consideration for what they call United States
14	Department of Agriculture, agriculture land easements
15	in which its permanent funding for agriculture land
16	and that has a historic preservation and protection of
17	open spaces and trying to get answers from the United
18	States Department of Agriculture these days in
19	relationship to a contract I signed associated with
20	Grasslands National Project in which they had various
21	restrictions on its use. I signed off on that, I
22	think, for 25 or 30-year length of time, and I've got
23	to figure out exactly how that interacts with or
24	intersects with the need for transmission lines to
25	come across this area, particularly since it's

1	Page 16 protecting it. So some of those questions I've asked
2	are going to take some time to get answers to, and
3	once I do figure out whether this is a simple or a
4	complex issue, I may very well need counsel. I'm also
5	interested in Nebraska and a Texas study that had to
6	do with what happened to overall land value as a
7	result of transmission lines crossing agriculture
8	property in those two states in which it decreased the
9	property values, and I'm actually trying to get in
10	contact with the authors of a couple of those to see
11	exactly what the results of those two studies that
12	that I'm looking for talked about, so that's
13	simply one of the reasons for my putting it off. I
14	know that takes some time, and these days with short
15	staff and the United States Department of Agriculture,
16	it may be a couple three months before I get an answer
17	from them or at least or really, even
18	representatives inside the State of Missouri. So
19	that's that was my concern is, there's some more
20	context associated with this property that I own in
21	relationship to plans I have for the future for it.
22	And the understanding of what the the easements
23	that's going to be required for for this. I know I
24	had previously, a couple years ago, found that the
25	NextEra had quite restrictive easements on exactly

Page 17 1 what you could do and couldn't do and what was going 2 to happen. So those are the questions that I have 3 that may take -- may take some time before we get to 4 the hearing.

5 LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. How about, I am 6 going to order every party to file their own 7 procedural schedule since we have a few varying parts. 8 I'm going to ask for at least the company's and -- and 9 entity intervenors to give deadlines for testimony and 10 issues and position statements. And then let's try to 11 get a hearing at some point as soon as we can. I sav 12 this kind of jokingly, but we can't just keep pushing 13 the case out. We do need to have a hearing date 14 scheduled, and the longer it takes to schedule, the 15 worse it'll be in all situations, I think. If we can 16 just get it scheduled, I think that'll at least move 17 all the parties a step forward. So again, I'm going to have all the parties do that, and I'll -- we'll --18 19 the Commission will decide amongst what's filed. T --20 I will also order the parties to give available dates 21 in August, June and -- or sorry, August, September, 22 and October. So file that with your proposed dates. 23 Is there anything else we need to cover today? 24 MR. FOSCO: And Your Honor, Carmen Fosco 25 for ATXI. Just to clarify.



1	Page 18 LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yes, sir.
2	MR. FOSCO: Available dates, you're
3	referring to hearing dates is what you're looking for?
4	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yes, for hearing. I
5	don't expect it to be more than two days especially
6	probably less than one, based on the issue that we'll
7	have, but. Regardless, if the parties can file their
8	available dates for a hearing, yes, sometime available
9	dates during the month of August, September, and
10	October.
11	MR. FOSCO: Certainly. Your Honor, if I
12	may comment, so for instance, you know, the issue of
13	evaluation is not an issue the Commission decides in a
14	CCN proceeding, so that's really not something that
15	gets decided here. I would just note that. And as we
16	stated in the joint filing, you know, the you know,
17	we need to set a procedural schedule, and we
18	understand that, and then parties need to have time,
19	but this case has been it'll be pending a year in
20	July. This docket is getting quite old, and you know,
21	the company has in-service dates schedule of February
22	2028, and as we also described in our filing, there is
23	a tree clearing window that can't commence until
24	easements are obtained over necessarily land and
25	and that window is is it's it's a risk

1	Page 19 pushing the schedule back a year, if that window is
2	missed, so. And it's already tight. I mean, it's not
3	a firm known thing because it depends on how long the
4	negotiations take and if there's condemnations, but.
5	But you know, with reasonable concerns for all
б	parties' interest, we do propose moving forward, you
7	know, as reasonably, expeditiously as followed. We
8	thought we would negotiate a schedule here today, but.
9	You know, we understand Your Honor's procedure, and
10	that's fine. We'll file a schedule like everyone
11	else.
12	MS. MARTIN: And Judge, I just wanted to
13	verify, are we limiting the scope of the hearing as
14	well; is that going to be in your or in your order
15	or
16	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yeah. It's it sounds
17	like the siting issue is the only issue to be
18	litigated really, if the parties have agreed to that.
19	And I'll defer back to you, Mr. Fosco. Was that the
20	case? It's what it seemed like to me.
21	MR. FOSCO: Your Honor, with OPC's
22	clarification, that's my understanding is that, you
23	know, putting the routing issues aside, you know, no
24	one had raised any dispute with staff's recommendation
25	with a revised conditions on all the other Tartan

1	Page 20 criteria. So, yeah. Need, you know, financial
2	ability, those kind of issues, my understanding is
3	there's no contest, and we support Mr. Small's
4	statements that, yeah, there should be a streamline
5	way of getting that testimony into the record since
6	it's not contested. And that the only issues at
7	hearing would be routing issues that would be raised
8	by parties.

9 LAW JUDGE FEWELL: All right. Are there 10 any other questions? I'll probably give a deadline --11 I'll push it out a little bit to the 23rd, so two 12 weeks.

13 MR. PRINGLE: Judge, just one thing from 14 staff real quick, just I was wondering if rather than 15 having each party do a full in-depth procedural 16 schedule, I -- I know we have a e-mail thread. Ι 17 don't think it would take too long for us to provide. These are the evidentiary hearing dates that parties 18 19 are available for, for those three months, have the 20 Commission pick an evidentiary hearing date, and then 21 we can make a procedural schedule together from there. 2.2 I don't know if the other parties would be open to 23 that, but I think we could possibly get that filing 24 together guicker than doing full procedural schedules. 25 If we can do that, I --LAW JUDGE FEWELL:



	Audio Transcription
1	Page 21 just I've already ordered one, and then we got
2	pushed out a couple weeks already, so. If the parties
3	are able to come up with something together and just
4	file it in one piece, then that's fine. My concern
5	is, I don't want to get this delayed further by
6	waiting for the parties be able to talk. That's the
7	concern.
8	MR. PRINGLE: And to be clear, it would
9	still be the Commission picking the evidentiary
10	hearing date because I think that's been the issue
11	finding a date that works for everyone. So it would
12	be just a kind of a filing showing everyone's
13	availability for an evidentiary hearing date in those
14	three months, and then the Commission picking one, and
15	then we go ahead and build a procedural schedule from
16	that evidentiary hearing date.
17	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. That works for
18	me.
19	NEIL MATTHEWS: Your Honor, I'm not
20	familiar with the evidentiary hearing as it relates to
21	a topic like this. What do you allow do you have
22	outside witnesses, experts in the field on routing, do
23	you you know, what kinds of are there some
24	perimeters or guidance, so I know exactly what to
25	expect in that sense, we were to have a discussion of

1	Page 22 not only appropriate dates, but related elements of
2	this proceeding, so it's under the related elements of
3	this proceeding that I'm interested in hearing someone
4	with the knowledge and background to basically explain
5	what this this procedural or what the elements
6	of the the hearing would be consist of.
7	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: I cannot give you legal
8	advice, but if you look I issued an order on the
9	20th, and it'll have all several references to
10	places on how to
11	NEIL MATTHEWS: Okay.
12	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: litigate your case.
13	Otherwise, I would hire counsel to help you with that.
14	NEIL MATTHEWS: Okay.
15	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Okay. Is there anything
16	else anyone wants to address today? Okay.
17	MR. PRINGLE: And Judge, will the line
18	still be open for a few minutes just for the parties
19	to just kind of talk real quick?
20	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: Yeah. That's perfectly
21	fine.
22	MR. PRINGLE: Okay.
23	LAW JUDGE FEWELL: All right. We'll leave
24	it open for you all to discuss. Everyone, have a good
25	afternoon. This hearing this conference is



1	adjourned.		Page 23
2		(Audio ended.)	
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			



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



Audio	Transcription
-------	---------------

1		agreed 9:17 19:18	authors 16:10
1		-	
	6	agreement 10:22	availability 21:13
10688 5:8	6 4:25	agriculture 15:14,	Avenue 2:23
180 2:19	60601 2:21	15,18 16:7,15	aware 11:17
1901 2:22	63102 4:23	ahead 21:15	
1:15 2:2	63166 2:24	Alliance 3:15,18 5:5	B
	65102 3:6	Ameren 2:5,22	back 9:16 19:1,19
2	65110 5:9	Ann 5:4,9	background 22:4
200 3:5	65804 4:13	Anna 3:10	backwards 9:2
201 3:19	6649 2:23	answers 15:17	based 18:6
2020 2:20		16:2	basically 11:22
2028 18:22	7	anticipate 8:3	15:8 22:4
20th 22:9	720 3:24	apologize 12:5	Battlefield 4:12
23rd 20:11		appearance 2:13	begin 2:12
24 13:9	9	appearing 2:21	behalf 2:21 3:17 4:16 5:5,22
25 15:22	99 8:20	3:25 4:21	Bell 5:21,22
29th 14:3	9th 2:2	applicant 11:2,6	Bill 4:1
2nd 6:2 8:15,16		application 2:5 15:12	bit 7:3,8 20:11
	A	approval 6:8	Box 2:23 3:5 5:8
3	ability 13:2 20:2	approximately 2:2	broader 10:23
30-year 15:22	additional 13:18	area 15:25	build 21:15
3010 4:12	address 3:4,12,18	argue 8:4	
319 4:22	4:22 7:2 12:9	arguments 13:15	С
360 3:5	22:16	Asbury 3:18	Caitlin 4:20
393.170.1 2:7	addressed 9:13, 21	associate 3:10	call 4:1 15:13
	addressing 8:6,8	attempt 12:7	call-in 4:25
4	adherence 11:1	attempted 11:22	capacity 7:18
4th 4:23	adjourned 23:1	attorneys 2:13	captioned 2:4
	advice 22:8	ATXI 2:17,21	Caramel 3:25
5	advocacy 6:19 7:3	17:25	Carmen 2:18
55104 3:19	advocate 6:23	audio 23:2	17:24
570 3:18	afternoon 2:14 3:2,16 22:25	August 14:13 15:10 17:21 18:9	case 2:4,9 7:7 9:24 12:10 17:13 18:19 19:20 22:12

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

	Audio Tra	inscription	Index: CCNEnvironmental
CCN 18:14	13:18 19:5	court 2:14	discussed 7:20,24
Center 3:24 4:22	condemnations	cover 17:23	discussing 11:1
cents 13:1	19:4	covered 13:24	13:14
certificate 2:6	conditions 8:15 19:25	criteria 20:1	discussion 11:25 21:25
Chicago 2:20	conference 2:4,15	cross 10:5,7	discussions 12:4
chosen 12:25	5:25 10:12 14:8	crossing 16:7	dispute 10:11
Chouteau 2:23	22:25		19:24
City 3:5,24 5:8	conflicts 7:11,13	D	distinguishing
clarification 19:22	14:22	date 2:16 7:23	13:15
clarify 17:25	confusion 15:9	11:19 17:13 20:20	doable 14:14
clarity 6:16 7:9	considerably 9:23	21:10,11,13,16	docket 18:20
11:4 13:13	consideration 15:13	dates 6:3,5,7 7:8 14:12,15 17:20,22	Doug 4:11
Clean 3:14,17 5:5	considered 11:7	18:2,3,8,9,21	Drive 3:25
clear 11:20 13:20	consist 22:6	20:18 22:1	
21:8	contact 16:10	day 14:4,5,10	E
clearer 7:14	contest 20:3	days 15:18 16:14 18:5	e-mail 14:19,20
clearing 18:23	contested 20:6	deadline 20:10	20:16
client 8:3	context 11:25	deadlines 6:4 17:9	EA-2024-0302 2:10
closely 9:15	12:3,22 13:3,6,7	dealing 9:25 10:2	earlier 5:17 12:16
Club 4:19,21	16:20	December 7:23	13:8,14
co-counsel 3:23	contract 15:19	decide 17:19	easements 15:14
commence 18:23	contradicted		16:22,25 18:24
comment 18:12	13:21	decided 18:15	easier 7:8,13
Commission 2:1,3 3:1 4:5 15:1 17:19	contribute 12:24	decides 18:13	East 4:12
18:13 20:20 21:9,	convenience 2:6	decreased 16:8	EFIS 8:20
14	conversations	defer 19:19	Electric 4:5
commissioner	correct 4:6	delayed 21:5	elements 22:1,2,5
14:5	counsel 3:1,4,8,	Department 15:14,18 16:15	Elizabeth 3:17
company 2:5,22 18:21	10,12,24 4:2 5:10	depends 19:3	Ellinger 5:22
company's 17:8	7:11 14:21,24,25	disagreement	end 14:9
complex 16:4	16:4 22:13	9:14	ended 23:2
concern 12:2	County 11:23	discovered 12:17	entity 17:9
16:19 21:4,7	couple 12:7 15:10 16:10,16,24 21:2	discuss 5:25	entries 2:13
concerns 8:7		10:25 22:24	Environmental

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

	Audio Transcription		Index: Ericintervenors
4:22	21:17 22:7,12,15,	give 8:11 17:9,20	Honor 2:18 3:3,16,
Eric 3:3	20,23	20:10 22:7	22 4:4 5:2 6:10 9:21 10:18 11:11
essentially 15:8	field 21:22	goal 11:21	13:11 14:16 15:4
established 11:4	figure 15:23 16:3	good 3:2,16 22:24	17:24 18:11 19:21
evaluation 18:13	file 3:12 8:2,14	granted 7:18	21:19
eventually 12:8	10:4 17:6,22 18:7 19:10 21:4	granting 6:20,21	Honor's 19:9
everyone's 21:12	filed 6:2,24 7:22	Grasslands 15:20	hoping 10:11
evidentiary 13:1	8:8 9:1,15,19	Great 4:21	Hyatt 5:17,18 14:19
20:18,20 21:9,13,	17:19	Grid 3:14,17 5:5	14.19
16,20	files 7:1	group 11:20	<u> </u>
examination 10:5,	filing 9:1 14:11	guess 8:1,3,7 12:5	
	18:16,22 20:23 21:12	guidance 21:24	idea 7:14
exist 10:25	financial 20:1		Illinois 2:6,20
expect 18:5 21:25	find 8:19	Н	important 12:1,22
expeditiously 19:7	finding 21:11	handling 10:16	in-depth 20:15
expert 8:12	fine 14:1 19:10	happen 17:2	in-service 18:21
experts 21:22	21:4 22:21	happened 16:6	inaudible 5:19
explain 22:4	firm 2:19 5:21 19:3	happening 9:6	14:7
	focused 7:6 9:24	Harding 4:25 5:11,	Indiana 3:25
F	forget 11:18	13 10:18,19,21	information 4:17 5:8,23
	forgot 12:20	11:10 13:12,16,21	inside 3:23 16:18
fact 12:18	forward 6:1 17:17	Healy 4:11,12	instance 6:24 7:10
fall 13:9	19:6	hear 13:3,16	18:12
familiar 21:20	Fosco 2:18,19	heard 5:16 13:18	interacts 15:23
farm 12:14 13:5	17:24 18:2,11	hearing 6:17,19	interest 19:6
Farms 5:20,22	19:19,21	7:10,12,15 8:2,4 10:3,6,10,14 11:3	interested 10:24
February 11:18 18:21	found 16:24	13:1 14:24 17:4,	12:12 13:6 16:5
	full 20:15,24	11,13 18:3,4,8	22:3
Fewell 2:1,11,25 3:7,13,20 4:3,6,8,	full-blown 10:10	19:13 20:7,18,20 21:10,13,16,20	interesting 12:25
10,14,19,24 5:3,6,	funding 15:15	22:3,6,25	interjecting 6:14
10,12,16,24 6:9, 12 7:16 8:16,18,	future 16:21	hearings 12:4	intersects 15:24
21 9:8,11 10:15,		hire 22:13	intervene 13:2
20 11:9,12,15	G	historic 15:16	intervened 9:24
13:10,22 14:17 15:3,6 17:5 18:1,4	gentleman 10:22	Hold 14:8	intervenors 3:14
19:16 20:9,25			7:17 8:6 10:23



	Audio Tra	nscription	Index: interventionmove
11:17 17:9 intervention 6:21	July 14:3 15:9 18:20	learning 12:11 leave 22:23	matter 2:4,12 3:12 12:18
7:18	June 2:2 6:2 17:21	legal 22:7	matters 9:22 10:11,12
investments 2:8 issue 7:19 8:6 9:12,13 13:19 16:4 18:6,12,13 19:17 21:10	K Kevin 5:17 kind 6:25 8:13,24 9:2 17:12 20:2	length 15:22 letters 12:7 limit 11:3 limited 6:19 7:18	Matthews 5:13,14 11:11,13,16 13:12,17,21 15:4, 5,7 21:19 22:11, 14
issued 22:8 issues 6:23 7:2,7, 12 8:1,3,23 9:25	21:12 22:19 kinds 21:23	10:1,8 13:2 limiting 6:21 10:13 19:13	Max 3:24 Mcginley 5:22
10:8,25 11:1,25 12:23 13:4,16,17 17:10 19:23 20:2,	knowledge 12:24 22:4 Kumar 2:22	lines 11:22 13:5 15:24 16:7	Mcginley- krawczyk 5:20
6,7 Item 8:20	L	listened 13:12 litigate 22:12	MEC 4:7,10 mentioned 7:17 14:4
J	land 9:7 15:14,15 16:6 18:24	litigated 19:18 live 10:7 14:1 LLP 2:19	Mers 4:16 Meyer 3:24
January 11:18 Jason 2:22	landowner 8:5 9:5 14:23	located 3:24 long 19:3 20:17	MIEC 4:3 mind 6:13
Jeff 3:23 6:10 13:11 Jefferson 3:5 5:8	landowners 11:21 large 13:3	longer 17:14 lot 9:15	Minnesota 3:19 minutes 22:18
joined 3:3,23 joint 18:16	largely 13:14 larger 12:3,9 13:4 Lasalle 2:20	Louis 2:23 4:23	MISO 3:21 6:11,24 7:1,6 MISO's 7:11
jokingly 17:12 judge 2:1,12,25	late 11:17,24 law 2:1,12,19,25	M made 11:20	missed 5:7 12:3 19:2
3:7,9,13,20 4:3,6, 8,10,14,19,24 5:3, 6,10,12,16,24 6:9, 12 7:16 8:14,16, 18,21 9:8,11 10:15,20 11:9,12, 15 13:10,22 14:17 15:3,6 17:5 18:1,4 19:12,16 20:9,13, 25 21:17 22:7,12, 15,17,20,23 Judith 5:4,9	3:7,13,20 4:3,6,8, 10,12,14,19,22,24 5:3,6,9,10,12,16, 21,24 6:9,12 7:16 8:16,18,21 9:8,11 10:15,20 11:9,12, 15 13:10,22 14:17 15:3,6 17:5 18:1,4 19:16 20:9,25 21:17 22:7,12,15, 20,23 learn 12:2	Madison 3:5 make 9:3 13:20 20:21 making 2:13 Marcus 14:9 Mark 4:24 5:11,12 10:18,19,21 14:7 married 5:18 Martin 3:9,10 8:1, 11,21,23 9:10 19:12	missing 13:7 Missouri 2:8,9,23 4:5,13,15,17,23 5:9 16:18 moment 8:11 month 12:20 14:9 18:9 months 12:4 16:16 20:19 21:14 move 6:1 17:16



Audio Transcription			Index: movingreasons
moving 6:8 19:6	oddly 12:1	period 6:7 14:15	Project 15:20
	office 3:7,11 5:9	permanent 15:15	property 6:18
N	Offices 4:12	phone 4:1	10:1,7 11:23 16:8, 9,20
National 15:20	OPC 8:14	pick 20:20	propose 19:6
Nebraska 16:5	OPC's 19:21	picking 21:9,14	proposed 17:22
necessarily 18:24	open 15:17 20:22	picture 10:23	protecting 16:1
necessity 2:7	22:18,24	piece 21:4	protection 15:16
needed 7:11	option 10:9	place 12:5 13:8,9	provide 20:17
negotiate 19:8	order 13:25 17:6, 20 19:14 22:8	places 22:10	provided 4:17
negotiations 19:4	ordered 21:1	planning 9:2	7:21 11:5
Neil 5:13,14 11:11,	owners 6:18 10:1,	plans 16:21	public 3:8,11 12:4
13,16 15:4,5,7 21:19 22:11,14	7	point 6:14 9:4 14:3	push 20:11
Nextera 11:20		17:11	pushed 21:2
16:25	P	position 17:10	pushing 17:12
Nicole 4:16	p.m. 2:2	possibly 20:23	19:1
North 2:20 4:22	P.O. 2:23 3:5 5:8	Preferably 14:24	put 8:10 11:22 15:1,8
11:23	partial 6:20	prehearing 10:12	putting 16:13
northeast 2:9	participation 6:22	preservation 15:16	19:23
northwest 2:9	parties 6:3 7:4,5,	pretty 6:25	
note 18:15	20,24 9:14,17,23 10:16 11:8 12:10	previous 11:19	Q
notified 11:19	13:24,25 14:2,14	previously 16:24	question 12:18
notifying 11:21	17:17,18,20 18:7,	primarily 12:8	questions 16:1
November 14:25	18 19:18 20:8,18, 22 21:2,6 22:18	Pringle 3:4 8:13,	17:2 20:10
number 2:9 8:20 9:23 13:2	parties' 8:15 19:6	17,20 20:13 21:8	quick 20:14 22:19
5.20 10.2	parts 17:7	22:17,22	quicker 20:24
0	party 13:7 14:11	problematic 14:3	R
objected 0:18	15:7 17:6 20:15	problems 6:15	
objected 9:18 objections 6:4,6	Paul 3:19	procedural 2:3 5:25 6:15 8:24	raise 6:22
9:3 10:15	Peggy 4:11	17:7 18:17 20:15,	raised 19:24 20:7
obtain 14:21,25	pending 18:19	21,24 21:15 22:5	real 20:14 22:19
obtained 18:24	people 10:4	procedure 19:9	reasonable 19:5
October 17:22	perfectly 22:20	proceeding 6:22 10:2 18:14 22:2,3	reasons 15:10
18:10	perimeters 21:24	process 15:11	16:13
		PI00033 10.11	



	Audio Tra	inscription	Index: recentlytakes
recently 12:13	restrictions 15:21	Services 2:22	Springfield 4:13
recommendation	restrictive 16:25	set 2:3 5:24 18:17	St 2:23 4:23
7:22 8:9 19:24	result 16:7	setting 6:15	staff 3:1,4 6:6 7:21
recommendations 7:21 9:16,18	results 16:11	seventh 8:25	8:9 9:19 16:15 20:14
record 4:18 5:23	reviewed 12:12	short 16:14	staff's 6:27:22
8:14 20:5	revised 2:7 8:15	showing 21:12	19:24
recorded 2:15	19:25	shown 7:24	stand 8:10
references 22:9	Riley 2:11	sides 7:25	star 4:25
referring 18:3	risk 18:25	Sierra 4:19,21	start 2:17
regulations 11:2,5	Rivers 4:21	signed 15:19,21	State 16:18
regulatory 2:12	Rochelle 5:17	similarly 7:5	stated 18:16
related 22:1,2	route 12:14,20	simple 16:3	statements 17:10
relates 21:20	routes 12:11	simplified 9:22	20:4
relating 2:8	routing 8:6 9:13 10:25 12:15,23	simplify 10:12	states 15:13,18
relationship 9:6	13:16,19 19:23	simply 16:13	16:8,15
12:22 15:19 16:21	20:7 21:22	sir 18:1	Statutes 2:7
remember 7:22	S	siting 6:23 7:2,7,	Steinmeier 4:1
Renew 4:14,16		12 9:13,25 13:16, 19 19:17	step 9:2 17:17
reporter 2:14	Saint 3:19	situated 7:6	Stephanie 5:21
reporting 5:11	schedule 6:15	situation 9:5	Stiltner 4:20
representatives	7:13 17:7,14 18:17,21 19:1,8,	situations 17:15	stipulated 10:5
16:18	10 20:16,21 21:15	Small 3:22,23	streamline 20:4
representing 3:4, 11	scheduled 17:14,	6:10,13 9:11,20	Street 2:20 3:5,18 4:23
request 6:2 8:2	16	13:11	studies 16:11
requested 6:18	schedules 20:24	Small's 20:3	study 16:5
10:14 14:23	scheduling 6:1 14:2	sounds 19:16	Sturtevant 2:19
requesting 6:21		spaces 15:17	Suite 2:20 3:19
required 16:23	scope 6:17 7:9,14 10:13 11:3 19:13	speak 7:4 10:19	4:12
rerouting 11:1	Section 2:7	14:18	super 9:15
reserving 9:3	sense 21:25	speaking 10:21	support 20:3
respectfully 11:7	separation 13:13	specific 6:3	
response 6:1 8:8,	September 14:12,	specifically 8:8	T
14,25 9:9	23 15:8 17:21	spelled 8:24	takes 16:14 17:14
responses 9:16	18:9	spoke 10:22	

	Audio Tra	anscription	Index: takingyea
taking 9:2	18:18 19:9	works 21:11,17	
talk 21:6 22:19	understanding	worse 17:15	
talked 16:12	7:19 9:20,22 13:23 16:22 19:22	worst 10:9	
talking 8:12	20:2	worth 12:4 13:1	
Tartan 19:25	United 15:13,17	written 13:25	
technical 8:12	16:15	wrong 12:8 14:8	
testimony 6:25	unmute 5:1	wrote 14:20	
7:1 10:4 14:1 17:9 20:5	unnamed 14:11		
Texas 16:5	user 4:25	Y	
that'll 17:16	V	year 18:19 19:1	
thing 14:7 19:3		years 11:20,24	
20:13	values 16:9	16:24	
things 7:14 9:3	Vandergriff 3:2,3 6:6 14:16,18		
thought 9:4 12:16 19:8	varying 17:7		
thoughts 11:10	verify 19:13		
thread 20:16	W		
tight 19:2			
time 2:3 6:7 14:14,	waiting 21:6		
15 15:22 16:2,14 17:3 18:18	wanted 19:12		
today 2:2 17:23	ways 10:17		
19:8 22:16	weeks 20:12 21:2		
topic 21:21	weighing 12:21		
transcribed 2:16	western 12:20		
transmission 2:5,	wheeler 3:16,17		
8 9:7 11:22 12:15 13:5 15:24 16:7	Whipple 4:4,7,9, 11		
Travis 3:3	Whitt 2:19		
tree 18:23	Willis 5:2,4,7,9		
U	window 18:23,25 19:1		
Uh-huh 11:15 15:6	witnesses 21:22		
unclear 7:3	wondering 20:14		
unclear 7.3 understand 12:1	work 14:10		

