

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

Cheri Meadows,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	<u>File No. EC-2025-0136</u>
)	
Grain Belt Express, LLC,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

GRAIN BELT EXPRESS LLC’S NOTICE OF FILING

COMES NOW Grain Belt Express LLC (“Grain Belt Express”), and pursuant to instructions from the Administrative Law Judge during the evidentiary hearing, files its opening statement presentation.

1. Grain Belt Express participated in the evidentiary hearing in the above captioned case on August 20, 2025. Counsel for Grain Belt Express presented the attached PowerPoint as a visual aid and outline during Grain Belt Express’ opening statement.

2. Judge Pridgin instructed counsel for Grain Belt Express to file a copy of the PowerPoint presentation through the Commission’s electronic filing and information system (“EFIS”).

WHEREFORE, Grain Belt respectfully submits this Notice of Filing and attaches a copy of the PowerPoint presentation that accompanied its opening statement.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI PC

/s/ Andrew O. Schulte

Anne E. Callenbach MBN 56028

Andrew O. Schulte MBN 62194

Sean Pluta MBN 70300

Polsinelli PC

900 W. 48th Place, Suite 900

Kansas City, MO 64112

Telephone: (816) 572-4760

Facsimile: (816) 817-6496

acallenbach@polsinelli.com

aschulte@polsinelli.com

spluta@polsinelli.com

ATTORNEYS FOR GRAIN BELT EXPRESS LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served upon all parties of record by email or U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this 25th day of August, 2025.

/s/ Andrew D. Schulte

Attorney for Respondents

August 20, 2025

Opening Statement of Grain Belt Express

Case No. EC-2025-0136



Legal Standard: Section 386.390 RSMo.

The Commission has authority to hear complaints “setting forth any **act or thing done or omitted to be done**” by a public utility “in violation, or claimed to be in violation, of any **provision of law** subject to the [C]ommission’s authority, of any **rule** promulgated by the [C]ommission, of any utility **tariff**, or of any **order or decision** of the [C]ommission.”

Legal Standard: Burden of Proof

- **The Complainant has the burden to proving the allegations in his or her Complaint.** *Howard v. Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren UE*, 2008 WL 5274284 (Mo.P.S.C. 2008), citing *State ex rel. GS Technologies Operating Co., Inc. v. Public Service Commission*, 116 S.W.3d 680 (Mo.App. 2003).
- **The standard for meeting this burden of proof is the preponderance of the evidence standard.** *Howard* at 6, citing *Rodriquez v. Suzuki Motor Corp.*, 936 S.W. 2d 104, 109-111 (Mo. Banc 1996)

Basis for Complaint

- **Initial Complaint (Oct. 15, 2024)**

- Allegation that the Project is not designed to have a minimal impact to land (Finding of Fact #138)*
- Allegation that the Routing Team did not try to avoid built-up areas and residences (Finding of Fact #140)*

*Subject to pending Motion for Reconsideration of Motion to Dismiss

- **Additional Allegations (March 21, 2025)**

- Allegation that Grain Belt Express prevented Ms. Meadows from contacting the Commission regarding the route for the Tiger Connector
- Allegation that Grain Belt Express deliberately omitted and withheld information regarding the Commission's route approval process

Full Findings of Fact

- 138. The Project is designed to have a minimal impact to land.** [citing to Ex. 10, White Surrebuttal, pp. 10-11.]
In Phase I for the HVDC Main Line approximately 9 acres will be taken out of agricultural production. For Phase I Tiger Connector approximately .2 acres will be taken out of agricultural production. And for the Phase II HVDC Main Line, approximately 7 acres will be taken out of agricultural production. [citing to Ex. 10, White Surrebuttal, p. 11.]
- 140. The Routing Team for the Project also tried to avoid built-up areas, residences,** wetlands, forested areas, center pivot irrigation, and where practical, to follow existing developed corridors such as roads and existing transmission and distribution lines. [citing to Ex. 17, Burke Direct, p. 6].

(Emphasis denotes the specific portions of the Findings of Fact comprising the allegations in Ms. Meadows' Complaint.)

Collateral Attacks Not Permitted

“The Commission has generally heard small complaint cases where Complainants have clearly articulated what might amount to a violation without being able to cite the particular law, rule, tariff, or Commission order provision that was violated. However, this is not a small complaint case and **the Commission does not intend for this complaint to turn into an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission’s order granting Grain Belt a certificate of convenience and necessity.**”

- Order Denying Motion to Dismiss, March 5, 2025

The Tiger Connector Will Be Constructed to the Highest Standards

- The Commission has previously found, several times, that Grain Belt Express and Invenergy have the qualifications and expertise to develop, construct, and operate the Project, including the Tiger Connector.
- Invenergy has developed and constructed over 4,000 miles of transmission and distribution voltage lines in the United States, traversing various geographical regions such as deserts, mountains, wetlands, farmland, and swampland.
- Grain Belt Express is required to design, engineer, and construct the Tiger Connector in accordance with strict engineering, safety, and reliability standards to meet the requirements established by:
 1. The North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC);
 2. The National Electric Safety Code (NESC); and
 3. The Commission's own regulation, 20 CSR 4240-18.010, *Safety Standards for Electrical Corporations, Telecommunications Companies, and Rural Electric Cooperatives*.

Ms. Meadows Was Directly Informed of Commission Proceedings

1. July 12, 2022 Notice Letter for Public Meeting.
2. Public Meeting Posterboard.
3. Public Meeting Handout.
4. August 18, 2022 Notice Letter for Application at Commission.
5. March 20, 2023 Easement Offer Letter.
6. August 4, 2023 phone call from Jason Brown.

+ *Ms. Meadows watched the evidentiary hearing in the CCN Case in real time.*



Polsinelli PC provides this material for informational purposes only. The material provided herein is general and is not intended to be legal advice. Nothing herein should be relied upon or used without consulting a lawyer to consider your specific circumstances, possible changes to applicable laws, rules and regulations and other legal issues. Receipt of this material does not establish an attorney-client relationship.

Polsinelli is very proud of the results we obtain for our clients, but you should know that past results do not guarantee future results; that every case is different and must be judged on its own merits; and that the choice of a lawyer is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements.

© 2025 Polsinelli® is a registered trademark of Polsinelli PC. Polsinelli LLP in California. Polsinelli PC (Inc.) in Florida.