Exhibit No. 806

Mark Harding – Exhibit 806
Testimony of Mark Harding
Direct
File No. EA-2024-0302

[redacted]

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MARK HARDING

AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS ("ATXI")-
NORTHERN MISSOURI GRID TRANSFORMATIION PROGRAM FOR
FDIM AND APLLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE
AND NECESSITY

CASE NO: EA-2024-0302

1. INTRODUCTION

Q: **Please state your name and business address.**
A: [redacted] Missou[redacted]

Q. **What are your qualifications and experience?**
A. I am a lifetime Worth County resident and a proud Missouri landowner. I purchased my first farm in November of 1980 at a price that soon crashed. My wife and I survived the 80's which many argue was the worst decade in history for farmers with many foreclosures and bankruptcy in the ag sector. My priorities in my life every day are God, Family and Country in that order. I am blessed beyond what I deserve in so many ways but especially with family. My wife and I started with less than nothing and now own farmland in 8 counties across the State of Missouri but my heart and my home is in [redacted] Missouri, Worth County, Missouri U.S.A. I have spent my entire life buying farmland and immediately setting out to improve that land focusing on soil erosion control and making large unobstructed fields out of small fields. I see myself as being a temporary steward of the land that will be here long after I am gone.

Q. **Have you testified previously before the Missouri Public Service Commission?**
A. No.

Q. **What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**
A. I want the Commission to have the truth as to why this line got rerouted for 9 miles and why it ended up in close proximity to [redacted] and [redacted] new home and lake. I want the Commission to know that ATXI's failures began at the most basic level of proper notifications of this project which allow for landowners Constitutional Rights to be respected and the fact that ATXI used very old data to notify landowners. I want the Commission to know that ATXI played favorites and discriminated against others in the placing of this line.

2 OVERVIEW

Q. **Are you opposed to this project?**

[redacted]

A. I don't have a strong opinion either way because I am uninformed as to the "necessity" or benefits to the local area.

Q. Are you opposed to this transmission line being on your property?

A. It depends. Not if it were determined by professionals that my property is the best path and every reasonable effort were made to follow existing corridors such as running very near and parallel with the existing property borders. I would invite working with a team of professionals to preserve my plans for my property and respect my neighbors at the same time.

Q. **Does DO-28 meet the above expectation on your farm?**

A. No. The line cuts diagonally through the middle of my large self-made terraced and tiled crop field seemingly with no regard for existing corridors. I never had an opportunity to participate in line location on my property until well after docket status and I did not find out about it from ATXI.

Q. **Did [redacted] and [redacted] receive any timely notices about this project?**

A. No

Q. **Why didn't [redacted] and [redacted] receive any notices about this project?**

A. We discovered that ATXI did not know [redacted] and [redacted] were landowners on the DO 28 path. They claim they did not know that [redacted] and [redacted] house existed.

Q. **Did you determine why your [redacted] were never timely notified?**

A. Yes. In an effort to find out when why and by whom this line got rerouted near the [redacted] home we discovered that ATXI had never purchased the tax roll from the Worth County Assessors Office. The [redacted] owned this property since February 2023 (three).

Q. **What does [redacted] want now?**

A. At least 1000' of clearance from [redacted] house to the line.

Q. **Why 1000'?**

A. Because in JN-D1 it is clear that ATXI rerouted to provide an additional 1000' for the "house near Kent lane" and because ATXI rerouted to avoid houses north of 46 highway that already had 1200' of distance to the DO 27 line.

3. NOTIFICATIONS

Q. **Did you and [redacted] t notification of the open house on April 9 2024?**

[redacted]

A. [redacted] and I received an invitation to the open house on April 9th. [redacted] did not.

Q. **Why didn't you attend?**
A. Because I took the virtual open house tour instead which contained no useful information for me. I was familiar with the map (seen throughout Leah Dettmers testimony) displayed on the virtual tour and on the open house invitation was the same map I had seen before and I knew it didn't include any of my property within that map. I also knew [redacted] did not get notice which further cemented my assumption that nothing had changed regarding the line location. I only attend meetings if they concern me. This line did not concern me as I knew the closest DO 27 would get to me was my extreme NW corner which could have a guy wire. That is the only portion of my farm that is in the map. A small fraction of an acre. I didn't care.

Q. **Did you get notified in July?**
A. Yes, I received five identical letters with the only difference being the sequence of numbers at the top being different.

Q. **Did [redacted] get any July 5 letters?**
A. No

Q. **What did you do upon receiving the five letters in July?**
A. I (we) went to the Ameren website and confirmed the same map we were accustomed to seeing was displayed there. There were no other maps displayed on the Ameren website.

Q. **Was there anything else about the July 5 letters?**
A. At that time I just knew they were a form letter sent to many people because it used language like "your property is along the path of'. It didn't say there is transmission line going through your property. I could tell it was some form letter because it mentioned the project over by St. Louis and it said you may be "along" the path of/or affected a substation. The only difference between the five letters was what appeared to be parcel id's in the corner but they were numbers we hadn't seen in years and didn't correlate to our tax records for our farm in that area.

Q. **Have you noticed anything similar since July about the July 5 letter?**
A. Yes. I see that the [redacted] property also received the July 5 letter and DO 28 does not go on that property. I believe there are others.

[redacted]

Q. **Why does the fact that people got the same letter whether the line was on them or near them bother you?**
A. Because people talk in a small community on a project such as this and it serves to add confusion rather than clarity.

Q. **Did you notice confusion from others about where the line actually was after July 5?**
A. Yes. As I got involved after Oct 5 one of the most surprising aspects was how literally no one I talked to had an accurate account of where this DO 28 is. It was also evident at the LPH in Albany.

Q. **Did you at the time try to figure out the numbers in the corner of that letter?**
A. Ye[redacted] and I made an effort to identify which parcels they were trying to reference.

Q. **What did you conclude after the July 5 letters?**
A. Because we had received five letters, AND [redacted] had received none, AND we knew what the map showed AND I couldn't imagine how a project could include all five parcels of my land in that area AND my land had never been considered for an electricity line before it was easy to conclude that this was a form letter to provide notice to a multitude of people about a power line going through the state. There was nothing specific in that letter. Since then, I have discovered nearly everyone (if not everyone) viewed and treated that letter the same way I did.

Q. **Anything else?**
A. Yes. I knew several people were getting approached by [redacted] in spring and summer of 2023 for this project. I knew the path in the area of my property based on who all were getting approached and also having seen the exact same map in the summer of 2023 that was used by ATXI all through 2024.

Q. **Have you ever been contacted or approached by anyone seeking to get an easement option on your farm?**
A. No. Which further explains why I never imagined the line could get majorly rerouted as the result of feedback from an open house!!

Q. **Was it reasonable to conclude the line was going as depicted by the skinny line on the map that was advertised so much?**
A. It would be unreasonable to conclude anything else and I haven't talked to anyone other than ATXI people who even question what the skinny line on the map indicates.

[redacted]

Q. **Do timely notifications matter?**
A. Yes, hugely. In our case, [redacted] had been notified, me, [redacted] my [redacted] would have all approached this completely different than we did around July 8.

Q. **What would you have done had you known the line had been rerouted and was now going through the middle of your crop field and in close proximity to [redacted] house and very near [redacted] recreational lake?**
A. The same thing we have done since finding out from our neighbor on Oct. 5 that the line had moved. Only we would have been able to make ATXI aware of a "new house north of 46" in close proximity to the power line that ATXI allegedly did not know about. We would have been able to take advantage of pre "docket status".

Q. **Do you think the rerouted portion was professionally evaluated?**
A. According to EFIS Item 15 (JN-D1) section 2.3 pages 15-17 the Initial Segment Placement and Refinement was done in the greater potential route area. After that process, there were no segments retained that correlate with the rerouted portion of DO28. In other words, an evaluation WAS done on the rerouted area and NO segments qualified for consideration to form a "route" in that geographic area that became DO-28. The rerouted portion of DO28 follows no segments that had been deemed eligible for a route. ATXI's reroute was developed in 15 days using a path that contained no studied and approved segments.

Q. **How do you know the above is true?**
A. I studied JN-D1. On page 19, figure 6, it shows the 30+ segments that survived the weeding out process. The first paragraph on page 17 explains the "retiring of segments" process.

Q. **How do you know the segments depicted in the Figure 6 (JND1) map and the rerouted portion of DO28 do not align?**
A. I can easily track DO28 and easily see the only place there are no qualifying segments used is within the entirety of the rerouted area. The rest of DO28 does follow qualifying studied segments. The ENTIRETY of DO 27 DOES follow the studied and approved segments as seen in Figure 6 on page 19 of JND1.

Q. **Did you take any other action to confirm the entirety of the FDIM route aligned with qualifying segments?**
A. Yes. I asked [redacted] to create an overlay map. See this map attached.

[redacted]

4. LEGITIMACY OF THE 3 REASONS TO REROUTE

Q. **Were the 3 reasons to reroute seen in JND1 page 29 a product of open house feedback or something else?**
A. The 3 reasons did not come as a result of feedback from the open house on April 9. Only the "newer residences north of 46" reason came from the open house feedback.

Q. **Was there anything provided at the open house on April 9 in Grant City that contributed to the rerouting?**
A. YES! There was a lot of attention paid to [redacted] desires. More later.

Q. **Why do you think the USDA hog barn issue was a product of fabricating an excuse in order to justify a radical rerouting of 9+ miles rather than a need to reroute as ATXI represents?**
A. Because of my own efforts to discover the truth about this property and because of my knowledge about these properties known locally as [redacted] property or [redacted] and because my efforts are consistent with information seen in EFIS Data Requests 0012.0-0012.1-0012.2-0012.3.

Q. **Has this topic been talked about a lot locally?**
A. Yes. Because locals are familiar with the land associated with these USDA hog barns, ATXI's claims were illogical and frankly laughable. NOTE: There were no "pig barns" near the rerouted portion of DO 27. There are and remain "pig barns" near the portion of DO 27 that was not rerouted. This added to the confusion of this bogus "reason" to reroute.

Q. **What was your conclusion after significant time spent determining if these properties are eligible for this project's consideration?**
A. There is no reason to avoid these properties. Recent floods have had a significant section of the new DO 28 route under water for several days which will present much more restrictions for maintenance and building of this line than any "USDA hog barn" land. This excuse was fabricated to justify a relocation at 46.

Q. **What is the "house near [redacted]" reason?**
A. ISSUE 2 from JND1 page 29 the second bullet point states in its entirety: "A residence is located at the intersection of N and 230th Road which effectively prevents the route from continuing north on the original alignment from the intersection of Highway N and 230th Road (this was one of the reasons for DO-27 making the turn to the west at this point). The owner of this residence expressed concern at the public meeting over the proximity of the line to their residence."

[redacted]

Q. **What is wrong with this testimony?**
A. After reading this in JND1 I asked the owner about having expressed concern at the public meeting...his version of his involvement at the open house was different than the depiction in ATXI testimony.

Q. **What did the owner of this property tell you?**
A. He supplied several possibilities of where he thought the line was going. He had no accurate knowledge of where the line proposals were in proximity to his house.

Q. **Did you learn anything else from your call with the owner of the house ATXI was rerouting because of his feedback at the open house?**
A. Yes. I will state his notable comment as close as I can.... Him talking; They told me if we (ATXI implied) put the line west of your house we may have to tear those buildings down over there to which he replied "well that would be a shame".

Q. **What was your take away after talking to the owner of that house?**
A. That he had attended the open house and spoke to some ATXI representative but had contributed nothing at the open house advocating for a reroute.

Q. **Is there anything recorded that documents ATXI engagement with the owner of this house at the open house?**
A. No. There is nothing in Data Requests 0009.0; 0025.0-0027.0 that suggests this landowner provided feedback insinuated by ATXI.

Q. **What is your conclusion on this reason to reroute?**
A. ATXI did not represent their engagement with the owner of this house accurately. This reason was created in order to create reasons to develop a route that doesn't encounter the resistance from [redacted]at 46 highway 8 miles to the north.

Q. **Don't you want [redacted]house (Local name for this house) to have at least 1000' clearance to the line as explained in JND1?**
A. ABSOLUTELY! And a simple micro-siting of DO 27 as I have proposed would accomplish that. Simply micro-siting here as I have proposed also gets the line from being over top of the [redacted] just south of this house on the east side of N. Those owners DO NOT want 345 KV directly over their facilities. (see EFIS DR 0032.0 Attach page 3)

[redacted]

Q. **Have you proposed this solution to Ameren?**
A. Yes. Most recently in a Data Request known to ATXI as [redacted]10 and a part of this testimony as Data Request 10 in the Data Requests attachment.

Q. **What has been the response of ATXI to this suggestion?**
A. ATXI dismisses it without comment.

Q. **What do you think is the only real reason to reroute 9+ miles of DO 27?**
A. To avoid going through [redacted]operty at 46 highway.

Q. **Is there evidence to support that conclusion?**
A. Yes. The line DID get rerouted and does avoid [redacted] property and again, this is a rural community and it isn't a secret as to how certain people feel about this project. Who could blame them for not wanting this 345KV line to go through.

Q. **Does this make the [redacted] unique?**
A. NO! Pretty clear that nobody wants the line in this area crossing 46 highway.

Q. **Do you have a problem with the [redacted] not wanting the line?**
A. No. However, I would have a problem if they were provided an opportunity to provide accurate information to ATXI and they failed to inform ATXI of [redacted] home if given an opportunity to present that information. If they saw a map being used by ATXI that did not include [redacted] and opted not to make [redacted]ouse known to ATXI I would have a problem with that. I would have a problem with [redacted] if they proposed the current DO 28 path because they did have knowledge of [redacted] home. If they were given a map specifically requesting them to mark the location of houses to avoid and they failed to include [redacted] home I would have a problem with that. If any of them knew the line had been moved to the current location and did not tell anyone in my family any time during the months of May, June, July, August, September and October and beyond, I would have a real problem with that. I think I would be the same as most people in this regard.

Q. **Why else do you think [redacted] were the reason for the reroute?**
A. By reading ATXI response to EFIS Data Request 0025.0 Confidential.

[redacted]

Q. **What did you notice from 025.0?**
A. The family that got the line moved were obviously organized and attended that Open House for one obvious and clear reason. To move the line away from their property. They provided no reason to do so that is unique to them. The [redacted] families received special treatment by [redacted] The line did get moved.

Q. **Does Data Request 0025.0 reveal that [redacted] families proposed the alternate path that affects you?**
A. No. There is nothing in Data Request 0025.0 that explains who provided this or any other alternate path.

Q. **How then can you determine who was responsible for providing the alternate path through your property?**
A. A better question is why isn't there mention of who proposed this new path in ATXI responses to DR 0025.0;DR 0009.0;DR 0027.0?
Again, the line did get moved at this location and the line did not get moved at any other location.

Q. **Scott Gross states (in part) i[redacted]) the following: "We took the data back from the Open House events and met May 1 to discuss areas of concern." That means a 9 mile stretch of line went from non-existent to an eligible route to submit for a CCN in 15 days. What do you think of that professionally?**
A. I think it is beyond unprofessional. Especially after discovering the rerouted portion follows NO studied and approved "segments" as documented in JND1 page 19 (of 54) figure 6.

Q. **Can you recap the reasons you think the reroute was done only to accommodate the [redacted]**
A. Yes. Bullet point 3 page 29 of JND1 states: "Proximity to newly constructed residences north of Highway 46 identified by landowners at the public meeting (see Figure 10 in the Appendices)."

The people on the north side of 46 at DO27 who wanted the line moved:

1. Definitely knew where the line was going prior to and during the open house on April 9, definitely organized and definitely participated in moving the line off (actually from near) their property.
    a. They knew the skinny line on the advertised map was the route at this location demonstrated by [redacted] comments seen at EFIS Data Request 25 lines 43-46.

b. They had just denied [redacted] efforts to acquire an easement option in 2023 for this exact location. [redacted] was using the same location to cross over 46 highway and [redacted]. ATXI knew of the obstacle presented by the [redacted] at this location crossing 46 highway with full knowledge that [redacted]. (The exception was [redacted])

2. [redacted] was invited to mark on a map any houses north of 46 [redacted] wanted avoided. (DR 0025.0 [redacted])
3. Scott Gross was [redacted] advocate as demonstrated by:
   a. Scott Gross spending the entirety of his time at the early open house meeting in Grant City with the exception of a few minutes with [redacted] at 11:53.
   b. Scott Gross' comment that they have to find a way to cut around these (2) houses and Scott Gross bringing James [redacted] into the discussion and James [redacted] stating that this area would be "re-reviewed. (DR 0025.0 lines 43-46)
   c. In the evening open house session Scott Gross met with [redacted] the resident of the 2nd house ([redacted]) referenced by James [redacted] in his testimony. (DR 025.0 lines 55-56)
   d. [redacted] checked back in with Scott Gross on 4/25/24 in an email to Scott Gross seen at line 149 of DR 025.0 which states: "Any updates on the location of the crossing of the transmission line over HWY 46 in Worth County? NOTE: There is no further correspondence between [redacted] and Scott Gross within DR 025.0
   e. On Nov. 15 at a virtual meeting with myself [redacted] and Scott Gross, I made repeated tries to get Scott to acknowledge a path crossing 46 at the DO 27 location then traveling straight south and rejoining DO 28. He finally reluctantly drew the line on his screen as I requested. This experience left me and [redacted] realizing Scott Gross was not willing to consider this "fix" and it provided even more evidence that this line was rerouted to accommodate [redacted].
   f. The only recorded input from landowners between April 1-May 15 that could be viewed as landowners providing information and requesting a route change was had between Scott Gross and [redacted] etal. See attached for Scott Gross [redacted] etal communications taken from DR 025.0 lines 22-24; 43-46; 149; 55-56

[redacted]

Q. **Why wasn't ATXI worried about placing the reroute at 46 closer to [redacted] residences (much closer than the [redacted] houses) even if they didn't know about [redacted] new house?**

A. They obviously didn't care about proximity to those residences because they did know they were there. They didn't plan on being found out. They succeeded in avoiding being found out until Oct 5. They knew they would hold no more meetings, they knew [redacted] and [redacted] and all of the neighbors affected assumed DO 27 was still going at the DO27 location. One comment that came from a person who attended the Open House in Grant City was "the only place they know for sure its going is right through here" (indicating the DO27 location north of 46) ATXI knew we were all totally in the dark and had confidence that the only locals who did know the line had been rerouted weren't going to reveal it.

Q. **What is your take away from how this really got rerouted?**

A. This Company is reckless and incompetent in the placing of a 9 mile reroute along a path that had no supported segments. ATXI relied on information from disgruntled people who have no valid reason to have the line moved. Furthermore, ATXI made NO effort to inform or ask or have any contact with the [redacted] before just going for it. Not to mention the entire routing team knew nothing about a new house that had been there since early 2023. The people who live on the north side of 46 most certainly knew about this new house and [redacted] ATXI was moving the route to this location it would be unsettling. [redacted] proposed this new route as is implied in JND1 page 28 (of 54) which states: "Based on information collected at the public information meetings, which included **several landowner-suggested reroutes,**....."that would be very inappropriate and ATXI should not be rerouting based on nothing more than people not wanting this line. Not wanting this line is not an exclusive point of view! NOTE: There is no direct mention of any landowner suggested reroutes in DR 025.0 which supposedly contains all interaction ATXI had with Open House attendees and phone calls and emails. But with such a major reroute at the eleventh hour and a claim that it was from feedback from an open house, logic says somebody provided some reroute ideas because it most certainly did get rerouted. I blame the Company for creating this mayhem in the community, not the locals. It began with a failure to get current addresses to notify people.

Q. **Why do you say ATXI was incompetent when they decided to switch to the reroute?**

A. Because it defies logic that a 9+ mile stretch of line can be determined the best route AND picked as the route to submit in 15 calendar days! (EFIS Data Request DR 36) On a path that had no qualifying segments! To not inspect the new area sufficient to notice a new house that had been there more than a year at the time is nothing less than incompetence. (See my testimony from the Albany LPH)

[redacted]

Q. **What do you know about ATXI's claims to have had maps available on Ameren.com during the crucial period of May 14 2024 through July 16 2025?**
A. Based on ATXI's responses to Staff Data Requests, after they finally admitted the truth, they admit they didn't have any maps displayed other than the same old skinny line/orange rectangle map.

5. LAND RECORDS FOR NOTIFICATIONS

Q. **Where did ATXI get the addresses for [redacted] County landowners in order to mail the July 5 notification letter?**
A. From some data set that included parcel identification numbers last seen on [redacted] County tax bills in 2021 and from some data set that showed landowners of parcels from several years ago and does not show landowners as of May 21-22, 2024.

Q. **Was a reasonable effort made by ATXI to get current (within 60 days) mailing addresses for the July 5 notification letters?**
A. No. There is zero evidence that ATXI gathered any records from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-May 22 2024 as they claim in the attached letters. The Worth County Assessor and the previous Worth County Assessor have provided testimony to OPC that there is no evidence or record of nor any memory of ATXI or its consultants gathering records from that office. There is no record in the Worth County Treasurers Office for any purchase of any records from ATXI or its Consultants on any date close to May 21-22 2024.

Q. **Do you have evidence to support your claim that ATXI did not query records from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-22 2024?**
A. Yes. I emailed the Worth County Assessor on 7/15/25. [redacted] confirmed a few examples that document ATXI could not have gotten the landowner addresses ATXI used for the July 5 notification letter from the Worth County Assessors' Office on May 21-22, 2024.

Question 1 posed to [redacted] On 5-14-24 it's recorded [redacted]. **What date did that transaction get entered into your system?**

Answer from [redacted] It was entered in the Assessor's office as [redacted] May 17, 2024.

In EFIS item #3 Appendix "D" ATXI has these parcels as owned by [redacted] which provides evidence that ATXI did not get the information for these parcels from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-22, 2024.

[redacted]

NOTE: Also, in support of this proof; EFIS Data Request 025.0 lines 206-213 documents a phone exchange initiated by [redacted] with agent Sherry [redacted] herry [redacted] onfirms that as of September 18, 2024, ATXI data shows a landowner pre-May 21-22, 2024. The Regulation governing CCN notices requires the most up to date records thus the reason for requiring an applicant to get records within 60 days of filing a CCN request.

Question 2 to [redacted] On July 24, 2023, [redacted] transferred 160 acres t[redacted] [redacted]. What is the new parcel number for the transferred 160 acres on the west side of the road? Old parcel number for this entire tract a few years back would have been [redacted]

Answer from [redacted] Parcel [redacted] was split into parcel 1.01 (40ac) to [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted] /24/23 and entered on 7/27/23.

In EFIS item #3 Appendix "D" ATXI has this old parcel number (as seen in EFIS Data Request 0024.0 attach) still owned by [redacted] his is another example that proves ATXI did not get the information about this parcel from the Worth County Assessors' Office on May 21-22 2024

Question 3 to [redacted] Confirm on what date the land that was transferred from [redacted] got entered into your system.

Answer from [redacted] This transfer was entered February 22 2023.

ATXI did not have any record of the [redacted]

This is yet more proof that ATXI did not query tax records from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-22 2024.

Q. **Why do you keep referring to May 21-22 2024?**

A. Because that is what ATXI repeatedly has claimed. ATXI's claims can be seen in EFIS Data Requests 0022.0 and 0022.1

The document seen in Data Request 0022.0 also claims ATXI got records from the Worth County Assessors Office in March of 2024. ATXI has since claimed a typo however it is unclear what the typo was. Data Request 0022.1 makes an attempt to reconcile multiple claims made by ATXI. ATXI's responses are unclear.

Q. **Is there more evidence that ATXI did not query tax records from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-22 2024.**

A. There is the [redacted] le which provides further documentation that ATXI could NOT have gotten an address from 2021 and old parcel numbers from the Worth County Assessors Office on May 21-22 2024. The OPC and PSC Staff have been provided evidence that further proves that ATXI did not query records for the [redacted] properties from the Worth County Assessor's Office on May 21-22, 2024. [redacted] has provided documentation that he never received notice as a direct result of ATXI using a very old mailing address.

[redacted]

Q. **Any other evidence on this matter?**
A. Yes. Anna[redacted] did an investigative pursuit involving the Assessor's Offices of Worth, Gentry, and Dekalb Counties and other sources. Her work can be seen at EFIS Item #69 titled "The Office of the Public Counsel's Response to ATXI and Staff.pdf"

6. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Q. **Do you have any other things you want the Commission to know?**
A. Yes. I have served 19 Data Requests on ATXI. Those Data Requests are an attachment to this testimony. ATXI has responded with nothing more than objections. Those responses are provided in an attachment to this testimony. ATXI has not answered any questions I have posed in my Data Requests.
Also,[redacted] building a new house near [redacted] new house [redacted] on the portion of this farm I learned to drive a tractor and played in the river on as a kid[redacted] is finally building where my family has talked about some member of our family building for generations. My days are spent working with[redacted] while my nights are spent defending our properties from this 11th hour reroute. I respectfully ask for some protective consideration to this new build and consideration for [redacted] with [redacted] who doesn't want the radiation from this line any more than the people who got it moved[redacted] [redacted] of the strong opinion that 1000' is a minimum comfortable distance from a 345KV line-certainly from a new home in a country setting. In the event that the Commission were to approve this CCN, I would respectfully ask the Commission to consider mandating that ATXI include a neutral third-party intervention between me,[redacted] and[redacted] because we have no confidence that ATXI will be reasonable with my family after I have provided so much damning evidence that ATXI has made unsubstantiated claims regarding the gathering of Assessor records. One suggestion I would respectfully offer is to allow the County Commissioners to have some governance over ATXI for the final placement of this line, be it DO-27 or DO-28.

Because of developments since the December LPH it is my opinion that this CCN request should be denied in lieu of my earlier conclusion of returning to the DO-27. Properly notifying people from a current data set of current landowners and allowing those landowners opportunity to provide input prior to achieving docket status is essential to the community at large. An equal chance at the starting line would be appreciated by this impacted landowner intervener. Playing catchup is proving to be quite challenging.

[redacted]

UPDATE AT 7 pm July 17 2024

These late developments are too late for me to properly evaluate and include in this testimony.

1. **I received a document today by email from the OPC as a response to a data request I served on the OPC. This document was received after a hearing and after an NDA was required in order to view the document the OPC provided. This document will be a part of this testimony only after gaining permission from ATXI to use it as such. Because it may take some time to gain permission from ATXI, I will find out the proper way to add it to this testimony.**
2. **Tonight I have received some responses to some of my Data Requests served on ATXI that are most relevant to portions of this testimony, particularly from where ATXI gathered parcel information for notifications of ATXI's intent to file for this CCN. I will need time to evaluate those responses but I am including them in this testimony by reference here. These responses arrived by email from [redacted] at 6:07pm and 6:10pm. The Data Requests I have served on ATXI are included in the attachments to this testimony.**

This page intentionally left blank.