

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

In the Matter of the Application of Ameren)
Transmission Company of Illinois for a)
Certificate of Convenience and Necessity)
Under Section 393.170.1, RSMo relating to)
Transmission Investments in Northwest)
And Northeast Missouri

Case No. EA-2024-0302

MOTION TO OVERRULE ATXI'S OBJECTIONS TO HARDING LATE FILED ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS

COMES NOW, Mark Harding respectfully requesting Your Honor to consider my reasoning before ruling on ATXI's objections to Harding Late Filed Additional Exhibits.

The "exhibits" in question were intended to be a part of my Post Hearing Brief to support claims I made in my brief. It was my understanding that the Post Hearing Brief was to allow parties to cover things discussed at the hearing, include things that may have been overlooked at the hearing and generally reiterate aspects of the case I want the Commission to consider. To that end I included attachments to my Post Hearing Brief. If it please the Court I would like to plead my case for the following exhibits. I believe Your Honor may consider it reasonable to overrule ATXI's objections on and allow to be admitted into the record in this case as Exhibits.

The Following Exhibits in question are seen at EFIS item #294

"Ameren Interactive Map Screenshot 10-7-2025.png" and "Ameren Interactive Map Screenshot 10-10-2025.png".

Because I had an exchange during the October 27th hearing with Staff witness Claire Eubanks about a Harding modification 5 that had been displayed on Ameren.com from some date prior to October 7th 2025 and October 16th 2025 I wanted to provide evidence to support my claim as Ms. Eubanks had no knowledge of such a route being displayed on the public interactive map. I prefer to provide evidence rather than make unsubstantiated claims so I attached a couple of screenshots showing the date and route on my property as displayed on the interactive map on Ameren.com. on the dates I claimed.

"Exhibit 820 Data Request Harding 13 Attachment.JPEG" and "Exhibit 820 Harding Data Request 13.pdf"

These are Exhibits already in the Record and can be seen at EFIS item #278. The reason I wanted these 2 attached to my Post Hearing Brief is because the ones on EFIS #278 do not depict what I handed out at the hearing. EFIS #278 "Exhibit 820C-Data Request Harding 13-Confidential.pdf" and "Exhibit 820B-Data Request Harding 13.pdf" are not recognizable. The maps, which are the most important part of the Exhibit are so distorted that no person could make out where my

property is in relation to the advertised study area map. I want the Commission to have access to the Exhibit as I handed out at the hearing and was received into the record. I want an accurate clear image to be available for viewing. That was my reasoning for these two.

The next one I will respectfully defend is "open house April 9 invite insides.jpg"

This was just another photo of the actual open house containing the map that allowed me to see where my property was in relation to the colored study area. I want it included in the record to support claims I have made in testimony. Again, I am seeking an accurate depiction of the map that was advertised on the open house invitation, not what is being displayed on EFIS at item # 270. The 2 Exhibits (800 and 800B) are of this map and clearly show the roads. The roads are the most important element of the photo as with any map. My exhibits 800 and 800B can be viewed on EFIS at item #270. My exhibits as depicted at EFIS #270 do not depict what I handed out at the October 27 hearing. Somebody (not me) altered those exhibits before being put on EFIS making the roads invisible. I want my exhibit to be as I offered it, not altered to make the roads disappear. It is the roads in relation to the colored portion of this map that is my case. To not show the map as it was advertised which clearly shows 46 highway makes my claims that I was able to identify where the line is in relation to my property a ridiculous claim. When an honest map is shown it becomes obvious that myself and others clearly knew the location of the proposed line at the time of the open house. I would also ask for this to be corrected by using the same map on EFIS #271 that I entered myself trying to prevent the worthless ones at 270 from being used. Or at least to offer a comparison.

The following Exhibits are seen at EFIS 298 and 299

These photos are intended to emphasize the fact that I am advocating for and sponsoring and supporting for Commission consideration Harding Modification 4, **NOT Harding Modification 1**. ATXI assigned modification 1 with that label. I did not nor do I currently support Harding Modification 1. It is my opinion that mod 1 is only being kept alive because ATXI prefers to compare it to DO-28 versus comparing Harding Modification 4 to DO-28 which is one option I am advocating for. (I did use a photo depicting what ATXI started calling Harding modification 1 but only as a general example of how one could both avoid the USDA hog barn property and provide 1200' of clearance to all residences at 46 highway) That is all that photo was intended for. ATXI is determined to assign that "modification" to me. Then they explain why it is inferior to DO-28 because of proximity to Pike Road. I welcome a comparison between Harding modification 4 and DO-28 but I do not sponsor or support "Harding modification 1" in any way. It is ATXI's route used only to make their route DO-28 look good. With that background, I wanted to draw attention to the Harding Modification 4 (four) I am supporting and advocating for. I wanted to add emphasis to my statements in my Post Hearing Brief about this particular route and attempt to silence ATXI's insistence to assign Harding Mod 1 to me. I just want the Commission to consider the best route (Harding modification 4), not a known inferior one. I respectfully ask Your Honor to consider this exhibit is to support my Post Hearing Brief position and provide clarity because the two routes are so similar and because ATXI is seemingly trying to confuse by using a route they can find fault with. I should get to say which Modification I am advocating, not ATXI. These maps combined with my comments in my brief make the truth

more clear and provide an accurate “proximity to roads” comparison between DO-28 and Harding Modification 4 for the Commissions’ consideration.

If it please the Court, I am respectfully asking for consideration of the purpose and intent of my filings as well as the letter of the law which appears to be ATXI’s basis for rejections. I am asking Your Honor to overrule ATXI’s objections and allow the above entries into the record so the Commission will have access to any and all information for their consideration. I also propose there is nothing in my filings that would be harmful to anyone with good intentions.

Additionally, if it please the Court, I am asking for the images currently on EFIS at item #270 and #278 discussed above which are so distorted they serve no purpose and actually hurt my case, to be replaced with photos of the actual exhibits I handed out at the October 27th hearing which I will be happy to provide.

Respectfully,
/s/ Mark Harding
30525 178th Rd
Denver, MO 64441
660-582-9780
253382@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the forgoing have been mailed, emailed or hand-delivered to all counsel of record this 18th day of November, 2025.