

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

City of Fulton, Hannibal Board of )  
Public Works, Kirkwood Electric, )  
City of Marceline and City of )  
New Madrid, Complainants, )  
)  
v. ) Case No. EC-2026-0156  
)  
Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren )  
Missouri, )  
)  
Respondent. )

**MARCELINE’S OBJECTIONS TO AMEREN MISSOURI’S  
FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS**

The City of Marceline (“Marceline”) received Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri’s (“Ameren”) Data Requests Numbered 1 – 13 in the above referenced case on Thursday, March 19, 2026. Per 20 CSR 4240-2.090(2), Marceline sets forth below each of the said Data Requests (“DRs”) along with Marceline’s objections:

- DR 1 Does Marceline own an interest in any generation units (whether as a sole owner or a partial owner)?
- a. If so, please,
    - i. For each unit, state when Marceline built the unit/acquired the ownership interest, as applicable,
    - ii. State the extent of Marceline’s ownership interest (e.g., 100%, 50%, etc.), by year, for each of 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025, by unit;
    - iii. Describe the generation type of each unit (e.g., coal, gas (simple-cycle, combined cycle), oil (simple-cycle), wind, solar),
    - iv. State each unit’s nameplate capacity,
    - v. State the year each unit was placed in service,
    - vi. State the county and state where each unit is located,
    - vii. State the megawatts of each unit’s MISO Accredited Capacity or Seasonal Accredited Capacity (if applicable), for each of Planning Years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024, that was available to Marceline to provide ZRCs to meet Marceline’s PRMR in each such Planning Year.

- viii. State the ZRCs from each unit that Marceline used toward meeting Marceline's PRMR, by Season (if applicable), for each of Planning Years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024,
- ix. State whether each unit was available to provide Seasonal Accredited Capacity to meet the MISO Resource Adequacy Requirement for the Fall MISO Season of 2024, Marceline's share (in megawatts) of such Seasonal Accredited Capacity by unit in that Season, and the quantity of ZRCs from each such unit Marceline used to meet its PRMR for such Season, and
- x. State whether each unit was available to provide Accredited Capacity to meet MISO Resource Adequacy Requirements for the Spring MISO Season of 2025, Marceline's share of such Accredited Capacity by unit in that Season, and the quantity of ZRCs Marceline used to meet its PRMR for such Season.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 1 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period and the unit(s) relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks information not within Marceline's possession or control; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

- DR 2 Does Marceline have contractual rights to (as a non-owner) any generation capacity?
- a. If so, please,
    - i. For each unit, state the year the contractual rights were obtained by Marceline,
    - ii. Describe the generation type of each unit (e.g., coal, gas (simple-cycle, combined cycle), oil (simple-cycle), wind, solar),
    - iii. State each unit's nameplate capacity,
    - iv. State the year each unit was placed in service,
    - v. State the county and state where each unit is located,
    - vi. State the megawatts of each unit's MISO Accredited Capacity or Seasonal Accredited Capacity (if applicable), for each of Planning Years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024, that was available to Marceline to provide ZRCs to meet Marceline's PRMR in each such Planning Year.
    - vii. State the ZRCs from each unit that Marceline used toward meeting Marceline's PRMR, by Season (if applicable), for each of Planning Years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024,
    - viii. State whether each unit was available to provide Seasonal Accredited Capacity to meet the MISO Resource Adequacy Requirement for the Fall MISO Season of 2024, Marceline's share (in megawatts) of such Seasonal Accredited Capacity by unit in that Season, and the quantity of ZRCs from each such unit Marceline used to meet its PRMR for such Season, and
    - ix. State whether each unit was available to provide Accredited Capacity to meet MISO Resource Adequacy Requirements for the Spring MISO Season of 2025, Marceline's share of such Accredited Capacity by unit in that Season, and the quantity of ZRCs Marceline used to meet its PRMR for such Season.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 2 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence;

this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period and the unit(s) relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks information not within Marceline's possession or control; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 3 For each of MISO Planning Years 2020-2021, 2021-2022, 2022 – 2023, 2023-2024, and 2024-2025, please state Marceline's PRMR (and, for Planning Years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025, state Marceline's PRMR by Season).

OBJECTION:. Marceline objects to DR No. 3 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and

which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 4 Reference Exhibit A attached hereto and provided by MISO with respect to Historical Unit Considerations ("HUCs"). Does Marceline agree that MISO's Business Practices Manual ("BPM") 011 outlines how an LSE may use HUCs as a financial hedge against price separation between MISO LRZs where an LSE owns or has certain contractual rights to generation capacity in a LRZ other than the LRZ for which the LSE must satisfy its PRMR? If Marceline's answer to the foregoing question is anything other than an unequivocal "yes," please provide a detailed explanation of why Marceline does not unequivocally agree.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 4 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in scope to the extent that it is a hypothetical inquiry and thus not relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information. Further, Marceline objects to the extent that DR No. 4 seeks data,

information, and/or materials that are protected by attorney-client privilege and/or other applicable privilege or doctrine, as well as to the extent that this DR impermissibly seeks a pure legal conclusion.

- DR 5 For each of MISO Planning Years 2023-2024 and 2024-2025, by Season, how many HUCs was Marceline eligible for, and how many HUCs did Marceline register with MISO? If Marceline was eligible for HUCs but did not register all of them in a given Season in either such Planning Year, please indicate how many of such HUCs Marceline did not register, identify the applicable Season when the HUCS were not registered, and provide a detailed explanation of why Marceline did not do so.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 5 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 6 For MISO Planning Year 2025-2026, by Season, how many HUCs was Marceline eligible for, and how many HUCs did Marceline register with MISO? If Marceline was eligible for HUCs but did not register all of them in a given Season in such Planning Year, please indicate how many of such HUCs Marceline did not register, identify the applicable Season when the HUCS were not registered, and provide a detailed explanation of why Marceline did not do so.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 6 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 7 In Response to MPSC Staff DR No. 9 Marceline described how it "actively works to minimize exposure to volatility in the MISO capacity markets" and takes actions "intended to prudently manage risk and protect Marceline's electric customers from unnecessary cost impacts associated with capacity and market volatility."

- a. Identify the "outside consultant" Marceline works with?
- b. When did Marceline begin working with this consultant?

- c. Please provide a copy of all documentation reflecting or evidencing any policy, practice, or procedure relating to “minimize[ing] exposure to volatility in the MISO capacity markets” or “protect[ing] Marceline’s electric customers from unnecessary cost impacts associated with capacity market volatility.”
- d. Has Marceline changed its approach to, or its actions with respect to, minimize[ing] exposure to volatility in the MISO capacity markets” [sic] or “protect[ing] Marceline’s electric customers from unnecessary cost impacts associated with capacity market volatility” since the Fall 2024 or Spring 2025 MISO PRAs cleared? If so, please provide a detailed explanation of the ways Marceline has done so, when such change(s) was made, why the change(s) was made, and provide a copy of all documents that evidence, reflect, or explain the change(s).
- e. Please provide a copy of all documents prepared by Marceline or on its behalf from 2021 through June 1, 2024, that discuss, identify, or address risks associated with the MISO capacity market that Marceline or those acting on its behalf perceived might exist if the Rush Island Plant were to retire.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 7 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren’s response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be “bad faith” for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information. Further, Marceline objects to the extent that DR No. 7 seeks

data, information, and/or materials that are protected by attorney-client privilege and/or other applicable privilege or doctrine, as well as to the extent that this DR impermissibly seeks a pure legal conclusion.

DR 8 Referencing Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, please provide a true and correct copy of the Market Participant Application by which Marceline sought to become a Market Participant in one or more of MISO's markets.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 8 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline also objects that this DR is vague and ambiguous and provides no reasoned basis from which Marceline can determine what information is sought because Paragraph 6 of the Verified Complaint does not address Marceline. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period and the MISO Planning Reserve Auction relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 9 Referencing Paragraph 6 of the Complaint, please provide a true and correct copy of the Market Participant Agreement to which Marceline is a party.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 9 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline also objects that this DR is vague and ambiguous and provides no reasoned basis from which Marceline can determine what information is sought because Paragraph 6 of the Verified Complaint does not address Marceline. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in time and scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the time period and the MISO Planning Reserve Auction relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 10 Was Marceline a LSE during the Fall Season of 2024 and the Spring Season of 2025? If Marceline was not a Load Serving Entity during such Seasons, please state whether another entity or agency acted as the LSE on Marceline's behalf, please identify such

entity or agency, and please provide a detailed explanation of how such entity or agency acted on Marceline's behalf.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 10 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks information not within Marceline's possession or control; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 11 When did Marceline first become a Load Serving Entity? If some other entity or agency acts or acted as the Load Serving Entity on Marceline's behalf, please identify the entity(ies) or agency(ies) and when they acted on Marceline's behalf.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 11 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has

failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in scope to the extent that it seeks information outside of the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks information not within Marceline's possession or control; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information.

DR 12 Does Marceline agree that the MISO FERC Electric Tariff together with Module E to said Tariff and MISO BPM 011, collectively, reflect and outline the Resource Adequacy Requirement applicable to LSEs? If Marceline's answer to the foregoing question is anything other than an unequivocal "yes," please provide a detailed explanation of why Marceline does not unequivocally agree.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 12 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g) would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that

this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in scope to the extent that it is a hypothetical inquiry and thus not relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information. Further, Marceline objects to the extent that DR No. 12 seeks data, information, and/or materials that are protected by attorney-client privilege and/or other applicable privilege or doctrine, as well as to the extent that this DR impermissibly seeks a pure legal conclusion.

DR 13 Does Marceline agree that under the MISO FERC Electric Tariff, the MISO Load Clearing Requirement for MISO LRZ 5 applies to the zone collectively and that no individual LSE in the zone is required to have any minimum quantity of owned or contracted for generation capacity that is physically located in the zone? If Marceline's answer to the foregoing question is anything other than an unequivocal "yes," please provide a detailed explanation of why Marceline does not unequivocally agree or otherwise contends that each LSE, including Marceline, is required to have a minimum quantity of owned or contracted for generation physically located in the zone, and include any supporting citations or materials that would support such an explanation.

OBJECTION: Marceline objects to DR No. 13 because it violates 20 CSR 4240-2.117(D), Missouri Rule of Civil Procedure 74.04, and the law of *Acoma Dev., LLC v. Com. Tower Place*, 725 S.W.3d 610, 616-618 (Mo. App. W.D. 2025) in that Ameren has failed to provide its affidavit showing good cause that this DR is necessary to permit Ameren's response to the pending *Motion for Determination on the Pleadings or, in the Alternative, Summary Determination*. Consequently, this DR appears to be presented solely for the purpose of delay, which would be "bad faith" for which Rule 74.04(g)

would provide Marceline with appropriate remedy. Marceline additionally objects that this DR seeks information that is not relevant to the subject matter of the pending *Motion* or this case and which is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence; this DR is overbroad in scope to the extent that it is a hypothetical inquiry and thus not relevant to the issues raised in the pending *Motion* or this case; this DR seeks an analysis, calculation or compilation which has not already been performed and which Marceline objects to performing; and this DR seeks confidential, proprietary or trade secret information. Further, Marceline objects to the extent that DR No. 13 seeks data, information, and/or materials that are protected by attorney-client privilege and/or other applicable privilege or doctrine, as well as to the extent that this DR impermissibly seeks a pure legal conclusion.

Marceline reserves all rights to amend or supplement these objections as may be necessary, and hereby expressly preserves, without waiver, all applicable objections and/or related rights.

Respectfully submitted,

HEALY LAW OFFICES, LLC

By: /s/ Peggy A. Whipple  
Peggy A. Whipple, #54758  
3010 E. Battlefield, Suite A  
Springfield, MO 65804  
peggy@healylawoffices.com  
Telephone: (417) 864-7018

DENTONS US, LLP  
Jacqueline M. Whipple  
Chandler Hiatt  
4520 Main St., Ste 1100  
Kansas City, MO 64111-7700  
jacqueline.whipple@dentons.com  
Telephone: (816) 460-2432  
chandler.hiatt@dentons.com  
Telephone: (816) 460-2488

*Attorneys for the City of Fulton, Hannibal  
Board of Public Works, Kirkwood Electric,  
the City of Marceline and the City of New  
Madrid*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing “Marceline’s Objections to Ameren Missouri’s First Set of Data Requests” have been served on all parties on the official service list for this matter via email on this 27<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

/s/ Peggy A. Whipple  
Peggy A. Whipple