BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

	`
IN THE MATTER OF SOUTHWESTERN))
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S) `
APPLICATION FOR: (1) ISSUANCE OF A) `
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE) `
AND NECESSITY AUTHORIZING	,
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF	,
TWO 230 KV TRANSMISSION LINES AND	,
ASSOCIATED SUBSTATION FACILITIES IN) CASE NO. 12UT
CURRY AND ROOSEVELT COUNTIES, NEW) CASE NO. 12UI
MEXICO; (2) APPROVAL OF THE) `
LOCATION OF THE 230 KV TRANSMISSION) `
LINES AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES;) `
AND (3) AUTHORIZING ACCRUAL OF AN) `
ALLOWANCE FOR FUNDS USED DURING) `
CONSTRUCTION FOR THE TRANSMISSION) `
LINES AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES,) `
) `
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE) `
COMPANY,) `
))
APPLICANT.))
	,

DIRECT TESTIMONY

of

HOWARD C. HIGGINS

on behalf of

SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

February 7, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLO	DSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINED TERMS	iii
LIST	Γ OF ATTACHMENTS	iv
	WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATIONS	
	ASSIGNMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
III.	ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	6
	PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION	
V.	CONCLUSION	15
VER	RIFICATION	16

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND DEFINED TERMS

Acronym/Defined Term

Meaning

CCN Certificate of Public Convenience and

Necessity

Commission New Mexico Public Regulation

Commission

Environmental Assessment Environmental Assessment for the

Proposed Project

FAA Federal Aviation Administration

kV Kilovolt

Proposed Project 230/115 kV Pleasant Hill Substation and

two 230 kV transmission lines and

associated substation facilities in Curry and

Roosevelt Counties, New Mexico

PUCT Public Utility Commission of Texas

SPS Southwestern Public Service Company

TRC Environmental Corporation

Xcel Energy Inc.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment

Description

HCH-1

Environmental Assessment: SPS Roosevelt County Substation to Pleasant Hill Substation; and Pleasant Hill Substation to Oasis Connection Point, 230 kV Transmission Lines in Curry and Roosevelt Counties, New Mexico

1 WITNESS IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATIONS 2 Q. Please state your name and business address. 3 My name is Howard C. Higgins, and my business address is 4221-A Balloon Park A. 4 Road NE, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 5 Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding? 6 I am filing testimony on behalf of Southwestern Public Service Company A. 7 ("SPS"), a wholly owned subsidiary of Xcel Energy Inc. ("Xcel Energy"). Xcel 8 Energy is a registered holding company and owns several electric and natural gas utility operating companies.¹ 9 By whom are you employed and in what position? 10 Q. 11 I am employed by TRC Environmental Corporation ("TRC") as a Vice President A. 12 and Principal Consultant.

¹ Xcel Energy is the parent company of the following four wholly owned utility operating companies: Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation; Northern States Power Company, a Wisconsin corporation; Public Service Company of Colorado, a Colorado corporation; and SPS, a New Mexico corporation.

1	Q.	Please briefly outline your responsibilities as Vice President and Principal
2		Consultant.
3	A.	As Vice President and Principal Consultant for TRC, my responsibilities include
4		overseeing all work performed by a team of professionals in the completion of the
5		Environmental Analysis for the SPS Roosevelt County Substation to Pleasant Hil
6		Substation and Pleasant Hill Substation to Oasis Connection Point, 230kV
7		Transmission Lines in Curry and Roosevelt Counties, New Mexico
8		("Environmental Assessment") prepared by TRC at the request of SPS. This
9		includes the selection of the team of TRC professionals assigned to the project,
10		field review of proposed routes, oversight of data collection activities, and
11		assistance with the compilation and review of the Environmental Assessment.
12	Q.	Please describe your educational background.
13	A.	In 1972, I received my AB degree in Comparative Religion from Princeton
14		University. In 1975, I received my MA degree in Anthropology from the
15		University of New Mexico. I received my Ph.D. in Anthropology from the
16		University of New Mexico in 1982.

1 Q. Please describe your professional experience.

A.

Since 1974, I have conducted environmental technical studies, assisted with environmental permitting, and conducted environmental projects for the United States and Canadian governments, federal and state agencies, municipalities, private companies, and utilities. Projects have included transmission lines, substation and generation facilities, mines, pipelines, fiber optic lines, housing developments, and a variety of other types of undertakings. I have been involved in transmission line routing studies since 1995, and I have managed or provided oversight on over 30 projects. The transmission line projects I have managed ranged in size from 69 kilovolts ("kV") to 345 kV, and have ranged in length from one mile to 180 miles.

12 Q. Have you testified before any regulatory authorities?

A. Yes, I have previously testified before the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ("Commission") and the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("PUCT"), where I have presented environmental assessments, biological evaluations, and cultural resource surveys for transmission line projects that were filed by SPS at the Commission and the PUCT.

II. ASSIGNMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2 Q. What is your assignment in this proceeding?

A.

A. I will discuss the environmental, biological, and cultural resource impacts related to SPS's request for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CCN"), as well as location approval of the two proposed 230 kV transmission lines and associated substation facilities in Curry and Roosevelt Counties ("Proposed Project").

8 Q. Please summarize your testimony.

The Environmental Assessment completed for this project indicates that the impacts associated with the construction of such a line and associated features within either the proposed or alternative routes studies are within the acceptable range for facilities of this type, will have minimal environmental impact, and will not impair environmental values. Construction will have short term low level impacts to air due to the emissions from and particulates associated with vehicles. There will be a minor amount of cropland in the footprints of the structures removed from production. During construction there will be a short term localized limitation on aircraft operations. There will be the addition to the view shed of a new visual element due to the transmission line itself. The project might

possibly affect previously unknown cultural resources in the study area. However, any such effect would be mitigated by 100% pedestrian survey of the approved rights-of-way by trained archaeologists prior to construction, and "avoidance by design" of any cultural resources found (that is through design of the pole placement so as to avoid any such resources). The effect upon sensitive biological species and mineral resources, are expected to be minimal. As with the cultural resources, a biological survey will be conducted prior to construction, and any small biological locations of sensitive species found will be "avoided by design". No effects are expected on paleontology, climate, or wetlands. The proposed and alternative rights-of-way and tower heights meet both FAA and Cannon Air Force Base requirements.

Finally, a positive effect on socioeconomics for the local community is expected as a result of the project.

1		III. <u>ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES</u>
2	Q.	Have you prepared an Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Project?
3	A.	Yes. The assessment is included as Attachment HCH-1.
4 5	Q.	Please identify and briefly discuss matters evaluated in the Environmental
6		Assessment.
7	A.	For the Environmental Assessment we reviewed and evaluated the effects of the
8		project on the human environment. Specific areas examined included Climate
9		and Air Quality; Land Use and Recreation; Visual Resources; Cultural Resources;
10		Biological, Earth, and Water Resources (including Paleontology); and
11		Socioeconomics. For each of these areas we considered the nature of the current
12		environment which would be affected, focusing upon existing conditions, and the
13		environmental consequences (impacts) the Proposed Project would have.
14	Q.	Please discuss the findings of the Environmental Assessment.
15	A.	The studies associated with the Environmental Assessment indicated that the
16		impacts associated with the proposed and alternative routes studied are within the
17		acceptable range for facilities of this type, and will not impair environmental
18		values.

1 Q. Based on the environmental and cultural resources studies conducted in the 2 assessment, have you formed a professional opinion regarding the effect of 3 the project on the human environment? 4 Yes. The project would have short-term, low level impacts on air due to tailpipe A. 5 emissions from construction and maintenance vehicles, and particulate emissions 6 due to fugitive dust, during construction and line maintenance. There could be 7 moderate effects on land use due to permanent removal from production of a minor amount of cropland in the footprint of the structures, compaction of soil 8 9 and short term limitation on aircraft operations during construction. The visual 10 character of the area will be altered by the addition of the additional transmission 11 lines in the viewscape. The project possibly could affect previously unknown 12 cultural resources in the study area. The effect upon sensitive biological species 13 and mineral resources, are expected to be minimal. No effects are expected on 14 paleontology, climate, or wetlands. A positive effect on socioeconomics is

expected as a result of the project.

15

1	Q.	Do you have an opinion regarding the need for further environmental studies
2		and/or future mitigation measures following approval of right-of-way?
3	A.	Yes. Based upon the studies conducted and the results of consultation with the
4		agencies, once a right-of-way has been granted and survey permission on the
5 .		private land is obtained, we recommend a 100% pedestrian survey of the
6		right-of-way by professional archaeologists, biologists and wetland experts prior
7		to construction. These surveys will enable design of the project so effects of the
8		pole and access road placements on previously unknown sensitive archaeological
9		sites, habitat for sensitive species, and wetlands are mitigated.
10	Q.	Did you conduct a biological evaluation and cultural resource survey for the
11		Proposed Project?
12	A.	Yes, we did. Site file searches and a drive through of the project area were
13		conducted by both a qualified archaeologist and a trained biologist, and both
14		biological and cultural resource consultation and evaluations were completed.
15		The site file search and inspection of the proposed rights-of-way were
16		conducted to identify any known locations of threatened and endangered species
17		or archeological resources which could be affected by the construction, operation,

1		and/or maintenance of the proposed project, and determine if any mitigation
2		measures would be necessary.
3	Q.	Please summarize the findings in the biological evaluation.
4	A.	TRC concludes that the proposed and alternatives routes appear to avoid the
5		biological resources. Small scale manifestations can be avoided by careful design
6		and pole placement. With such design and placement, the project would not have
7		any adverse affect on wildlife or vegetation.
8	Q.	What is your recommendations regarding the biological aspect of the
9		project?
10	A.	As stated earlier, we recommend that once there is an approved right-of-way and
11		survey permission for the private land is obtained, the proposed right-of-way be
12		100% pedestrian surveyed by a trained biologist, focusing especially upon
13		burrowing owl burrows, black tailed prairie dog colonies (if any), the potential
14		habitat for other sensitive species, and wetlands. Following this survey the pole
15		and access road placement can be designed to avoid any such sensitive habitat or
16		wetlands.

1 Q. Please summarize the findings in the cultural resource study.

A.

A. The site file search and drive through inspection by a trained archaeologist indicated that the routes themselves appear to be acceptable from the standpoint of avoiding cultural resources. There have been 27 prior cultural resource surveys in the area. These have located three historic buildings, and 16 previously recorded archaeological sites within one mile of the center line of the transmission line alternatives. Of these, the proposed power line will be within the view shed of the three historic buildings (all of which are in the community of Ranchevale); and the 16 previously recorded archaeological sites might be effected by the proposed lines depending upon which alternatives are selected, where the poles will be placed, and where the access road will be located.

Q. What is your conclusion regarding the need for further cultural resource studies and/or further mitigation measures?

Once a right-of-way has been approved and survey permission is obtained for the private land, a 100% pedestrian archaeological survey will be done by trained archaeologists before any ground disturbance associated with the project. Based upon that survey, the locations of all cultural resources that could be affected will be known (whether previously recorded or not). This information will guide the

- locations of the poles and the access road to avoid or mitigate the effects on these
- 2 resources.

IV. PUBLIC AND AGENCY PARTICIPATION

A.

Q. Please describe the agency and public involvement process conducted in
 association with the studies.

Efforts were made to include the public and local agencies in the study process. Local agency personnel were contacted in conjunction with inventory efforts associated with the project, and a public open house meeting was held by SPS in Clovis at the Clovis-Carver Public Library on April 26, 2011, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. A newsletter describing the project was also sent to landowners with property within 300 feet of the approximated centerline of the alternatives, as well as to federal and state agencies, local government, and other key stakeholders in the area. This newsletter invited individuals to attend and provide comments on the proposed project at the open house and provided a website address (www.powerfortheplains.com) for access to project information available on Xcel Energy's *Power for the Plains* website. A copy of this newsletter is provided in the Environmental Assessment report.

Meeting attendees were provided comment forms and allowed to browse informational boards and maps of the proposed project. Representatives from SPS were available to answer questions. Detailed aerial photographs illustrating

the location of alternatives were available for the landowners to review and to identify their properties. Comment forms provided the opportunity for attendees to identify themselves and provide information regarding key potential factors to be considered in the environmental studies. These forms were completed onsite and submitted at the open house or sent to SPS by mail.

Representatives from Cannon Air Force Base and Clovis Municipal Airport were also consulted during the planning process. It was determined that the proposed alternatives fall outside the Runway Protection Zones and the towers will meet Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") height requirements for their locations. A final evaluation by Cannon Air Force Base will occur after SPS files the proposed pole locations with the FAA. While no conflicts are anticipated, H-frame structures, in lieu of single poles, could be used as mitigation should it be determined that shorter structures are needed to meet FAA maximum height requirements. In addition, representatives from AeroTech, a small private air facility in the study corridor, were contacted; they concluded that the final alternatives being considered for the transmission line in this area would be compatible with their flight operations.

1 Q. What were the principal concerns expressed by the public?

- 2 A. The majority of the concerns expressed in the public comments centered on 3 avoidance of residences, followed by effects to agricultural operations. 4 Additional concerns were expressed with regards to aesthetics, potential conflicts 5 with airstrips, damage to property values, stray voltage and effects to phone 6 service, potential conflicts with pipelines and fiber optics, and rehabilitation. 7 These concerns were considered in the evaluation process by SPS, including the 8 ability of SPS to mitigate impacts associated with these concerns and the 9 constraints associated with the study corridor.
- 10 Q. Did you consult with federal and New Mexico state agencies regarding this 11 project?
- 12 A. Yes, the responses were favorable, but the agencies requested that biological and
 13 archaeological surveys be done prior to ground disturbance. As discussed earlier,
 14 I have recommended that these surveys be done and SPS agrees that biological
 15 and archaeological surveys will be done before ground disturbance. Copies of the
 16 replies from the agencies are appended to the Environmental Assessment.

1		V. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
2	Q.	Was Attachment HCH-1 prepared by you or under your direct supervision
3		and control?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	Does this conclude your pre-filed direct testimony?
6	٨	Ves it does

VERIFICATION

STATE OF NEW MEXICO)
) ss
COUNTY OF BERNALILLO)

Howard C. Higgins, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and states that he is the witness identified in the foregoing prepared testimony, that he has read the testimony and is familiar with its contents, and that the facts set forth are true to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief.

Howard C. Higgins

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me this **30**day of January, 2012.

Notary Public, State of New Mexico

My Commission Expires: 2-22-2012

OFFICIAL SEAL
Mirinda R. Gerber
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
My Commission Expires: 2-22-300