# APPLICATION TO AMEND A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR A PROPOSED 115-KV TRANSMISSION LINE WITHIN HALE COUNTY, TEXAS

## **DOCKET NO. 40216**

Submit seven (7) copies of the application and all attachments supporting the application. If the application is being filed pursuant to P.U.C. SUBST. R. 25.101(b)(3)(D) or P.U.C. Subst. R. 25.174, include in the application all direct testimony. The application and other necessary documents shall be submitted to:

Public Utility Commission of Texas Attn: Filing Clerk 1701 N. Congress Ave. Austin, Texas 78711-3326

1. Applicant (Utility) Name: For joint applications, provide all information for each applicant.

Applicant Name:	Southwestern Public Service Company	
Certificate Number:	30153	
Street Address:	600 South Tyler Street	
Mailing Address:	Amarillo, TX 79105-1261	

3.

 Please identify all entities that will hold an ownership interest or an investment interest in the proposed project but which are not subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. Not applicable.

Person to Contact:	James M. Bagley
Title/Position:	Manager Regulatory Administration
Phone Number:	806-378-2868
Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 1261
	Amarillo, TX 79105-1261
Email Address:	James.Bagley@xcelenergy.com
Alternate Contact:	Donnie R. TeBeest
Title/Position:	Project Manager
Phone Number:	806-378-2321
Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 1261
	Amarillo, TX 79105-1261
Email Address:	Donald.R.TeBeest@xcelenergy.com
Legal Counsel:	Jerry F. Shackelford
Phone Number:	512-658-5781
Mailing Address:	816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1650
	Austin, TX 78701
Email Address:	Jerry.F.Shackelford@xcelenergy.com
Legal Counsel:	Andrea Moore Stover
	Graves Dougherty Hearon & Moody, PC
Phone Number:	512-480-5727
Mailing Address:	401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2200
	Austin, TX 78701
Email Address:	astover@gdhm.com

#### 4. **Project Description:**

Name or Designation of Project:

SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S APPLICATION TO AMEND A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR A PROPOSED 115-kV TRANSMISSION LINE WITHIN HALE COUNTY, TEXAS. THE PROJECT NAME IS KISER SUBSTATION TO COX SUBSTATION.

Provide a general description of the project, including the design voltage rating (kV), the operating voltage (kV), the CREZ Zone(s) (if any) where the project is located (all or in part), any substations and/or substation reactive compensation constructed as part of the project, and any series elements such as sectionalizing switching devices, series line compensation, etc. For HVDC transmission lines, the converter stations should be considered to be project components and should be addressed in the project description.

Southwestern Public Service Company (SPS), a subsidiary of Xcel Energy Inc. is proposing to construct a single-circuit, 115-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line between the proposed Kiser Substation and the existing Cox Substation located in Hale County, Texas. The design voltage rating for this project is 115-kV, and the operating voltage is also 115-kV.

The proposed transmission line is presented with 11 alternative routes consisting of a combined 29 segments and is estimated to be approximately 8 to 12 miles in length depending on which route is selected. All routes described below begin at the proposed Kiser Substation to be located in the northeast portion of the City of Plainview, on the southwest corner of the intersection of Farm-to-Market Road 400 and 24<sup>th</sup> Street. All routes end at the existing Cox Substation located southwest of the intersection of County Road (CR) 95 and CR EE east of the City of Plainview.

ALTERNATIVE ROUTE	SEGMENT COMBINATION	
1	2C-9C-16C-21C-24C-29C	
2	2C-9C-16C-19C-20C-23C-29C	
3	2C-9C-13C-15C-18C-23C-29C	
4	2C-8C-10C-11C-17C-22C-24C-29C	
5	1C-4C-6C-10C-12C-14C-18C-23C-29C	
6	1C-4C-6C-10C-12C-25C-26C-27C	
7	1C-4C-6C-10C-11C-17C-20C-23C-29C	
8	1C-3C-7C-26C-28C	
9	1C-3C-5C-6C-10C-11C-15C-18C-23C-29C	
10	10 1C-4C-6C-10C-11C-17C-22C-24C-29C	
11 2C-8C-10C-11C-17C-20C-23C-29C		

**Refer to Figure 2-2 in Attachment 1 (Appendix C in the Environmental Assessment and Alternative Route Analysis [EA]) to view a map of the alternative segments.** 

Refer to Appendix E of the EA, Attachment 1, for segment descriptions.

The proposed 115-kV single-circuit transmission line would be constructed utilizing single-pole steel structures requiring a smaller surface area than H-frame structures and eliminating the need for guy wires for corner structures.

This project is included in the 2009 Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Transmission Expansion Plan (STEP) Report, and SPS has been issued a Notification to Construct (NTC) these facilities.

Design Voltage Rating (kV): 115 kV Operating Voltage Rating (kV): 115 kV Normal Peak Operating Current Rating (A): 803 amps

If the project will be owned by more than one party, briefly explain the ownership arrangements between the parties and provide a description of the portion(s) that will be owned by each party. Provide a description of the responsibilities of each party for implementing the project (design, Right-Of-Way acquisition, material procurement, construction, etc.).

Southwestern Public Service Company owns 100 percent of the project.

If applicable, identify and explain any deviation in transmission project components from the original transmission specifications as previously approved by the Commission or recommended by a PURA §39.151 organization.

The project deviated from the transmission project component originally specified by SPP in the NTC letter. SPP specified the proposed line as "Cox-Plainview 115-kV line." The existing Plainview City Substation is insufficient to accommodate the proposed line and cannot be expanded because it is a landlocked, load-serving substation. Therefore, SPS will build a new substation approximately three quarters of a mile northeast of the Plainview City Substation, which will be named "Kiser Substation" because it could not duplicate the name Plainview City Substation. SPP will issue an NTC modification to address this geographical and substation name change.

## 5. Conductor and Structures:

#### Conductor Size and Type:

Conductor will be 397.5 kcmil (1,000 circular mils), aluminum conductor steel reinforced (ACSR), 26/7 stranded, code name IBIS. Static wire will be one, 3/8 inch extra high strength (EHS) galvanized steel wire and one optical ground wire, Brugg 27AY59ACS-3C.

Number of conductors per phase: 1 (one)

Continuous Summer Static Current Rating (A): 803 amps at 160MVA (see below) Continuous Summer Static Line Capacity at Operating Voltage (MVA): 160 MVA Continuous Summer Static Line Capacity at Design Voltage (MVA): 160 MVA

#### Type and composition of Structures:

SPS proposes to use primarily single-circuit, single-pole, self-supporting steel structures. However, double-circuit structures may be used where the right-of-way (ROW) is shared with other existing transmission lines.

## Height of Typical Structures:

The typical height for these structures will be between 70 to 140 feet as required by the National Electric Safety Code (NESC) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT).

Explain why these structures were selected; include such factors as landowner preference, engineering considerations, and costs comparisons to alternate structures that were considered. Provide dimensional drawings of the typical structures to be used in the project.

As mentioned above, SPS plans to construct the line using primarily single-pole steel structures and will use direct burial on tangent structures and drilled pier foundations on all angle and corner structures. Typical heights are shown on the drawings included in Section 1 of the EA, Attachment 1; actual heights are dependent on the clearance requirements to be determined. Highway crossings will utilize structures whose heights are greater than the minimum heights required by TxDOT and/or the NESC.

SPS chose single-pole steel structures over wood structures, in part, because of the low maintenance cost, strength of the line during adverse conditions, resistance to fire damage, increased span lengths, and the unavailability of wood poles in heights greater than 110 feet. Transmission lines constructed with wood poles have an estimated maintenance cost of \$49,000 per mile for the expected life of the line; whereas, there is no expected maintenance associated with a transmission line built with steel structures. The estimated life of a typical steel structure is approximately 20 years longer than a comparable wood structure (SPS expects a wood structure to last for 50 years and a steel structure to last for 70+ years).

In addition to the other benefits previously mentioned, wood pole lengths exceeding 110 feet capable of supporting 3-phase "IBIS" conductor at 750-foot spans are difficult to find at a comparable cost and quality to an equivalent steel structure. Steel monopoles are also typically easier to construct and cost less to transport since they are fabricated in multiple sections. This solution is not only expected to decrease costs but it also addresses the Commission's concerns regarding storm-hardening the system.

The primarily agricultural land use and the presence of residential buildings in the area was an additional factor in selecting this type of structure since a single-pole steel structure minimizes the impact to both farmers and landowners because it eliminates the need for guy wires on the landowner's property, which results in a smaller footprint than a guyed structure. Also, since utilizing steel poles results in using fewer structures, this makes it easier to span existing irrigation systems. During the public meeting held for this project, landowners had no opposition to the single-pole steel design.

#### Refer to Section 1 of the EA, Attachment 1 for example structure diagrams.

For joint applications, provide and separately identify the above-required information regarding structures for the portion(s) of the project owned by each applicant.

Not applicable. This is not a joint application.

#### 6. Right-of-Way:

Miles of Right-of-Way:	Approximately 8 to 12 miles
Miles of Circuit:	Approximately 8 to 12 miles
Width of Right-of-Way:	70 feet
Percent of Right-of-Way Acquired:	0%

For joint applications, provide and separately identify the above-required information for each route for the portion(s) of the project owned by each applicant.

Not applicable. This is not a joint application.

Provide a brief description of the area traversed by the transmission line. Include a description of the general land uses in the area and the type of terrain crossed by the line.

The proposed area is located within Hale County, Texas. The land uses in this area are diverse, and include dry land farming, irrigated farming, ranching, rural residential, urban residential, commercial, and industrial development. The terrain can be characterized as flat to gently sloping with playas interspersed.

#### 7. Substations or Switching Stations:

List the name of all existing HVDC converter stations, substations or switching stations that will be associated with the new transmission line. Provide documentation showing that the owner(s) of the existing HVDC converter stations, substations and/or switching stations have agreed to the installation of the required project facilities.

Cox Substation

The Cox Substation will be modified by adding a new 115-kV circuit breaker terminal.

This substation is owned by SPS.

List the name of all new HVDC converter stations, substations or switching stations that will be associated with the new transmission line. Provide documentation showing that the owner(s) of the new HVDC converter stations, substations and/or switching stations have agreed to the installation of the required project facilities.

• Kiser Substation

The new Kiser Substation will be constructed as a 115/69-kV interchange with a three-terminal 115-kV ring bus and five terminal 69-kV straight bus. A new 115/69-kV, 84MVA autotransformer will be installed. There is a separate

proposed project to build the Kiser Substation (refer to Section 14 for additional information on PUC Docket No. 40125).

The new Kiser Substation will be owned by SPS.

## 8. Estimated Schedule:

Estimated Dates of:	Start	Completion
Right-of-Way and Land Acquisition	Following CCN approval	6 months following CCN approval
Engineering and Design	On going	8 weeks before construction
Material and Equipment Procurement	Following CCN approval	6 weeks before construction
Construction of Facilities	As ROW is acquired	6 months following ROW acquisition
Energize Facilities	Following completion of construction	Within 30 days of completion of construction

## 9. Counties:

For each route, list all counties in which the route is to be constructed.

All 11 alternative routes are located in Hale County, Texas.

## 10. Municipalities:

For each route, list all municipalities in which the route is to be constructed.

The proposed Kiser Substation is located in the City of Plainview. Portions of all 11 alternative routes are located within the city limits of the City of Plainview. Please refer to Figure 2-2 in Attachment 1 (Appendix C in the EA) for the location of alternative route segments in relation to the city limits.

For each applicant, attach a copy of the franchise, permit or other evidence of the city's consent held by the utility, if necessary or applicable. If franchise, permit, or other evidence of the city's consent has been previously filed, provide only the docket number of the application in which the consent was filed. Each applicant should provide this information only for the portion(s) of the project which will be owned by the applicant.

Refer to PUC Docket No. 40125 for the franchise agreement with the City of Plainview. SPS plans to purchase an easement for the transmission line proposed in this application.

## 11. Affected Utilities:

Identify any other electric utility served by or connected to facilities in this application.

Lighthouse Electric Cooperative, Inc. will be served by, and connected to, facilities in this application.

Describe how any other electric utility will be affected and the extent of the other utilities' involvement in the construction of this project. Include any other electric utilities whose

existing facilities will be utilized for the project (vacant circuit positions, ROW, substation sites and/or equipment, etc.) and provide documentation showing that the owner(s) of the existing facilities have agreed to the installation of the required project facilities.

Lighthouse Electric Cooperative, Inc. will not be directly involved in the construction of facilities proposed under this application.

## 12. Financing:

Describe the method of financing this project. For each applicant that is to be reimbursed for all or a portion of this project, identify the source and amount of the reimbursement (actual amount if known, estimated amount otherwise) and the portion(s) of the project for which the reimbursement will be made.

The proposed project will be financed through internally-generated funds.

#### **13.** Estimated Costs:

Provide cost estimates for each route of the proposed project using the following table. Provide a breakdown of "Other" costs by major cost category and amount. Provide the information for each route in an attachment to this application.

**Refer to Attachment 2 for the estimated cost table.** Note that the costs to construct the Kiser Substation were included in the Kress Substation to Kiser Substation CCN filing (PUC Docket No. 40125, discussed in Section 14) and are not included in estimated costs for this project.

For joint applications, provide and separately identify the above-required information for the portion(s) of the project owned by each applicant.

Not applicable. This is not a joint application.

#### 14. Need for the Proposed Project:

For a standard application, describe the need for the construction and state how the proposed project will address the need. Describe the existing transmission system and conditions addressed by this application. For projects that are planned to accommodate load growth, provide historical load data and load projections for at least five years. For projects to accommodate load growth or to address reliability issues, provide a description of the steady state load flow analysis that justifies the project. For interconnection projects, provide any documentation from a transmission service customer, generator, transmission service provider, or other entity to establish that the proposed facilities are needed. For projects related to a Competitive Renewable Energy Zone, the foregoing requirements are not necessary; the applicant need only provide a specific reference to the pertinent portion(s) of an appropriate commission order specifying that the facilities are needed. For all projects, provide any documentation of the review and recommendation of a PURA §39.151 organization.

SPS is a member of, and its entire transmission system is located within, the SPP. The SPP is an organization that meets the requirements of Public Utility Regulatory Act

(PURA) Section 39.151 as an independent system operator. SPS does not operate in the Electric Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT) region, and ERCOT takes no position on SPS's transmission projects.

The proposed transmission line will connect the proposed Kiser Substation to the existing Cox Substation, both in Hale County, Texas. The proposed transmission line was identified by SPP as needed for reliability to address overloads and low voltage in the Plainview-Cox service areas due to area load growth. The proposed transmission line is a result of the 2009 STEP study of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff which is part of the Ten-Year Regional Transmission Organization Regional Reliability Assessment (2010-2019).

#### **Existing Transmission System:**

The existing transmission system in Castro, Parmer, Swisher, Bailey, Lamb, and Hale counties, referred to herein as SPS Central Service Area, consists of 319 miles of 345-kV lines, 851 miles of 230-kV lines, 460 miles of 115-kV lines, and 436 miles of 69-kV lines. The SPS Central Service Area is fed from two different transmission lines at the 230-kV level coming from the coal-fired Tolk Generating Station and five different transmission lines at the 115-kV level coming from the gas-fired Plant X Generating Station. The total nameplate generating capacity of Tolk and Plant X Generating Stations is 1,395 megawatts (MW).

The SPS Central Service Area is supported from the north and south of the SPS system at the 230-kV level. The Swisher Substation that is 230/115-kV is fed by the Amarillo South Substation from the north, while the TUCO Substation that is 345/230/115/69-kV is fed by the Tolk Generating Station and Jones Generating Station from the south. The Swisher County and TUCO Substations are connected by a 230-kV transmission line. The TUCO Substation is also fed at the 345-kV level from AEP's Oklaunion Substation to the east. The Lamb County Substation that is 230/115-kV is fed from the Tolk Generating Station at 230-kV level and is also fed from the Plant X Generating Station at 115-kV level. Cox Substation is fed at the 115-kV level from TUCO Substation from the south, via Hale County and Floyd County substations. Plainview City Substation is fed at 69-kV level from Kress Substation from the north. The Cox and Plainview City substations are connected by a 69-kV transmission line.

SPP studied and analyzed reliability issues in the region and identified the proposed transmission line, substation and substation upgrade as part of the regional reliability upgrades listed in Appendix B of the 2009 STEP Report. Based on the report, SPP has determined there is a need for the proposed transmission line and has issued an NTC letter to SPS. NTC letter 20084, Project ID 840 and Network Upgrade ID number 11109 directs SPS to build a "Cox - Plainview 115-kV line" from the Cox Substation to the Plainview Substation. This same NTC specified a proposed line for a "Kress-Plainview City 115-kV line," with Kress Substation and Cox Substation extending to the same substation. SPS has changed the project component in the transmission project specified by SPP in the NTC letter. The existing Plainview City Substation is insufficient to accommodate the proposed line and cannot be expanded because it is a landlocked, load-

serving substation. Therefore, SPS will build a new substation approximately three quarters of a mile northeast of the Plainview City Substation, which will be named "Kiser Substation" because it could not duplicate the name Plainview City Substation. SPP will be issuing an NTC modification to address this geographical and substation name change.

The new Kiser Substation is proposed to be constructed under PUC Docket No. 40125, SPS's Application to Amend a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for a Proposed Transmission Line within Hale and Swisher counties, Texas. All costs to construct the Kiser Substation were included in PUC Docket No. 40125 and are not included in estimated costs for this project. If approved under Docket No. 40125, Kiser Substation would also serve the proposed Kiser Substation to Cox Substation 115-kV transmission line. If the proposed Kiser Substation were not addressed under PUC Docket No. 40125, SPS would need to address it in this project.

Refer to Attachment 3 for the "SPP NTC" letter (SPP-NTC-20084, Project ID: 840, Upgrade ID: 11109).

Refer to Attachment 4 for the SPS Acceptance Letter to the NTC Letter (SPP-NTC-20084).

Refer to Attachment 5 for an excerpt from the "2009 STEP" Report addressing the need for this project.

## 15. Alternatives to Project:

For a standard application, describe alternatives to the construction of this project (not routing options). Include an analysis of distribution alternatives, upgrading voltage or bundling of conductors of existing facilities, adding transformers, and for utilities that have not unbundled, distributed generation as alternatives to the project. Explain how the project overcomes the insufficiencies of the other options that were considered.

There were no analyses of distribution alternatives, upgrading voltage or bundling of conductors of existing facilities, adding transformers, or distributed generation alternative options provided to SPS when SPP issued an NTC to SPS to construct the proposed 115-kV line from the Kiser Substation to the Cox Substation. None of these alternatives would satisfy the STEP Report reliability requirements to address overloads and low voltage in the Plainview and Cox service areas due to area load growth.

## 16. Schematic or Diagram:

For a standard application, provide a schematic or diagram of the applicant's transmission system in the proximate area of the project. Show the location and voltage of existing transmission lines and substations, and the location of the construction. Locate any taps, ties, meter points, or other facilities involving other utilities on the system schematic.

#### Refer to Attachment 6.

## 17. Routing Study:

Provide a brief summary of the routing study that includes a description of the process of selecting the study area, identifying routing constraints, selecting potential line segments, and the selection of the routes. Provide a copy of the complete routing study conducted by the utility or consultant. State which route the applicant believes best addresses the requirements of PURA and P.U.C. Substantive Rules.

The EA and alternative routing analysis for this project was produced by POWER Engineers, Inc. (POWER), the environmental firm contracted by SPS, with input from SPS Siting and Land Rights personnel and is included as Attachment 1 to the Application.

The first step in selection of alternative routes was to select a study area. This area needed to encompass both project termination points, which are the proposed Kiser Substation and the existing Cox Substation. It also needed to include a large enough area within which an adequate number of alternative routes could be located. The study area for the proposed 115-kV transmission line is approximately 39 square miles, and is located in Hale County, Texas.

The data used by POWER and SPS in the delineation of alternative routes included published literature (documents, reports, maps, aerial photography, etc.) and information obtained from local, state, and federal agencies, including information obtained from county appraisal district maps and records. Aerial photography acquired from the Environmental Systems Research Institute; Bing maps dated 2010; U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic maps, TxDOT county maps, and ground reconnaissance surveys were used throughout the selection and evaluation of alternative routes. Ground reconnaissance of the study area and computer-based evaluation of digital aerial imagery were utilized for both refinement and evaluation of alternative routes.

The next step in the process was to identify routing constraints within the study area. These consisted of habitable structures, out buildings and barns, irrigation wells, centerpivot irrigation systems, cemeteries, historic sites, wetlands, playa lakes, parks, churches, schools, endangered or threatened species habitat, and communication towers. Additionally, where possible, existing compatible ROW, property lines, and roadways were utilized or paralleled.

After preliminary segments were identified, modifications were made based on the results of ground reconnaissance surveys and review of aerial photography. In order to solicit public opinion about the project, these preliminary segments were presented at a public open-house meeting at the Plainview Independent School District's Education Complex Boardroom in Plainview, Texas on August 11, 2011 between the hours of 5:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.

After careful consideration and study of numerous possible routes within the study area, along with possible environmental constraints and landowner input, POWER and SPS Siting and Land Rights personnel developed 11 alternative routes for this project. The potential routes were evaluated comparing all routes from a strictly environmental

viewpoint, based upon the measurement of 41 separate environmental criteria and the consensus opinion of POWER's group of evaluators.

POWER determined that Route 5 represents the best balance between land use, environmental, and cultural resource factors. Route 5 was the top ranked route because it:

- is one of the shortest routes, tied with Routes 7 and 11 at 8.7 miles;
- has the fewest number of habitable structures (20) located within 300 feet of its centerline;
- has the third shortest total length of ROW within cropland areas with pivot or mobile irrigation systems with 8,787 feet;
- parallels existing linear features for 77 percent of its length, which is ranked third; and
- does not have any portion of its ROW within the foreground visual zone of Interstate, U.S. and State highways.

Further, like each of the alternative routes, Route 5:

- is not located within 1,000 feet of any cemeteries;
- crosses no known/occupied habitat of federally endangered or threatened species;
- crosses no rivers;
- is not located within the 100-year floodplain; and
- crosses no National Register of Historic Places-listed or -eligible sites.

After carefully reviewing POWER's environmental assessment and alternative route analysis, landowner/agency concerns and preferences, visiting the various proposed routes, and comparing engineering constraints and cost estimates, SPS agrees with Power's recommended Alternative Route 5. Alternative Route 5 is among the shortest routes, has the fewest number of habitable structures, and parallels existing linear features for 77 percent of its length.

However, SPS believes that Alternative Route 11 is an equally good route for other reasons. POWER's recommendation of Alternative Route 5 was weighted heavily on the land use evaluation and did not take overall cost and engineering into consideration. Although Alternative Routes 5 and 11 are both approximately 8.7 miles in length, Alternative Route 5 will be more expensive to build because of the number of corner structures required to divert the line back and forth across the road to reduce the impacts to habitable structures. Alternative Route 11 is the least expensive route to construct. Additionally, Alternative Route 5 will require an entirely new ROW while Alternative Route 11 includes Segment 2C, which would utilize approximately two miles of existing ROW.

Segment 2C parallels the south side of Farm-to-Market Road 400/E 24<sup>th</sup> Street and traverses agricultural land, including approximately 5,189 feet of irrigated cropland. This segment has an existing 69-kV transmission line currently located on a 30-foot wide ROW. The existing ROW is occupied by two pole, wooden, H-frame structures with guy wires. If Alternative Route 11 is selected, this ROW will be expanded to 70 feet to accommodate the proposed single pole 115-kV transmission line which SPS is proposing to double-circuit for this approximately two mile segment. The 69-kV portion will be rebuilt at SPS's standard voltage of 115 kV and operated at 69 kV until the circuit is upgraded in the future. Double-circuiting the proposed project with the existing 69-kV transmission line using single pole structures without guy wires will minimize the addition of new corridors in the study area, resulting in less land disturbance. Further, minimizing the number of structures within the ROW would also reduce potential impacts to existing agricultural use.

There are currently 46 habitable structures within 300 feet of the existing 69-kV line constructed on two pole wood structures (Segment 2C). The two pole structures will be removed, reducing the structure footprint, and replaced with single pole steel. Using single pole steel will create longer span lengths and reduce the number of poles within the view of these existing 46 habitable structures.

SPS believes that both Alternative Route 5 and Alternative Route 11 satisfy the criteria specified in PURA § 37.056 (c)(4) and the P.U.C. Substantive Rules for consideration in the granting of CCNs.

Refer to Table 4-2 in the EA, Attachment 1 (environmental data for route evaluation).

#### **18.** Public Meeting or Public Open House:

Provide the date and location for each public meeting or public open house that was held in accordance with P.U.C. PROC. R. 22.52. Provide a summary of each public meeting or public open house including the approximate number of attendants, and a copy of any survey provided to attendants and a summary of the responses received. For each public meeting or public open house provide a description of the method of notice, a copy of any notices, and the number of notices that were mailed and/or published.

One open house meeting was held for this project. The meeting took place on August 11, 2011 at the Plainview Independent School District's Education Complex Boardroom between the hours of 5:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.

SPS mailed individual written notices of the meeting to the 107 owners of property within 300 feet of the centerline along the preliminary alternative route segments as delineated at the time of the public open house meeting.

Refer to Appendix A of the EA, Attachment 1, for a list of federal, state, and local agencies that received notice of the project, and Appendix B for a sample copy of the notice letters sent to landowners regarding the open house meeting.

A total of eight meeting attendees signed in at the open house meeting. All of the participants were encouraged to fill out a questionnaire and return it at the meeting or by mail at a later date. A total of seven questionnaires were completed and returned at the meeting, along with two additional questionnaires following the meeting. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix B of the EA, Attachment 1.

Refer to Section 5.2 of the EA, Attachment 1, for representative comments received from landowners.

## **19.** Routing Maps:

Base maps should be a full scale (one inch = not more than one mile) highway map of the county or counties involved, or other maps of comparable scale denoting sufficient cultural and natural features to permit location of all routes in the field. Provide a map (or maps) showing the study area, routing constraints, and all routes or line segments that were considered prior to the selection of the routes. Identify the routes and any existing facilities to be interconnected or coordinated with the project. Identify any taps, ties, meter points, or other facilities involving other utilities on the routing map. Show all existing transmission facilities located in the study area. Include the locations of radio transmitters and other electronic installations, airstrips, irrigated pasture or cropland, parks and recreational areas, historical and archeological sites (subject to the instructions in Question 27), and any environmentally sensitive areas (subject to the instructions in Question 29).

Provide aerial photographs of the study area displaying the date that the photographs were taken or maps that show (1) the location of each route with each route segment identified, (2) the locations of all major public roads including, as a minimum, all federal and state roadways, (3) the locations of all known habitable structures or groups of habitable structures (see Question 19 below) on properties directly affected by any route, and (4) the boundaries (approximate or estimated according to best available information if required) of all properties directly affected by any route.

For each route, cross-reference each habitable structure (or group of habitable structures) and directly affected property identified on the maps or photographs with a list of corresponding landowner names and addresses and indicate which route segment affects each structure/group or property.

**Refer to Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, for a map depicting the alternative routes.** Alternative segments presented at the public meeting held on August 11, 2011 were not modified.

Refer to Table 4-3 (Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1, for the habitable structures list (by segment, route, and distance) and associated map identification on Figure 2-2, Alternative Routes Map (Appendix C) of the EA.

#### 20. Permits:

List any and all permits and/or approvals required by other governmental agencies for the construction of the proposed project. Indicate whether each permit has been obtained.

- A TxDOT Utility Installation Request will be submitted to TxDOT, and a permit obtained for any crossing of a state-maintained roadway prior to construction. Permits will be obtained after the Commission has approved a route and prior to construction. State maintained roadways crossed by the alternative routes include U.S. Highway 70 and Farm-to-Market Roads 400, 2286, and 789.
- A Texas Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Permit will be obtained upon determination of the requirement for any such permit once the Commission has approved a route.
- A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required for all projects disturbing more than one acre during construction, and since more than five acres will be disturbed, a Notice of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, and will be obtained after the Commission has approved a route. The controls specified in the SWPPP will be monitored in the field.
- Cultural resource clearance will be obtained from the Texas Historical Commission (THC) for the proposed project, if necessary. Clearance will be obtained after the Commission has approved a route.
- After alignments and structure locations/heights are adjusted and set, a final determination will be made regarding the need for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) notification, based on structure locations and structure designs. In some areas, if necessary, SPS could use lower-than-typical structure heights and SPS could add markers to address FAA concerns or potential concerns.
- A crossing permit will be required if the alternative route crosses an existing railroad.

## 21. Habitable structures:

For each route list all single-family and multi-family dwellings and related structures, mobile homes, apartment buildings, commercial structures, industrial structures, business structures, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, schools, or other structures normally inhabited by humans or intended to be inhabited by humans on a daily or regular basis within 300 feet of the centerline if the proposed project will be constructed for operation at 230 kV or less, or within 500 feet of the centerline if the proposed project will be constructed for operation at greater than 230 kV. Provide a general description of each habitable structure and its distance from the centerline of the route. In cities, towns or rural subdivisions, houses can be identified in groups. Provide the number of habitable structures in each group and list the distance from the centerline of the route to the closest and the farthest habitable structure in the group. Locate all listed habitable structures or groups of structures on the routing map.

Table 4-2 in the EA, Attachment 1, identifies by route the total number of habitable structures located within 300 feet of the centerline of each alternative route. Table 4-3 (Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1 provides a general description of each habitable

structure and its distance from the centerline of the route. The habitable structures are shown on the routing map (Figure 2-2, Appendix C, of the EA, Attachment 1).

## 22. Electronic Installations:

For each route, list all commercial AM radio transmitters located within 10,000 feet of the center line of the route, and all FM radio transmitters, microwave relay stations, or other similar electronic installations located within 2,000 of the center line of the route. Provide a general description of each installation and its distance from the center line of the route. Locate all listed installations on a routing map.

There is one AM radio transmitter within 10,000 feet of all 11 alternative routes. There is also one known communication tower (FM radio transmitter, microwave relay station, cellular tower or other similar electronic facility) located within 2,000 feet of the alternative routes. Each structure is located on Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, and corresponds to the list of structures in Table 4-5 of the EA.

## 23. Airstrips:

For each route, list all known private airstrips within 10,000 feet of the center line of the project. List all airports registered with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with at least one runway more than 3,200 feet in length that are located within 20,000 feet of the center line of any route. For each such airport, indicate whether any transmission structures will exceed a 100:1 horizontal slope (one foot in height for each 100 feet in distance) from the closest point of the closest runway. List all listed airports registered with the FAA having no runway more than 3,200 feet in length that are located within 10,000 feet of the center line of any route. For each such airport, indicate whether any transmission structures will exceed a 50:1 horizontal slope from the closest point of the closest runway. List all listed airports registered within 10,000 feet of the center line of any route. For each such airport, indicate whether any transmission structures will exceed a 50:1 horizontal slope from the closest point of the closest runway. List all heliports located within 5,000 feet of the center line of any route. For each such heliport, indicate whether any transmission structures will exceed a 25:1 horizontal slope from the closest point of the closest point of the closest landing and takeoff area of the heliport. Provide a general description of each listed private airstrip, registered airport, and heliport; and state the distance of each from the center line of each route. Locate and identify all listed airstrips, airports, and heliports on a routing map.

Each airstrip, and airport is located on Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, and corresponds to the list of airstrips in Table 4-4 in the EA. POWER identified one FAA registered airport with at least one runway longer than 3,200 feet, that all alternative routes are within 20,000 feet of: Hale County Airport and one FAA registered airport with at least one runway less than 3,200 feet, that all alternative routes are within 10,000 feet of: Horan Airport. No FAA registered or private heliports were identified within 5,000 feet of any of the alternative route centerlines. Table 4-3 (Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1, provides the distance from the centerlines of each route to each airstrip, and airport.

After the PUC approves a route for the project, and engineering and pole placement along the route is finalized, the Project Team will provide the FAA Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (FAA Form 7560-1) for all transmission structures proposed to be located within the specified distances of any of the airports listed in Table 4-3

(Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1. The result of this notification, and any subsequent coordination with the FAA, could include changes in the line design and/or potential requirements to add markers.

## 24. Irrigation Systems:

For each route identify any pasture or cropland irrigated by traveling irrigation systems (rolling or pivot type) that will be traversed by the route. Provide a description of the irrigated land and state how it will be affected by each route (number and type of structures etc.). Locate any such irrigated pasture or cropland on a routing map.

The study area is heavily developed with center pivot irrigation sprinkler systems, and all alternative routes traverse cropland or pasture land; however the routes are located on the edge of irrigated cropland. The sprinklers range in radius from a quarter of a mile to one-half mile in length. The 11 alternative routes selected will not interfere with any of the existing center pivot sprinkler systems. Where the sprinklers overlap the potential easement location, transmission lines will be designed in such a manner as to span the length of the sprinkler overlap area. See Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, for locations of irrigation systems.

## 25. Notice:

Notice is to be provided in accordance with P.U.C. PROC. R. 22.52.

A. Provide a copy of the written direct notice to owners of directly affected land. Attach a list of the names and addresses of the owners of directly affected land receiving notice.

Refer to Attachment 7 for: (1) a sample copy of the notice letter; (2) the segment descriptions; PUC Landowner Brochure, Comments Form, and Intervenor Form; and Landowner's Bill of Rights, all of which were included with each notice packet; and (3) the list of landowners to whom notice was sent. Also, refer to Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, for the map that was included with each landowner notice packet.

B. Provide a copy of the written notice to utilities that are located within five miles of the routes.<Lighthouse Coop & GSEC>

Refer to Attachment 8 for a copy of the notice letter sent to utilities. Refer to Attachment 7 for a copy of the segment descriptions that were included with each notice packet. Also, refer to Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) in the EA, Attachment 1, for the map that was included with notice.

C. Provide a copy of the written notice to county and municipal authorities.<Hale Co. judge & Plainview mayor>

Refer to Attachment 9 for a copy of the notice letters sent to counties and municipal authorities. Refer to Attachment 7 for a copy of the segment descriptions that were included with each notice packet. Also, refer to

Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1, for the map that was included with each notice.

D. Provide a copy of the notice that is to be published in newspapers of general circulation in the counties in which the facilities are to be constructed. Attach a list of the newspapers that will publish the notice for this application. After the notice is published, provide the publisher's affidavits and tear sheets.<Plainview Daily Herald>

## Refer to Attachment 10 for a copy of the newspaper notice and map along with the list denoting the newspaper that will publish the notice.

For a CREZ application, in addition to the requirements of P.U.C. PROC. R. 22.52 the applicant shall, not less than twenty-one (21) days before the filing of the application, submit to the Commission staff a "generic" copy of each type of alternative published and written notice for review. Staff's comments, if any, regarding the alternative notices will be provided to the applicant not later than seven days after receipt by Staff of the alternative notices, Applicant may take into consideration any comments made by Commission staff before the notices are published or sent by mail.

Not applicable.

## 26. Parks and Recreation Areas:

For each route, list all parks and recreational areas owned by a governmental body or an organized group, club, or church and located within 1,000 feet of the center line of the route. Provide a general description of each area and its distance from the center line. Identify the owner of the park or recreational area (public agency, church, club, etc.). List the sources used to identify the parks and recreational areas. Locate the listed sites on a routing map.

POWER reviewed U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps, TxDOT county highway maps, recent aerial photography, and conducted ground reconnaissance surveys to identify park and recreational areas. Based on this review, POWER identified one park or recreational areas located within 1,000 feet of the centerline of the alternative routes 8 and 9. Frisco Park is owned by the City of Plainview, is located along Calle Fr. Daley and Martinez Street, and offers a basketball half-court, a picnic area, and a playground.

A listing, with the approximate distance and direction from the ROW centerline for each of the alternative routes are presented in Table 4-3 (Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1. The parks and recreational areas within the study area are shown on Figure 2-2 (Appendix C) of the EA, Attachment 1.

## 27. Historical and Archeological Sites:

For each route, list all historical and archeological sites known to be within 1,000 feet of the center line of the route. Include a description of each site and its distance from the center line. List the sources (national, state or local commission or societies) used to identify the sites. Locate all historical sites on a routing map. For the protection of the sites, archeological sites need not be shown on maps.

POWER conducted a literature review and records search at the THC and The Texas Archeological Research Laboratory at the University of Texas at Austin to identify known historical and archaeological sites located within 1,000 feet of the alternate routes.

Based on this review, no previously recorded historic sites are located within 1,000 feet of any of the alternative routes. There is one known prehistoric archaeological site located within 1,000 feet of the ROW centerline of six of the alternatives, Site 41HA09, a small lithic scatter site. A listing with the approximate distance and direction from the ROW centerline for the alternative route is presented in Table 4-3 (Appendix D) of the EA, Attachment 1. For the protection of this site, it is not shown on routing maps.

## 28. Coastal Management Program:

For each route, indicate whether the route is located, either in whole or in part, within the coastal management program boundary as defined in 31 T.A.C. §503.1. If any route is, either in whole or in part, within the coastal management program boundary, indicate whether any part of the route is seaward of the Coastal Facilities Designation Line as defined in 31 T.A.C. §19.2(a)(21). Using the designations in 31 T.A.C. §501.3(b), identify the type(s) of Coastal Natural Resource Area(s) impacted by any part of the route and/or facilities.

None of the routes are located within the coastal management program boundary as defined in 31 T.A.C. § 503.1.

## **29.** Environmental Impact:

Provide copies of any and all environmental impact studies and/or assessments of the project. If no formal study was conducted for this project, explain how the routing and construction of this project will impact the environment. List the sources used to identify the existence or absence of sensitive environmental areas. Locate any environmentally sensitive areas on a routing map. In some instances, the location of the environmentally sensitive areas or the location of protected or endangered species should not be included on maps to ensure preservation of the areas or species. Within seven days after filing the application for the project, provide a copy of each environmental impact study and/or assessment to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) for its review at the address below. Include with this application a copy of the letter of transmittal with which the studies/assessments were or will be sent to the TPWD.

Wildlife Habitat Assessment Program

Wildlife Division

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

4200 Smith School Road

Austin, Texas 78744

The applicant shall file an affidavit confirming that the letter of transmittal and studies/assessments were sent to TPWD.

Refer to the Environmental Assessment and Alternative Route Analysis for the Proposed Kiser to Cox 115-kV Electric Transmission Line Project in Hale County, Texas labeled as Attachment 1.

A copy of the application, including the EA, Attachment 1, was sent to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department on the day of the filing of this application. **Refer to Attachment 11 for a copy of the transmittal letter.** 

At the request of the Office of Public Utility Counsel (OPUC), only a copy of the segment descriptions and Figure 6-1 (Appendix E) of the EA was sent to the OPUC on the day of the filing of this application. **Refer to Attachment 12 for a copy of the transmittal letter.** 

#### **30.** Affidavit

Attach a sworn affidavit from a qualified individual authorized by the applicant to verify and affirm that, to the best of their knowledge, all information provided, statements made, and matters set forth in this application and attachments are true and correct.

## **AFFIDAVIT**

## STATE OF TEXAS

## COUNTY OF POTTER

I, James M. Bagley, after first being duly sworn state the following: I am filing this application as Manager, Regulatory Administration. I am qualified and authorized to file and verify this application, and am personally familiar with the information supplied in this application; and to the best of my knowledge, all information provided, statements made, and matters set forth in this application and attachments are true and correct; and all requirements for the filing of this application have been satisfied. I further state that this application is made in good faith and that this application does not duplicate any filing presently before the commission.

AFFIANT James M. Bagley

**SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME,** a Notary Public in and for the state of Texas, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of March 2012.

SEAL

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_