[illegible] 115kV

1	[illegible]	Southwestern Public Service Company
	Certificate Number:	30153
	Street Address:	600 South Tyler Street
	Mailing Address:	Amarillo, TX 79105-1261

2. [illegible]

[illegible]

N/A

3.	[illegible] 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
	[illegible] Contact	Donnie R. TeBeest
	Title/Position:	Project Manager
	Phone Number:	806-378-2321
	Mailing Address:	P.O. Box 1261
		Amarillo, TX 79105-2321
	Email Address	Donald.R.TeBeest@xcelenergy.com
	Legal Counsel:	Matthew Loftus
	Phone Number:	512-478-1327
	Mailing Address:	816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1650
		Austin, TX 78701
	Email Address:	Matthew.P.Loftus@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. [illegible]

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 GRAY AND WHEELER COUNTIES, TEXAS. THE PROJECT NAME IS BOWERS SUBSTATION TO HOWARD 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 and operate a single circuit, 115-kilovolt (kV) electrical transmission line between the existing Bowers Substation located in Gray County, Texas and the existing Howard Substation located in Wheeler County, Texas. Depending on the route chosen, the majority of the proposed transmission line could be constructed and operated as a double-circuit transmission line with the existing 69-kV Circuit Y62, allowing SPS to utilize an existing corridor. The proposed transmission line was identified by SPP as needed for reliability to address low voltage issues in the Gray-Wheeler counties service area during contingency events. The design and operating voltage rating for the proposed transmission line is 115 kV.

The proposed transmission line is presented with 13 alternative routes consisting of a combined 58 segments and is estimated to be approximately 35 to 44 miles in length depending on which route is selected. All routes described below begin at the existing Bowers Substation located in Gray County, Texas 3.1 miles west-northwest of Lefors, Texas. All routes end at the existing Howard Substation located in Wheeler County, Texas 0.5 miles southwest of the intersection of Farm to Market Road 2473 and State Highway (SH) 83 in Wheeler, Texas.

The segments that comprise each route are as follows:

R	S	R le g
A	2a, 7a, 9a, 23a, 33a, 40a, 46a, 50, 49	34.7
B	2, 7, 9, 23, 33, 40, 46, 51	34.5
C	1, 5, 13, 16, 22, 23, 33, 40, 46, 50, 49	38.3
D	2, 7, 9, 23, 33, 40, 45, 44, 49	35.4
E	2, 7, 9, 23, 33, 40, 47, 48	36.0
F	1, 5, 13, 16, 25, 29, 36, 37, 43, 44, 49	37.8
G	2, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16, 22, 23, 33, 40, 46, 50, 49	38.3
H	1, 5, 13, 16, 25, 29, 36, 34, 39, 40, 46, 51	37.9
I	1, 5, 13, 16, 25, 29, 35, 42, 43, 44, 49	37.4
J	1, 4, 14, 20, 21, 26, 24, 22, 23, 33, 40, 46, 50, 49	44.3
K	3, 32, 38, 40, 46, 50, 49	41.0
L	3, 32, 41, 47, 46, 50, 49	43.0
M	2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 20, 21, 28, 42, 43, 44, 49	41.7

R oF g e 7 - fi E niv o en a A ssme t (E), Attab en nt 1 fin
a w wh 3o ts

R p A D E A hen t fo e gn e deb os

The proposed 115-kV single-circuit transmission line would be constructed utilizing primarily single-pole steel structures requiring a smaller surface area than H-frame structures. Using steel structures instead of wood poles eliminates the need for guy wires.

Design Voltage Rating (kV): 115 kV
Operating Voltage Rating (kV): 115 kV
Normal Peak Operating Current Rating (A): 1,156 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.

Not applicable.

5. C to a S ute

Conductor Size and Type:
Conductor will be 477 kcMIL, aluminum conductor steel supported (ACSS), 26/7 stranded, code name HAWK. Static wire will be one 3/8" EHS galvanized steel and one Optical Ground Wire.

Number of conductors per phase: 1 (one)

Continuous Summer Static Current Rating (A): 1,156 amps

Continuous Summer Static Line Capacity at Operating Voltage (MVA): 232 MVA

Continuous Summer Static Line Capacity at Design Voltage (MVA): 232 MVA

Type and composition of Structures:

SPS proposes to use primarily single-circuit, single-pole, self-supporting steel structures; however, depending on which route is approved, it is possible that some H-frame structures also will be utilized. If Segments 2a, 7a, 9a, 23a, 33a, 40a, and 46a are used in the approved route, that portion of the line will require double-circuiting (single-pole steel structures), because these segments will be combined with an existing transmission line (wreck-out/rebuild).

Height of Typical Structures:

The typical height for these structures will be between 80 and 140 feet.

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.

This line will be built using primarily single-pole steel structures; however, it is possible that some H-frame structures also will be utilized. For those segments in the approved route that are part of the wreck-out/rebuild portion of the line, the structures will be double-circuit and single-pole. The

proposed transmission line structures will consist of a combination of direct burial for in-line structures and drilled pier foundations for corner and angle structures. Typical heights are shown on the attached drawings (Attachment 2) and 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 the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and/or the National Electric Safety Code (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 101 feet. Transmission lines constructed with wood poles have an estimated maintenance cost of $49,000/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 "HAWK" conductors at 660-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 line minimizes the impact to both farmers and landowners because it eliminates the space required by an H-frame structure. SPS opted for the use of steel structures as opposed to wood poles eliminating 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 instead of wood poles results in using fewer structures, it is easier to span existing irrigation systems. During the public meetings held for this project, landowners indicated a preference for the single-pole steel design.

[illegible]

Typical 115-kV single-circuit steel tangent structure is shown on SPS drawing T-0-427A.
Typical 115-kV single-circuit steel angle structure is shown on SPS drawing T-0-468.
Typical 115-kV single-circuit steel corner structure is shown on SPS drawing SD-T0-426.
Typical 115-kV double-circuit steel tangent structure is shown on SPS drawing T-0-521.
Typical 115-kV double-circuit steel corner structure is shown on SPS drawing T-0-412.
Typical 115-kV double-circuit steel angle structure is shown on SPS drawing T-0-455.

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.

6. Right-of-way:

Miles of Right-of-Way:	Approximately 35 to 44 miles.
Miles of Circuit:	Approximately 35 to 44 miles.
Width of Right-of-Way:	70 feet; wider in exceptional circumstances.
Percent of Right-of-Way Acquired:	0%

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 transmission line is located in Gray and Wheeler counties in the Texas Panhandle. Land use throughout the study area is dominated by rangeland with some smaller areas of cultivated land. The majority of cultivated land is located primarily in the eastern half of the study area near US 152. The developed land is primarily found around the various towns in the study area. The largest percentage of the land found in the study area is used as pasture or rangeland. The terrain within the study area varies. In the eastern portion of the study area, it is relatively flat where the land cover is predominately cropland. In the central and western portions of the study area, the terrain is more pronounced where it is associated with various rivers and tributaries that run through this region.

7. S a s o S S ta :

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.

- Bowers Substation
- Howard Substation

These substations are owned by SPS.

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.

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.

There are no new substations or switching stations associated with this project.

8 E S e

E D ates of:	Start	Comple n
Right-of-way and Land Acquisition	Following CCN approval	6 months following CCN approval
Engineering and Design	Ongoing	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. C :

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

[illegible] 115kV

All routes are located in Gray and Wheeler counties, Texas

[illegible]

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

All 13 routes cross into Wheeler, Texas because the Howard Substation is located just inside the municipal boundaries of Wheeler. R

[illegible] a [illegible] is ty fo [illegible] p [illegible] 115kV [illegible] [illegible]

lines between the AEP system and SPS system. The 69-kV connection is primarily for emergency services

[illegible] 5 fo [illegible] [illegible] te te (SP N TG 2006 6, P jte D : 085 , Upgre D : 5045 3).

[illegible] fo [illegible] 2012 [illegible] p o [illegible] [illegible] e d fo prje

[illegible] 7 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] C, [illegible] S [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ts fo [illegible] [illegible] C.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Rep t [illegible] .001 4, [illegible] 24 ,201 .

Refe to At [illegible] r the [illegible] M ai in od [illegible] m pa t Std [illegible] t [illegible] 13 0, Ma [illegible] 0, 2012 .

[illegible] 01 fo [illegible] mbe r 23, 2011 e [illegible] S [illegible] 5 MW fo [illegible] id t on la l oad c apac ty .

[illegible] fo [illegible] July 26, 2011, e [illegible] C fo SPS for 4 . 25 MW id t o la l oad a ja ty .

[illegible] fo [illegible] 2 fo [illegible] r 22, 2011 e [illegible] fr [illegible] fo [illegible] 1 MW fo [illegible] id t on la l oad c apac ty .

[illegible] 3 [illegible] [illegible] M [illegible] on Sy [illegible] R ep t No . 10 9 08, [illegible] [illegible] 29, 201 .

Refe to Attach [illegible] fo h [illegible] [illegible] oe [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] vi [illegible] a.

Refe to Attach [illegible] fo [illegible] fo [illegible] [illegible] st.

5. [illegible] ve to P je t

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.

In the GB Howard Load System Impact Study Report No. 01104 dated February 24, 2011 that SPS conducted in response to GSEC's request for a load capacity increase of 20 MW, SPS reviewed three alternatives to mitigate voltage and line overload violations in the Northeast Service Area that could occur during an outage of the Howard Substation 115/69-kV transformer or the Wheeler Substation to Howard Substation 115-kV transmission line. The first alternative studied was the installation of a second 115/69-kV transformer at the Howard Substation and the installation of a 115kV transmission line between the Howard and Bowers substations (the proposed line). The second alternative studied was the re-conductor of three 69-kV lines to 477 ACSR and the addition of a 144 MVAR, 69-kV capacitor bank at the Howard Substation. The three 69-kV lines considered for re-conductor were the Greenbelt-Kellerville Substation to Magic City Substation 69-kV line, approximately 6.1 miles in length; the Magic City Substation to Howard Substation 69-kV line, approximately 4.7 miles in length; and the Greenbelt-Kellerville Substation to Bowers Substation 69-kV line, approximately 23 miles in length. The third alternative studied was the addition of a second 115-kV circuit between the Wheeler and Howard substations. However, this alternative did not solve the violation caused by the Howard

Substation 115/69-kV transformer contingency and therefore was not considered a viable alternative. The report recommended Alternative 1 because it more comprehensively addresses the complexity of scheduling outages during construction as compared to Alternative 2. SPS also conducted additional studies of the impact of additional load coming on to the system in the northeast area of the system. These studies supported the findings in Report No. 01104 that the proposed transmission line is needed to avoid violations on the system due to the additional load.

SPP conducts studies in order to evaluate if there are reliability issues within the transmission system and whether or not additional transmission lines or upgrades to existing transmission lines are needed. In the process of conducting the analysis, SPP determines what projects will be included in NTCs issued to utilities. SPS and other Load Serving Entities (*i.e.*, GBEC and NPEC through GSEC) provided SPP with load forecast information for use in the 2012 STEP study. SPS also provided suggestions and comments to SPP on proposed system improvements that would alleviate the problems SPP had found in its analysis. SPP reviewed and modified those solutions based on its analysis. The result of the studies concluded that the project was needed for reliability purposes and to mitigate low voltage issues in the SPS Northeast Service Area due to single-contingency events. The studies that were performed are discussed in the executive summary and Section 8.0 of the 2012 STEP report. See pages 4-8 and 41-48 of Attachment 6 to SPS's Application. Because an in-depth analysis was conducted by SPP, in coordination with SPS, and it was determined that this project was needed for purposes of reliability, it was not necessary for additional analysis of alternatives to be conducted. None of the alternatives listed in the question would satisfy the STEP study reliability requirements to mitigate low voltage violations in the SPS Northeast Service Area, which could occur during an outage of either Bowers to Grapevine 115-kV line or Bowers Substation 115/69-kV transformer.

16. [illegible]

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.

[illegible] t o A a [illegible] 16.

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.

SPS retained Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. (Burns & McDonnell) to prepare an Environmental Assessment and Alternative Route Analysis Report (EA) for this project. The EA was produced by Burns & McDonnell, with input from SPS Siting and Land Rights personnel and is included as Attachment 1 to the Application. The objective of this study was to identify and evaluate alternative transmission line routes for SPS's proposed 115-kV transmission line project. Burns & McDonnell used a comprehensive transmission line routing and evaluation methodology to identify and evaluate alternative transmission line routes in accordance with PURA § 37.056 (c)(4)(A)-(D), the PUCT's CCN application form, and P.U.C. SUBST. R. 25.101. The process consisted of study area delineation, data collection, constraints mapping, identification of preliminary alternative routes, public open house meetings, modification and addition of

alternative route segments following the public open-house meetings, and alternative route evaluation.

The first step in the identification of alternative routes was to select a study area. This area needed to encompass the Bowers Substation and the Howard Substation, and include an area large enough that a reasonable number of alternative routes could be identified. The study area for this project was developed to take advantage of existing corridors which included the existing SPS and Cross Texas Transmission corridor to the south, SH 152 to the north, and the existing north/south transmission lines in the east and west portions of the study area.

One of the first data collection activities for this project was the development of a list of officials to be mailed a consultation letter regarding the proposed project. The purpose of the letters was to inform the various officials and agencies of the proposed project and give them the opportunity to provide information they may have regarding the study area. Other data collection activities consisted of file and record reviews conducted at various state regulatory agencies, a review of published literature, available Geographic Information System mapping, and frequent review of a variety of maps including recent color aerial photography, U.S. Geological Survey topographic maps, various roadway maps, and county appraisal district land parcel boundary maps. Ground reconnaissance surveys were also conducted by visual observations from public roads and public ROW located within the study area.

The data and information collected during the data collection phase were utilized to develop an environmental and land use constraints map. The geographic locations of exclusionary areas, avoidance areas, and opportunity areas, as well as environmentally sensitive areas within the study area, were located and considered during transmission line route identification. Burns & McDonnell utilized the following to identify the alternative routes:

- input received from the various correspondence with local officials and others;
- input received from the two public open-house meetings;
- results of the visual reconnaissance activities of the study area;
- review of recent aerial photography;
- findings of the various data collection activities;
- environmental and land use constraints;
- apparent property boundaries;
- existing compatible corridors; and
- location of towns and cities.

It was Burns & McDonnell's intent to identify an adequate number of alternative routes which were environmentally acceptable, considering such factors as community values, park and recreational areas, historical and aesthetic values, environmental integrity, length of route parallel to or utilizing existing compatible ROWs, length of route parallel to apparent property boundaries, and the PUCT's policy of prudent avoidance.

The preliminary alternative routes identified by Burns & McDonnell were then presented at two public open-house meetings. After the meetings, Burns & McDonnell reviewed and evaluated each questionnaire that was submitted at the meetings (or mailed at a later date) as well as all routing maps that had areas of interest identified by the attendees. Attendee comments were evaluated, considered, and factored into the overall evaluation of the alternative routes. As a result of input from the meeting attendees, additional evaluation of the preliminary alternative routes by Burns & McDonnell, and additional input by SPS, some segments were removed from

consideration, modifications were made to the location of portions of one existing segment, and a rebuild alternative was added.

After modifications to the existing segments were made, a total of 137 alternative routes were identified. The Burns & McDonnell Project Team then completed a detailed evaluation of each alternative route to identify the proposed routes that would be presented in this Application. Burns & McDonnell used a z-score screening methodology using the 37 different environmental and land use criteria that were calculated for each route, as well as the results of the public involvement program, to identify the 13 routes proposed in this application. These routes represented the top-ranking route in each corridor as well as additional routes. Burns & McDonnell then evaluated the advantages and disadvantages of each proposed route using the environmental and land use criteria, input from the agencies, and public input, and determined that Route A represented the best balance between land use, environmental, and cultural resource factors. Route A was selected because it is one of the shortest routes and would involve rebuilding the existing transmission line currently extending between the Bowers and Howard substations as a double-circuit line. As such, new impacts to almost all aspects of the natural and social environment would be minimized.

SPS subsequently selected Route A as the route it believed best addresses the requirements of PURA and P.U.C. Substantive Rules, based on a review of potential environmental impacts, land use, community values, estimated costs, and landowner input. With regards to the wreck-out/rebuild alternative, this option will concurrently upgrade and update the existing Y-62 69-kV transmission line between the Bowers and Howard substations to present-day standards. The existing circuit was constructed in 1930 with H-frame wood structures and a combination of #2/0 6/1 aluminum conductor steel reinforced (ACSR) "Quail" (338 amperes rating) and #4/0 6/1 ACSR "Penguin" (435 ampere rating) conductor. In addition to the new structures being constructed with single pole steel that will utilize longer spans and fewer structures having a smaller footprint, it will also increase the size of the existing 69-kV conductor to 397.5 kcMIL 26/7 ACSR "Ibis" (798 ampere rating) conductor and will be insulated with the ability to be operated at 115kV. It is estimated that it would cost in excess of $19 million to wreck out and rebuild the existing Y-62 circuit in place should it be decided that the wreck-out/rebuild should not be a part of this project. The additional cost of Route A includes the previously-described removal and upgrade plus the incremental cost of double-circuit height steel structures. SPS did not find any engineering, constraints, maintenance, or construction concerns, or any system operating conditions that would alter its selection of Route A. SPS would purchase a new 70-foot easement for Route A and purchase an additional 30-foot temporary construction easement to be used during construction. The 30-foot temporary constuction easement would then be released upon completion of line construction. SPS will also release the old 30-foot easement that was in place for the existing 69-kV line. Although SPS recommends Route A, it can construct and operate any of the transmission lines on any of the routes proposed in this Application.

[illegible] ab e 7 - [illegible] A , [illegible] 1

18. [illegible] or [illegible] s

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.

Two open-house meetings were held for this project. These meetings took place on October 11 and 13, 2011 between the hours of 5:30 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. The October 11 meeting was held at the Wheeler County Agricultural and Family Life Center located at 7939 U.S. Highway 83 in Wheeler, and the October 13 meeting was held at the Americ Inn Event Center located at 1101 N. Hobart in Pampa. Attendees were able to fill out and submit questionnaires related to this project at either meeting.

SPS mailed individual written notices of the meeting to all 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 (488 notices were mailed).

[illegible]

At each open-house meeting, SPS set up information stations in the meeting space. Each station was devoted to a particular aspect of the project and was manned by SPS (Welcome Table, CCN Certification Process, and Purpose/Need of the Project), Burns & McDonnell (Environmental and Routing), and Manning Land (Landowner Identification and Right-of-Way). Each station had maps, illustrations, photographs, and/or text explaining each particular topic.

A total of 25 people signed in as attending the open-house meeting in Wheeler, Texas; 21 people signed in as attending the meeting in Pampa, Texas. All of the participants were encouraged to fill out a questionnaire and return it at the meeting or by mail at a later date. In total, 12 completed questionnaires were returned either at or after the open-house meetings. After the public open-house meetings, Burns & McDonnell reviewed and evaluated each questionnaire that was submitted as well as all routing maps that had areas of interest identified by the attendees. Attendee comments were evaluated, considered, and factored into the overall evaluation of the alternative routes.

[illegible]

[illegible]

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

[illegible]

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.

[illegible]

20. [illegible]

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.

Below is a list of permits that will be required for construction of the transmission line project on any of the routes:

- Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) permit(s) will be required for crossing state-maintained roadways or using TxDOT ROW to access the project (not yet obtained).
- Depending on the location of structures, floodplain development permits and road crossing permits might be required by the counties in which the approved route is located (not yet obtained).
- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and a Notice of Intent will be submitted at least 48 hours prior to the beginning of construction to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality under the Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit (not yet obtained).
- If necessary, a cultural resources survey plan will be developed and clearance obtained from the Texas Historical Commission (THC) for the proposed project (not yet obtained).
- If the approved route triggers Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) criteria regarding proximity to airports, SPS will file a Notice of Construction form with the FAA (not yet obtained).
- Consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will occur following the Commission's approval of this Application to determine appropriate requirements under Section 404/Section 10 Permit criteria (not yet obtained).
- Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will occur following the Commission's approval of this Application to determine appropriate requirements under the Endangered Species Act (not yet obtained).

21. [illegible]:

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 7-3 in the EA (Attachment 1) identifies, by route, the number, type, distance, and direction of all habitable structures located within 300 feet of the proposed routes. Figure 7-1 of the EA, Attachment 1 depicts the location of the habitable structures.

22. [illegible]:

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.

No AM radio transmitters were identified within 10,000 feet of the alternative routes. Table 7-5 in the EA (Attachment 1) lists all FM radio transmitters, microwave relay stations, and other electronic installations identified within 2,000 feet of the alternative routes. Figure 7-1 of the EA depicts the location of the electronic installations.

23. [illegible]:

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 100:1horizontal 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 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 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.

Table 7-4 in the EA (Attachment 1) lists the two private airstrips located within 10,000 feet of the centerline of the alternative routes. There are no airports registered with the FAA within 10,000 feet or 20,000 feet of any of the alternative routes. Table 7-4 in the EA (Attachment 1) also lists the only heliport within 5,000 feet of the center line of any route. Figure 7-1 of the EA depicts the location of the private airstrips and the heliport.

[illegible] a [illegible] is ty fo [illegible] p [illegible] 1 15 k V
[illegible]

24. [illegible] 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.

All traveling irrigation systems that were identified as being crossed by a route were center pivot irrigation systems. Table 7-2 of the EA, Attachment 1, lists the number of crossings and the total length of land irrigated by traveling irrigation systems crossed by the proposed routes. The center pivot irrigation systems are visible on Figure 7-1 of the EA, Attachment 1.

25. [illegible]

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 17 for: (1) a sample copy of the notice letter, (2) the segment descriptions; PUCT Landowner Brochure, Comments Form, and Intervenor Form; and landowner bill of rights, all of which were included with each notice packet, (3) the list of landowners to whom notice was sent, and (4) a copy of the Landowner Notification Map. Also, refer to Figure 7-1 in the EA, Attachment 1, for the maps included with each notice packet.

B. *Provide a copy of the written notice to utilities that are located within five miles of the routes.*

Refer to Attachment 18 for a copy of the notice letters. Refer to Attachment 17 for a copy of the segment descriptions that were included with each notice packet. Also, refer to Figure 7-1 in the EA, Attachment 1, for the maps included with notice.

C. *Provide a copy of the written notice to county and municipal authorities.*

Refer to Attachment 19 for a copy of the notice letters. Refer to Attachment 17 for a copy of the segment descriptions that were included with each notice packet. Also, refer to Figure 7-1 in the EA, Attachment 1, for the maps 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.*

Refer to Attachment 20 for a copy of the newspaper notice (including maps) and the list denoting the newspapers 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 notice. 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 Recreational 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.

There are no parks or recreational areas either crossed by, or within 1,000 feet of, any of the proposed routes. Burns & McDonnell conducted a review of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department's (TPWD) digital data sources, as well as federal, state, and local maps, and other digital data, and also completed field reconnaissance to identify parks and recreation facilities within the study area.

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.

SPS contracted with Burns & McDonnell to identify any possible historical or archeological sites within 1,000 feet of the centerline of the proposed project. In an effort to identify known cultural resources that could be affected by this project, an on-line search of the THC Texas Atlas was conducted by Burns & McDonnell archaeologists in August 2011 and was followed up by a file search at the Texas Archaeological Research Laboratory. The search also included state archaeological landmarks, historical markers, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) properties, cemeteries, military sites, sawmills, and bridges. In addition, a search of the National Park Service NRHP database was conducted. Only one route, Route M, crosses a known recorded cultural resource site (Fort Elliot). Fort Elliot is crossed by Segment 28 for a distance of approximately 3,000 feet. None of the other proposed routes would be located within 1,000 feet of any recorded cultural site. In addition, there are no NRHP sites located within 1,000 feet of any of the proposed routes.

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. Environment

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

[illegible] 115-kV [illegible]

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.

[illegible] Environmental Assessment and Alternative Route Analysis Report for the Proposed Bowers Substation to Howard Substation 115-kV Transmission Line Project in Gray and Wheeler Counties, Texas, [illegible]

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.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

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.

[illegible] James M. Bagley

[illegible], a Notary Public in and for the state of Texas, this ___ day of July 2012.

SEAL

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: _____