Control Number: 37448

Item Number: 200

Addendum StartPage: 0

Comments in Docket No. 37,448

If you want to be a PROTESTOR only, please complete this form. Although public comments are not treated as evidence, they help inform the PUC and its staff of the public concerns and identify issues to be explored. The PUC welcomes such participation in its proceedings.

Mail this completed form and 10 copies to:

Public Utility Commission of Texas
Central Records
Attn: Filing Clerk
1701 N. Congress Ave.
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, TX 78711-3326

RECEIVED
09 NOV 30 PM 2:56
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
FILING CLERK

First Name: LAURIE Last Name: HENDERSON, ET AL

Phone Number: 512/556-0700 Fax Number: 512/556-0702

Address, City, State: c/o RICHARD H. HAMMETT P.O. BOX 1787, LAMPASAS, TX 76550

I am NOT requesting to intervene in this proceeding. As a PROTESTOR, I understand the following:

- I am NOT a party to this case;
- My comments are not considered evidence in this case; and
- I have no further obligation to participate in the proceeding.

Please check one of the following:

☐ I own property with a habitable structure located near one or more of the utility's proposed routes for a transmission line.

☒ One or more of the utility's proposed routes would cross my property.

☒ Other. Please describe and provide comments. You may attach a separate page, if necessary.

SEE ATTACHMENT.

Signature of person submitting comments:

Richard H. Hammett Date: 11/30/09

Effective: January 1, 2003

ATTACHMENT

My name is Richard H. Hammett; I am an attorney licensed to practice law in Texas, and I represent Laurie M. Henderson, Julie M. Bucek, and Janna M. Hammett (Janna M. Hammett is my wife). They own the Martin Ranch which is located on Big Lucy Creek, close to the confluence of Big and Little Lucy Creeks, at 5265 CR 3420 in Lampasas County, several miles northeast of the City of Lampasas. The Martin Ranch is directly affected land, and is directly affected by Link C31 of the proposed LCRA Transmission Services Corporation's 345 KV electric transmission lines Alternate Routes GN1, GN2, and GN9, in your Docket No. 37448.

With regard to the Martin Ranch, locating the alternate routes at Link31 will negatively impact the use and enjoyment of the property, affecting more than just the owners, impacting some twenty people, and probably more. All of them are, or will be, dissatisfied with the line being located in that segment.

There appears to be no good reason to approve Link C31 (being connected to Link C23 or to Link C25). An obvious point is the lack of economy and increased cost due to the increased construction costs of C23-C31 or C25-C31, increased easement acquisition costs, and the like.

The factors shown on page two of the brochure entitled "Landowners and Transmission Line Cases at the PUC Competitive Renewable Energy Zone (CREZ) Projects" do not really support the locations of either C23-C31 or C25-C31.

With regard to each of the six factors, please consider the following:

1. Approving the application would actually increase costs, when compared to other routes; the lines sought apparently do not serve the proximate area, or its utility.

2. The routes using link C31 do not utilize existing compatible rights-of-way (or existing multiple-circuit transmission lines); in fact, there are none in this area which go to the Newton Station. There are existing rights of way in or perhaps available to other segments which may be utilized (e.g., see Figure 3, Primary Alternative Routes, Gillespie Newton Project, C18, T109, T-154).

3. Since there are no existing compatible rights-of-way to parallel running to Newton Station, this factor is not applicable. There are existing rights of way in or perhaps available to other segments which may be used to parallel (e.g., see Figure 3, Primary Alternative Routes, Gillespie Newton Project, C18, T-109, T-154).

4. The routes may parallel, to some extent, property lines, or other natural or cultural features; at the same time, paralleling property lines or natural features in this specific area (Big Lucy Creek) will destroy property value, will increase costs, and likely will affect cultural features, historic values, recreational values, community values and aesthetic values, without limitation. For example, running these transmission lines down Big Lucy Creek at this location alone will disrupt current hunting and fishing uses, uses by Cub or Boy Scouts (occasionally each year), farming and ranching activities, and potential habitations.

5. Though Link C31 may appear to conform to the policy of prudent avoidance, exposure (probably daily) to electric and magnetic fields could not be avoided; the investments of money and effort to limit exposure in these areas would not be reasonable. See the example in number "4.", above.

6. Community values, recreational areas, aesthetic values and environmental integrity would be disturbed; there would be no improvement of service or lowering of cost to consumers in the area, as these consumers are not served. The disturbances are magnified by the location of the Oncor line (Docket No. 37,464).

The application, as far as Link C31, should not be approved.