



Control Number: 37448



Item Number: 795

Addendum StartPage: 0

January 9, 2010

Direct Testimony of I. Diana Fisch
SOAH Docket # 473-10-1097
PUC Docket # 37448

FILED
JAN 25 AM 9:12
FILING CLERK

Q1. What is your name?

A1. My name is I. Diana Fisch

Q2. What is your relationship to this case?

A2. My husband, Alan J. Fisch, and I are owners of 5 acres of property at 2944 County Road 2001 in Lampasas, Texas. My brother, Curt Rhodes, is owner of approximately 50 acres at 2940 County Road 2001 in Lampasas, Texas.

Q3. Are you and your wife potentially affected by the application and proposed project of the LCRA subject of this case?

A3. Yes

Q4. How are you affected?

A4. Our home, my brother's home and my mother's home are all within 500' of the proposed LCRA alternate route #'s GN1, GN2, GN4, GN5, and GN9 link number 31. These are all habitable structures on our property. We have livestock on the property that we work. Due to the fact that property will be devalued with the large transmission towers so close by, it may interfere with trying to add on to the current structures or adding additional structures, making improvements. These proposed routes also appear to cross the preferred route that ONCOR has in hearings at this time for their transmission towers going up County Road 2001 from Kempner, their Brown-Newton Project. These are also 345kV towers. We would then have these 120' towers on two sides of our property lines with a huge electromagnetic field. We are very concerned with wildfires that could be started, not to mention how this may effect migrating species that come through this area at different times of the year. I do want to make a correction from previous letters that I have written regarding the LCRA tower corridor. I misunderstood that the 500' "yellow marker line" on the maps are not the same "corridor" as the 160' "actual corridor" line on each side of the towers. It was explained to me in December when I was asking LCRA questions regarding the lines.

Q5. Are you opposed to the LCRA building a 345kV double-circuit transmission line along All the proposed routes, or just some of them?

A5. We do not oppose LCRA building transmission lines. We know that they are needed to bring necessary power throughout the state. We do feel that both Oncor and LCRA should have worked **together** when choosing routes and choosing routes with the least distance to keep the cost down. I know that they did not work together because when I talked to both companies, from August through December they both told me that they did not know about the crossing of routes in our area. We feel that LCRA and Oncor should be utilizing the current transmission already lines in place and upgrading those lines so that less of the countryside is tracked with more and more of these 120' transmission towers. There are the more sleeker monopoles that

1995

appear to use less space and do not break into our Texas horizon that would be less offensive. The Texas ratepayers are paying for all these projects. I would rather pay a little more for something that is less offensive to the eye and that would not take away more land from Texas landowners. We have all worked hard to buy our land, we pay taxes on it and we do not want to see it devalued or taken away.

Q6. On what route would you prefer the LCRA to build its transmission line?

A6. We feel that LCRA and PUC should determine the shortest route for their Gillespie to Newton line. It appears that having the LCRA route go way north and then turning to go south to the final station is going way out of their way and also causing a higher cost because the route would be so much longer. They should try to upgrade any lines in the area to carry the new generated power along with what is there already in place. Upgrading what we have to bigger and better sounds so much better than making a whole lot more of little tracks all over the place. They should use easements along any roadways already owned by the state or county if in the area. Largely uninterrupted expanses of land tend NOT to funnel migrating species into narrow or obvious pathways. Power lines go up, migrating pathways change. We have an airport in our direct vicinity, Lampasas Airport, and airports need unimpeded flight path areas for safe operation. We understand that the airport is also planning an expansion. Fish & Wildlife Service does state that structures such as power lines, wind farms and off-shore rigs have been known to affect migratory birds. If the proposed primary route is the shortest, we support that route and a route that is not near airports.

Q7. What is the basis for your preference as stated in the previous questions?

A7. The less miles you cover, the less property transactions that take place. The money saved from having to purchase landowner's property on all these out of the way routes could be used to buy a less offensive transmission pole such as the monopoles.

Q8. Does this conclude your testimony?

Q9. Yes. Thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns.

Diana Fisch