



Control Number: 45624



Item Number: 334

Addendum StartPage: 0

LARRY W. FIELDS

P.O. BOX 129
CARTHAGE, TEXAS 75633
(903) 693-8888
FAX (903) 693-9009

RECEIVED
2016 MAY 26 AM 9:12
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
FILING CLERK

May 19, 2016

Central Records
Public Utility Commission of Texas
1701 N. Congress Ave.
PO Box 13326
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Via Overnight Delivery

**RE: City of Garland Rusk-Panola Transmission Line
SOAH Docket No. 473-16-2751
PUC Docket No. 45624**

Dear Sir/Madam:

Enclosed you will find the following documents:

1. Certificate of Service
2. Direct Testimony of Larry W. Fields

Very truly,

Larry W. Fields

Enclosure as Indicated

334

1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2

We certify that a copy of this document will be serviced on all parties of

3

record on May 18, 2016, in accordance with Public Utilities Commission

4

Procedural Rule 22.74.

5

6

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Larry W. Fields", is written over a horizontal line.

7

Larry W. Fields

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 Direct Testimony of Larry W. Fields

22 SOAH Docket No. 473-61-2751

23 PUC Docket No. 45624

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-2751
PUC DOCKET NO. 45624**

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
GARLAND TO AMEND A	§	
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE	§	
AND NECESSITY FOR THE	§	
PROPOSED RUSK TO PANOLA	§	OF
DOUBLE CIRCUIT 345-KV	§	
TRANSMISSION LINE IN RUSK AND	§	
PANOLA COUNTIES, TEXAS	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

LARRY W. FIELDS

MAY 17, 2016

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-2751
PUC DOCKET NO. 45624

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF
GARLAND TO AMEND A § BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE §
AND NECESSITY FOR THE §
PROPOSED RUSK TO PANOLA § OF
DOUBLE CIRCUIT 345-KV §
TRANSMISSION LINE IN RUSK AND §
PANOLA COUNTIES, TEXAS § ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
LARRY W. FIELDS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	3
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	4
III.	WHY THE LINE SHOULD NOT CROSS MY PROPERTY	4
IV.	A ROUTE THAT PROTECTS COMMUNITY VALUES	8
V.	A REASONABLE CONDITION THAT SHOULD APPLY	9
VI.	CONCLUSION	10

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-2751
PUC DOCKET NO. 45624

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
GARLAND TO AMEND A	§	
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE	§	
AND NECESSITY FOR THE	§	
PROPOSED RUSK TO PANOLA	§	OF
DOUBLE CIRCUIT 345-KV	§	
TRANSMISSION LINE IN RUSK AND	§	
PANOLA COUNTIES, TEXAS	§	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

1
2 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS.

3 A. My name is LARRY W. FIELDS.

4 My address is:

5 P.O. BOX 129

6 CARTHAGE, TEXAS 75633

7 Q. HAVE YOU EVER PROVIDED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE PUBLIC
8 UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS BEFORE?

9 A. No.

10 Q. WOULD YOUR PROPERTY BE AFFECTED BY ONE OR MORE OF
11 THE SEGMENTS USED TO MAKE ONE OR MORE OF THE
12 PROPOSED ROUTES FOR THE CITY OF GARLAND'S APPLICATION?
13 IF SO, PLEASE IDENTIFY THE SEGMENTS THAT WOULD AFFECT
14 YOUR LAND.

15 A. Yes, Segment 30.

16

1 Q. WHAT MATERIALS HAVE YOU REVIEWED FOR YOUR
2 PREPARATION OF THIS TESTIMONY?

3 A. The maps of the project and many of the filings in this case.
4
5

6 Q. IS THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN YOUR TESTIMONY TRUE AND
7 CORRECT TO THE BEST OF YOUR INFORMATION?

8 A. Yes.
9

10 **II. PURPOSE OF THE TESTIMONY**

11 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

12 A. The purpose of my testimony is to show that the facts demonstrate why it
13 would be contrary to the routing criteria set out in the statute and
14 Commission rules for the proposed transmission line to be routed on my
15 property. Although I sympathize with any landowners having the
16 transmission line routed on their property, I also discuss a route that I
17 believe most Intervenors would support and that would comply with
18 Panola County community values

19 **III. WHY THE LINE SHOULD NOT CROSS MY PROPERTY**

20 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BACKGROUND OF THE ACQUISITION OF
21 YOUR PROPERTY AND HOW IT IS UTILIZED.

22 A. I purchased the property from Ms. Baldwin with the anticipation that a child
23 or grandchild would be able to utilize it for a home site at the appropriate
time in their life. At the time of purchase it was put in my parents name (to

1 be held for me in Trust) because it joined their larger tract. It has not been
2 being utilized. One son anticipates building a house on the adjoining tract
3 belonging to C.W. Fields and hopes this tract will be available at the
4 appropriate time for my grandchild to build on.

5

6 **Q. DO YOU OPPOSE THE ROUTING OF THE RUSK TO PANOLA 345 KV**
7 **TRANSMISSION LINE BEING ON YOUR PROPERTY?**

8 A. Yes, I do oppose the transmission line crossing my property on Segment
9 30. The property was originally acquired as a homesite, 6 acres at the
10 corner of FM 699 and the county road. The line will render the property
11 unusable for a homesite.

12 **Q. IS THERE A ROUTE YOU SUPPORT AS BEING IN ACCORDANCE**
13 **WITH COMMUNITY VALUES?**

14 A. Yes, there was discussion of a route at a meeting held in Carthage that
15 that I support. It includes Segments 1, 7, 9, 13, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 41, and
16 43. There were very few Intervenors that would be affected. It was also a
17 route where one of the Intervenors preferred that the line to be routed.

18 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THE ROUTE YOU DESCRIBE WOULD BE IN**
19 **KEEPING WITH COMMUNITY VALUES?**

20 A. Yes.

21

1 Q. WHAT, IF ANY, ADVERSE IMPACT WOULD THE USE OF THE
2 SEGMENT AFFECTING YOUR LAND HAVE ON HISTORICAL AND
3 AESTHETIC VALUES AND ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY?

4 A. It would destroy the aesthetic value.
5
6

7 Q. ARE THERE ANY NEARBY RECREATIONAL OR PARK AREAS THAT
8 WOULD BE AFFECTED IF THE ROUTE USING THE SEGMENT
9 IMPACTING YOUR PROPERTY IS USED?

10 A. No.
11
12

13 Q. HAS THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE BEEN ROUTED ON
14 YOUR PROPERTY SO AS TO MODERATE ANY IMPACT TO YOU AND
15 YOUR FAMILY?

16 A. No.
17
18

19 Q. DOES THE SEGMENT ON YOUR PROPERTY PARALLEL AN
20 EXISTING TRANSMISSION LINE? IF IT DOES, HOW MANY
21 TRANSMISSION LINES ALREADY CROSS YOUR PROPERTY?
22 WOULD THE NEW LINES BE CLOSER TO A HABITABLE

1 **STRUCTURE THAN ANY EXISTING TRANSMISSION LINES ON YOUR**
2 **PROPERTY?**

3 A. No. Not a large transmission line. A Deep East Texas Electric Coop single
4 line is on the property but not running adjacent to this property line.
5
6
7

8 Q. **DOES THE ROUTING OF THE TRANSMISSION LINE PARALLEL**
9 **YOUR PROPERTY BOUNDARIES?**

10 A. No.
11
12
13

14 Q. **DOES THE ROUTING OF THE LINE ON YOUR PROPERTY PARALLEL**
15 **EXISTING ROADS, HIGHWAYS, OR OTHER COMPARABLE RIGHT-**
16 **OF-WAY? IF NOT, WHERE DOES IT CROSS YOUR PROPERTY?**

17 A. No, it appears to cross the middle of it.
18
19
20

21 Q. **IS THE ROUTING OF THE TRANSMISSION LINE ON YOUR**
22 **PROPERTY WITHIN 500 FEET OF A HABITABLE STRUCTURE?**

23 A. No.

1 Q. ARE THERE ANY HEALTH ISSUES THAT COULD BE ADVERSELY
2 AFFECTED IF THE TRANSMISSION LINE IS ROUTED ACROSS YOUR
3 PROPERTY? IF SO, PLEASE EXPLAIN.

4 A. No, not today.
5
6
7

8 Q. IN YOUR OPINION, DOES THE ROUTING OF THE TRANSMISSION
9 LINE ON YOUR PROPERTY CONFORM WITH COMMUNITY VALUES?
10 IF NOT, PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY IT DOES NOT.

11 A. No, it cuts through the middle of the property, not along the proposed line.
12
13
14

15 Q. WOULD THE ROUTING OF THE TRANSMISSION LINE ON YOUR
16 PROPERTY ADVERSELY AFFECT YOUR BUSINESS OR OTHER
17 INCOME PRODUCING ACTIVITIES? IF SO, PLEASE EXPLAIN

18 A. No.
19

20 IV. A ROUTE THAT PROTECTS COMMUNITY VALUES

21 Q. WHAT ROUTE, IN YOUR OPINION, BEST SUPPORT COMMUNITY
22 VALUES?

1 A. A route comprised of segments 1, 7, 9, 13, 23, 24, 28, 31, 34, 41, and 43.
2 It appears from City of Garland's map that there are only six Intervenor
3 that are on those segments. It seems they have only three habitable
4 structures that are within 500 feet of the transmission line. I also strongly
5 recommend that the utility be required to route the transmission line on the
6 Intervenor's property so that it would have minimal impact on their property
7 in accordance with the Intervenor's wishes.

8 **V. A REASONABLE CONDITION THAT SHOULD APPLY**

9 **Q. ARE THERE REASONABLE CONDITIONS THAT SHOULD BE**
10 **INCLUDED IN THE ORDER IN THIS PROCEEDING THAT WOULD BE**
11 **IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?**

12 A. Yes. City of Garland said at the technical conference held in Carthage,
13 Texas on April 20, 2016 that no progress had been made to construct the
14 transmission line to Mississippi and Alabama from the DC tie because of
15 financial reasons. I urge the Commission to condition the condemnation
16 and purchase of transmission easement for the City of Garland's proposed
17 Rusk to Panola 345 kV transmission project until Southern Cross provides
18 sufficient evidence to this Commission that sufficient financing and state
19 authority has been obtained to construct the transmission line to
20 Mississippi and Alabama. Panola landowners should not have their land
21 taken if in fact the transmission line proposed to be built to Mississippi and
22 Alabama is never built. Without the proposed transmission line in SERC
23 being built there will be no Southern Cross Project. It is reasonable and in

1 the public interest to ensure that landowner property is not condemned if
2 the project does not happen.

3 **VI. CONCLUSION**

4 **Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

5 **A. Yes, sir.**