



Control Number: 47003



Item Number: 65

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-17-4267
P.U.C. DOCKET NO. 47003

RECEIVED

2017 NOV 16 AM 11:02

APPLICATION OF ENTERGY
TEXAS, INC. TO AMEND ITS
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE
AND NECESSITY FOR A 230-KV
TRANSMISSION LINE WITHIN
JEFFERSON COUNTY

§
§
§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION

OF

MATTHEW J. BULPITT

ON BEHALF OF

ENTERGY TEXAS, INC.

NOVEMBER 16, 2017

65

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION OF MATTHEW BULPITT
ENTERGY TEXAS, INC.
SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-17-4267
DOCKET NO. 47003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction and Purpose	1
II. Overview of Stipulation	2
III. Reasonableness of Stipulation	5
IV. Conclusion	5

1 I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

2 Q1. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS AFFILIATION.

3 A. My name is Matthew J. Bulpitt. I am employed by Entergy Services, Inc.
4 ("ESI"). My office is located at 10055 Grogans Mill Road, The Woodlands,
5 Texas.

6

7 Q2. PLEASE STATE HOW YOU ARE EMPLOYED.

8 A. I am the Manager, Capital Projects for Entergy Texas, Inc.'s ("ETI" or "the
9 Company") Transmission Business. My area of responsibility includes
10 management of new transmission projects for ETI.

11

12 Q3. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?

13 A. I am submitting this testimony to the Public Utility Commission of Texas
14 ("Commission") on behalf of ETI.

15

16 Q4. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY OR PARTICIPATED IN
17 THESE PROCEEDINGS?

18 A. Yes. I filed Direct Testimony in this proceeding on August 2, 2017 and
19 Supplemental Direct Testimony on September 15, 2017. In addition, in
20 my role as Manager of Capital Projects, I secured resources to form the
21 project team and monitor team progress and performance throughout the

1 entire life-cycle of the Project. I also provided support to ETI in the
2 negotiations that resulted in the settlement of this docket.

3

4 Q5. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

5 A. Through this testimony, I address the settlement agreement on Route
6 No. 11. My testimony provides an overview description of the route and
7 explains that the Route 11 best meets the PUCT criteria, is reasonable
8 and should be approved by the Commission.

9

10 II. OVERVIEW OF STIPULATION

11 Q6. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ROUTE WHICH WAS AGREED UPON BY
12 INTERVENORS IN THE STIPULATION?

13 A. The Company, the Staff of the Public Utility Commission, and current
14 intervenors: Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, Fred Rosen, and R&S
15 Company, came to an agreement on Route No. 11. This route affects 60
16 habitable structures. It has a length of 13.11 miles and an estimated cost
17 of \$70,346,901 including both transmission and substation facilities costs.

18

19 Q7. WHICH INTERVENORS ARE DIRECTLY AFFECTED BY THE
20 STIPULATED ROUTE NO. 11?

1 A. None of the current intervenors in this proceeding are directly affected by
2 Route No. 11. All of the intervenors have agreed or are unopposed to this
3 Stipulation.

4
5 Q8. HOW DOES THE AGREED ROUTE DIFFER FROM THE PROPOSED
6 ROUTE NO. 11 INCLUDED IN THE COMPANY'S APPLICATION AT THE
7 TIME OF FILING?

8 A. It is the exact same route. There were no modifications to the proposed
9 Route 11 included in the application. Consequently, there is no additional
10 analysis needed of the impact of the Route No. 11 on the criteria under
11 Public Utility Regulatory Act ("PURA") or the Commission's rules.

12
13 Q9. HOW DOES THE AGREED ROUTE NO. 11 MEET THE
14 REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH UNDER PURA SECTION 37.056 AND 16
15 T.A.C. § 25.101?

16 A. In Company witness Salvatore Falcone's Direct Testimony in this
17 proceeding, he listed all of the reasons why Route No. 11 was beneficial
18 and why it met the requirements set out in PURA and the PUCT
19 Substantive Rules. Route No. 11 is:

- 20 • Overall best total weighted score.
21 • Overall 2nd best total raw score.
22 • Overall best environmental raw score.

- 1 • Overall best environmental weighted score.
- 2 • Best ranked for all environmental weightings of 40% and greater.
- 3 • Tied for 1st with routes 4, 9, and 10 for having the least estimated
- 4 length over open water, at zero.
- 5 • Tied for 1st with routes 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 for the least
- 6 estimated length in pineywoods small stream and riparian
- 7 herbaceous wetland, at zero.
- 8 • Tied for 1st with routes 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 for the least
- 9 estimated length in pineywoods small stream and riparian wet
- 10 prairie, at zero.
- 11 • Tied with routes 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16 for the fewest
- 12 number of parks/recreational areas within 1,000 feet, at zero.
- 13 • Most route length parallel to existing 230 kV transmission lines, at
- 14 3.14 miles.
- 15 • Tied for 2nd with Route 14 for the least estimated length within the
- 16 Chenier Plain fresh and intermediate tidal march area, at 1.34
- 17 miles.
- 18 • Ranked 2nd in least length of route in FEMA-mapped 100-year
- 19 flood plain, at 4.40 miles.
- 20 • Tied for 3rd with Routes 8 and 9 for the most length of route
- 21 utilizing existing transmission line right-of-way.

- 1 • Tied for 4th with Route 14 for the least estimated length within the
- 2 Gulf Coast Salty Prairie, at 0.29 mile.
- 3 • Does not enter the J. D. Murphree Wildlife Management Area.

4 Based on these factors, the Company feels Route No. 11 best meets the

5 criteria set forth in PURA Section 37.056 and 16 T.A.C. §. 25.101.

6

7 Q10. HOW DOES THE COST OF ROUTE 11 COMPARE TO THE OTHER

8 ROUTES?

9 A. It is one is one of the least expensive routes among the 16 alternate

10 routes considered. Thus, the cost of Route No. 11 is reasonable.

11

12 III. REASONABLENESS OF STIPULATION

13 Q11. WHAT IS THE COMPANY'S POSITION REGARDING COMMISSION

14 APPROVAL OF THIS STIPULATION?

15 A. ETI had determined that Route No. 11 was the route that best addressed

16 the criteria under PURA and the Commission's rules. Therefore, the

17 Stipulation is reasonable and within the public interest. Furthermore, the

18 agreement is supported or unopposed by all intervening parties and

19 represents a reasonable result. For these reasons and those listed earlier

20 in my testimony and in ETI's application, Route 11 best meets the PUCT

21 criteria and should be approved by the Commission.

1 Q12. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

2 A. Yes.