



## **Filing Receipt**

**Filing Date - 2023-09-07 02:46:40 PM**

**Control Number - 55067**

**Item Number - 1786**

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-23-21216  
PUC DOCKET NO. 55067**


<b>APPLICATION OF ONCOR ELECTRIC</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE</b>
<b>DELIVERY LLC TO AMEND ITS</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>NECESSITY FOR THE RAMHORN</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>OF</b>
<b>HILL – DUNHAM 345-KV</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>TRANSMISSION LINE IN DENTON</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>AND WISE COUNTIES</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS</b>

**ALLIANCE WEST, LP'S  
INITIAL POST-HEARING BRIEF**

September 7, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

JACKSON WALKER LLP



---

Heath D. Armstrong  
State Bar No. 24105048  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 236-2098  
(512) 391-2163 (Fax)  
harmstrong@jw.com

**ATTORNEY FOR ALLIANCE  
WEST, LP**

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-23-21216  
PUC DOCKET NO. 55067**

<b>APPLICATION OF ONCOR ELECTRIC DELIVERY LLC TO AMEND ITS CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE RAMHORN HILL – DUNHAM 345-KV TRANSMISSION LINE IN DENTON AND WISE COUNTIES</b>	<b>§ § § § § § §</b>	<b>BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE   OF  ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS</b>
--	--	--

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
II.	PRELIMINARY ORDER ISSUES 8, 9, AND 10: ROUTING .....	4
	A. The ALJs Should Recommend That the Commission Approve Route 179-C, With Denton’s Proposed Modifications, Because it is Superior to Route 179 and is the Route That Best Meets the Factors Set Forth in PURA § 37.056 and the Commission’s Rules. ....	4
	B. If the ALJs Do Not Recommend Route 179-C, the ALJs Should Recommend a Route That Does not Utilize Segment M3. ....	9
III.	CONCLUSION.....	11

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-23-21216  
PUC DOCKET NO. 55067**

<b>APPLICATION OF ONCOR ELECTRIC</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE</b>
<b>DELIVERY LLC TO AMEND ITS</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>NECESSITY FOR THE RAMHORN</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>OF</b>
<b>HILL – DUNHAM 345-KV</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>TRANSMISSION LINE IN DENTON</b>	<b>§</b>	
<b>AND WISE COUNTIES</b>	<b>§</b>	<b>ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS</b>

**INITIAL POST-HEARING BRIEF OF ALLIANCE WEST, LP**

Alliance West, LP (“Alliance”) hereby files this Initial Post-Hearing Brief following the hearing on the merits in the above-captioned docket. By agreement of the parties and as ordered at the hearing, initial post-hearing briefs are to be filed by September 7, 2023. Therefore, this brief is timely filed.

**I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Oncor Electric Delivery Company, LLC (“Oncor”) proposes to construct the Ramhorn Hill to Dunham 345 kV transmission line in Denton and Wise Counties using proposed Route 179. Alternatively, Alliance, along with Commission Staff and a number of other intervening parties to this proceeding, recommend that the Administrative Law Judges (“ALJs”) approve Route 179-C as the route that best meets the factors set forth in PURA<sup>1</sup> § 37.056 and 16 TAC § 25.101(b)(3)(B).<sup>2</sup> Route 179-C ranks fourth in the number of habitable structures impacted and, of the routes that directly affect fewer habitable structures, Route 179-C is shorter in length and less expensive.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Public Utility Regulatory Act, Tex. Util. Code §§ 11.001-66.016.

<sup>2</sup> The following parties have agreed to support (or, as indicated below, not oppose) this recommendation are: Edgar Brent Watkins and Mary Ann Livengood, Co-Trustees of the Watkins Family Trust; Bill Beverly Jr.; Bobby Norris; David Bratton and Jerry Bratton; GRBK Edgewood, LLC and GBTM Sendera, LLC; GFAT, LLC; H3M Property Holdings LP (not opposed); Margaret and Antonio Chavez; Martin Rojas; Matthew A. Spacetic; New Dimension Investment II, LLC (Steve Elis); Rama Prasad Chalasani; Wayne and Norma Wilkerson; Denton County Land & Cattle, LP and Denton County Land & Cattle 2; and Ross Brewer (not opposed) (the “Western Parties”).

<sup>3</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 (Errata to the Direct Testimony of John Poole) at 000052.

Further, compared to the routes that impact fewer habitable structures, Route 179-C parallels apparent property boundaries or utilizes existing compatible rights-of-way (“ROWS”) to a greater extent and does not cross any parks and recreational areas. Finally, compared to Route 179, Oncor’s recommended best meets route, Route 179-C only impacts one additional habitable structure and is approximately \$2.4 million cheaper. Denton County Land & Cattle, LP and Denton County Land & Cattle 2 (“Denton”) has also proposed minor modifications to Segments M1 and M5 which Alliance supports, that Oncor has determined are viable and constructible.<sup>4</sup> For the reasons discussed in further detail below, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend Route 179-C to the Commission, with Denton’s proposed modifications to Segments M1 and M5, as the route that best meets the factors set forth in Texas Utilities Code § 37.056 and the Commission’s rules.

If the ALJs determine that Route 179-C is not the best meets route, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend that the Commission approve an alternative route that does not utilize Segment M3 as it would have a significant detrimental impact on Alliance’s future development plans for its property.

## **II. PRELIMINARY ORDER ISSUES 8, 9, AND 10: ROUTING**

### **A. The ALJs Should Recommend That the Commission Approve Route 179-C, With Denton’s Proposed Modifications, Because it is Superior to Route 179 and is the Route That Best Meets the Factors Set Forth in PURA § 37.056 and the Commission’s Rules.**

Commission Staff has determined that Route 179-C is the route that best meets the factors set forth in PURA § 37.056 and the Commission’s substantive rules.<sup>5</sup> However, Oncor determined

---

<sup>4</sup> See DCLC Ex. 5 at 000004 and 000006 (Oncor responses to DCLC’s First RFI’s).

<sup>5</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000017.

in its Application that Route 179 is the best-meets route.<sup>6</sup> Compared to Route 179, Route 179-C is \$2.4 million cheaper,<sup>7</sup> impacts only one more habitable structure,<sup>8</sup> is 4,525 feet shorter at 110,373 than Route 179,<sup>9</sup> and parallels or uses existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries to a greater extent.<sup>10</sup> Oncor received numerous comments from community members about their concerns and preferences for the project and those comments expressed an “overwhelming” preference for, among other things, maximizing distances relative to residences and recreational areas.<sup>11</sup> Route 179-C crosses within 500 feet of 98 habitable structures, which is only five more Route 164, the route that impacts the fewest habitable structures at 93.<sup>12</sup> However, compared to Route 164, 179-C is both 5,109 feet shorter and over \$21.5 million cheaper.<sup>13</sup> Overall, Route 179-C ranks fourth when compare to the 84 potential routes in avoiding habitable structures.<sup>14</sup> Further, Route 179-C does not cross any recreational areas or parks and it only comes within 1,000 feet of four such areas. Therefore, based on the overwhelming preference of the community that the project avoid residences and recreational areas and the other factors outlines in PURA § 37.056(c), Route 179-C is a superior route to Route 179 as it impacts nearly the same number of habitable structures while costing over \$2.4 million less.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Application of Oncor Electric Delivery LLC to Amend Its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for the Ramhorn Hill - Dunham 345 kV Transmission Line in Denton and Wise Counties*, (“Application”) at 000024 (“Oncor then evaluated the alternative routes and selected Route 179 as the route that best addresses the requirements of PURA § 37.056(c)(4)(A)-(D) and 16 TAC § 25.101”).

<sup>7</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000040.

<sup>8</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000049.

<sup>9</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000046.

<sup>10</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000046.

<sup>11</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000026.

<sup>12</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000049.

<sup>13</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000045-000046.

<sup>14</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000049.

In addition to the community's overwhelming preference to avoid impacting residences and recreational areas, community members also expressed the concern that the transmission line be as short as possible and affect aesthetics as little as possible.<sup>15</sup> Of the 84 proposed routes, Route 179-C ranks 29th in terms of length, but is less than one mile longer than the shortest route, Route 16. However, Route 16 crosses within 500 feet of 191 habitable structures, over double the number of habitable structures impacted by Route 179-C.<sup>16</sup> Further, Route 16 crosses recreational areas and parks while Route 179-C does not.<sup>17</sup>

It is difficult to quantify the effects that a route will have on aesthetics, but a route that parallels or uses existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries is less likely to negatively affect the aesthetic value of the property impacted and is also less likely to affect property values and the future development of the land than a route that does not.<sup>18</sup> The Commission's substantive rule, 16 TAC § 25.101(b)(3)(B), reflects this idea by requiring that, in addition to the criteria outlined in PURA § 37.056(c), a new transmission line must be routed to the extent reasonable to moderate the impact on the affected community and landowners. The Commission's rule accomplishes this by requiring that the Commission to consider whether the routes parallel or utilize existing compatible ROWs for electric facilities, including the use of vacant positions on existing multiple-circuit transmission lines; whether the routes parallel or utilize other existing compatible ROWs, including roads, highways, railroads, or telephone utility ROWs; and whether the routes parallel property lines or other natural or cultural features.<sup>19</sup> Route 179-C parallels

---

<sup>15</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000028.

<sup>16</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000049.

<sup>17</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000048.

<sup>18</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000030.

<sup>19</sup> 16 TAC § 25.101(b)(3)(B).

existing compatible ROWs for 23.25 percent of its length, compared to 22.68 percent for Route 179.<sup>20</sup> In addition, all but two of the routes that parallel or use more existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries directly affect more habitable structures than Route 179-C.<sup>21</sup> However, those two routes, Route 164 and Route 164-R, are approximately \$25 million more expensive than Route 179-C.<sup>22</sup> Ultimately, there is no route that is cheaper, crosses within 500 feet of fewer habitable structures, and also parallels or utilizes more existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries than Route 179-C.

Lastly, as a property owner whose land is adversely impacted by Route 179-C, Denton proposed modifications to Segments M5 and M1 in order to minimize the adverse impact to both Denton's and Alliance's property while still accommodating the transmission line. As can be seen from the illustration below, these two minor alterations reduce the overall negative impact to Denton and Alliance while simultaneously maintaining Route 179-C as a less expensive route than Route 179.



<sup>20</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000046.

<sup>21</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000049.

<sup>22</sup> Commission Staff Ex. 2 at 000040.



Oncor has confirmed that alternative Segment M1 is viable and constructible and in its evaluation made a slight alteration to alternative Segment M5, which is represented in the illustration below, Oncor has concluded that with this minor alteration the alternative Segment M5 is also viable and constructible.<sup>23</sup>



Based on Oncor's evaluation, the cost associated with alternative Segment M1 is \$247,129 and the cost associated with alternative Segment M5 as adjusted by Oncor is \$484,303.<sup>24</sup> Making the total cost difference associated with both modifications \$731,432 and maintaining Route 179-C as a less expensive route than Route 179 by approximately \$1.7 million.

Commission Staff, as well as the Western Parties, support Route 179-C as the route that best meets the criteria outlined in PURA § 37.056(c) and 16 TAC § 25.101(b)(3)(B). Furthermore, Oncor has indicated that it considers Route 179-C to be a viable and constructible route and is not

<sup>23</sup> DCLC Ex. 5 at 000005.

<sup>24</sup> DCLC Ex. 5 at 000004.

opposed to the Commission selecting it as the best meets route.<sup>25</sup> Route 179-C mitigates the concerns expressly outlined to Oncor by members of the community. Overall, Route 179-C best addresses the criteria to be considered and is superior to Route 179. Therefore, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs proposal for decision recommend that the Commission approve Route 179-C, with the modifications outlined above to Segments M5 and M1, as the best meets route.

**B. If the ALJs Do Not Recommend Route 179-C, the ALJs Should Recommend a Route That Does not Utilize Segment M3.**

Alliance respectfully request that the ALJs recommend Route 179-C, with Denton's proposed modifications to Segments M1 and M5, as the best meets route. However, if the ALJs refuse to recommend Alliance's proposed modifications, Alliance still prefers Route 179-C over any route that utilizes Segment M3. If a route other than Route 179-C is to be recommended, then Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend a route that does not use Segment M3 for the reasons described in detail below.

Segment M3 as proposed by Oncor would materially and adversely impact Alliance's property and the development of valuable business interests in and around the property, causing substantial damage to the economic and developmental value of the property and the surrounding area. While the property is currently undeveloped, its location makes it highly valuable for future commercial development. Constructing Segment M3 on Alliance's property as proposed by Oncor would stifle future development, rendering Alliance's existing engineering and land use development plans virtually worthless. Specifically, light industrial facilities and public infrastructure improvements, including a four lane road, are part of the development plans at the location of the proposed M3 route segment. The inclusion of Segment M3 in the approved route

---

<sup>25</sup> Watkins Ex. 8 at 23 (Response of Oncor to Watkins' First Request for Information).

would adversely impact Alliance and its plans to develop the property as the transmission line would result in lost access points to the property and an overall reduction of the area that is capable of being developed. Further, the adverse land use impact and economic loss that would result from the placement of the transmission line on the proposed M3 segment alignment would be significant from an investment perspective, including but not limited to lost square footage for commercial buildings, significant division of the property and the resulting inefficiency of infrastructure, and a significant reduction in the attractiveness of the commercial development to potential tenants due to necessary adjustments that will have to be made to account for the existence of the transmission line in Alliance's original concept plan and engineering models, which were developed at significant expense.

There are routes that are shorter, cheaper, or parallel or use more existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries than those that use Segment M3. For example, Route 16 is the shortest route and doesn't utilize Segment M3 and Route 117 parallels or uses the most existing compatible ROWs and property boundaries and does not use Segment M3. In fact, of the 22 routes that are less expensive than Route 179, including Route 179-C, only one uses Segment M3.<sup>26</sup> Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend that the Commission approve Route 179-C with Alliance's modifications as the best meets route. However, for the reasons outlined above, if the ALJs intend to recommend a route other than Route 179-C, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend a route that does not utilize Segment M3.

---

<sup>26</sup> Oncor Ex. 4 (Direct testimony and Exhibits of Brenda J. Perkins) at Routing Memorandum of Brenda Perkins Part 4. (Routes 1, 16, 19, 29, 36, 41, 42, 67, 68, 72, 86, 94, 96, 103, 142, 143, 146, 191, 192, and 219 are all listed in Attachment 7 to the Application, as less expensive than Route 179. Only Route 29 uses Segment M3: A0-A4-B1-B5-B8-C3-C6-E6-G1-G3-G6-H3-I5-I8-J3-K1-L5-L4-L3-L2-M1-M2-M3-R4-V2-Z.)

### **III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend that the Commission approve Route 179-C as the route that best meets the criteria set forth in PURA § 37.056 and 16 TAC § 25.101(b)(3)(B) with the modifications proposed by Denton to Segments M1 and M5. In the alternative, Alliance respectfully requests that the ALJs recommend that the Commission approve Route 179-C without Denton's proposed modifications. Finally, Alliance requests that if Route 179-C is not recommended by the ALJs as the best meets route, that the ALJs recommend a route that does not utilize Segment M3 to avoid significant adverse impacts to Alliance's property.