Control Number: 48358

Item Number: 149

Addendum StartPage: 0

RECEIVED
2018 SEP 10 PM 1:33
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
FILING CLERK

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-18-5064
PUC DOCKET NO. 48358

APPLICATION OF LCRA TRANSMISSION SERVICES CORPORATION TO AMEND ITS CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE PROPOSED COOKS POINT 138-KV TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT IN BURLESON COUNTY, TEXAS	§ § § § § § § §	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF

MELINDA JENSEN

ON BEHALF OF

APPLICANT
LCRA TRANSMISSION SERVICES CORPORATION

September 10, 2018

149

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-18-5064
PUC DOCKET NO. 48358
DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT OF MELINDA JENSEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS 3

II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY 5

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND ROUTING STUDY 6

IV. INFORMATION ADDRESSING PURA AND THE PUC'S CCN APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS 14

V. ADDITIONAL COMMISSION ROUTING CONSIDERATIONS 18

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 20

EXHIBIT

Exhibit MLJ-1: Resume of Melinda Jensen

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. My name is Melinda Jensen. My business address is 9400 Amberglen Boulevard, Austin, Texas 78729.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION?

A. I am employed by URS Corporation (URS), a legacy AECOM company and engineering and environmental consulting firm. I hold the position of Senior Project Manager and serve as a Practice Leader for the Impact Assessment and Permitting Department within our company's Central Region, covering 22 states from the Gulf of Mexico to the US-Canada border, including Texas.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND?

A. I earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in Wildlife Management from Texas Tech University in 1997 and a Master of Science Degree in Zoology from Texas Tech University in 2000. I have worked as a full-time professional environmental consultant for over 18 years, beginning with Wendy Lopez & Associates (a legacy URS company) in 2000. In 2017 I became a Practice Leader for the Impact Assessment and Permitting Department within URS' Central Region. In this position I am involved in managing various types of environmental assessment projects and ensuring all projects under my direction address the requirements of applicable local, state, and federal agency regulations. I also have administrative and business development responsibilities across URS' Central Region.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS.

A. Since my initial employment as an environmental consultant, I have provided environmental planning and consulting services for electric transmission line projects, transportation projects, land development projects, and other linear infrastructure projects, including a variety of pipelines. The first electric transmission line routing study in which I participated was for a 138-kilovolt (kV) transmission line in Texas in 2004. Since that

time, I have managed or provided technical management on numerous environmental impact analyses for electric transmission line projects in Texas. These projects have ranged in size from 138-kV to 345-kV and have been as long as approximately 95 miles. I have also managed or provided technical review for dozens of environmental assessment or environmental impact assessment documents. My educational and professional qualifications are more fully presented in Exhibit MLJ-1 attached hereto.

Q. HAVE YOU SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN A PROCEEDING BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS (COMMISSION OR PUC)?

A. Yes, I have previously testified in the following PUC dockets:

Project Name	PUC Docket No.	SOAH Docket Number
Cogdell – Clairemont 138-kV Transmission Line Project, Kent and Scurry Counties, Texas	47808	473-18-1930
Permian Basin – Culberson 138-kV Transmission Line Project, Culberson, Loving, Reeves, Ward, and Winkler Counties, Texas	42583	473-14-4953
Oklaunion – Fisher Road 345-kV Transmission Line Project, Wichita County, Texas	39524	473-12-0068
Newton – Killeen 345-kV CREZ Transmission Line Project, Bell, Burnet, and Lampasas Counties, Texas	37463	473-10-0709

Q. WERE YOUR TESTIMONY AND THE PORTIONS OF THE APPLICATION YOU SPONSOR PREPARED BY YOU OR BY KNOWLEDGEABLE PERSONS UPON WHOSE EXPERTISE, JUDGMENT, AND OPINIONS YOU RELY IN PERFORMING YOUR DUTIES?

A. Yes, they were.

Q. IS THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN YOUR TESTIMONY AND IN THE PORTIONS OF THE APPLICATION YOU SPONSOR TRUE AND CORRECT TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF?

A. Yes, it is.

II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to introduce, support, sponsor, and describe the *Environmental Assessment and Alternative Route Analysis for LCRA Transmission Services Corporation's Proposed Cooks Point 138-kV Transmission Line Project in Burleson County, Texas* (EA) prepared by URS at the request of LCRA Transmission Services Corporation (LCRA TSC). The EA is sponsored by me and included as Attachment 1 to LCRA TSC's Application to Amend its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity (CCN) for the Proposed Cooks Point 138-kV Transmission Line Project (Application) filed on May 31, 2018.

Q. WHICH QUESTIONS IN LCRA TSC'S APPLICATION IN THIS DOCKET DO YOU SPONSOR?

A. I sponsor the responses to Questions 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, and 28 of the Application. I co-sponsor the responses to Questions 6, 20, and 23 of the Application with Ms. Jessica Melendez, the responses to Questions 18, 19, and 29 with Mr. Justin Stryker, and the response to Question 17 with Ms. Melendez and Mr. Stryker. I also sponsor Sections 2 through 6 of the EA (Attachment 1 to the Application) and co-sponsor with Mr. Stryker Attachment 6 to the Application. Please refer to Exhibit JAS-4 to Mr. Stryker's direct testimony for an overview of the sponsorship of the Application in this case.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND ROUTING STUDY

Q. WHY DID URS PREPARE THE EA?

A. LCRA TSC retained URS to perform and prepare an EA and Routing Study for the proposed Cooks Point 138-kV Transmission Line Project (Project). My responsibility as Project Manager involved overseeing and participating in the preparation of the EA.

Q. WAS ANYONE OTHER THAN YOU INVOLVED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE EA AND THE ROUTING STUDY PROCESS?

A. Yes. I oversaw a team of professionals with expertise in different environmental and land use disciplines (geology/soils, hydrology/water quality, terrestrial ecology, wetland ecology, land use/aesthetics, and cultural resources) who were involved in data acquisition, routing analysis, and environmental assessment for the Project. Section 5.0 of the EA presents a list of the primary preparers of the EA.

Q. WHAT DOES THE EA ADDRESS?

A. The EA provides a detailed description of the data gathered and analyzed by URS in association with the Project and the routing procedures and methodology utilized by URS to delineate and evaluate alternative routes.

Q. WHAT INFORMATION DOES THE EA CONTAIN?

A. The EA includes information on physiography, geology, soils, prime farmland, mineral and energy resources, surface water, floodplains, groundwater, vegetation, terrestrial and aquatic wildlife, endangered and threatened species, land use, habitable structures, existing linear facilities, recreational areas, agriculture, aesthetics, transportation and aviation facilities, communication towers, socioeconomics, and cultural resources as such information is potentially related to the Project.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EA.

A. The objectives of the EA were to identify and evaluate alternative transmission line routes for the Project. The approach taken by URS consisted of a series of tasks designed to address the requirements of Public Utility Regulatory Act (PURA) Section 37.056(c)(4)(A)–(D), Commission Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B), including

the Commission's policy of prudent avoidance, and the Commission's CCN application requirements. The tasks included scoping and study area delineation, data collection, constraints mapping, preliminary alternative route segment and alternative substation site identification, participation in an open house meeting, modification/addition/deletion of alternative route segments following the open house meeting, and primary alternative route development and evaluation.

Q. HOW DID URS IDENTIFY PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVE ROUTE SEGMENTS AND ALTERNATIVE SUBSTATION SITES FOR THE PROJECT?

A. To identify preliminary alternative route segments for the Project, URS delineated a study area, sought public official and agency input, gathered data regarding the study area, performed constraints mapping, identified preliminary alternative route segments and alternative substation sites, and reviewed and adjusted the preliminary alternative route segments and alternative substation sites following field reconnaissance and the open house meeting.

Study Area Delineation

The study area for the Project was identified to include the two alternative southern endpoints—the existing Bluebonnet Electric Cooperative (BBEC) Lyle Wolz Substation located off State Highway 21 (SH 21) approximately nine miles southwest of Caldwell, Texas, and the existing BBEC Lyons Substation located off SH 36 approximately 12 miles southeast of Caldwell—as well as the four northern endpoint Cooks Point Substation alternatives located northeast of Caldwell. The study area was delineated to be large enough that an adequate number of reasonably differentiated alternative routes could be identified. Figure 2-1 of the EA shows the study area identified by URS and LCRA TSC.

Data Collection and Agency Contact

Once the study area was delineated, URS and LCRA TSC initiated a variety of data collection activities. One of the first data collection activities was the development of a list of agencies and officials to be mailed a consultation letter regarding the Project. URS and LCRA TSC mailed consultation letters concerning the study area in October 2017. The purpose of the letters was to inform the various officials and agencies of the Project and to

1 give those officials and agencies the opportunity to provide any information they had
2 regarding the Project and/or general study area. In response, URS and LCRA TSC received
3 written and verbal information from various agencies and public officials. Written
4 responses to the consultation letters are included in Appendix A of the EA. Additional data
5 collection activities URS performed included a review of available local, state, and federal
6 files and records, published literature, and a variety of spatial data and maps, including
7 recent aerial photography (flown October 2017), U.S Geological Survey topographic maps,
8 Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) county highway maps, and National
9 Wetland Inventory maps from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. During the course of the
10 data collection activities, URS and LCRA TSC personnel also conducted numerous
11 reconnaissance surveys of the study area in November 2017, January 2018, and March
12 2018.

13 Constraints Mapping

14 Given that a significant number of potential routes could be delineated to connect either
15 the Lyle Wolz Substation or Lyons Substation to the proposed Cooks Point Substation
16 siting area, a constraints mapping process was used in selecting and refining possible
17 alternative routes and substation sites. The information collected during the various data
18 collection activities was utilized to develop an environmental and land use constraints map.
19 Appendices C and D of the EA depict the majority of the environmental and land use
20 constraints compiled by URS. Archeological resources are not shown on the figures to
21 protect these sites.

22 Preliminary Alternative Route Segment and Substation Delineation

23 Upon completion of the initial data collection activities and constraints mapping, the next
24 step in the routing process was to identify preliminary alternative route segments to connect
25 either the Lyle Wolz Substation or Lyons Substation to a new substation in the vicinity of
26 the Cooks Point community. URS delineated a network of preliminary alternative route
27 segments between the two alternative Project endpoints (the Lyle Wolz and Lyons
28 substations) and the proposed substation sites in the Cooks Point area. Preliminary
29 alternative route segments were identified in accordance with PURA Section
30 37.056(c)(4)(A)–(D), Commission Substantive Rule 25.101, including the PUC's policy

of prudent avoidance, and the PUC's CCN Application requirements. URS identified a number of geographically diverse preliminary alternative route segments that were environmentally acceptable, considering such factors as community values, park and recreational areas, historical and aesthetic values, environmental integrity, length of route parallel to or utilizing existing compatible corridors (including apparent property boundaries), and prudent avoidance.

LCRA TSC and URS identified four alternative preliminary substation sites for the proposed Cooks Point Substation. Some of the factors considered in identifying these locations included proximity to the electric load growth area that would be served from the new substation, location on a single property owner with approximately eight to nine acres, proximity to existing distribution facilities, proximity to suitable access roads, and potentially impacted environmental features and land uses. The delineated network of preliminary alternative route segments and alternative Cooks Point Substation locations were presented to the public at an open house meeting on January 30, 2018 (Appendix B of the EA).

Following feedback from the public, government agencies, and public officials and evaluation of preliminary alternative route segments and alternative Cooks Point Substation locations, URS worked with LCRA TSC to identify 84 primary alternative route segments that connected either the Lyons Substation or Lyle Wolz Substation to the four Cooks Point Substation alternatives. The locations of the primary alternative route segments and four Cooks Point Substation alternatives presented in the Application are shown in Appendices C and D of the EA.

Q. DID URS CONSIDER INPUT FROM GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES?

A. Yes, as discussed in Section 2.2 of the EA and in my testimony above, URS and LCRA TSC solicited information and comments from a variety of state and federal agencies.

Q. DID URS CONSIDER INPUT FROM LOCAL OFFICIALS?

A. Yes, as discussed in Section 2.2 of the EA and in my testimony above, URS and LCRA TSC solicited information and considered comments from a variety of local officials with interest in the study area.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW AND WHEN IN THE PROCESS URS UTILIZED THE COMMENTS AND INFORMATION FROM GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND LOCAL OFFICIALS.

A. URS utilized comments and information from governmental agencies and local officials in the preparation of the existing environmental setting section of the EA (Section 2.3), the constraints maps, and in the selection and evaluation of both the preliminary and primary alternative route segments and substation sites.

Q. WHAT PROCESS DID URS UTILIZE TO IDENTIFY AND COMPARE THE PRIMARY ALTERNATIVE ROUTES FOR THE PROJECT?

A. In identifying and comparing the primary alternative routes, URS considered a variety of information including, among other things: input received from the public, previously identified preliminary alternative route segments that provide geographic diversity within the study area, and an inventory and tabulation of a number of environmental and land use criteria for the primary alternative routes as shown in Appendix F.

Public Open House Meeting Input/Route Segment Revisions

The preliminary alternative route segments were presented to the public during an LCRA TSC public open house meeting held on January 30, 2018. Following the open house meeting, revisions were made to the preliminary alternative route segments, many responding to landowner input received by LCRA TSC and then discussed with URS. The revisions are documented in Section 3.4 of the EA and depicted on Figures 3-1 through 3-11, with the resulting 84 primary alternative route segments depicted in Appendix E.

Identification of Primary Alternative Routes

URS and LCRA TSC identified a total of 26 geographically diverse primary alternative routes for inclusion in the Application. Many more alternative routes could be formed by connecting the primary alternative route segments in various combinations. Any such reasonably forward-progressing route that satisfies the need for the Project would be a feasible alternative.

Primary Alternative Route Evaluation/Impact Assessment

As detailed in Section 4.0 of the EA, URS examined each of the 26 primary alternative routes selected for detailed analysis via site reconnaissance from publicly accessible locations in the study area and aerial photography. The primary alternative routes were also evaluated considering a variety of environmental and land use criteria. The evaluation of each route involved inventorying and tabulating the number or quantity of each criterion along each route as demonstrated in Appendix F of the EA.

Q. WAS LCRA TSC INVOLVED IN THE REVIEW OF THE PRIMARY ALTERNATIVE ROUTES?

A. Yes, LCRA TSC reviewed the primary alternative routes with regard to cost, construction, engineering, right-of-way (ROW) maintenance issues, and constraints. LCRA TSC also conducted field reconnaissance of the primary alternative routes.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM YOU MENTIONED PREVIOUSLY.

A. The public involvement program included an open house meeting and a period of consultation between LCRA TSC and landowners. The public involvement program also involved consultation and solicitation of information from local officials and various state and federal agencies in order to give such officials and agencies the opportunity to provide URS with any information they had regarding the Project and/or study area. Information received from the public involvement program was considered and incorporated into URS' evaluation of the Project. Correspondence to and from local officials and state and federal agencies regarding the Project is located in Appendix B of the EA. LCRA TSC also provided an internet website for the Project, as described in Section 3.3.2 of the EA.

For additional information on the public involvement program, please refer to Mr. Stryker's direct testimony.

Q. WERE ANY MODIFICATIONS MADE TO THE PRELIMINARY ALTERNATVE ROUTE SEGMENTS AND SUBSTATION LOCATIONS FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM?

A. Yes. URS and LCRA TSC reviewed and evaluated each questionnaire to better understand the respondent's values, concerns, and preferences. That information was considered in the overall identification and evaluation of the alternative route segments. Section 3.3.1 of the EA provides a summary of the responses received in the questionnaires during and after the open house meeting. Based on input, comments, information received at and following the open house meeting and additional analysis conducted by LCRA TSC and URS, eight preliminary alternative route segments were modified, eight preliminary alternative route segments were deleted, and six alternative route segments were added. Section 3.4 of the EA describes the route segment modifications that were implemented following the open house meeting.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS FOLLOWED BY URS TO EVALUATE THE PRIMARY ALTERNTIVE ROUTES.

A. URS evaluated the primary alternative routes based upon the requirements set forth in PURA Section 37.056(c)(4)(A)–(D), Commission Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B), and the Commission's application requirements. Section 4.0 of the EA describes the evaluation of the primary alternative routes.

Q. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF URS' INVESTIGATIONS REGARDING THE PROPOSED TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT?

A. No significant impact to existing land use, socioeconomic, hydrological, ecological, geological, or wetland resources and no adverse effects to historic-age or archeological resources are anticipated as a result of construction of any of the primary alternative routes for the Project. Section 4.0 of the EA describes in detail the results of the primary alternative route evaluation and the potential impacts for the primary alternative routes.

Q. ARE THE ROUTES INCLUDED IN LCRA TSC'S CCN APPLICATION CONSISTENT WITH THE APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF PURA AND THE COMMISSION'S SUBSTANTIVE RULES AND CCN APPLICATION FORM?

A. Yes. URS staff with expertise in many different disciplines delineated and evaluated potential alternative routes for the Project based upon environmental and land use conditions present along each potential route, reconnaissance surveys, and information obtained during the public involvement program. URS evaluated the routes included in the EA in accordance with the requirements of PURA Section 37.056(c)(4)(A)–(D), Commission Substantive Rule 25.101, and the Commission's application requirements. I personally evaluated each potential route and in my professional opinion, all of the alternative routes in the Application, and their constituent route segments, comply with the routing requirements of PURA Section 37.056(c)(4)(A)–(D), Commission Substantive Rule 25.101, and the Commission's CCN application requirements.

The routes vary in the tabulation of the various metrics, as would be expected in a process that attempts to present a robust set of geographically diverse routes for consideration. Additionally, other reasonably forward-progressing routes that connect the Project endpoints may be created by utilizing the existing segments. Such routes may be proposed for consideration in this case and evaluated for compliance with these statutory and regulatory criteria.

Q. HAVE YOU IDENTIFIED ANY UPDATES TO THE APPLICATION OR EA THAT NEED TO BE MADE?

A. Yes. Following the filing of the Application, LCRA TSC and URS determined that Habitable Structure 13 near Segment E is not a habitable structure. As a result, the following changes should be made to the Application:

- The table provided in response to Question 21 on Page 33 should be revised to reduce the total number of habitable structures within 300 feet of the centerline for each of the Routes 13-24 by one habitable structure;
- Habitable Structure 13 should be removed from Attachment 6, Map 11 of 11; and
- Habitable Structure 13 should be removed from the table in Attachment 8, Page 18.

In addition, the following changes should be made to the EA:

- Text on Page 4-16 of the EA should reflect a total of 18 (not 19) habitable structures for Routes 15 and 23;
- Text on Page 4-25 of the EA should reflect a total of 19 (not 20) habitable structures for Route 13; a total of 18 (not 19) habitable structures for Routes 15 and 23; and a total of 20 (not 21) for Route 16;
- Habitable Structure 13 should be removed from the topographic map (Appendix C);
- Habitable Structure 13 should be removed from Pages D-29, D-30, D-32, D-33, D-35, D-37, D-39, D-41, D-43, D-45, D-47, and D-48 and the adjoining map in Appendix D; and
- Habitable Structure 13 should be removed from Pages F-1 and F-2 of Appendix F, Line Item 8 for Routes 13-24.

These changes to the Application and EA will be reflected in the exhibits that will be offered into evidence in this proceeding.

IV. INFORMATION ADDRESSING PURA AND THE PUC'S CCN APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Q. HOW WAS THE INFORMATION COMPILED BY URS USED FOR PURPOSES OF THE APPLICATION?

A. URS provided environmental and land use information for the primary alternative routes which was used to complete several specific questions in the Application.

Q. WHERE WILL THE PROJECT BE LOCATED?

A. LCRA TSC proposes to construct a new single-circuit 138-kV transmission line and load-serving substation in Burleson County. The Project will connect from either the existing Lyle Wolz Substation or the existing Lyons Substation to a new substation in the vicinity of the Cooks Point community.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS REGARDING PROXIMITY TO HABITABLE STRUCTURES IN THE VICINTY OF THE ROUTES?

A. The number of habitable structures within 300 feet of the centerline of each of the alternative routes is presented in Appendix F of the EA. Routes 15 and 23 have the least number of habitable structures within 300 feet (19), while Route 5 has the greatest number

of habitable structures within 300 feet (63). The habitable structures located within 300 feet of the routes are shown in Appendix D of the EA.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO AM RADIO TRANSMITTERS WITHIN 10,000 FEET OF THE CENTERLINE AND OTHER TYPES OF ELECTRONIC INSTALLATIONS WITHIN 2,000 FEET OF THE ROUTES?

A. No known AM radio transmitters were identified within the study area or within 10,000 feet of the primary alternative routes. The number of microwave towers and other electronic communication towers located within 2,000 feet of any of the primary alternative routes ranges from zero for Routes 14 and 16 to nine for Route 11. The number of electronic installations within 2,000 feet of a primary alternative route centerline are shown in Table 4-4 of the EA, along with general descriptions of the installations and their distances from the nearest primary alternative route segment.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION (FAA) REGISTERED AIRSTRIPS OR AIRPORTS, PRIVATE AIRSTRIPS AND HELIPORTS IN THE VICINITY OF THE CENTERLINE OF THE ROUTES?

A. URS identified the Caldwell Municipal Airport (which has a runway length of greater than 3,200 feet) as being within 20,000 feet of each of the primary alternative routes. In addition, one private airstrip and the private Weber Ranch Airport (each with a runway length of 3,200 feet or less) were identified within 10,000 feet of one or more of the primary alternative routes. There are no public FAA-registered airports or military airstrips with runways shorter than 3,200 feet within 10,000 feet of any of the primary alternative routes. One FAA-registered heliport, the Burleson County Hospital Heliport, was identified within 5,000 feet of one or more of the primary alternative routes. Each airport, airstrip, and heliport is listed and described with the approximate distance from the centerline of each of the primary alternative routes in Table 4-3 and Appendix D of the EA. These facilities are shown on Figures 2-6 and Appendices C and D of the EA.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO AREAS IRRIGATED BY TRAVELING IRRIGATION SYSTMS IN THE VICINTY OF THE ROUTES?

A. None of the primary alternative routes cross any known cropland or pastureland irrigated by traveling irrigation systems, either rolling or pivot type.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO COASTAL MANAGEMENT ZONE IMPACTS IN THE VICINTY OF THE PROJECT?

A. No part of any of the primary alternative routes are located within the Coastal Management Program boundary, as defined in 31 TAC §503.1.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO PARKS AND RECREATIONAL AREAS, INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF PARKS AND RECREATIONAL AREAS WITHIN 1,000 FEET OF THE CENTERLINE OF THE PRIMARY ALTERNATIVE ROUTES?

A. URS identified two parks or recreational areas, the Copperas Hollow Country Club and a TxDOT Rest Area, located within 1,000 feet of the centerline of several of the primary alternative routes. A general description of these recreational areas and their distances from the centerline of the primary alternative routes are provided in Section 4.7.3 and Table 4-1 of the EA, as well as shown in Appendices C and D.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON HISTORICAL AND AESTHETIC VALUES FROM THE PROJECT, INCLUDING HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES WITHIN 1,000 FEET FROM THE CENTERLINE OF THE PRIMARY ALTERNATIVE ROUTES?

A. URS identified 14 historic resources located within 1,000 feet of a primary alternative route, including six Official Texas Historical Markers and eight cemeteries. In addition, five archaeological sites are located within 1,000 feet of a primary alternative route. These sites are listed and described with the approximate distance from the centerline for each of the primary alternative routes in Tables 4-5 and 4-6, and historic sites are depicted on Appendices C and D of the EA. For the protection of the archaeological sites, they are not shown on the routing maps.

The study area is primarily rural with concentrations of residential and commercial development within the City of Caldwell and along SH 21 and SH 36. The predominant land use within the study area is undeveloped or agricultural land. Construction of the proposed 138-kV transmission line could have both temporary and permanent aesthetic effects. Temporary impacts would include views of the actual assembly and erection of the structures. Where wooded areas are cleared, the brush and wood debris could have an additional negative temporary impact on the local visual environment. Permanent impacts from the Project would involve the views of the structures and lines. New visual impacts could be minimized by constructing the new transmission line parallel to existing transmission lines.

Route 26 has the longest length within the foreground visual zone of U.S. and State highways, approximately 16.8 miles, while Route 20 has the shortest length, approximately 4.3 miles. Route 3 has the longest length, approximately 3.5 miles, within the foreground visual zone of parks or recreational areas, while Routes 4, 10, 19, and 20 have the shortest length, zero miles. The lengths of each primary alternative route segment and primary alternative route within the foreground visual zone of U.S. and State highways and parks or recreational areas are presented in Appendices E and F of the EA.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO IMPACTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY FROM THE PROJECT?

A. The impacts on environmental integrity from the Project are summarized in Section 4.5.2.5 of the EA. The Project has the potential to impact habitat for the federally listed endangered Houston Toad. Of the primary alternative routes within the study area, Routes 11 and 12 cross the least amount of modeled optimal Houston Toad habitat, with approximately 0.21 mile and 0.32 mile, respectively. Routes 6 and 10 cross the most modeled optimal Houston Toad habitat, with approximately 3.18 miles and 5.30 miles, respectively. The length of potential Houston Toad habitat crossed by each primary alternative route is presented in Appendix F of the EA. Coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service may be required if suitable habitat is observed during the field survey of the PUC-approved route.

In addition to the potential impacts discussed above, the Project may cause short term impacts to soil, water, and ecological resources. Notwithstanding the existence of endangered species and habitat in the study area, the Project is not anticipated to

significantly adversely impact populations of any federally listed endangered or threatened species. Prior to construction, a natural resources assessment will be conducted that will consider threatened and endangered species along the approved route.

V. ADDITIONAL COMMISSION ROUTING CONSIDERATIONS

Q. HOW HAS URS' ANALYSIS CONSIDERED SUCH FACTORS AS (1) USE AND PARALLELING OF EXISTING COMPATIBLE RIGHTS-OF-WAY, (2) USE OF VACANT POSITIONS ON EXISTING MULTIPLE CIRCUIT TRANSMISSION LINES, AND (3) PROPERTY BOUNDARIES OR OTHER NATURAL OR CULTURAL FEATURES?

A. URS considered the criteria that are contained in Commission Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B) while also considering PURA Section 37.056. Each alternative route segment was developed to parallel existing compatible ROW and property boundary lines where feasible. All of the primary alternative routes parallel existing transmission line ROW for a portion of their length, ranging from approximately 0.1 mile for Routes 10, 19, and 20 to approximately 14 miles for Route 21. The lengths paralleling existing transmission line ROW for each primary alternative route segment and primary alternative route are provided in Appendices E and F.

There are no vacant or open positions on any existing transmission lines located within the study area. None of the primary alternative routes utilize existing transmission line ROW.

Paralleling other existing compatible ROW is also considered to be a favorable routing criterion. URS identified railroad and roadway ROW as potential paralleling opportunities in accordance with the provisions of Commission Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B). The primary alternative route lengths parallel to roadway ROW range from approximately 0.3 mile for Routes 21 and 23 to approximately 13 miles for Route 1. The lengths paralleling existing roadway ROW for each primary alternative route are provided in Appendix F. The total primary alternative route lengths parallel to railroad ROW range from zero miles for Routes 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 17, 25, and 26 to approximately 10.7 miles for Routes 15 and 23. The lengths paralleling existing railroad ROW for each primary alternative route are provided in Appendix F.

All primary alternative routes parallel apparent property boundaries, where practical, considering other environmental and land use constraints. As described in Section 4.7.2 of the EA, there can be differences between property lines and parcel lines depending on how the information is organized at the county appraisal district. LCRA TSC provided URS with updated parcel line data that was obtained from Universal Field Services, Inc., and grouped the parcel data where possible in an effort to identify potential aggregate ownership. The total primary alternative route lengths parallel to apparent property boundaries ranges from approximately 1.7 miles for Routes 15 and 23 to approximately 16.7 miles for Route 10. Where there are contiguous parcels in apparent common ownership, only paralleling of the outside boundary of the parcels was tabulated. The lengths paralleling apparent property boundaries for each primary alternative route are provided in Appendix F of the EA.

Q. HAVE AN ADEQUATE NUMBER OF ALTERNATIVE ROUTES BEEN FORMULATED FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONDUCT A PROPER EVALUATION?

A. Yes. Considering the distance between the Project endpoints and nature of the study area, the 26 routes included in the Application provide an adequate number of geographically diverse alternative routes for evaluation. In addition, LCRA TSC determined that the new Cooks Point Substation could be adequately served from either the existing Lyle Wolz Substation or the existing Lyons Substation, as described in Mr. Kristian Koellner's direct testimony. As a result, and because of the four alternative sites identified for the new Cooks Point Substation, this Application includes a wide range of geographically diverse routes. The 26 filed routes represent an adequate number of reasonable, viable, geographically diverse alternative routes for an approximately 17- to 23-mile transmission line project.

Q. BRIEFLY DESCRIBE YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMMISSION'S POLICY OF PRUDENT AVOIDANCE.

A. Commission Substantive Rule 25.101 defines prudent avoidance as "the limiting of exposures to electric and magnetic fields that can be avoided with reasonable investments of money and effort." My understanding of the Commission's policy of prudent avoidance is that the process of routing a proposed transmission line should include consideration of

routing options that will reasonably avoid population centers and other locations where people gather. This does not mean that a proposed transmission line must avoid habitable structures at all costs, but that reasonable alternatives should be considered.

Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT LCRA TSC'S ROUTES COMPLY WITH THE COMMISSION'S POLICY OF PRUDENT AVOIDANCE?

A. Yes. In my professional opinion, the primary alternative routes and segments presented in the Application and EA conform to the Commission's policy of prudent avoidance in that they reflect reasonable investments of money and effort in order to limit exposure to electric and magnetic fields.

Q. HAS URS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED BY LCRA TSC FOR THIS PROJECT TO DECREASE POTENTIAL IMPACTS FROM THE PROPOSED LINES?

A. Yes, mitigation measures for the Project are described in Sections 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and 4.0 of the EA.

Q. WHAT ARE URS' CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THESE MITIGATION MEASURES?

A. Where applicable and practical, the proposed mitigation measures should mitigate the potential adverse effects of construction and operation of the Project to an appropriate extent.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. I have personally reviewed all of the primary alternative routes and their constituent segments, and determined that they are environmentally acceptable, have been routed in a prudent manner, and comply with PURA and the Commission's rules, policies, and procedures for transmission line routing. All of the primary alternative routes and segments in the Application are viable, feasible, and acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

URS

Melinda L. Jensen

TITLE
Practice Leader, Impact Assessment & Permitting Department, Central Region

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
19

EDUCATION
M.S., Zoology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 2000

B.S., Wildlife Management, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas, 1997

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS
Women's Transportation Seminar, Heart of Texas Chapter
2011-2012 President
Leadership Austin Emerge Program, Class of 2007

SPECIALIZED TRAINING
2005/Advanced Jurisdictional Hydrology Wetland Training Institute

2002/Management Training, Richard Chinn Environmental Training, Inc.

2002/Basic Wetland Delineation, Wetland Training Institute

2002/Endangered Species Identification and Survey Methodology, Center for Marine and Wetland Studies

2003/Applied Fluvial Geomorphology, Rosgen Training

CERTIFICATIONS
2002 Certificate of Training Fundamentals of NEPA and Environmental Documentation

Mrs. Jensen's experience includes serving as a Project Manager, Technical Manager, and Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) Manager for transmission line routing studies and linear corridor Environmental Assessments (EAs) and Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) in Texas and throughout the U.S. She has managed and prepared EAs and EISs in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and performs all routing studies in accordance with Title II: PURA §37.056(c)(4)(A)-(D) of the Texas Utilities Code, PUCT Procedural Rule 22.52(a)(4), PUCT Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B), and the PUCT's policy of prudent avoidance. Mrs. Jensen has further experience in natural resources impact analyses and planning, including an EA/Habitat Conservation Plan for inclusion in a USFWS Section 10(a) permit application for Oncor Electric Delivery. She has conducted numerous biological assessments and wetland delineations and has extensive experience in coordinating projects with federal, state, and municipal officials as well as environmental review agencies such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) on impacts to environmental resources.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery (Oncor) and Brazos Electric Power Cooperative (Brazos Electric) Cogdell – Clairemont 138 kV Transmission Line Environmental Assessment and CCN Application Support, Kent and Scurry Counties, TX. Managed the EA and Routing Study for the proposed Cogdell – Clairemont 138 kV Transmission Line Project in Kent and Scurry Counties, TX. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application as well as direct and rebuttal testimony. Mrs. Jensen participated as an expert witness at the Hearing on the Merits for the proposed project in July 2018.

Project Manager, Brazos Electric Power Cooperative (Brazos Electric) Clairemont – Salt Creek 138 kV Transmission Line Route Study and Environmental Report / CCN Application, Kent County, TX. Served as Project Manager for the completion of an Environmental Report and Route Study for a new 138 kV transmission line connecting the existing Brazos Electric Clairemont Substation and the proposed Salt Creek Switch in Kent County, TX. The Route Study and Environmental Report was prepared in accordance with U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service (RUS) and PUCT requirements including RUS Environmental Policies and Procedures (7 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1794), NEPA, §37.056(c)(4)(A)-(D) of the Public Utility Regulatory Act (PURA), PUCT Procedural Rules §22.52(a)(4), and PUCT Substantive Rule §25.101. Also prepared the CCN Application and associated attachments for PUCT filing in January 2018.

URS

Project Manager, American Electric Power (AEP) Solstice - Roserock POI 138 kV Electrical Transmission Line EA and CCN Application Support, Pecos County, TX. Served as Project Manager for the completion of an EA and CCN Application for the Solstice - Roserock POI 138 kV transmission line constructed between two proposed stations, Solstice and Linterna, a distance of approximately 4.5 miles. Services included an EA, data collection and analysis, and constraints mapping in support of the submittal of AEP's CCN Application to the PUCT. The services were performed in accordance with §37.056(c)(4)(A)-(D) of the Texas Utilities Code, PUCT Procedural Rule 22.52(a)(4), PUCT Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B), and the PUCT's policy of prudent avoidance. The CCN Application was filed in May 2017 with the PUCT.

Project Manager, Oncor McKenzie Draw – Texaco Mabee 138 kV Electrical Transmission Line EA and CCN Application Support, Martin and Andrews Counties, TX. Managed the EA for the proposed 138 kV transmission line between the proposed Oncor McKenzie Draw Switching Station in Martin County and the existing Oncor Texaco Mabee Station in Andrews County, a distance of approximately 13 miles. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the proposed route. The EA was developed in accordance with the criteria established in PUCT and Texas Utilities Code rules and regulations. Also provided assistance with the preparation of the Oncor's CCN application filing.

Deputy Project Manager, Cross Texas Transmission (CTT) Limestone – Gibbons Creek 345 kV Electrical Transmission Line Routing Study and Environmental Assessment, Brazos, Freestone, Grimes, Leon, Limestone, Madison, and Robertson Counties, TX. Completed a transmission line routing study and EA for the proposed Limestone – Gibbons Creek 345 kV Transmission Line Project, a new 345 kV double-circuit transmission line connecting the existing Centerpoint Energy Limestone Substation in Limestone County to the existing Texas Municipal Power Agency Gibbons Creek Substation in Grimes County. The proposed transmission line was approximately 80 miles in length and constructed within an approximately 130-foot ROW. Components of the project included delineating a study area, identifying and mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying preliminary alternative routes, managing public involvement open-house meetings, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative routes. Consideration was given to existing corridors, land use, habitable structures, potential areas of protected species habitat, potential cultural resources, and community perspectives. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in §37.056(c)(4)(A)-(D) of the Texas Utilities Code, PUCT Procedural Rule 22.52(a)(4), PUCT Substantive Rule 25.101(b)(3)(B), and the PUCT's policy of prudent avoidance. Provided services in preparation for the client's CCN application filing and Request for Information management. Managed landowner communications for the project including the project hotline and email.

Deputy Project Manager, Electric Transmission Texas (ETT) and Sharyland Utilities (Sharyland) North Edinburg to Loma Alta 345 kV Transmission Line CCN Project Management Support, Hidalgo and Cameron Counties, TX. Provided support to ETT and Sharyland for RFI management as well as landowner communications. Staffed a phone line and email address for the project to respond to landowner questions and concerns

URS

within a 24-hour response timeframe. Prepared record of communications forms to document all landowner conversations and created an intervenor tracking form to provide a status of intervention, landowner names, and other pertinent information for ETT and Sharyland. A summary of landowner and intervenor communications was provided to ETT and Sharyland on a weekly basis.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, Permian Basin – Culberson 138 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Culberson, Loving, Reeves, Ward, and Winkler Counties, TX. Managed the EA and Routing Study for the proposed Permian Basin - Culberson 138 kV transmission line in Culberson, Loving, Reeves, Ward, and Winkler Counties, Texas. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application.

***Deputy Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, Permian Basin – Moss* 345 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Crane, Ector, Ward, and Winkler Counties, TX.** Assisted with the management of the EA and Routing Study for the proposed Permian Basin - Moss 345 kV transmission line in Crane, Ector, Ward, and Winkler Counties, Texas. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, and EA preparation. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. This project is currently on hold pending approval by ERCOT.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, Benedum (LCRA) – Centralia 138 kV Transmission Line EA, Upton County, TX. Managed the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the construction of the new Benedum (LCRA) – Centralia 138 kV transmission line in Upton County, Texas. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the proposed route. The EA was developed in accordance with the criteria established in PUCT and Texas Utilities Code rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen also provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application filing.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, Oklaunion – Fisher Road 345 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Wichita County, TX. Managed the EA and Routing Study for the relocation of a segment of the existing Oklaunion – Fisher Road 345 kV transmission line north of Sheppard Air Force Base in Wichita County, Texas. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application filing as well as written testimony.

URS

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, CREZ Newton - Killeen, 345 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Bell, Burnet, and Lampasas Counties, TX. Managed the EA and Routing Study for a double-circuit transmission line. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen also provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application filing as well as written and live testimony.

Deputy Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, CREZ Brown - Newton, 345 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Brown, Mills, Lampasas, McCulloch, and San Saba Counties, TX. Assisted with the management of the EA and Routing Study for a double-circuit transmission line. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations. Mrs. Jensen provided assistance with the preparation of the client's CCN application filing.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery EA/HCP for USFWS Section 10 Permit Application-Copperas Cove, TX. Managed the preparation of an Environmental Assessment/Habitat Conservation Plan for inclusion in a USFWS Section 10(a) permit application for the proposed 16-mile, TXU Copperas Cove 138 kV Transmission Line in Bell and Coryell Counties. Field work included habitat assessments and presence/absence surveys to determine the likelihood that the endangered golden-cheeked warbler and black-capped vireo would appear in the area. The permit application was completed in November 2006 and a Section 10(a) permit received from the USFWS in January 2007. Currently, Mrs. Jensen is managing annual reporting requirements, which summarize on-site environmental monitoring services, per the requirements stipulated in the approved Habitat Conservation Plan.

Project Manager, Oncor Electric Delivery, Corinth South 138 kV Natural and Cultural Resources Report, USACE Easement Request, Denton County, TX. Mrs. Jensen managed the completion of a Natural and Cultural Resources Report for inclusion in Oncor's USACE Easement Request, which was required for the installation of a 1-mile 138 kV transmission line within Lake Lewisville USACE property. Work efforts included a wildlife habitat analysis, tree inventory, wetlands and Section 404 permit assessment, endangered species habitat identification, cultural resources evaluation, hazardous materials identification, and flood storage evaluation.

Senior Environmental Scientist, Oncor Electric Delivery, Ables Springs, 138 kV Transmission Line EA and Routing Study, Kaufman County, TX. Assisted with the routing analysis and EA for two double-circuit transmission lines. Components of the project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints, identifying alternative routes, public meeting organization and participation, EA preparation, and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. The alternative routes were

URS

developed in accordance with the criteria established in all PUCT and Texas Utilities Codes rules and regulations.

Senior Environmental Scientist, Oncor Electric Delivery, Temple Pecan Creek to Temple North 138 kV Transmission Line-Temple, TX. Mrs. Jensen assisted with the routing analysis, ranking and EA for a five-mile line north of Temple, Texas. Components of this project included mapping existing and future environmental constraints; identifying alternative routes; organizing public meeting and participation; and identifying and evaluating the impacts of the alternative and preferred routes. Consideration was given to existing corridors, community values, recreational and park areas, historical and archeological areas, aesthetics, habitable structures, engineering constraints, and overall environmental integrity. The study area contained habitable structures; potential areas of species diversity including a native and restored prairie, socio economics, prime farmland, geology and potential cultural resources. The alternatives were routed in accordance with the regulations and rules of the PUCT and state of Texas.

Natural Resources Team Leader, Texas Central Railway High Speed Rail EIS, FRA/TxDOT, TX. Mrs. Jensen is currently serving as the Natural Resources Team Leader for the proposed high speed rail project connecting Dallas to Houston, TX. The project is being implemented under NEPA by the lead federal agency FRA and co-lead federal agency TxDOT. Mrs. Jensen is overseeing the completion of all tasks required for the EIS pertaining to natural resources (ecological, soils/geology, water, air quality, and climate change), including coordination with natural resource agencies for potential impacts to threatened/endangered species within the study area, the Houston toad, large-fruited sand verbena, and Navasota Ladies'-Tresses.

Project Manager, Chevron, Environmental Evaluation Summary Report and Permitting Work Plan for the Coahoma Loop WTLPG Pipeline Project, Howard County, TX. Provided an Environmental Evaluation Summary Report and Permitting Work Plan for the Coahoma Loop West Texas Liquefied Petroleum Gas (WTLPG) Pipeline Project. The project consisted of the installation of the Coahoma Loop WTLPG in Howard County, Texas. The loop consisted of installing six miles of 14" pipeline to replace an existing 10" pipeline. URS developed an Environmental Evaluation Summary Report based on the preliminary evaluation of biological, cultural and hazardous waste information within the project area. Via coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer, concurrence was received from the Texas Historical Commission that the project would not adversely affect cultural resources. In addition, URS prepared a Nationwide Permit application to the USACE for Section 404 of the Clean Water Act compliance for impacts to waters of the U.S. within the project area. A Nationwide Permit 12 - Utility Line Activities was received from the USACE issuing concurrence to proceed with the project.

Chevron, Environmental Evaluation Summary Report and Permitting Work Plan for the WTLPG Optimization Project, Project Manager. Provided an Environmental Evaluation Summary Report and Permitting Work Plan for the WTLPG Optimization Project which consisted of the following activities within Andrews, Gaines, Upton, Midland, Glasscock, and Martin Counties, Texas: improvements to the Aspen tie-in, Hobbs Station, Midkiff Station, South Lateral Tie-in, DCP Injection Pump Location to Pegasus

URS

(including the installation of two, 10" 1,500' pipelines), Lee Station, and the Stanton Station. Project activities also included the Antelope and Dollarhide to Versado Eunice Plant Connection within Lea County, New Mexico. URS developed an Environmental Evaluation Summary Report based on the preliminary evaluation of biological and cultural information within the project areas. In addition, URS prepared a soil survey evaluation from data retrieved from the Natural Resources Conservation Service. For each soil type at each proposed work location, data on the soil's general characteristics, chemical properties, physical properties, and engineering properties were compiled and summarized within the summary report.

Program Manager, Statewide NEPA Environmental Documentation Services Evergreen, TxDOT-ENV, TX. Under this effort, Mrs. Jensen managed the completion of various NEPA documents required for transportation improvement projects across the State of Texas for the TxDOT-ENV. Under Mrs. Jensen's management, URS was also designated by TxDOT-ENV as a lead QA/QC consultant. For that effort, Mrs. Jensen managed the review of numerous EAs and EISs for TxDOT and completed a detailed comment/response process for each review. The QA/QC process was completed by a team of subject matter experts who reviewed each document for consistency with current local, state, and federal regulations, as well as current TxDOT standards. Mrs. Jensen also participated in QA/QC meetings with TxDOT, FHWA, and NEPA document consultant to discuss review comments and assist TxDOT and FHWA with comment resolution. Documents QC'd under this contract included:

- TxDOT-Houston District Grand Parkway, Segment F-2, EIS
- TxDOT-Houston District Grand Parkway, Segment C, EIS
- TxDOT-Houston District Grand Parkway, Segment H &I-1, EIS
- TxDOT – Tyler District US 69 / Loop 49 North Lindale Reliever Route EIS
- TxDOT – Waco District US 190 EA
- TxDOT – Dallas District SH 190 EIS
- TxDOT – Pharr District South Padre Island 2nd Access Project EIS
- TxDOT – Waco District IH 35 EA

Statewide NEPA Environmental Documentation Services Indefinite Delivery Contract, TxDOT – Aviation Division, TX, Program Manager. Mrs. Jensen managed the completion of several EAs required for proposed improvements at various airports across the State of Texas for the TxDOT – Aviation Division. EAs completed to date include Lone Star Executive Airport, Granbury Regional Airport, New Braunfels Municipal Airport, and Mustang Beach Airport.

Deputy Project Manager, TEXRail EIS, Fort Worth Transportation Authority (The T) - Fort Worth, TX. Prepared the EIS for the TEXRail EIS for The T in accordance with NEPA. Project tasks included leading the analysis of existing conditions and environmental impacts including land uses, air and water quality, floodplains, threatened/endangered species, wetlands, hazardous materials, and environmental justice. This project required close coordination with project stakeholder agencies, including the FAA. As the alignment impacted airport property, FAA was a concerned agency for review of the EIS. Assisted with the preparation of the EIS outline, which was created to specifically address the FAA's concerns expressed in early coordination meetings while also meeting FTA requirements.