BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

In the Matter of the Application of Grain)	
Belt Express, LLC for a Siting Permit for the)	
Construction of Two 345 kV Transmission)	Docket No. 24-GBEE-790-STG
Lines and Associated Facilities through)	
Gray, Meade, and Ford Counties, Kansas.)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

JAMIE PRECHT

ON BEHALF OF

GRAIN BELT EXPRESS LLC

July 26, 2024

Contents

I.	Introduction	. 3
II.	Evaluation of Alternative Routes	. 3
III.	Conclusion	. 9

1 I. INTRODUCTION

- Q. Please state your name, business address, and present position.
- A. My name is Jamie Precht. I am the Manager of the Environmental Studies
- 4 Department of Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. ("Burns & McDonnell"). My
- 5 business address is 9450 Ward Parkway in Kansas City, Missouri 64114.
- 6 Q. Are you the same Jamie Precht who previously filed direct testimony in this
- 7 proceeding?
- 8 A. Yes, I am.
- 9 Q. Has this testimony been prepared by you or under your direct supervision?
- 10 A. Yes, it has.
- O. What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?
- 12 A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to respond to portions of testimony
- submitted by Bradley Boyd, specifically regarding his alternate route proposals.
- O. Are you sponsoring any exhibits as part of your Rebuttal Testimony?
- 15 A. Yes, I am sponsoring the following exhibit:
- Exhibit JP-7¹ Map of Boyd Alternative Routes and Proposed Route
- 17 II. EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVE ROUTES
- 18 Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Bradley Boyd's written direct testimony?
- 19 A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Can you summarize Mr. Boyd's direct testimony?
- A. Mr. Boyd is a landowner along Grain Belt Express' Proposed Route for the Meade-
- 22 Dodge City Line. Mr. Boyd's direct testimony disputes the Meade-Dodge City Line's proposed

¹ Exhibits JP-1 through JP-6 were included with my Direct Testimony.

- 1 route's reasonableness and proposes an alternative route ("Boyd Alternative 1").² Mr. Boyd also
- 2 proposed a second alternative route in a letter to the KCC Staff ("Boyd Alternative 2"), which I
- 3 also address below.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- 4 Q. Please summarize Boyd Alternative 1, as described in Mr. Boyd's Direct 5 Testimony.
- A. The Proposed Route, as filed by Grain Belt Express, goes from west to east along
 C Road and then turns north at Highway 23/Road 18 and tracks Road 18 north approximately ten
 miles before turning back to the east. Mr. Boyd proposes that the line should "turn north two miles
 sooner on C Road and go north to JJ Road/16 Road and continue going north on 16 Road until it
 turns back to the east to . . . CC Road." Mr. Boyd also provided Exhibit BBB-1 illustrating the
 Proposed Route and Boyd Alternative 1.
 - Q. What is your position on whether Boyd Alternative 1 should be accepted?
 - A. Boyd Alternative 1 is not consistent with the routing principles identified in the Routing Study because of its potential to have greater impacts to designated critical habitat associated with Crooked Creek, closer proximity to residential structures and potential for increased visibility with less vegetative screening, greater acres of row crop and pivot irrigation crossed combined, access concerns, and increased potential conflicts to existing utilities within and along the proposed alternative route's right-of-way (utility building in right-of-way and additional distribution lines being paralleled) as compared to the corresponding segments of the Proposed Route.

 $^{^2}$ See generally Direct Testimony of Bradley B. Boyd, at pp. 2–5 ("Boyd Direct Testimony").

³ *Id.* at p. 4.

Q. What are the increased social impacts of Boyd Alternative 1?

A. Boyd Alternative 1 has the potential to increase visibility for residences along 16 Road compared to residences along the Grain Belt Proposed Route. The residential structure identified from aerial imagery at the corner of 16 Road/JJ Road would be approximately 231 feet from the Boyd Alternative 1 centerline. An additional residential structure is visible on recent aerial imagery near the southwest corner of 16 Road/E Road which is approximately 228 feet from Boyd Alternative 1. While Boyd Alternative 1 has one less residential structure within 300 feet of centerline compared to the Grain Belt proposed route, both of these residential structures along Boyd Alternative 1 are located closer to the route centerline than any of the three closest residential structures along the corresponding portion of the Grain Belt proposed route. The residential structures within 500 feet of the corresponding portion of the Grain Belt Proposed Route are approximately 273 feet, 358 feet, and 395 feet, respectively. In addition to being further away, these three residences along the Grain Belt proposed route were observed to be heavily screened by existing vegetative cover such as evergreens, thereby potentially reducing the visual impacts of the proposed route, while the residences along Boyd Alternative 1 do not appear to have any such vegetative screening.

Potential impacts of Boyd Alternative 1 to agricultural practices were different from the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route. While Boyd Alternative 1 reduces the amount of center-pivot irrigation crossed, it does potentially impact more non-irrigated cropland/row crops compared to the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route. I understand that impacts to the pivot-irrigation areas can be mitigated by spanning of these locations where feasible; however, potential impacts to non-irrigated croplands, which are potentially too large to span, are greater along Boyd Alternative 1.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q. What are the increased environmental impacts of Boyd Alternative 1?

A. Constraints identified in the study area included sensitive species habitat. As part of the agency outreach for the Meade Line, the Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks ("KDWP") indicated that Crooked Creek in Meade County is designated critical habitat for the plains minnow (*Hybognathus placitus*), a state-listed threatened species (Exhibit JP-2; pp. 173-175). The Boyd route crosses the designated critical habitat of the plains minnow by crossing Crooked Creek in Meade County. Additionally, Boyd Alternative 1 crosses Crooked Creek through an adjacent grassland area. KDWP stated that new lines should be routed through cropland and/or along road rights-of-way when possible. The Grain Belt Express Proposed Route follows this guidance by crossing Crooked Creek along existing road right-of-way while the Boyd Alternative 1 does not. All of the route alternatives evaluated in the Routing Study (Exhibit JP-2) crossed Crooked Creek along existing road or transmission rights-of-ways, which aligns with the routing principles set forth in the Routing Study as well as guidance from KDWP.

Q. Are there any other concerns you have with Boyd Alternative 1?

A. Yes. A utility building was also observed at the southeast corner of the intersection of 16 Road/HH Road that would be located within the right-of-way of Boyd Alternative 1. In order to avoid this structure and potential impacts for both the utility building and the proposed transmission line, additional impacts to agricultural practices are likely in order to avoid the utility building, and the alignment would no longer parallel the road as closely in this area. Additional angles in Boyd Alternative 1 may also be required to avoid this utility building. Boyd Alternative 1 also parallels existing distribution lines for over five additional miles compared to the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route. As noted in the Routing Study (Exhibit JP-2, pp. 4-10), "paralleling

existing distribution lines can have additional engineering and construction challenges created by construction next to or potentially underbuilding along [such routes]."

Boyd Alternative 1 does not follow an existing road between C Road and KK Road, while Grain Belt Express' Proposed Route does. With no north/south roads present along the Boyd Route between C Road and KK Road, access to the route during and after construction could be more difficult. To reduce potential impacts to streams and riparian areas during and after construction, stream crossings are generally preferred at a perpendicular angle and the routes should avoid paralleling waterways if possible. The Boyd Alternative 1 crosses Crooked Creek at a bend and also parallels the creek for over 1,000 feet. Impacts to this critical habitat area could potentially be greater with Boyd Alternative 1 and has greater potential for erosion and sedimentation impacts. Access for potential maintenance could also present challenges without an established road, especially following rain events.

Q. Did Mr. Boyd propose another alternate route for Grain Belt Express' consideration?

A. Yes. We were notified via e-mail on July 12, 2024 that Mr. Boyd discussed another potential re-route option ("Boyd Alternative 2") with the KCC Staff at the local public hearing in Dodge City on July 10, 2024. That e-mail indicated that Boyd Alternative 2 is Mr. Boyd's first choice as an alternative route.⁴ Boyd Alternative 2 would turn north approximately 3 miles east of the intersection of 13 Road/C Road, towards the intersection of 16 Road/KK Road and proceed north for 3 miles (one mile into Gray County), then turn east at the intersection of JJ Road/16 Road (7 miles south of Boyd Alternative 1), and proceed east along JJ Road to Highway 23 (18 Road).

⁴ Office of Public Affairs and Consumer Protection Report on Public Comments, p. 16 (July 23, 2024) ("This would be my first choice as an alternative route").

Q. What is your position on Boyd Alternative 2?

For similar reasons, this route is inconsistent with the routing principles in the A. Routing Study. Boyd Alternative 2 does not address the environmental concerns of Boyd Alternative 1. As with Boyd Alternative 1, it does not cross through the designated critical habitat associated with Crooked Creek along a road or through cropland, unlike the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route. While Boyd Alternative 2 does address other concerns of Boyd Alternative 1 by reducing distance along existing distribution lines and avoiding the utility building located within the proposed right-of-way, it does not address the lack of existing roads and access between C Road and KK road. Boyd Alternative 2 does remove one residential structure from Boyd Alternative 1 and also increases the distance from the residence at the northwest corner of 16 Road/JJ Road. However, the potential visual impacts could potentially increase as a larger angle structure would be required at the corner of 16 Road/JJ Road as it turns east. Because this is a turn, the location of the structure would not likely be able to be micro-sited to reduce the potential increase in visual impacts. Lastly, Boyd Alternative 2 increases the number of heavy angles by 2 compared to the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route and the Boyd Alternative 1. The acres of nonirrigated cropland are still more than the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route and Boyd Alternative 2 does not decrease the acres of pivot-irrigation crossed compared to Boyd Alternative 1.

- Q. Should the Commission approve either of Mr. Boyd's proposed alternate routes?
- A. No, for the reasons stated above, I believe the Grain Belt Express Proposed Route remains the best option compared to either of the Boyd alternative routes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. Is Grain Belt Express proposing any alternatives to address the Boyds' concerns?
- 3 Yes, I understand that Grain Belt Express is proposing an alternative, as discussed A. 4 in Kevin Chandler's Rebuttal Testimony (the "Grain Belt Alternative"). For some of the same 5 reasons discussed with regard to the Boyd alternatives, the Grain Belt Alternative is not the optimal 6 solution based on the routing principles set forth in my Direct Testimony and the Routing Study. 7 However, it is consistent with a micrositing process more confined to the landowner's property, 8 rather than a wholesale change to the Proposed Route. It is possible that the Grain Belt Alternative 9 has less impact on Crooked Creek and associated critical habitat areas than the Boyd alternatives, 10 subject to additional study of those impacts. The Grain Belt Alternative also avoids the additional 11 residences that would be impacted by the Boyd alternatives.
- 12 III. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
 - Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 14 A. Yes, it does.

VERIFICATION

I, Jamie Precht, do solemnly, sincerely and truly declare and affirm that I am the Manager of the Environmental Studies Department at Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc., that I have read the foregoing testimony and know the contents thereof, and that the facts set forth therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and this I do under the pains and penalties of perjury.

By: /s/ Jamie Precht

Jamie Precht

July 26, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties listed below by email or U.S. mail, postage prepaid, this 26th day of July, 2024.

Keith A. Brock, Attorney Anderson & Byrd, L.L.P. 216 S Hickory PO Box 17 Ottawa, KS 66067 kbrock@andersonbyrd.com

James G. Flaherty, Attorney Anderson & Byrd, L.L.P. 216 S Hickory PO Box 17 Ottawa, KS 66067 iflaherty@andersonbyrd.com

Kirk Thompson, C. M. S. Electric Cooperative, Inc. 509 E Carthage P O Box 790 Meade, KS 67864-0790 kthompson@cmselectric.com

James P Zakoura, Attorney Foulston Siefkin LLP 7500 College Boulevard, STE 1400 Overland Park, KS 66201-4041 jzakoura@foulston.com

Kevin Chandler Grain Belt Express LLC One South Wacker Drive, STE 1800 Chicago, IL 60606 kchandler@invenergy.com

Nicole Luckey Grain Belt Express LLC One South Wacker Drive, STE 1800 Chicago, IL 60606 nluckey@invenergy.com Brad Pnazek Grain Belt Express LLC One South Wacker Drive, STE 1800 Chicago, IL 60606 bpnazek@invenergy.com

Brian G. Fedotin, General Counsel Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead RD Topeka, KS 66604 Brian.Fedotin@ks.gov

Carly Masenthin, Litigation Counsel Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead RD Topeka, KS 66604 Carly.Masenthin@ks.gov

Kyler C. Wineinger, Assistant General Counsel Kansas Corporation Commission 1500 SW Arrowhead RD Topeka, KS 66604 Kyler.Wineinger@ks.gov

Tim J. Larson Larson, Brown & Ebert, PA 7570 W 21ST ST N., STE 1026A Wichita, KS 67205 tim@larsonbrown.law

James Brungardt,
Mid-Kansas Electric Company, Llc
301 W 13th ST
PO Box 980
Hays, KS 67601
jbrungardt@sunflower.net

Leah M. Davis Morgan Williamson LLP 500 S. Taylor, Suite 900 Amarillo, TX 79101 ldavis@mw-law.com

Anne E. Callenbach, Attorney Polsinelli PC 900 W 48TH Place STE 900 Kansas City, MO 64112 acallenbach@polsinelli.com

Jared R. Jevons, Attorney Polsinelli PC 900 W 48TH Place STE 900 Kansas City, MO 64112 <u>jjevons@polsinelli.com</u>

Andrew O. Schulte, Attorney POLSINELLI PC 900 W 48TH Place STE 900 Kansas City, MO 64112 aschulte@polsinelli.com

Clarence Suppes,
Sunflower Electric Power Corporation
301 W. 13th
PO Box 1020
Hays, KS 67601-1020
cdsuppes@sunflower.net

Al Tamimi, SVP & COO - Transmission Sunflower Electric Power Corporation 301 W. 13TH PO Box 1020 Hays, KS 67601-1020 atamimi@sunflower.net

Amanda Wray, Corporate Paralegal Sunflower Electric Power Corporation 301 W. 13th PO Box 1020 Hays, KS 67601-1020 awray@sunflower.net

Taylor P. Calcara, Attorney Watkins Calcara Chtd. 1321 Main St STE 300 PO Drawer 1110 Great Bend, KS 67530 TCALCARA@WCRF.COM

Jeffrey M Kuhlman, Attorney Watkins Calcara Chtd. 1321 Main St STE 300 PO Drawer 1110 Great Bend, KS 67530 jkuhlman@wcrf.com

/s/ Anne E, Callenbach

Attorney for Grain Belt Express, LLC