

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 22-0856-EL-BTX
SECOND SET**

I. Data Request 1 Follow-Up

1) Response #6 indicates geotechnical borings were conducted in 2022 and no further borings are anticipated. Please provide Staff with the boring data including an assessment of the conditions found and how those conditions demonstrate soil and geologic suitability with the proposed project.

RESPONSE:

Site specific soil borings along the preferred route were completed in 2022 to support preliminary engineering for the proposed route alignments. The soil boring report is currently being compiled by the Company and will not be available until later in March.

2) Response #8 (Re: presence of historic oil and gas wells beneath the surface/avoidance of) suggests that OUPS/811 would be used to locate underground utilities. Staff doesn't believe these historic oil and gas well features are considered utilities that would be identified via a OUPS survey. The ODNR review indicated "ODNR has record of 795 oil and gas well within one mile of the proposed project area". Has the Applicant assessed the locations (from ODNR) of these historic oil and gas well features as they relate to the locations of the routes proposed for this project? Please discuss any alternate methods/technology the Applicant may exercise to avoid these subsurface features.

RESPONSE: These locations have been assessed by the Company from ODNR's Div. of Oil & Gas records. ODNR records indicate there are five records of wells within 50 feet of the centerline along the rebuild portion of the Project. Based on aerial imagery, there is limited information on the presence of the wells, but they are indicated in ODNR's database as plugged, non-producing, or no record of location. Utilizing hydrovacating at structure locations in close proximity to these recorded well locations can be used to avoid impacts.

II. Additional Data Request Questions

1) According to the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency Coordination Response letter, a portion of the proposed project may be located within an old landfill area known as McComb Village Dump. Ohio Administrative Code 3745-513 would be applicable to this landfill and the proposed project if the project occurs on top of or within 300 ft of the landfill. Would this project fall within the area of this landfill? If so, has the Applicant coordinated with the Ohio EPA's Division of Materials and Waste Management? If the project does overlap with the landfill and coordination has been initiated, please provide this correspondence. If the project does overlap with the landfill and coordination has not been initiated, please begin this coordination as soon as possible and provide the initial feedback to OPSB Staff.

RESPONSE: The location of the historic landfill (McComb Village Dump) as provided by OEPA's DMWM map tool is located at latitude 41.11, longitude -83.78. The indicated location is currently flat crop land. This section of the line is planned for rebuild on centerline, between crop fields along a property boundary. The Company will contact OEPA DMWM's Northwest

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 22-0856-EL-BTX
SECOND SET**

District Office to inquire about any additional information regarding the former dump/landfill (e.g., more precise location/extent) and then determine if further coordination is necessary, or an application is warranted per OAC 3745-513-300.

2) Page 3-1 of the Application states; "After evaluation of the different proposals that were submitted during the window, PJM selected the proposed Project ...". Were these different proposals submitted by the Company?

RESPONSE: Yes. The Company and its affiliate Transource submitted five proposals in total. No other proposals to solve the identified issues were received from other developers during the window.

3) Page 3-1 further states; "The Project was presented at the PJM TEAC meetings ...". What entity would have made this presentation?

RESPONSE: The Project was presented at the PJM TEAC meetings by PJM.

4) Was the PSS/E power flow analysis done by the Company, a consultant, or some other entity?

RESPONSE: As the Project was identified by PJM as a baseline project, PSS/E power flow analysis for the Project was performed by both the Company and PJM.

5) Please define or describe the meaning of the "tower contingency" mentioned by PJM when referring to studies related to b3273.

RESPONSE: A tower contingency is formally defined by NERC under the TPL-001-4 standard as a P7 type contingency. It looks at a system event related to a loss of a double circuit tower where both circuits would be lost simultaneously. The circuits need to share a common structure for more than a mile for it to be a valid event.

6) What are the voltages of the lines associated with the existing McComb Station?

RESPONSE: The lines that currently serve the McComb Station are operated at 34.5 kV.

7) Just for information, is the McComb Station of this Project, occasionally confused with the McComb Station facing the Beatty Substation in Columbus?

RESPONSE: Within the Company there is not confusion as the stations are further differentiated as McComb OP Station, which is the non-jurisdictional station mentioned in the application, and McComb Station, the station located in Columbus, Ohio. Externally there is occasional confusion with the common naming.

**AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY'S RESPONSE TO
OHIO POWER SITING BOARD STAFF'S
DISCOVERY REQUEST
OPSB CASE 22-0856-EL-BTX
SECOND SET**

8) How many wood poles would be replaced by how many new steel monopoles along the various circuits?

RESPONSE: There will be 201 wood structures removed on the existing Leipsic – McComb 69 kV Line, which will be replaced with 90 steel structures on the new install of the East Leipsic – Rader Road 138 kV Line. There will be 160 wood structures removed on the New Liberty – McComb 34 kV Line which will be replaced with 66 steel structures.

9) Please provide the kcmil, ACSR description of the existing conductor along the lines of interest. Replacement conductor is (795-26/7 ACSR).

RESPONSE: The existing conductor on the Leipsic – McComb 69 kV Line is 336.4 kcmil ACSR 18/1 “Merlin”. The existing conductor on the New Liberty – McComb 34 kV Line is 2/0 Copper.

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

3/3/2023 12:37:14 PM

in

Case No(s). 22-0856-EL-BTX

Summary: Response Discovery Responses to Staff's 2nd Set electronically filed by
Hector Garcia-Santana on behalf of AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc.