



GOVERNOR TERRY E. BRANSTAD
LT. GOVERNOR KIM REYNOLDS

ELIZABETH S. JACOBS, CHAIR
SWATI A. DANDEKAR, BOARD MEMBER
VACANT, BOARD MEMBER

May 10, 2013
File: E-22118

MidAmerican Energy Company
Attn.: Robert P. Jared
106 East Second Street
P.O. Box 4350
Davenport, IA 52808

Dear Mr. Jared:

On March 27, 2013, in compliance with Iowa Code chapter 478, you filed with the Iowa Utilities Board a petition for electric franchise for 0.38 mile of 72.5 kV maximum voltage (69 kV nominal voltage) electric transmission line in Palo Alto County, Iowa. The petition has been assigned to Docket No. E-22118; please identify this filing by this docket number in all future communications.

Staff review of the petition has identified several deficiencies, which must be corrected for processing to continue.

1. The Petition

Page 1, 2nd paragraph, line "a.", you indicated the proposed line's mileage of 0.38 mile which appeared not proper. Please refer to comments of Exhibit A below and revise (if necessary).

2. Exhibit A

a. Main paragraph, lines 1 thru 4, "The beginning and ending of ... in Section 32, last named Township and Range" found not proper. By 199 IAC 11.2(1)"a" and 199 IAC 11.3(6), we suggest lines 1 thru 4 be removed and revised as **"Beginning at an electrical connection point with an existing MidAmerican Energy Company's 69 kV transmission line on Union Pacific Railroad Company's private right of way, said point is approximately xyz mile/feet (please indicate) north of and xyz mile/feet (please also indicate) east of the southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) of the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4) of Section 32, Township 96 North, Range 32 West of the 5th P.M.,**

Palo Alto County, Iowa (the ultimate west terminus would be an existing MidAmerican Energy Company's Emmetsburg East Substation located in the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4) of the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4) of said Section 32)".

b. Main paragraph, line 5, toward the end of line, for clarity and consistency we suggest it to be revised as "thence south in private easement, a distance of 0.19 mile, entering **a proposed MidAmerican Energy**".

c. Main paragraph, line 6, at the beginning of line, for clarity please indicate the location of Freedom Substation. We suggest it to be revised as "Company's Freedom Substation **located in the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) of said Section 32**; thence exiting **said proposed MidAmerican Energy Company's Freedom**".

d. Main paragraph, line 7. For consistency, we suggest it to be revised as "Substation **and continuing** north in private easement, a distance of 0.19 mile to **and connecting to said existing MidAmerican Energy Company's 69 kV transmission line at a point on Union Pacific Railroad Company's property, such point is approximately xyz mile/feet (please indicate) north of and xyz mile/feet (please also indicate) east of the southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) of the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4) of said Section 32, last township and range (the ultimate east terminus would be a point of electrical connection with an existing Corn Belt Power Cooperative's 69 kV transmission line located near the northeast corner of Section 4, Township 95 North, Range 32 West, Palo Alto County) the Northeast corner of the**". Second, however the above line segment of 0.19 mile appeared not properly since an existing 69 kV line (where the proposed lines tap off of) is not parallel to the proposed Freedom Substation. Please review and revise (if applicable), perhaps carrying to three decimal points or indicating the line length in feet.

e. Main paragraph, lines 8 thru 10. By the comments above (in item 2.d.), please remove of lines 8 thru 10 for consistency and clarity.

f. Last line (in bold print) of total distance. Please refer to 2.d. above, 2nd comment, and revise the mileage (if necessary).

3. Exhibit B

a. Section 32, NW1/4 of NW1/4, SW1/4 of NW1/4 and NW1/4 of NE1/4, and Section 33, NW1/4 of NW1/4, all in T96n, R32W, you indicated MidAmerican Energy Company (MEC) 12.5 kV distribution lines which found not consistent with the previous approved franchise, docket E-21684 (indicating the voltage as 13.8 kV). Please explain. Second, same section, NE1/4 of NW1/4, for consistency please indicate the ownership of an existing substation. Third, SE1/4 of NE1/4, the detail of terminus point found not proper. By our comments

above (of Exhibit A), we suggest to remove of “Tap Structure In The NE Corner Of The” and replace by “**MidAmerican Energy 69 kV line**”. Fourth, same terminus detail, please also revise as “SE1/4 of NE1/4 of Sec. 33 32”. Fifth, by Google aerial photos, there are some existing railroad tracks south of and parallel to existing MEC 69 kV line. For clarity and to be consistent with what you indicated in Exhibit C, page 1, line 11 (railroad clearance), please revise by showing such spur railroad tracks in the map part as well.

b. Sections 31, 32 and 33, T96N, R32W, south halves, you indicated a pipeline symbol, but which one is it (out of the two pipeline companies)? Please indicate.

c. Sections 28 and 33, T96N, R32W, and Section 4, T95N, R32W, west halves, there found (in the map) a vertical thin black color line. Please indicate what it is.

d. Section 4, T95N, R32W, just south of the northeast corner, there found inconsistent color code/font of road symbol. See the Legend and revise.

e. The list of railroad companies, 1st company, by previous MEC dockets, the address has a mail stop 1690 (**MS 1690**). Please revise by including it. Second, 2nd company, you listed Iowa, Chicago and Eastern Railroad Corporation (which was shown in previous MEC docket E-21684 of the year 2005 as well). However, by referencing Iowa DOT County Maps (2012), “**Dakota, Minnesota & Eastern Railroad Corporation**” is listed. Please review and revise if necessary.

f. The list of pipeline companies. Are the pipelines underground? If yes, then we suggest it to be revised as “Pipelines – **Underground**” or “**Underground pipelines**”.

g. The Legend, Electrical Transmission Lines To Be Franchised, the proposed line mileage of 0.38 mile. Please refer to 2nd comment of 2.d. above and revise (if applicable). Second, please do the same to “Total Franchised” within the same list.

h. The Features list, 1st and 2nd road symbols found the same. For clarity, please differentiate them (primary and secondary roads). Or otherwise use one road symbol for all, but identify or differentiate among US Highway, State Highway and County Highway/Road symbols (as found being used in the map part). Second, same list, 3rd symbol (section line) found not consistent (in color code or font) with what in the map part. Please revise.

4. Exhibit C – Segment 1 of 1

a. Page 1, line 3, mileage. See 2.d. above, 2nd comment, and revise (if needed).

b. Page 1, line 13, 2nd filled-in blank, you indicated “2 – 4/0” which would be the construction of a conductor, not the conductor size. By referencing of Alcoa

conductor book, we believe the conductor size would be **423.2** kcmil. Please revise.

c. Page 1, line 14, you listed two (2) shield wires, one optical ground wire and one extra high strength steel, which found not consistent with structure drawings. Please explain and indicate where they (two shield wires) are being used. Second, if two shield wires were maintained for the proposed tap lines, then please provide this office a copy of such OPGW catalog sheet(s).

Note: The record of E-21684 (of the existing MEC 69 kV line along the railroad track) has indicated one (1) shield wire of 3/8" EHS steel only.

d. Page 1, line 22, 2nd column from left, you indicated 330 kV which found to be a voltage value of Impulse Positive Withstand, not a Negative Impulse Flashover Voltage as asked for. Please correct.

e. Page 2, line 28 found not consistent with Exhibit C1 (structure drawing of 69 kV Steel Line Tap Structure). Please revise or explain.

f. Exhibit C1 drawing, if assumed the support arm is steel, then the conductor end of such steel support arm would be a grounding point. Please indicate a conductor separation from the end of steel arm (along a suspension insulator). Second, for clarity please indicate the cross section/top view/plane view at shield wire(s) and conductor levels (showing how the lines are tapped and going to the proposed substation with one or two shield wires).

5. Exhibit D

a. Page 1, 3rd paragraph, line 4, at the beginning of line, refer to 2nd comment of 2.d. above and revise (if necessary).

b. Page 2, sub-paragraph "E.", last line, at the end of line, you indicated E-21132 which found not correct. We believe the docket **E-22113** is being filed on May 7, 2013 for the new additional line (with such public information meeting held on March 13, 2013 in Iowa Lakes Community College, Emmetsburg, Iowa). Please correct.

6. Exhibit F

a. List of utility addresses, page 1, last address (Union Pacific Railroad). Please refer to 3.e. above, 1st comment and revise. .

b. List of utility addresses, page 2, 4th address. Please refer to 3.e. above, 2nd comment and revise (if applicable). If applied, then please resend the notification letter to such new company, and provide this office a copy of resent letter (to new company) for record.

7. Safety and Route

Due to our present inspection schedule of the petitioned line route, we will notify you at a later time if there were any safety concerns or questions along the line route.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at 515-725-7339 or at bao.nguyen@iub.iowa.gov

Sincerely,

/s/ Bao Nguyen

Bao Nguyen
Utilities Regulation Engineer
Safety and Engineering Section