

765 Burnet County CX CT 12. 23. 25

Good morning, and MERRY CHRISTMAS! My name is Tom Green. Thank you for allowing my spoken and written message to be heard and read.

Today, it will be more of a bulleted outline rather than a narrative... some important background to understand.

A. Beware the domino effect

1. There are 3 Permian basin import paths: 5 sections, 5 CCN's
2. The eastern half of the state has even more lines that are being proposed. Overall, Texas will be ensnared.
3. 1st CCN for western leg of northern route (Longshore to Drill Hole) has been filed. Intervener applications deadline 1/12/26
4. 2nd CCN scheduled for filing in latter December. It is for the western leg of the center route (Big hill to Sand lake). That is the route that goes through Burnet County. Intervener applications deadline will be latter January 2026.
5. Other CCN's to be filed in January, February, and March, 2026.
6. **Domino effect:** once the western leg of northern route has been approved, the chances for not approving the eastern leg are diminished. The same applies for our center route.
7. "Time is of the essence" is an understatement. The PUCT process must be paused until a reality check of the proposed approach AND the much better alternatives can be accomplished.
8. And as a noteworthy sidebar, isn't it just so very peachy shows that they choose to submit these filings during the Christmas and New Year Holiday season. Just another way the cards are stacked against us, the people. And, they are supposed to be serving us. Go figure.

B. Forecasted gigawatt loads

- 1 An important understanding. The entire proposed approach is based upon forecasted loads which have been shown to be highly uncertain and of more than

questionable origin. The forecasted GW (gigawatt) demands have been highly influenced by, if not virtually dictated by the TSPs (Transmission Service Providers), e.g.: Oncor, AEP, LCRA, CPS.

2. Letters from appropriate TSP executives were used to establish the forecasted GW loads. You say... *what?*
3. Is there not just a tiny bit of a fundamental problem here? The people profiting from the construction and operation of these lines are also having huge influence on how big they need to be and how many there needs to be.
4. Is this not the definition of conflict of interest? Can it make one wonder how many more such conflicts exist in the proposed approach?
 - i. Remember! TSP's do not serve you, they do not serve me, they do not serve Texans at large. They serve, literally, themselves and their shareholders. It is, in fact, their jobs.
 - ii. Does that reality make them evil people? I think not. But does it inescapably bias their perspectives. Absolutely. It's the system that is messed up, not the individuals.
 - iii. Some have opined that, beyond the lip service needed to prevail in their self-interest plan, we are of no consequence. Does evidence support that opinion? You decide, once you learn more evidence.

C. What about what was not considered in the forecasted loads and the proposed approach

1. Current compute technologies. These compute technologies, current and being deployed globally, are literally three orders of magnitude faster and more efficient (*that's 1000X*) than the 3-4 decades old architecture being used which relies on data centers.
2. The alternatives of "local" power (including behind the meter, dispatchable power), which is *already being used in and planned for* facilities to advance their timelines, was not pursued. (I can't help but wonder if it has anything to do with the transmission companies not having a dog in that local option hunt?)
3. Emerging generation technologies, of which there are several which will fundamentally change the electrical generation and transmission landscape. Maybe its important for the TSPs to build before that happens,

even if what they build is under utilized (if uses at all)? Just a thought...

4. Many argue, literally, that the whole proposed program (data centers themselves and the transmission lines and related infrastructure) will be obsolete before they are placed into service.

D. What about Water?

1. Based on extensive reviews and conversations to date, there are no proposed state or regional plans for dealing with the immense water consumption of the data centers... which *will* follow the transmission lines... in every county (Remember, data centers (including ai and crypto) are **the** primary reason for the transmission lines. The lines are not for us.)
2. Hummm. Does it seem a good idea to build all sorts of infrastructure to supply power to data centers without knowing how another critical need, water, will be supplied? Does anybody else see a flaw there?. A Meta data center in Georgia is a wonderful example. Texas' right to capture makes doing so wonderfully easy for the data centers.
3. Though rare in Texas, if it occurs, use of surface waters is not exempt from issues as well. Regulatory constraints make surface water a less likely to be pursued alternative.

E. What about Natural gas? We can talk about it next time. Until then...

1. Available data indicates sufficient natural gas to serve a great number of data centers is available in the Permian Basin... in the ground... for a "long while." (My translation.)
2. However, trunk line and pipeline distributions and compressor stations are not adequate to serve the demands of the data centers. Not even close.
3. **A question. So, why would natural gas be piped eastward for central state power generation and the power transmitted *back* to the Permian Basin? Perhaps another "Go figure..."**

F. Water and natural gas opinion: Important info from an "in the know" high ranking public agency official in Texas:

1. When asked the question how will all the water demands of the projected data centers be met without adverse impacts to other needs for water, the answer was (paraphrasing): “Nobody knows. There is no defined plan. There has been study, but no conclusive results. We don’t know.”
2. This official continued by noting that “...and the natural gas is no different. We don’t know.”
3. The information was offered as anecdotal opinions, not as official positions. Still...

G. The oh so real Environmental dangers. Note that we haven't even begun discussing the health and environmental issues which are created by the transmission lines themselves, the water use, the natural gas use, and the ensuing data centers. We can talk about those and other issues at a later setting.

The main message, the main question now is if the County is to assist in protecting its citizens from the damages of the proposed approach, it's time to saddle up and ride. We have previously spoken of various means to create awareness and allow communication for all sides of the story to occur, but little appears to have been done about any of that to date. Ditto for the 391 Commission which gives (as I understand it) the county an equal standing with the state agencies affected. This regional planning tool is fundamentally important and will permit all sides of whatever issues to be vetted. And BTW, I am assured resources are available to foot the bill for 391 Commission legal expenses that counties may incur.

And so I ask. What is the County's intent, what is its action plan, and how can I and others help?
Again, Merry Christmas!

R.B
#3

Robert Berry
2400 County Road 202
District 2
Burnet, Texas 78611

December 23, 2025 Commissioners Court
Berry Topic Outline

1. Introduction – District 2 Landowner and resident.
Participant with the Hill Country Land and Legacy Alliance
that is opposed to the proposed ONCOR/LRCA 765kV G6
powerline.
2. Thank you for your willingness to serve and lead Burnet
County.
3. Thank you for your resolution of October 28, 2025
regarding the planned 765kV powerline.
4. Citizen interaction.
The planned powerlines appear to be exclusive to District
2.
There have been various discussions regarding our
Commissioner working with citizens affected by 765kV
powerline.
I Encourage such interaction and since citizens from each
designated section have organized to respond to the 765kV
powerline I also encourage that at least one citizen from
each designated section be invited to participate.
5. Thank you and Merry Christmas!

