



Control Number: 51023



Item Number: 487

Addendum StartPage: 0



SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-21-024

P.U.C. DOCKET NO. 51023

**In re Application of the City of San Antonio, Acting By and Through the City Public Service Board (CPS Energy) To Amend its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for the Proposed Scenic Loop 138-kV Transmission Line Project in Bexar County, Texas**

**BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**

**STATEMENT OF POSITION OF PETER EICK and FAMILY**

1. My name is Peter Eick and I have been a Consulting Geophysicist for approximately 33 years of which the last 5 years have been based in San Antonio, Texas.
2. My family and I own several tracts that make up the property at 23960 Scenic Loop Road
3. We live on-site in 2 different houses and run the business Serenity Geophysical Consults, LLC from the same property.
4. Our property is approximately 18 acres.
5. Serenity Geophysical Consultants, LLC (“SGC”) has been in business since 2015 and services clients in the government, energy, and mining business.
6. SGC works primarily in the seismic data acquisitions end of the geophysical business. We test and use large construction like equipment ranging from 140-ton mobile cranes to 45-ton seismic vibrators. We also deal with well bore strings which can be over 150 ft in length down to testing seismic data records of the size of a can of soda. Most of our work is not published due to its proprietary nature but an example of our work for Los Alamos National Labs and investigation of nuclear tests can be found here:  
<https://ctnw.ctbto.org/ctnw/abstract/21876>

## **T2.2-P5 GEOPHYSICAL IMAGING OF AN UNCOLLAPSED NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVE TEST**

**R. Abbott<sup>1</sup> , E. Matzel<sup>2</sup> , C. Rowe<sup>3</sup> , C. Gammans<sup>3</sup> , J. Hampshire II<sup>4</sup> , P. Eick<sup>4</sup> , L. Worthington<sup>5</sup> , R. White<sup>6</sup> , R. Keegan<sup>7</sup> , P. Lee**

The poster for this talk shows our use of the Linkbelt TCC 1400 140-ton crane and the 30-ton Seismic Hammer out on the old Nevada Test Site. See figure 4 of the poster for a picture of the system in operation.

7. SGC is planning on building its shop, yard and testing facility for this type of equipment in the flat area near Scenic Loop Road taking up few acres of our property once COVID subsides. In the course of our testing, we plan upon bringing in large cranes, commercial vehicles and large vibes as needed for our consulting work. We feel that it is not prudent to run a large powerline directly through what will be an ongoing testing and commercial site with large cranes and heavy equipment routinely being moved about. Experience has shown that large cranes and powerlines are a bad combination for safety. This is especially true when the live load may actually be taller than the powerline for example, when well bore strings are suspended. Currently, if a vibrator truck or semi backs into something, the worst they can do is knock over a fence or hit a tree. If there were a powerline overhead the situation could be more significant.

8. Segment 16 of the proposed powerline cuts directly through where our yard would be located and would be in the direct path of heavy machinery coming on and off Scenic Loop Road. The rest of our property does not have a location that is of sufficient size and flatness to allow a semi truck or mobile crane to drive in and maneuver around to unload equipment nor to park, maintain and store heavy machinery. Given the lay of the land there are no other practical options to put the yard and offices.

9. I object to Segment 16, which is part of several routes from crossing my property for the following reasons:

9.1 It would place severe safety and access restrictions on the use of that portion of our property for commercial use and or residential property development in the future.

9.2 It would create a major safety risk for field operations in the yard and use of large cranes near the power lines during high winds or weather conditions.

9.3 It may create or pick up on the magnetic fields used in seismic data recording and either disrupt the equipment or the equipment could disrupt it.

9.4 It will disrupt smooth flow of heavy equipment on and off Scenic Loop if each operator has to come and plan their entry to avoid disruption into the power lines.

10 Our property is currently subdivided to allow two separate lots with direct Scenic Loop Road Access.

11 At some point in the future, we intend on developing those properties as residential sites.

12. We may further develop residential sites along both fence lines to the east similar to our two existing sites currently platted.

13. I further object to the placement of segment 16 on our property for the following reasons.

13.1 The powerline would severely impact the value of the properties directly in its path due to lack of desirability and buyers' reasonable concerns over the safety and access required to live underneath and power line.

13.2 The powerline would decrease the value each additional residential property we wanted to build due to the visual impact on the view. Few buyers would not consider a view directly out into a powerline instead of a clear vista to be value adding site condition for a new residential build.

14. I also object to the actions of the developers along this section of Scenic Loop Road. They build several large subdivision development and have many hundreds of acres of land at their disposal, yet they did not provision their plans for a powerline to allow all those people to live. They burdened us, the owners of land along Scenic Loop Road with the powerline and all the decrease in property value, visual clutter and associated headaches of dealing with the

construction and maintenance of the line for basically the developer's financial benefit and our financial loss and inconvenience.

15. If segment 16 is required, the line could be placed on the opposite side of the road on property currently occupied by the subdivision developer in a mobile sales trailer. The power line would then be on the land that it generally would serve.

16. We have not had problems with the electrical service on our property and have no particular need of addition power provided by the new line nor does it serve our interests. We object that we would be burdened with the loss of use of our land, visual blight of the line all for the benefit the subdivision and developer across the street.

WHEREFORE, I respectfully request that the Administrative Law Judges avoid selecting routes S, V, and W as these routes include Segment 16.

Respectfully submitted this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2021

/s/ Peter M. Eick  
Peter M. Eick  
23960 Scenic Loop RD, San Antonio, 78255  
T. (832)766-2986  
E. peter.eick@gmail.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been filed with the Commission and served on all other parties via the PUC interchange on this 16<sup>th</sup> day of February 2021 pursuant to SOAH Order Number 3 issued in this docket.

/s/Peter M. Eick

---

Peter M. Eick

