

Control Number: 51023



Item Number: 626

Addendum StartPage: 0

THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEAR CONTRACT AND 17

FILING OLEAN

In re Application of the City of San Antonio, Docket Number: 51023 5 Acting By and Through the City Public Service Board (CPS Energy) To Amend its Certificate SOAH Docket No. 473-21-0247 6 of Convenience and Necessity for the Proposed Scenic Loop 138-kV Transmission Line Project PATRICK CLEVELAND'S 7 in Bexar County, Texas FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION 8 AND ADMISSIONS TO LISA CHANDLER, CLINTON R. 9 CHANDLER AND PAMELA AND CHIP PUTNAM REGARDING THE TESTIMONY 10 OF BRIAN C. ANDREWS

I, Patrick Cleveland, pursuant to 16 Tex. Admin. Code § 22.141 - § 22.144 and the parties' agreements made at the prehearing conference, respectfully request that you provide the following information and admissions of fact under oath.

Instructions

Please answer the attached questions on separate pages and copy the question immediately above the answer to each question. Following each answer, please identify the witness or witnesses who will sponsor each of your answers at the hearing in this PUC Docket No. 51023. These questions are continuing in nature and, should there be a change in circumstances that would modify or change any of your answers, then, in such case, please change or modify such answer and submit such changed answer as a supplement to the original answer within five (5) working days of your discovery that such change or modification is appropriate.

In answering these requests for information, you are requested to furnish such information as is available to you, including information which you are able to obtain by due diligence from your present or former attorneys, accountants, investigators, consultants, experts employees, agents, and persons acting on your behalf. To the extent any information responsive to a general

PATRICK CLEVELAND: FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO LISA CHANDLER, ET. AL. - 1

1

2

question is also responsive to another more specific question, provide the information in response to the more specific request.

If you are unable to answer any request fully and completely after exercising due diligence to make inquiry and to secure information, you are to answer such request as fully and completely as you can and to specify the portions which you are unable to answer in such request. In addition to specifying those portions, you are to state with regard to each portion:

1. The fact on which you base the contention that you are unable to answer that portion.

2. The knowledge, information, and belief you have concerning that portion; and

3. The acts done and inquiries made by you in attempting to answer such request.

If any of the foregoing information is not available, state any other available means of identifying such document.

If you deny any question, please explain the reason you are denying it and if the question involves a mistake in numbers, identify the correct number(s).

ALJ refers to Administrative Law Judges in the Texas State Office of Administrative Hearings.

The words "you" and "your" refer to Lisa Chandler, Clinton R. Chandler, and Chip and Pamela Putnam, and any and all of their attorneys, employees, consultants, contractors, experts, or representatives.

"PUC" or "Commission" means the Public Utility Commission of Texas.

ROW means right of way.

The words "The Testimony" refer to the testimony of Brian C. Andrews in this docket.

The words "this docket" refer to PUC Docket No. 51023 / SOAH Docket No. 473-21-0247.

PATRICK CLEVELAND: FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO LISA CHANDLER, ET. AL. - 2

Request for Information and Admissions

1. In PUC Case No. 30168, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission did not cross, bisect, or encroach on any actively managed tract within the LBJ Grasslands.

2. In PUC Case No. 30168, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that none of the proposed segments crossed a recreational area.

3. In PUC Case No. 37464, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that Commission selected a route that was approximately \$6,000,000 more than the route selected by the ALJ's.

4. In PUC Case No. 37464, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the ALJ's would have crossed the Lampasas River at a previously undisturbed site, while the route the Commission selected crossed it at a previously disturbed site.

5. In PUC Case No. 37464, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission did not have any length within the foreground visual zone of park and recreation areas.

6. In PUC Case No. 38230, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission had 25 habitable structures within 500 feet of the centerline, which was the second best among all proposed routes.

7. In PUC Case No. 38230, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission did not cross any park or recreational areas.

PATRICK CLEVELAND: FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO LISA CHANDLER, ET. AL. - 3

8. In PUC Case No. 38354, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the cost of the route selected by the Commission was approximately \$84.2 million more than the preferred route of the electric utility company.

9. In PUC Case No. 38354, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the Commission found that the lower cost of the electric utility's preferred route did not outweigh the benefits associated with paralleling more ROW.

10. In PUC Case No. 38354, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that none of the most favorable routes fragmented a recreational area.

11. In PUC Case No. 47808, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission had two habitable structures within 300 feet of its centerline.

12. In PUC Case No. 47808, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that out of all of the 144 proposed routes, the highest number of habitable structures within 300 feet of the centerline of any route was four.

13. In PUC Case No. 47808, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission did not cross any parks or recreational areas.

14. In PUC Case No. 38597, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission cost \$19,225,000 more than the preferred route of the electric utility company.

15. In PUC Case No. 38597, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route selected by the Commission had less habitable structures within 500 feet of the centerline than the route preferred by the electric utility.

PATRICK CLEVELAND: FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO LISA CHANDLER, ET. AL. - 4

1	
1	16. In PUC Case No. 38597, which was referred to in The Testimony, please admit that the route
2	selected by the Commission did not cross any parks or recreation areas, while the route preferred
3	by the electric utility company crossed 8,285 feet of parks and recreation areas.
4	17. Please state and describe any certifications or licenses issued to Brian C. Andrews by any
5	government body in Texas.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	Respectfully submitted this 11th day of March 2021.
11	
12	/Patrick Cleveland/
13	
14	Patrick Cleveland State Bar #24101630
15	High Country Ranch 26332 Willoughby Way
16	Boerne, TX 78006
17	T. 908-644-8372 Email: pjbgw@gvtc.com
18	
19	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
20	
21	I certify that notice of the filing of this document was provided to all parties of record via
22	electronic mail on March 11, 2021, in accordance with the Order Suspending Rules, issued in
23	Project No. 50664.
24	
25	
26	/Patrick Cleveland/
27	Patrick Cleveland
28	PATRICK CLEVELAND: FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO LISA CHANDLER, ET. AL 5