



Control Number: 51023



Item Number: 699

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-21-0247

PUC DOCKET NO. 51023

RECEIVED

2021 MAR 29 PM 3:23

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
TRAINING CENTER

APPLICATION OF THE CITY OF §  
 SAN ANTONIO, ACTING BY AND §  
 THROUGH THE CITY PUBLIC §  
 SERVICE BOARD (CPS ENERGY) TO § BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE  
 AMEND ITS CERTIFICATE OF §  
 CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY § OF  
 FOR THE PROPOSED SCENIC LOOP §  
 138-KV TRANSMISSION LINE §  
 PROJECT IN BEXAR COUNTY, § ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
 TEXAS §

**OBJECTIONS AND MOTIONS TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF INTERVENOR  
 CROSS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF INTERVENORS THE SAN  
 ANTONIO ROSE PALACE, INC. AND STRAIT PROMOTIONS, INC.**

The San Antonio Rose Palace, Inc. and Strait Promotions, Inc. (collectively, “**Rose Palace**”) file the following objections and motions to strike intervenor cross-rebuttal testimony. Rose Palace moves to strike this cross-rebuttal testimony as objected to below.

PARTY; WITNESS; ITEM NUMBER	LOCATION	OBJECTION
Save Huntress Lane Area Association; Harold L. Hughes Jr.; 671	Page 7, lines 17-23; Page 8 lines 1-3	Mischaracterizes the evidence. Speculation. Facts not in evidence. Mr. Hughes alleges that Mr. Buntz’s testimony is conflicting with that of another party’s but fails to identify any incorrect statements or conclusions contained in Mr. Buntz’s testimony.
	Page 10, lines 5-9 (“Therefore...Road”) and lines 12-13 (Therefore...rural”)	Not rebuttal testimony. Relevance. No foundation. Mr. Hughes lays no foundation for the statement that “Scenic Loop Road has as much or more historical significance than does Toutant Beauregard.” Further, Mr. Hughes provides no basis for his characterization of the study area.
	Page 10, lines 10-13	Speculative. Relevance. Mischaracterizes the evidence. Mr. Buntz’ direct testimony describes direct and impact impacts to cultural resources.

699

	Page 10, lines 18-21	Mischaracterizes the evidence. Speculative. Mr. Buntz's direct testimony describes direct and indirect impacts.
Save Huntress Lane Area Association; Cynthia Grimes, David Clark, and Jerry Rumpf; 672	Page 12-13, last answer on page 12 and carryover answer on page 13.	Not rebuttal testimony, but improper additional direct testimony.
	Page 13, answer to first question	Speculative. Mischaracterizes the evidence. For example, Mr. Buntz stated in his testimony that the Heidemann Ranch is a constraint that should be considered and evaluated in this case.
	Page 14, answer to first question	Speculative. Assumes facts not in evidence. Ms. Grimes provides no basis to conclude that the Rose palace is not "historic in nature" in her opinion.
	Page 14, answer to fourth question	Mischaracterizes the evidence. Ms. Grimes mischaracterizes Mr. Buntz's testimony regarding the historic marker and Mr. Buntz's testimony discusses the importance of the intersection to the historic corridor.
	Page 15, third paragraph	Speculative. Facts not in evidence.
	Page 15, "Indeed, as the first marker photograph below indicates, the only Historic corridor original portions that still exist are along Scenic Loop Road."	Facts not in evidence. Speculative. There is no basis for this conclusion. Mr. Buntz's testimony discusses the extent and breadth to this historic corridor.
	Page 15 "This means that the original portions of what became today's Toutant Beauregard Road no longer exist."	Facts not in evidence. Speculative.
	Page 15, fifth paragraph.	Hearsay. Speculative.
	Page 18, "The Rose Palace, located far away from Segment 36, does not have authority to object to routing a line along Segment 36 based on someone else's historic property aspects."	Not rebuttal testimony. Speculative. Mischaracterization of testimony. No legal basis.
Bexar Ranch, L.P.; Sarah A. Bitter; 669	Page 3, lines 13-15.	Improper direct testimony. Facts not in evidence.

	Page 5, lines 18-20, (“While...Road”), 20-22 (Therefore...road”)	Speculative. Mischaracterization of testimony.
	Page 9, lines 7-17	Relevance. Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterization of testimony. No basis in regulatory framework. Ms. Bitter’s assertion that Bexar Ranch is part of a ranch that was listed in the National Registry of Historic Places is not supported by any evidence.
	Page 9, lines 19-21 (rather...family)	Assumes facts not in evidence. Mischaracterization of testimony. It is not clear what is “recognized,” nor is there evidence regarding any “recognized historical” 10,000-acre ranch, to the extent such recognition relates to being on the National Registry of Historic Places.
	Pages 9-10, lines 22-23 and carryover lines 1-2 (Given...claims)	Mischaracterization of testimony. Speculative.

Respectfully submitted,

BARTON BENSON JONES PLLC

/s/ Luke E. Kraus

Luke E. Kraus

State Bar No. 24106166

lkraus@bartonbensonjones.com

Buck Benson

State Bar No. 24006833

bbenson@bartonbensonjones.com

745 E. Mulberry Avenue, Suite #550

San Antonio, Texas 78212

(210) 610-5335

(210) 600-9796 (fax)

ATTORNEYS FOR THE SAN ANTONIO

ROSE PALACE, INC.

AND STRAIT PROMOTIONS, INC.

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of March 2021, notice of the filing of this document was provided to all parties of record via the PUC Interchange in accordance with SOAH Order No. 3.

/s/ Luke E. Kraus

Luke E. Kraus