



Filing Receipt

Received - 2021-10-27 02:13:18 PM

Control Number - 51023

ItemNumber - 909

October 27, 2021

Chairman Peter Lake
Commissioner Will McAdams
Commissioner Lori Cobos
Commissioner Jimmy Glotfelty
Public Utility Commission of Texas
PO Box 13326
Austin, TX 78701

Re: PUC Docket No. 51023; *Application of the City of San Antonio to Amend its Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for the Scenic Loop 139-KV Transmission Line in Bexar County*; **Letter In Lieu of Oral Argument in CPS Scenic Loop CCN Proceeding**

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

My name is Tom Dreiss, and I am the landowner representative for Toutant Ranch, Ltd., Pinson Interests Ltd., ASR Parks, LLC, and Crighton Development Co. (collectively “Companies”) in Commission Docket No. 51023. Based on the Commission’s memorandum issued September 17, 2021, I had planned to present oral argument via telephone. Yesterday, the Commission issued another memorandum indicating that all oral argument will be held in person. I am unable to travel to Austin on such short notice, so I am submitting this letter in lieu of presenting oral argument.

The Companies are in the process of developing large tracts of unimproved ranchland into residential communities. When this transmission line was first presented to the public, some of the proposed paths cut through the center of projects that we were in the process of developing. Early in this proceeding, we engaged with CPS Energy to negotiate modifications to certain segments that only impact our properties and reduce our potential exposure. As part of the resulting agreement with CPS Energy, we agreed that if the Commission selected a route that crosses our property, we would support the use of a path that begins at the node that interconnects Segments 41, 42a, 46, and 46a and travels to the west across our properties.

In line with the Companies’ agreement with CPS Energy, the Companies would be willing to support the PFD’s selected Route Z2 insofar as it follows the “least bad” negotiated path across our properties. In particular, if the Companies are going to be impacted by the line, we prefer a route that uses Segment 46 rather than Segment 46a, which would unnecessarily bisect several completed home sites that are otherwise ready to be sold.

Importantly, the Companies would not oppose the Commission routing the line along a path that would avoid their properties and ongoing development projects, as that result would undoubtedly be better for our developments from a business perspective. As I emphasized at the hearing, *we don’t want this power line more than anyone else.*

I would like to thank CPS Energy for their willingness to work with the Companies throughout this proceeding, and I would like to thank the Commission for their effort and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tom Dreiss

cc: All parties of record