

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT

AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)	Docket No.
OF SALT RIVER PROJECT)	L-00000B-21-0393-00197
AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND)	
POWER DISTRICT, IN CONFORMANCE)	LS CASE NO. 197
WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA)	
REVISED STATUTES, SECTIONS)	
40-360, et seq., FOR A)	
CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL)	
COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING THE)	
EXPANSION OF THE COOLIDGE)	
GENERATING STATION, ALL WITHIN)	
THE CITY OF COOLIDGE, PINAL)	
COUNTY, ARIZONA.)	
_____)	

At: Casa Grande, Arizona

Date: February 7, 2022

Filed: February 22, 2022

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME I
(Pages 1 through 204)

COASH & COASH, INC.
 Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing
 1802 North 7th Street, Phoenix, AZ 85006
 602-258-1440 staff@coashandcoash.com

By: Carolyn T. Sullivan, RPR
Arizona CR No. 50528

1 INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

2	ITEM	PAGE
3	Opening Statement of Mr. Acken	29
4	Opening Statement of Mr. Emedi	40
5	Opening Statement of Mr. Rich	42
6	Opening Statement of Mr. Stafford	48
7	Opening Statement of Ms. Post	50
8	Public Comment Session	129

9

10 INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

11	WITNESSES	PAGE
12	JOHN COGGINS	
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Acken	55
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Rich	72
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Stafford	84
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Post	95
15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Emedi	99

16

ANGIE BOND-SIMPSON, WILLIAM MCCLELLAN, GRANT SMEDLEY

17

Direct Examination by Mr. Acken 116

18

19

20

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

21	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
22	SPR-1	SRP CEC Application filed with the ACC on December 13, 2021	115	--
23	SRP-2	SRP's Presentation Slides	115	--

24

25

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the
3 Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting
4 Committee at Radisson Hotel Casa Grande, 777 North Pinal
5 Avenue, Casa Grande, Arizona, commencing at 1:09 p.m., on
6 the 7th day of February, 2022.

7

8 BEFORE: PAUL A. KATZ, Chairman

9 ZACHARY BRANUM, Arizona Corporation Commission
10 LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality
11 JOHN RIGGINS, Arizona Department of Water Resources
12 JAMES PALMER, Agriculture Interests
13 MARY HAMWAY, Incorporated Cities and Towns
14 RICK GRINNELL, Counties
(via videoconference)
KARL GENTLES, General Public
15 MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public
(via videoconference)

16 APPEARANCES:

17 For the Applicant:

18 JENNINGS, STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C.
19 Mr. Albert Acken
One East Washington Street
Suite 1900
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

20 and

21 SALT RIVER PROJECT
22 Ms. Karilee Ramaley
Senior Principal Attorney
23 P.O. Box 52025
Legal Services PAB381
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-2025

25

1 APPEARANCES: (Cont.)

2 For the Sierra Club:

3 ROSE LAW GROUP PC
4 Mr. Court Rich
5 Mr. Eric Hill (via videoconference)
6 7144 East Stetson Drive
7 Suite 300
8 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

9 For Western Resource Advocates:

10 WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES
11 Mr. Adam Stafford
12 1429 North 1st Street
13 Suite 100
14 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

15 For the Randolph Residents:

16 Ms. Dianne Post
17 1826 East Willetta Street
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85006

19 and

20 Ms. Autumn T. Johnson, pro hac vice
21 autumn@tierrastrategy.com
22 (via videoconference)

23 For the Arizona Corporation Commission Staff:

24 Mr. Stephen J. Emedi
25 Ms. Kathryn Ust
26 Staff Attorneys
27 Legal Division
28 1200 West Washington Street
29 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

1 CHMN. KATZ: We can go on the record. If
2 there's any need for us to go off for a few minutes,
3 we'll do that. But, otherwise, we'll do everything on
4 the record. Carolyn Sullivan is our court reporter and
5 needs to make sure that we don't talk over one another.
6 But she has nametags and knows some of the attorneys.

7 This is the time set for hearing the application
8 of Salt River Project for the expansion of their Coolidge
9 Power Plant, and it's CEC Case No. 197.

10 And I would first ask the attorneys -- I guess
11 we can do it in the order that you're seated -- the
12 attorneys to introduce themselves and indicate on whose
13 behalf you're appearing.

14 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
15 afternoon, Members of the Committee. Bert Acken of
16 Jennings, Strouss & Salmon, and Karilee Ramaley, in-house
17 counsel, on behalf of the applicant, Salt River Project
18 Agricultural Improvement District.

19 MR. EMEDI: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.
20 Stephen Emedi and Katie Ust on behalf of the Arizona
21 Corporation Commission Staff.

22 MR. RICH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Members
23 of the Committee. My name is Court Rich with the Rose
24 Law Group. From time to time this week, I'll be joined
25 by my colleague, Eric Hill, and we represent the Sierra

1 Club.

2 MR. STAFFORD: Good afternoon, Chairman, Members
3 of the Committee. Adam Stafford on behalf of Western
4 Resource Advocates.

5 MS. POST: Good afternoon, Chairman and Members
6 of the Committee. Dianne Post on behalf of the Randolph
7 Residents. And Autumn Johnson is also on the Zoom;
8 however, she said there's no audio or video -- or audio
9 on the Zoom, so she can't hear anybody.

10 CHMN. KATZ: I'm surprised. Do we not have
11 audio? I don't know if she has the ability to be on the
12 Zoom audio and visually.

13 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, she should be --
14 working better. Do you want to take five to make sure
15 that technology is working correctly? Because that's
16 news to me. It should be working, and it should be
17 available for both Ms. Johnson on that feed as well as
18 members of the public should have audio and visual.

19 CHMN. KATZ: Is anybody in touch with -- can
20 anybody get in touch with Ms. Johnson?

21 MEMBER PALMER: We have one of our members on
22 the Zoom. Can you hear us okay?

23 MEMBER LITTLE: This is Toby Little. I can hear
24 you and see you. But I see the room, me, and
25 Mr. Grinnell -- or Member Grinnell. That's all I see.

1 CHMN. KATZ: And we do have Rick Grinnell
2 appearing virtually, correct? I see you.

3 Are you there, Mr. Grinnell, and can you hear
4 us?

5 Member Grinnell, can you hear us? Are you still
6 muted or something isn't working right?

7 MEMBER GRINNELL: Mr. Chairman, can you hear me?

8 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, I can hear you now. Let's
9 just go off the record a minute, and we'll see if we can
10 make sure Ms. Johnson is able to participate.

11 MR. ACKEN: I have received an email that
12 individuals who are watching on the audio/visual public
13 line are able to hear it.

14 MS. POST: I text her and she said she can hear
15 it, but she can't understand it.

16 (A recess was taken from 1:14 p.m. to 1:26 p.m.)

17 CHMN. KATZ: This is the time set for hearing
18 Salt River Project's, or SRP's, application for the
19 expansion of their Coolidge Power Plant, CEC 197.

20 The lawyers, I believe, have identified
21 themselves. I'm not sure whether we got the appearance
22 of everybody for Randolph, but I believe Dianne Post is
23 physically present here, and Autumn Johnson is appearing
24 with us virtually.

25 I would ask the Committee Members, just for the

1 record, to identify themselves, first those who are here
2 in person, and then we'll deal with our two fine members
3 who are appearing virtually.

4 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
5 evening. My name is Carl Gentles, representing the
6 public.

7 MEMBER PALMER: Jim Palmer representing
8 agriculture.

9 MEMBER RIGGINS: John Riggins representing
10 Department of Water Resources.

11 MEMBER HAMWAY: Mary Hamway representing cities
12 and towns.

13 MEMBER DRAGO: Len Drago representing the
14 Arizona Department of Environmental Quality.

15 CHMN. KATZ: And I first would ask -- and I'll
16 have ladies go first, but I would ask the member from
17 Flagstaff if she could identify herself for the record.

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Toby Little representing the
19 public.

20 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you. And last -- well, we'll
21 have one more after that, but I'll have Mr. Grinnell
22 identify himself for the record.

23 MEMBER GRINNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rick
24 Grinnell representing the counties.

25 CHMN. KATZ: And I believe that Mr. Branum

1 wasn't here when we were taking attendance. I'll have
2 him identify himself.

3 MEMBER BRANUM: Thank you. Zachary Branum
4 representing the Arizona Corporation Commission.

5 CHMN. KATZ: And I believe we are at least ready
6 to start the process. There are a couple of matters that
7 the Committee needs to address. And we have requests or
8 motions for intervention by the Sierra Club, by Western
9 Resource Advocates, and by the Randolph community or
10 neighborhood that is very close to the existing plant and
11 the area where it would be expanded. And I believe that
12 those are all of our parties here.

13 But I don't know if the Committee desires to
14 hear from a representative of each or whether we just
15 want to have a motion to grant intervention to the three
16 parties that are requesting it. And I think it probably
17 is appropriate that we do do so. But I don't know
18 whether or not there's any comments from the applicant
19 before we take a vote or hear a motion.

20 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would
21 like to be heard on the intervention requests.

22 Two of the intervention requests are from Sierra
23 Club and Western Resource Advocates. They have a right
24 to intervene under 40-360.05 as nonprofit corporation or
25 associations formed in whole or in part to promote

1 conservation or national beauty to protect the
2 environment. And that's under (A)(3). So we think they
3 meet the standard for intervention as a matter of right.
4 Certainly, the Commission Staff, we would agree, has
5 intervention as a matter of right.

6 As it relates to the Randolph Residents, I
7 believe there are six individual residents seeking
8 intervention. Let me be clear that SRP does not oppose
9 the intervention of those six individuals. We think for
10 precedent purposes and also clarity of record that it be
11 clear that their intervention is permissive. Under
12 A.R.S. 40-360.05(A)(4), they are not a nonprofit
13 corporation or association. It's six individuals at the
14 community of Randolph.

15 And why does that matter? It doesn't matter
16 practically in this case because, again, SRP does not
17 oppose their intervention. But it matters for precedent
18 and for how this Committee treats interventions and
19 setting -- you know, a handful of individuals may
20 intervene, but they may intervene in an individual
21 capacity.

22 The other piece is that they have sought to
23 intervene to represent -- I believe the wording is to
24 represent -- well, the residents to be named as
25 representative of the interests of the town. And that is

1 a concern of ours. We think that they certainly have the
2 right to intervene in their individual capacity, but
3 there is no -- there is no town. This is unincorporated
4 Pinal County. There's been no vote by a town council
5 electing the council for the Randolph individuals to be
6 their duly elected, duly nominated council.

7 We have had some communications with counsel for
8 Randolph, who has expressed the opinion that
9 communications between SRP and Randolph and her -- and
10 their residents should only be through counsel. And
11 that's fine. But that should not apply to residents who
12 they don't represent.

13 And so we just think that it's proper for them
14 to be named as intervenors, but named as intervenors in
15 their individual capacities.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Ms. Johnson or Ms. Post.

17 MS. POST: Briefly, thank you.

18 We did intervene under (A)(4), but we also
19 intervened under (A)(3) as an unincorporated corporation
20 because the values that they are seeking to uphold by
21 their intervention are precisely the values that are
22 listed in (A)(3), which is conservation of beauty,
23 protect the environmental, personal health, historic
24 area, and development of the area. So we believe they
25 should be -- definitely come in under (4), but that they

1 also might come in under (3) as an unincorporated
2 association. Thank you.

3 MEMBER GRINNELL: Mr. Chairman --

4 CHMN. KATZ: Go ahead. Yes, Member Grinnell.

5 MEMBER GRINNELL: I've got all these documents
6 and have been trying to decipher who is who. Is Autumn
7 Johnson representing the Randolph association?

8 CHMN. KATZ: Dianne Post and Autumn Johnson are
9 both here as advocates. I'm only going to allow, if
10 there are multiple attorneys, one attorney to address the
11 witness on direct or cross-examination. But it's Autumn
12 Johnson as well as Dianne Post.

13 MEMBER GRINNELL: But if they are not an
14 organized homeowners association and they're individuals,
15 do they claim to represent the whole area, or just
16 Ms. Post?

17 CHMN. KATZ: I'll have counsel, either Ms. Post
18 or Ms. Johnson, answer that.

19 MS. POST: They do claim to represent the area
20 in the fact that one of them will be testifying as the,
21 quote, unofficial mayor, unquote, and the other is a
22 long-standing resident of 70 years of the area. So, yes,
23 they are the community unofficial leaders. Granted, they
24 are not an incorporated town.

25 MEMBER GRINNELL: So, therefore, they have no

1 legal authority to take representation for all of the
2 residents in that area?

3 CHMN. KATZ: From the Chair's perspective, even
4 if they don't represent the community at large, I think
5 we need to have an understanding, through various
6 witnesses, as to what they believe the impact of this
7 might have on the community as a whole. But, obviously,
8 if they are testifying or they appear here as members of
9 the public, they'll be here as individuals. But I think
10 we need to take a look at the whole neighborhood.

11 And I did ask, at our prehearing conference, the
12 attorneys whether there was any objection to my asking
13 this Committee to take judicial notice of the fact that
14 the Randolph community, even though it isn't
15 incorporated, is a at least culturally historic Black
16 community located I believe across the street -- is it to
17 the west -- of the existing power plant and the area
18 where expansion would occur.

19 So I will be asking the Committee, unless
20 there's an objection now, to take judicial notice of the
21 fact that that is a long-standing community. I don't
22 know when it was founded or when people first started
23 living there, but I think it was long before most of the
24 industry that now surrounds the neighborhood that is in
25 place.

1 MS. POST: 1930.

2 CHMN. KATZ: So with that in mind, we might be
3 able to save some time in some of the witness testimony.

4 But, again, I think that A.R.S. 40-360.05
5 requires that we grant both the Sierra Club and Western
6 Resource Advocates the right to intervene as parties in
7 this matter. And I believe that under A.R.S. Section 360
8 (A)(4) and 360.03 that while they will be appearing as
9 individuals and we know that they can't speak for the
10 entire community because we don't have a board or formal
11 association of homeowners or otherwise. But I think that
12 there's no objection to them being allowed to intervene.
13 I haven't decided yet what, if any, testimony I might
14 limit from any party in these proceedings because I want
15 to make sure that we're only addressing issues that are
16 within our jurisdiction. But I won't prejudge that until
17 I start hearing from various witnesses.

18 Do I have a motion to allow the intervention of
19 these three parties? And if there's any discussion,
20 let's get the motion first, and if we have one and a
21 second, and then we can have discussion if there's any
22 need to.

23 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chairman, I would make the
24 motion to accept all three intervenors in this
25 proceedings. And in all honesty, I certainly hope we

1 don't restrict any testimony by any community member,
2 particularly the community members that have been here
3 and are representing the Randolph community itself.

4 CHMN. KATZ: And, again, we have a couple of
5 them listed as witnesses, but we have a number of people
6 that will probably address us during the public session,
7 and we'll hear from them and have them express their
8 concerns.

9 Do we have a second?

10 MEMBER PALMER: Second.

11 CHMN. KATZ: All in favor say "aye."

12 (A chorus of "ayes.")

13 CHMN. KATZ: Anyone opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHMN. KATZ: Hearing silence, the motion is
16 granted.

17 That all being said, let me just ask first,
18 Mr. Acken, do we want to hear opening remarks from
19 everybody and then get our witnesses sworn?

20 MR. ACKEN: Your Honor --

21 CHMN. KATZ: You can just call me the X man.
22 That's my name in my prior life. And you can tell I'm
23 not dressed in my robe today, so ...

24 MR. ACKEN: We should take an over-under. I
25 don't know how many times I will call you "Your Honor."

1 I would propose that all parties do their
2 opening statements now. I think that will help the
3 Committee understand the lay of the land, so to speak.

4 One other procedural matter that I would like to
5 bring to the Committee's attention is whether to hold a
6 tour. I don't know when you want to have that
7 discussion. Do you want to do that now?

8 CHMN. KATZ: That was -- if I turn my page back,
9 that was the second thing, other than intervention, that
10 I wanted to bring up. I know that when we initially
11 spoke last week that there wasn't a definite request that
12 we have a tour. I know that some buses were arranged, at
13 least, for the parties and the Committee. But my
14 understanding initially was that nobody was demanding a
15 tour. Mr. Acken just mentioned earlier in passing -- we
16 didn't get into a substantive discussion -- that he would
17 like to discuss that matter with us.

18 And I believe I have at least three Committee
19 Members who are present here today that may very well
20 want to take a tour. Maybe it's the entire Committee.
21 Maybe we need to poll everyone.

22 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would
23 like to share the applicant's thoughts. We do think a
24 tour would be helpful in this case. And those of you who
25 have seen me appear before in other cases know that I

1 don't always say that. And every case is unique, every
2 case, when you look at that question of whether a tour
3 adds value based on the facts presented in that case.

4 Here, you have a contested case. SRP believes
5 in full transparency. We think the tour itself is fairly
6 limited in duration and time and distance from this
7 location. We can do it in a half day, maybe
8 three-quarters of a day. And it will allow the Committee
9 to see with its own eyes the information that the
10 applicant is providing, the information that intervenors
11 are providing, and so you get the full picture without
12 having that through the lens of the advocate. So in this
13 case, we do think the tour is beneficial. We would
14 recommend it to the Committee.

15 And the last thing I would add on that is the
16 witness schedule that you will see, there are some
17 restrictions with some of the intervenors' witness
18 availability for early next week -- into early next week.
19 And so from a timing standpoint, there's really no
20 downside to holding a half day or even a three-quarter-
21 day tour because we will remain on target for intervenor
22 witness availability.

23 So SRP strongly recommends an in-person tour in
24 this case. We would recommend that that occur Wednesday
25 so that you have the benefit of our project manager's

1 testimony likely tomorrow, who will present an overview
2 of the project, a project description, a virtual tour, so
3 that you will have a good lay of the land and foundation
4 for when the actual tour occurs.

5 We are set up for COVID considerations.
6 Obviously, that's something we all take seriously in
7 this -- in these days. We have a very large bus for
8 seven to eight or however many Committee Members come.
9 So there's plenty of opportunities for social distancing
10 and as well as at the stops themselves. So I'll stop
11 there and just reiterate that SRP believes a tour is time
12 well spent in this matter.

13 Thank you.

14 CHMN. KATZ: Before I hear from any of the other
15 attorneys, I just need to make sure that we get done by a
16 week from this Friday because the following Monday, the
17 21st, is a federal and state holiday, and I have also a
18 medical appointment on that date, and the Committee has
19 set aside time from their respective employment to finish
20 this week and next.

21 So one of the things I beg and plead with all of
22 you, that we not get a lot of redundant testimony. And
23 if one witness covers something, other than saying, I
24 agree with that person, I don't need to hear the story a
25 second time. So with that admonition, in a moment, I'll

1 ask for a motion.

2 But do any of the parties object to conducting a
3 tour?

4 Yes, Ms. Post.

5 MS. POST: For the Randolph Residents, we don't
6 object to a tour, but we do think it should go through
7 Randolph in order to see the kind of impact that it will
8 have on them.

9 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, the tour protocol that
10 we shared with all the parties, including Ms. Post, does
11 have a stop in the Randolph community.

12 CHMN. KATZ: That's fine. And we're just going
13 to get an overview, but any of the other parties have an
14 objection?

15 I'll then ask for a motion from one of our
16 Members, if he or she would, to agree to the tour. I
17 know that two of our participants will be deprived of
18 that, but I also believe that we're going to have a
19 virtual flyover tour; is that correct?

20 MR. ACKEN: It is.

21 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make
22 a motion that we do a tour. It would be no greater honor
23 to me than to have the tour on my birthday on Wednesday
24 to take a look at this community and this project.

25 So with that, I make a motion to have a tour.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. As long as the next week, on
2 the 15th, we celebrate my 71st. So that all being
3 said --

4 MEMBER PALMER: In honor of Mr. Gentles' 29th
5 birthday, I'll second the motion.

6 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you.

7 CHMN. KATZ: And I don't mind a little bit of
8 humor, and I'm glad to see nobody showed up in a suit and
9 tie or a skirt or a dress or anything formal. Because I
10 grew up in the federal courts and I was kind of nasty
11 when I was on the bench, making everybody formally
12 dressed and using the podium. So no podium is necessary.
13 It might be when we have some public members talking.

14 Anyway, do we have a motion one way or the other
15 on the tour?

16 MEMBER GENTLES: I made the motion.

17 CHMN. KATZ: Oh, you made the motion? Do we
18 have a second?

19 MEMBER PALMER: I seconded.

20 MEMBER GRINNELL: Mr. Chairman --

21 CHMN. KATZ: Yes. Yes, sir, Mr. Grinnell.

22 MEMBER GRINNELL: Are we talking about doing it
23 this Wednesday?

24 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

25 MEMBER GRINNELL: Okay. If you set aside a time

1 or a day to go, I'll drive up for the day. I do have
2 some other responsibilities right after the afternoon.
3 But if somebody would let me know what time, I would
4 be -- make arrangements to come up and join the tour.

5 CHMN. KATZ: Based upon the schedule that you
6 prepared, which I have yet to review, what would be,
7 Mr. Acken, your belief in terms of when would be a good
8 time to take the tour?

9 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Member
10 Grinnell. The tour protocol, as set up, starts at 9:00,
11 and there's assembly at 8:30. We could have some
12 discussion offline with the parties and the Committee and
13 yourself to see if an earlier start time Wednesday makes
14 more sense or less sense. I understand you have to
15 travel, but it's currently set at a 9:00 a.m. departure
16 from the location in which the hearing is being held at
17 this hotel in Casa Grande.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Do we have a second?

19 MEMBER PALMER: Second.

20 CHMN. KATZ: Oh, I think Mr. Palmer seconded.

21 And in light of what you've heard, Mr. Grinnell,
22 what do you think you'd like to do?

23 MEMBER GRINNELL: Well, I could make it up --
24 would it be too much of an imposition to start the tour
25 at 10, or would that be putting everybody out of -- I

1 have a 7:00 conference call I have to do from here. So
2 I'm an hour and a half or two hours away, depending on
3 traffic.

4 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, Member Grinnell, from
5 the applicant's standpoint, if Committee Members want to
6 participate in a tour, we want to accommodate that. We
7 are mindful of the time in getting this hearing done in
8 two weeks. But, certainly, you know, I don't think an
9 hour later is going to make that big a difference in the
10 grand scheme of things.

11 Perhaps what we could do, if need be, with the
12 Committee's approval, is maybe stay later Wednesday to
13 get through some witnesses. So if we go 10 to 6. But I
14 don't think we have to make that decision today.
15 Certainly, we want to make this tour accessible to
16 Committee Members.

17 CHMN. KATZ: Well, my recommendation, then, is
18 that we go ahead and vote on whether or not we want to
19 take a tour. And if we do, we'll try to accommodate
20 Mr. Grinnell's schedule. And if we have to go a little
21 bit later that evening, we'll do that.

22 Our court reporter will be coming with us, but I
23 don't want a lot of questioning and discussion, and I
24 don't want to violate the Open Meeting Law either. So we
25 may have somebody just saying this -- verifying what

1 location we are at and viewing, but I don't think we want
2 to get into group discussions and individual discussions.
3 We don't want to violate the Open Meeting Law, and we
4 don't want to beat the heck out of a good court reporter
5 when we are outside in various locations.

6 But, anyway, all those in favor of taking a tour
7 this coming Wednesday, please say "aye."

8 (A chorus of "ayes.")

9 CHMN. KATZ: Anybody opposed?

10 (No response.)

11 CHMN. KATZ: The motion carries.

12 MEMBER PALMER: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, Mr. Palmer.

14 MEMBER PALMER: Just a thought. Coolidge is
15 probably just as close for Mr. Grinnell as Casa Grande
16 is, and we might meet him there and save that half an
17 hour if we met him there at 10 rather than him coming
18 here and then traveling that far. So just a thought to
19 save some time.

20 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman and Member Palmer,
21 that's a good thought. And certainly we would be
22 amenable to that. What I can do is commit to have our
23 team, whether through you, Chairman Katz, share the tour
24 protocol with Mr. Grinnell so he knows where we will be
25 starting and what time we will be there if he wanted to

1 meet us there directly.

2 CHMN. KATZ: How long of a ride is it at normal
3 speed limit?

4 MR. ACKEN: Approximately 30 minutes.

5 CHMN. KATZ: So maybe we can -- I don't want to
6 beat a dead horse right now, but maybe we can just maybe
7 plan on leaving around 9:15 or 9:30 and meeting
8 Mr. Grinnell, if that works for him, at the site where
9 the tour begins, and he can either perhaps park his car
10 somewhere and join us on the bus or he can just follow
11 along behind.

12 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And,
13 again, thank you for the suggestion, Mr. Palmer. What
14 we'll well do is maybe on a break but while we still have
15 the AV feed, I'll make sure someone who is completely up
16 to speed on the tour gives that information to Member
17 Grinnell so he knows where we'll be and when.

18 MEMBER GRINNELL: Thank you.

19 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. What I would like to then do
20 is in the order that you have agreed to, to allow the
21 parties to each make hopefully a very succinct and
22 relatively brief opening statement.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: This is Member Little. I would

1 just like to say for the record that I am very familiar
2 with that area. I lived in Casa Grande for 25 years.
3 And so although I will -- I'm sorry that I will not be
4 able to make the tour in person, I would like to be able
5 to -- I at least am familiar with the area.

6 CHMN. KATZ: That's nice to know. And we'll
7 also be doing a virtual flyover to give a perspective.
8 But I think being on the ground in person would be
9 helpful. And if any members of the public want follow
10 along the buses, they may.

11 I just want to make sure that all of the members
12 of the public that might be appearing virtually now know
13 that at 5:30 this evening, we're having a public comment
14 session. And I did get two requests -- I just will
15 discourage the use of cellphones, but I have to use mine.
16 We have received a request from a Councilwoman Yassamin
17 Ansari, who's with the Phoenix City Council, who wants to
18 address us this evening, and we would probably allow her
19 to be our first speaker if she's here virtually at that
20 time.

21 We also have been contacted by Kevin Cavanaugh,
22 who's a member of the Board of Supervisors of Pinal
23 County, who said he probably wouldn't be available until
24 tomorrow morning, and we would let him to do that the
25 first thing at 9:00 or thereabouts if he can't make it

1 this evening.

2 Other than that, I would like to begin our
3 proceeding. And any time you're ready, Counsel.

4 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Chairman, just one quick
5 point of clarification.

6 CHMN. KATZ: Sure.

7 MEMBER GENTLES: On our tour, did you say that
8 you encourage members of the public to follow the bus on
9 the tour? Is that what I heard you say?

10 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, Member Gentles, this
11 is actually going to be a little bit unusual. We will
12 have a bus for the Committee. We had reserved a second
13 bus so parties and members of the public, to the extent
14 there is room, will be able to be on that second bus.
15 Depending on how many members of the public want to
16 attend, some of them may need to follow along in their
17 own vehicles.

18 Traditionally, when we have done these, they are
19 open meetings, they are open to the public, and the
20 public has followed along in their individual vehicles.
21 We encourage carpooling to the extent that they can.
22 Again, the tour will leave from this location and end at
23 this location. So if folks want to carpool, they can.
24 But in this case, we will have a bus that can accommodate
25 some members of the public. It's just a question of how

1 many members want to attend and whether some of them will
2 have to take their own vehicles.

3 MEMBER GENTLES: And, Mr. Acken, is there any
4 precedent for members of the public to ask questions of
5 the Committee while on the tour?

6 MR. ACKEN: No. Chairman Katz, Member Gentles,
7 historically, for open meeting and unauthorized
8 communications concerns, the Committee is ensconced on
9 one bus with the court reporter separate from everybody
10 else.

11 And when we come to stops, the way it works is I
12 will ask our project manager to orient the Committee to
13 what they are seeing. And the Committee can ask some
14 questions, but that is not the opportunity for members of
15 the public or cross-examination during the tour. It's a
16 really -- it's a challenging environment for the court
17 reporter to try and manage that. So that's the way we
18 try to do it, is just limit the number of speakers to the
19 counsel, the project witness, and Members of the
20 Committee who have follow-up questions.

21 But the idea is anyone who has follow-up
22 questions, you know, certainly intervenors, can ask those
23 when we get back to the hearing room. Members of the
24 public -- and, actually, that's an interesting question.
25 I don't know that we have a good system to provide

1 further opportunity for members of the public to ask
2 questions. They have a public comment opportunity.
3 Maybe we can cross that bridge when we get to it.

4 MEMBER GENTLES: Okay. So is it -- is it by
5 statute that members of the community, if they were with
6 us on the tour and we stop someplace and everybody got
7 off the bus, everybody's corralled in their specific
8 corrals?

9 CHMN. KATZ: Let me try to answer that.

10 MEMBER GENTLES: Okay. Do you know where I'm
11 going?

12 CHMN. KATZ: Yeah, I know where you're going. I
13 think -- here's the problem. As we go forward here today
14 and tomorrow and the next day, it's only going to be the
15 attorneys and the Committee Members that can question
16 witnesses. The public isn't invited to question those
17 witnesses, but they're invited to listen and see. And if
18 we have to have another public session later in the week
19 or next week, we can always schedule that one afternoon
20 or one evening. But it gets to be too complicated. And
21 we can end up -- we have to discourage the public from
22 talking to individual Committee Members. We don't want
23 to violate the Open Meeting Law when we have a quorum or
24 more.

25 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 That's all I have.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Now we can get ourselves rolling.
3 Feel free, Mr. Acken, to present your opening remarks.

4 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members
5 of the Committee, for the opportunity to present the
6 Coolidge Expansion Project for your review and
7 consideration as to the environmental compatibility of
8 the chosen location. I will try to be succinct in my
9 remarks. It's not something that comes naturally to most
10 lawyers.

11 I want to start out by discussing why we're
12 here. The slideshow on a few screens before you tell the
13 tale of rapid and unprecedented growth that SRP is seeing
14 in its service territory.

15 Maricopa County is the fastest growing county in
16 the U.S. The certain demands being driven by a number of
17 factors, including residential growth and industrial
18 growth in a number of sectors, including semiconductor
19 manufacturing, data centers, and other high-tech
20 industries.

21 As a result, SRP's forecasts have changed, and
22 it has an urgent need for significant, additional
23 resources now. And while this is a contested matter, I
24 understand no party challenges the need for additional
25 resources.

1 And I should say all the slides that you see
2 here will be slides that are part of our witnesses'
3 presentations.

4 SRP has an urgent need for additional power.
5 That brings us to our next question. What is SRP doing
6 to meet that need?

7 The slide on your left illustrates that SRP has
8 a comprehensive "and" strategy. As a prudent operator
9 focused on providing reliable service, it is not putting
10 all of its eggs in one basket. Instead, as the slide
11 shows, it has added 2,000 megawatts of solar by 2025, an
12 additional 450 megawatts of batteries by 2023. Natural
13 gas units and upgrades. Additional output from Palo
14 Verde. 150 megawatts in demand response progresses by
15 this year. And an additional 125 megawatt of wind by
16 2024. That is the "and" strategy you will hear about.

17 Those measures are significant, I think
18 unquestionably significant. But still more resources are
19 needed. The slide on the right shows the capacity
20 additions from these new resources shown in blue on the
21 left-hand side of the screen but reveals that SRP still
22 needs more than 700 megawatts of capacity by 2024 and
23 more than 1,000 megawatts by 2025. I cannot underscore
24 enough that we are in unprecedented times both with
25 respect to growth and the transformation of the

1 electrical generation portfolio to renewable resources.

2 So how does this project fit in? It will
3 provide the near-term capacity desperately needed as well
4 as the reliability backbone so that SRP can integrate
5 even more renewable resources. This is because Coolidge
6 Expansion Project is a flexible resource, able to start
7 up and shut down quickly as needed during hot summer
8 months, morning and afternoon winter peaks, during cloud
9 cover that reduces solar output, and when needed for
10 reliability for longer-duration events.

11 Another question that comes up is why natural
12 gas turbines instead of alternative technologies. Even
13 though SRP's resource planning decisions are under the
14 exclusive jurisdiction of SRP's elected board, not the
15 Commission or this Committee, SRP will provide testimony
16 regarding its analysis of alternatives, such as battery
17 storage paired with solar, and why SRP management
18 recommended to SRP's elected board to proceed with this
19 project.

20 In so doing, SRP seeks to provide context and
21 background just as applications for gen-ties provides
22 some information regarding the nonjurisdictional
23 generation components, such as a solar or battery project
24 or a wind project that this Committee is very familiar
25 with.

1 Here, SRP conducted an analysis to see what an
2 alternative portfolio of battery resources would look
3 like to meet the urgent need for significant additional
4 power. The slide on the right shows the results of this
5 analysis. SRP would need three to four times the
6 batteries and carbon-free resources to provide similar
7 reliability as this project. SRP's analysis further
8 showed that the net present value of this expansion
9 compared to other alternatives was over \$600 million.

10 But SRP did not stop there. SRP conducted a
11 number of sensitivity analyses with respect to its
12 investments regarding future gas and battery costs, and
13 each show that Coolidge is by far the most economic
14 choice.

15 To summarize the key attributes of this project
16 and why it is so critically needed, it is necessary for
17 reliably dramatic near-term growth. It will enable
18 integration of additional renewable energy that everyone
19 in this room wants to see. As I mentioned earlier,
20 battery storage is an important part of SRP's present and
21 future, and SRP has integrated batteries in a measured,
22 pragmatic approach that it must to ensure reliability.
23 And it is the most affordable option that provides the
24 greatest value to SRP's customers.

25 With that said, as you can see, some in this

1 room will disagree with the need for fast-ramping natural
2 gas to integrate renewable energy. But independent
3 planning organizations recognize the importance of
4 resources like this one. The quote on the right screen
5 is from the North American Electric Reliability
6 Corporation with regards to the role of natural gas units
7 such as Coolidge. And I want to give you a minute to
8 read that.

9 Until storage technology is fully developed and
10 deployed at scale, which cannot be presumed to occur
11 within the time horizon of the LTRA, which is 2031,
12 natural gas-fired generation will remain a necessary
13 balancing resource to provide increasing flexibility
14 needs. Policy decisions must ensure that sufficient
15 balancing resources are developed and maintained for
16 reliability.

17 Another question that will be hotly debated in
18 this proceeding is why did SRP choose this location.
19 There are many reasons.

20 At threshold one is that this is not a
21 greenfield site but an expansion of an existing facility
22 approved by this Committee and the Commission in Case
23 141, with construction completed in 2011. The existing
24 facility has 12 simple-cycle natural gas turbines with a
25 nameplate capacity of 620 megawatts, and the existing

1 plant interconnects with SRP's 230kV system at the
2 Randolph Switchyard.

3 The map on the right shows the location of the
4 existing facility in this project. It is located in the
5 city of Coolidge, approximately equidistant between
6 Phoenix and Tucson.

7 Key points regarding the expansion project are
8 shown on the left-hand slide. It will include 16 new
9 turbines with 820 megawatts of capacity. Eight units go
10 online in 2024, eight more in 2025.

11 The slide on the right is a -- contains two
12 visuals. The first is a photograph of the Randolph
13 community showing existing conditions. You see the
14 substation -- or excuse me -- the switchyard for the
15 existing facility in the middle ground, the turbines in
16 the background, and the railroad and transmission lines
17 in the foreground.

18 And the visual below is a representation of what
19 the expansion project will look like from the Randolph
20 community. And you can see the new 500kV switchyard in
21 that middle ground, and then behind there will be the new
22 turbines for the expansion project.

23 I want to take a moment and describe what SRP is
24 requesting approval for. The diagram on the left shows
25 both the existing facilities and the new components

1 highlighted in yellow. SRP is requesting approval for
2 both the generating facility and the interconnection
3 facilities necessary for the project. And that's where
4 the diagram on the right comes in. It highlights the
5 interconnection components.

6 In the blue box, you see the transmission lines
7 that will interconnect the new turbines to the new
8 switchyard. The yellow box shows the new switchyard --
9 the new 500kV switchyard. And the green box shows the
10 transmission lines that will interconnect the new 500kV
11 switchyard to SRP's existing 500kV system. So, again,
12 SRP is requesting approval for the generation components
13 as well as this transmission line interconnection.

14 Next I want to highlight the public outreach
15 process. As you would expect for SRP, SRP engaged in a
16 very robust public outreach project. It included, as you
17 see on the left, numerous mailers; newspaper ads;
18 virtual, online, and in-person open houses; social media;
19 and meeting with shareholders.

20 But SRP did not stop there, particularly as it
21 related to the Randolph community. The slide on the
22 right shows SRP's additional efforts in Randolph. SRP
23 recognizes Randolph is historically significant and its
24 residents are rightfully proud of it. SRP conducted
25 robust Randolph-specific outreach and will testify as to

1 the feedback it received and the goals of that outreach
2 to identify concerns of the community and identify
3 methods to support, facilitated by a community working
4 group, as SRP has successfully used for other plant
5 expansions in Tempe and Gilbert.

6 You will hear from the intervenor representing
7 six Randolph residents representing their opposition to
8 this project, and you may hear additional public comments
9 too. But the story is not so simple, and opposition is
10 not so unanimous.

11 What SRP heard from its outreach was that some
12 residents were not even aware of the existing plant.
13 Others saw the expansion as an opportunity to benefit
14 their community through measures such as visual screening
15 from the plant and other industrial uses, landscaping,
16 and other community improvements. These residents were
17 open to a continued working relationship with SRP. And
18 bottom line, SRP is committed to working with the
19 Randolph community, and SRP has a track record of backing
20 up its commitments.

21 The slide on the left shows SRP's community
22 partnerships charter. The testimony will show that SRP
23 has a long-standing record of developing partnerships
24 with the communities it serves and the areas in which it
25 has plants to work collaboratively with its neighbors.

1 SRP has and will do the same with Randolph.

2 With respect to the focus of the Committee's
3 review, the evidence will show that this project is
4 environmentally compatible, with minimal impacts on the
5 surrounding areas, including Randolph.

6 SRP will provide testimony that the project
7 effects are minimal and consistent with other projects
8 approved by this Committee and the Commission, including
9 the existing Coolidge generating plant, and the project
10 is environmentally compatible with the factors set forth
11 in A.R.S. 40-36.07. And, again, even though this project
12 will have minimal effects on Randolph, SRP is committed
13 to working with its neighbors in a collaborative process
14 to provide additional benefits to the community.

15 The final points I'd like to discuss concern the
16 legal standard overview. On the left is A.R.S.
17 40-360.06. There are a lot of words on the page. This
18 is the Committee's scope of the review, and this is the
19 statutory framework.

20 In this proceeding, certain intervenors are
21 going to ask you to go far beyond that statutory
22 framework and establish new Arizona policy regarding
23 climate change, seek to turn this proceeding into a
24 referendum on SRP's resource planning process, and ask
25 you to second-guess the resource planning decisions made

1 by SRP's elected board. Similar requests have been made
2 in prior CEC proceedings, and this Committee and
3 Commission have refused to go beyond their statutory
4 mandate. Consistent with this past precedent, we ask
5 that you focus your review on the statutory
6 considerations the legislature has established for this
7 Committee, as shown on the screen on the left.

8 You will see those considerations are focused on
9 the suitability of the proposed site, not alternative
10 technologies, not SRP's resource planning process, not
11 broader policy considerations regarding climate change.

12 I want to highlight subparts (7) and (8), as I
13 expect you will hear that these provisions give you the
14 authority to question SRP's resource choices. They do
15 not.

16 Subsection (7) speaks of the previous experience
17 with equipment and methods available for achieving an
18 objective. It does not provide an opportunity to tell
19 the applicant that it should have selected a different
20 technology.

21 Subsection (8) addresses the cost of the
22 facility as prepared by the applicant and then compared
23 to the cost as recommended by the Committee.

24 It is not a prudence review of SRP's decision.
25 That decision is made by SRP's board, and SRP's board has

1 already spoken on the issue, relying on the
2 recommendations of its management that this project was
3 the right choice for reliability, sustainability, and
4 cost. And as I explained earlier, we will present you
5 with that testimony so that you can see the basis on
6 which SRP's board made its decision.

7 After your consideration, the Commission will
8 review, based on the balancing test set forth on the
9 right screen, and that comes from A.R.S. 40-360.07.
10 Here, again, we understand no party is taking the
11 position that additional power is not critically needed
12 now. The only question for the Committee -- excuse me --
13 the Commission will be how to balance the need for that
14 power with the desire to minimize environmental effects.

15 The record in this proceeding will show that
16 this expansion project, like the original project
17 previously approved by this Committee and the Commission,
18 is appropriately sited and environmentally compatible
19 with minimal effects on the surrounding area.

20 We greatly appreciate the opportunity to present
21 this critically needed project. I can't underscore the
22 urgency. We thank you for your time. We thank you for
23 coming down and being here online for the testimony. We
24 anticipate this will be a lengthy, contentious hearing,
25 and we appreciate your consideration.

1 Thank you.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you.

3 I didn't know whether the Corporation Commission
4 wanted to present anything at this time. If not, we can
5 go to Mr. Rich, unless you agreed to a different order.

6 MR. EMEDI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have
7 a very brief --

8 CHMN. KATZ: We'll try to get your microphone
9 working.

10 MR. EMEDI: The universe is trying to tell me
11 not to make this statement.

12 Testing. Maybe if I just back up. How about
13 getting close. Mr. Rich, you were right.

14 Staff has just a very brief opening statement.

15 Good afternoon, Chairman Katz and Members of the
16 Committee. Staff believes that the issuance of a
17 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility for the
18 Coolidge Expansion Project will allow the applicant to
19 meet growing peak demand by providing fast-ramping
20 generation capable of quickly responding to fluctuations
21 in demand. The flexible generation provided by the
22 project will support the increasing integration of
23 renewable resources onto the legible grid by maintaining
24 the grid's reliability.

25 Although Staff supports the project, it notes

1 that when it evaluated SRP's application, the company had
2 not yet completed a System Impact Study. And while a
3 System Impact Study has still not yet been completed,
4 it's Staff's understanding that SRP has reached some
5 preliminary results regarding the project's impact on the
6 grid.

7 Staff reiterates its stance that the Line Siting
8 Committee should allocate time during this hearing to
9 consider the project's impact on the reliability and
10 safety of the grid in light of SRP's preliminary results.

11 Finally, Staff does not believe the line siting
12 statute allows the Committee to make resource planning
13 decisions on behalf of SRP; rather, the statute requires
14 the Committee to base its decision on the factors
15 enumerated in A.R.S. 40-360.06, which was just shown on
16 the screen here.

17 Staff looks forward to hearing testimony on the
18 enumerated factors of the environmental capability and of
19 the proposed project site.

20 Thank you.

21 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Rich, do you wish to go next?

22 MR. RICH: I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 Good afternoon again. We'll see if the
24 high-pitched noise goes away there. Testing. All right.
25 Sounds good.

1 Good afternoon again. As a reminder, my name is
2 Court Rich, and I'm here today representing the Sierra
3 Club.

4 I want to start and thank you all for the time
5 you're going to spend here this week. I know a lot of
6 you are even staying here, taking time away from your
7 families and your jobs to do this, and I certainly
8 appreciate that, and we'll try to be respectful of your
9 time and provide you with only useful and concise
10 information as we go along.

11 So I know that this proceeding is going to be
12 significantly different than the recent cases that you
13 all have been hearing, which have predominantly been, you
14 know, a gen-tie line to connect a solar facility or some
15 renewable facility to the transmission grid. Those have
16 been, no doubt, largely straightforward with some, you
17 know, details around easements and where they should be
18 located.

19 But this is a much different situation in this
20 case. In fact, I'm not sure that this Committee has been
21 asked to look at the -- I know there have been some sort
22 of remodels of existing gas plants, but I don't know that
23 there's been a new significant nearly \$1 billion
24 investment in a gas plant to come before this Committee
25 in a long time. And so I think you're going to find a

1 lot of differences between this and what you've typically
2 see.

3 And what we intend to show you, through the
4 evidence in this case -- I'll go through some of that and
5 highlight what I think you should be listening for.

6 First of all -- and this was surprising to me,
7 but SRP is proposing to go through this -- build this
8 almost \$1 billion plant, and they went through no RFP
9 process. Typically, maybe exclusively, when utilities go
10 through a process to decide whether or not to install
11 some infrastructure of this size, they go through what
12 they call an all-source RFP to look at proposals from
13 different entities that would propose building
14 alternatives. You know, they would say: What is the
15 most useful type of generation that we can get, and what
16 would that look like, and what would it cost.

17 And, in fact, SRP knows how to do this because
18 they're doing it right now for a similar-size chunk of
19 generation, and they are going through an all-source RFP
20 process. But they didn't do it in this instance, which
21 leaves a lot of questions unanswered, and we'll get into
22 that.

23 The other thing that you're going to hear, which
24 probably won't surprise you, is that this gas-generation
25 facility, in addition to the squeaky noise I'm hearing,

1 it's dirty; right? I mean, burning gas is dirtier than
2 the alternatives that we have today. It's dirty insofar
3 as it puts out particulate matter emissions into the air
4 in Pinal County. And Pinal County is one of, frankly,
5 the places in the United States with currently the
6 dirtiest air, unfortunately. And so adding more of that
7 particulate matter in this area is something that we
8 should think very carefully about before we approve doing
9 so.

10 One of the important things that you're going to
11 hear is that, you know, the applicant talks about how
12 there are attributes of the gas-fired power plant and
13 it's quick-ramping and it does these other great things.
14 Well, you know what's even quicker ramping and has even
15 more positive alternatives and benefits to the grid, is
16 battery storage. A combination of solar energy,
17 renewable products, and battery storage, you're going to
18 be shown throughout this hearing, can do more, be more
19 flexible, respond better, and be done for a better price
20 than for what they're proposing in front of you today.
21 Now, the applicant would have known that if they had done
22 an all-source RFP.

23 Batteries, you'll find, can -- you know, they
24 talk about fast-ramping this project, it takes ten
25 minutes to ramp up. Well, batteries can ramp up from

1 nothing to everything instantly. So that's even faster
2 ramping. Batteries can be built incrementally around the
3 grid to not only take advantage of the generation, of the
4 amount of electricity that they can store, but if you put
5 them in certain locations, they can avoid distribution
6 upgrades and other upgrades to the grid, and those
7 benefits pile up on top of each other. And these are
8 things that a large, centralized utility plant can't do.
9 And you'll hear evidence about that as we go forward.

10 Pinal County is in a desperate situation with
11 regard to groundwater. This plant uses groundwater. And
12 we're going to provide testimony about that. It's the
13 wrong thing to do in the wrong place at a time when you
14 have such problems.

15 You're going to hear a lot about the adjacent
16 community. You've already heard some of it today. My
17 goodness, I ask you to take a look when you're out there
18 at the area that's gone up around this Randolph community
19 and ask yourself, how could this happen?

20 I mean, here is a residential community that is
21 surrounded with industrial uses. And I know when SRP
22 sees that, they say, Well, let's just throw another
23 industrial use there. Well, no. At some point, it has
24 to stop. It's ridiculous. And I think, you know, when
25 you're out there, you'll get a sense of it.

1 But, you know, the truth is, this plant is not
2 just another industrial use next to a community that's
3 been sort of, for whatever reason, in the bullseye of
4 industrial uses. This has real health impacts, as you're
5 going to hear from our witnesses, about how burning more
6 fossil fuels and natural gas has quantifiable impacts on
7 the numbers of asthma attacks and heart attacks and
8 life-and-death situation here for a power plant that,
9 it's important to keep in mind, doesn't even serve the
10 area.

11 So SRP wants to put this adjacent to -- just
12 immediately adjacent to this community, and it's about 30
13 miles or maybe even more from where SRP actually serves
14 electricity. How fair is this? How does that make any
15 sense?

16 And so we're not asking you -- they're going to
17 try to characterize us asking you to vote no on this
18 application as us asking you to substitute, you know,
19 your judgment, I think they said, for the resource
20 planning decisions of the applicant. Well, you certainly
21 have the right to vote no, and we're going to give you
22 the tools to do that.

23 We're going to show you this is bad for the
24 environment, we're going to show you it's expensive, and
25 we're going to show you that you don't need to feel bad

1 about voting no because there are alternatives. There
2 are cleaner, cheaper, better alternatives that can
3 actually do more for the utility.

4 And they talk about how urgently they need this.
5 Well, don't let them fool you. You know what you can
6 build faster than this gas plant? Batteries. You can
7 build them really fast. So, you know, they may have an
8 urgent need, but it doesn't mean they can't do the right
9 thing.

10 At the end of the day, we're going to have three
11 witnesses. I'll just orient you, we'll have two
12 witnesses, Sandy Bahr, who is the executive director of
13 the Arizona Chapter of the Sierra Club; and Cara
14 Bottorff, who works for the Sierra Club. They will
15 testify together and talk about water and environmental
16 and air quality issues. And then Mr. -- Michael Goggin
17 will be here to testify about his analysis of SRP's
18 analysis about what alternatives are out there to this
19 project.

20 So we really appreciate, again, your time this
21 week and your attention to this really important issue,
22 and I look forward to providing you with the details that
23 I just covered. And I hope at the end of the day, you'll
24 feel comfortable in telling SRP no to this project.
25 Thank you.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you.

2 Mr. Stafford, you're going to be the one
3 presenting for Western Resources; correct?

4 MR. STAFFORD: Yes, Chairman.

5 CHMN. KATZ: Please feel free to begin.

6 MR. STAFFORD: Thank you.

7 Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Members of the
8 Committee. I'm Adam Stafford, representing Western
9 Resource Advocates.

10 In making its decision to approve or deny an
11 application for a Certificate of Environmental
12 Compatibility, A.R.S. 40-360.06(A)(6) requires this
13 Committee to consider the total environment of the area.

14 The evidence will show that greenhouse gases
15 emitted by fossil fuel power plants like the Coolidge
16 Expansion Project pose a threat to the health and welfare
17 of the people in Randolph, Coolidge, and Pinal County.
18 The evidence is incontrovertible that human-caused
19 greenhouse gas emissions have critically warmed the earth
20 by 1.1 degree Celsius from preindustrial levels.

21 The evidence will show that unless carbon
22 dioxide and other greenhouse gases are significantly
23 reduced now, global temperatures will likely rise by 2
24 degrees or more by mid century.

25 According to SRP's application, these new gas

1 plants will emit over half a million tons of carbon
2 dioxide per year. As our planet warms, the frequency and
3 intensity of extreme heatwaves will increase. Extreme
4 temperature events, which used to happen once every ten
5 years, are likely to happen almost every three years now
6 at 1 degree of warming. And at 1 1/2 degrees, these
7 events are expected to occur four times every ten years.
8 At 2 degrees, almost six times. And at 4 degrees, 9.4
9 times. That's almost every year. With each additional
10 half degree of warming, the intensity of the heatwaves
11 will also increase. At 2 degrees, heatwaves will likely
12 reach critical thresholds for the tolerance of our health
13 and agriculture.

14 The people in Randolph, Coolidge, and Pinal
15 County will suffer the consequences of increased carbon
16 emissions. It's going to get hotter there. There will
17 be more heat-related deaths. Drought is projected to
18 become more frequent, intense, and last longer. Crop
19 yields will decrease. The people who live in this area
20 are going to have to run their air conditions more to
21 survive. If you burn more gas to power the air
22 conditioners, you increase the amount of carbon dioxide
23 you're dumping into the air, making the planet warmer and
24 increasing the need for more air conditioning.

25 The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

1 states that the key to 1 1/2-degree increase in global
2 temperatures, economywide carbon dioxide emissions must
3 be net zero by 2050. Warmer than that will trigger
4 catastrophic, irreversible consequences.

5 The evidence will show that it is not too late
6 to limit warming to approximate 1 1/2 degrees. But to do
7 that, immediate, significant reductions in greenhouse gas
8 emissions, particularly carbon dioxide, are necessary.
9 If we do not reduce the economywide carbon dioxide
10 emissions to net zero by 2050, even 2 degrees may be out
11 of reach, and that will have a devastating impact to the
12 total environment of the area around these post new gas
13 plants.

14 The Committee should deny SRP's application.

15 Thank you.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you.

17 And, Ms. Post, I don't know if you're going to
18 do the opening?

19 MS. POST: Yes.

20 I'm Dianne Post, and you've already heard a bit
21 this morning about the Randolph Residents and the fact
22 that I and Autumn Johnson represent them.

23 You're going to hear more about Randolph. And
24 we will demonstrate by our witnesses that this extension
25 violates 40-360.06 with the different factors that are

1 outlined in that statute.

2 Here's what you're going to learn from our
3 witnesses:

4 You've already heard that this is a historical
5 African American town, and you're going to learn why that
6 is important not just to the residents, but also to Pinal
7 County and Arizona.

8 It's also required by law to be considered by
9 the factors under (A)(5). You're going to hear from the
10 residents what it's like to live next door to a huge
11 power plant and how much worse it will be with the noise
12 and light pollution if another one is built even closer
13 to their homes.

14 Again, these are not issues that are important
15 only to the residents, but by law, they must be
16 considered. The noise emission must be considered under
17 (A)(3).

18 You're going to hear from an economist about the
19 encroachment of heavy industry, how much that has already
20 cost the residents, and how much more it will cost them
21 with this new plant if it's built. This issue, too, was
22 completely ignored, but it is one of the factors under
23 (A)(6) that must be considered.

24 You will hear from four witnesses about
25 environmental injustice and environmental racism.

1 They'll explain what it is, what are the health and
2 safety consequences, what's the danger to the people
3 living nearby, and what has been observed locally in
4 Pinal County.

5 These health and safety consequences and this
6 impact on the community are public interest
7 considerations. They highlight why these issues have
8 become so significant in our society. Not only has the
9 Federal Government had initiatives since 1994, but even
10 SRP has accepted this by using the environmental
11 protection area -- Environmental Protection Agency tools
12 in writing their own environment compliance document.

13 But this application, this CEC application, is
14 still woefully defective because they did not properly
15 incorporate or weigh these necessary factors that you'll
16 hear testimony about.

17 These issues of environmental injustice and
18 discrimination against African American, Hispanic
19 American, and Native American people who live in Randolph
20 may implicate both federal and state laws, which also
21 must be considered under (A)(9). This proposed expansion
22 reduces the value of homes and property in a historic
23 Black community, disregards the cultural resources that
24 is Randolph, ignores the negative factors that impact the
25 residents, harms the total environment by ignoring

1 environmental justice, and violates the public interest.

2 The residents want this application denied, full
3 stop. They do not believe that this project is
4 environmentally compatible with their homes and their
5 lives. If the Committee doesn't do this, they believe
6 that when the public interest is balanced, as it is
7 required to be, they should be given appropriate weight.
8 And that weight must be very heavy.

9 Serious consideration must be given to
10 conditions that protect the residents of the town, such
11 as compensation for their lost property values,
12 relocation assistance for those who choose to relocate
13 out of the negative impacts, infrastructure for the town
14 for those who chose to remain, amelioration of the
15 damages that will result from the plant to the residents,
16 their children, and their grandchildren.

17 Thank you.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you.

19 I don't know how -- let me just go off the
20 record for a second.

21 (A recess was taken from 2:32 p.m. to 2:32 p.m.)

22 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Acken, our court reporter
23 doesn't immediately need a break. I usually try to break
24 about once every hour and a half maximum, but we got
25 started a little bit late. But I don't know if we want

1 to get started with one of our witnesses or I at least
2 can affirm or swear in your first panel of witnesses.

3 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If Carolyn
4 is amenable, we will call our first panel of witnesses,
5 John Coggins.

6 CHMN. KATZ: A panel of one. Okay. So is he --
7 oh, here he is. And he would be seated -- yeah, we do
8 have a space for Mr. Coggins right at that table. And
9 while you're passing, would you prefer an oath or an
10 affirmation?

11 MR. COGGINS: Oath is fine.

12 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. And if you would, remain
13 standing and raise your right hand.

14 (John Coggins was duly sworn by the Chairman.)

15 CHMN. KATZ: You may be seated.

16 Mr. Acken, you may begin.

17 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Coggins, let me know when you're
18 ready to proceed.

19 THE WITNESS: Okay.

20 Make sure that's in a position -- it sounds like
21 you can hear me. Okay.

22

23

24

25

1 JOHN COGGINS,
2 called as a witness on behalf of Applicant, having been
3 previously sworn by the Chairman to speak the truth and
4 nothing but the truth, was examined and testified as
5 follows:

6

7

DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. ACKEN:

9 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Coggins. Please state your
10 name and business address for the record.

11 A. Well, first off, let me say, Mr. Chairman and
12 Members of the Committee, we very much appreciate the
13 opportunity to present this project to you over the next
14 several days.

15 My name is John Coggins, and my address is 1500
16 North Mill Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85281.

17 Q. Please provide the Committee a brief summary of
18 your educational background.

19 A. Yeah. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in
20 mechanical engineering from the University of Arizona.

21 Q. Next please provide a brief summary of your
22 career at SRP, including the current position which you
23 hold.

24 A. Sure.

25 I'm coming up on 37 years of experience at SRP.

1 It's been a good run. In this experience I have worked
2 with generation, transmission, and distribution
3 operations; wholesale markets and energy commodity
4 trading; system strategy and planning; and also
5 competitive retail in energy markets. My current role is
6 associate general manager and chief power system
7 executive for SRP.

8 Q. Describe the scope of your responsibilities as
9 the associate general manager/chief power system
10 executive.

11 A. Well, I have overall responsibility for the
12 operation of the SRP electric system.

13 Q. And in your role as the chief power system
14 executive, describe your interaction with SRP's CEO, the
15 SRP board, and SRP's Power Committee?

16 A. Sure.

17 I report directly to our CEO, Mike Hummel. I
18 attend all of our board and board committee meetings,
19 including the Power Committee. I provide regular updates
20 to the board and reports. I also bring items to the
21 board for approval on a periodic basis. And I also meet
22 with board members individually on occasion to discuss
23 topics in more detail as needed.

24 Q. Mr. Coggins, there are a few areas I'd like you
25 to address with the Committee. And that includes the

1 changing electric industry as a whole that you've seen
2 over your career as a whole and in recent times, SRP's
3 power generation changes, and how this project fits into
4 those plans.

5 Let's discuss industrywide transfers. What are
6 your thoughts and observations regarding the electric
7 utility industry changes that you see occurring?

8 A. Well, transformational change is occurring
9 across the utility industry as it seeks to lower carbon
10 emissions and reduce impacts from climate change.

11 This change is occurring across all major
12 functions in the industry, and that include generation,
13 transmission, distribution, and our customer programs.
14 Within each of those major functions, technologies are
15 changing, processes and systems are all being
16 transformed.

17 Q. Thank you. Let's talk specifically regarding
18 SRP and how SRP is facing those challenges and the
19 specific pressures and demands on SRP.

20 A. Sure.

21 SRP is also in the midst of this
22 transformational change that I described. For SRP,
23 however, the changes are even more impactful because
24 we're also facing unprecedented load growth in our
25 service territory.

1 In addition to meeting load growth, some
2 examples of this change include eliminating coal-fired
3 power plants; making extensive increases in utility-scale
4 generation; enabling customer generations, including
5 rooftop solar and batteries; increasing customer options
6 for demand response, energy efficiency, and time of use
7 rates; adding flexible utility-scale generation like
8 batteries and natural gas; and participating in new
9 wholesale energy markets and resource adequacy programs.

10 Q. So you just mentioned the steps SRP is taking
11 for this transition to renewables and meeting the
12 significant load growth that you've seen.

13 I'd like you to share your thoughts with respect
14 to the opportunities and challenges associated with -- I
15 think your term was the transformational change
16 associated with the electric system transformation.

17 A. Sure.

18 Well, with regard to opportunities for me
19 personally and I think for most of our employees, it's an
20 incredibly exciting time to be at SRP. We're at the
21 forefront of many new technologies and really a whole new
22 way of operating the grid going forward.

23 As an engineer myself, it's exciting to see
24 these technologies develop and also to see them to begin
25 to be deployed out on the grid. It's also very

1 satisfying to see these technologies being utilized to
2 reduce carbon emissions.

3 In terms of challenges, all of this change will
4 certainly bring new challenges. And the one that really
5 sticks out in my mind more than others is reliability.
6 And the challenge there is how do we maintain
7 industry-leading reliability for our customers while also
8 leading the load growth that we've described, lowering
9 carbon emissions, and managing costs going forward.

10 Q. I'd like you to spend a little more time
11 discussing reliability and address it in the context of
12 SRP's role in providing reliability.

13 A. Well, I would say in the context of this
14 particular project and resource decision, there are three
15 main components of reliability:

16 The first is we need to be able to meet peak
17 customer demand while that demand is growing.

18 We need to firm up and balance renewable --
19 intermittent renewable resources that are being added to
20 the system.

21 And we need to plan to unplanned outages and
22 longer duration reliability events.

23 I think it's also helpful, when we think about
24 reliability, to remind ourselves why reliability is so
25 important. Even short-term power outages over a wide

1 portion of SRP's service territory could impact public
2 safety and security, financial returns for large and
3 small businesses, economic development in the region, and
4 the integrity of the Western U.S. grid. So, in other
5 words, if SRP doesn't properly manage its portion of the
6 grid, those problems could potentially cascade to other
7 states.

8 Q. Earlier, I think you testified that it was an
9 exciting time with respect to managing load growth and
10 the changing resource mix in reliability. Can you
11 explain how SRP is addressing those challenges.

12 A. Well, you might imagine, we have a number of
13 different initiatives that we're pursuing along these
14 lines. We're making changes to the processes, the tools,
15 and the systems that support both volt power system
16 operations and our distribution system operations. We're
17 conducting research on new technologies. We're piloting
18 new technologies, and we're implementing new technologies
19 with demonstrated capabilities. We're enhancing many of
20 our planning processes, including resource planning,
21 system planning, and forecasting.

22 With regard to planning, I think one of the most
23 important actions that SRP has taken to inform our
24 resource plan is to define specific goals for the
25 reduction of carbon emissions. And these goals include a

1 65 percent reduction in carbon intensity by 2050. These
2 goals were developed through an extensive external
3 stakeholder process over a five-month period.

4 The process included 60 stakeholders
5 representing customers, environmental groups, cities,
6 universities, and economic development and water adequacy
7 plans. We also received over 4,000 comments during the
8 public comment period. Reliability, affordability, and
9 growth were all considerations in developing these goals.

10 At the end of the process, stakeholders voiced
11 support not only for the process itself but for the goals
12 that were developed. The goals were approved by the SRP
13 board in June of 2019. And, you know, I really think the
14 value of these goals is that they provide an important
15 standard by which we can evaluate resource decisions as
16 we seek to balance reliability with sustainability and
17 affordability while also meeting growth.

18 So leading up to the time that we developed
19 these goals and after these goals were established, I'd
20 like to just list for you some of the resource decisions
21 that have been made. And as I walk through this list, I
22 think it's important for context to just understand that
23 our system today has a peak load of about 7,500
24 megawatts.

25 So, again, some of the resource decisions that

1 we've made:

2 We've completed the shutdown of 1,000 megawatts
3 of coal for a total of 1,300 megawatts that's been shut
4 down.

5 We're shutting down an additional 1,300
6 megawatts of coal by 2032.

7 We're adding 2,025 megawatts of utility-scale
8 solar by the year 2025 for a total on our system of about
9 2,500 megawatts of solar.

10 We're adding 500 megawatts of battery storage by
11 2023. And that number will continue to grow as we go
12 forward.

13 We're adding 160 megawatts of Arizona wind by
14 2024, and that will give us a total of about 300
15 megawatts of wind.

16 We're adding 114 megawatts of nuclear generation
17 in the purchase from another utility by 2024.

18 We're adding 100 megawatts of energy efficiency
19 by 2025, and that will give us a total of 900 megawatts
20 of peak demand reduction from energy efficiency programs.

21 We're adding about 50 megawatts of demand
22 response by 2025, and that will give us a total of about
23 200 megawatts of peak demand reduction as a result of
24 demand reduction programs.

25 We're adding a little bit under 200 megawatts of

1 flexible natural gas resources, and that's just to meet
2 the accelerated load growth that we've described.

3 And, finally, we're pursuing 1,000 megawatts of
4 long-term storage by 2032.

5 So I think, as you listen to this list, two
6 things are apparent: One, it is transformational change
7 that we're talking about for SRP; and, two, SRP has a
8 strong commitment to using these technologies to drive
9 down carbon emissions.

10 I think you'll also note from this list our
11 significant commitment to large-scale battery storage.

12 Q. Let's next turn to this project before this
13 Committee, the Coolidge Expansion Project.

14 First of all, have you been personally involved
15 in the project?

16 A. Yes, I have. I'm a member of what we refer to
17 as the Executive Oversight Team for the project. So I
18 provide general guidance to the members of the team and
19 specifically input regarding operations. If the project
20 does proceed, then I'll be responsible for construction,
21 operations, and maintenance of this facility.

22 Q. In your perspective as the chief power systems
23 operator, why is this project needed?

24 A. Well, even with all of the new resources that I
25 just described to you, we still have a need for an

1 additional 700 megawatts by the summer of 2024 and 300
2 more megawatts by the summer of 2025 for a total of 1,000
3 megawatts.

4 As you will be hearing in detail from other
5 witnesses, we have completed a thorough analysis of our
6 options and concluded that the Coolidge expansion is the
7 only project that meets our reliability requirements with
8 a high degree of certainty, supports our carbon reduction
9 goals, meets the inservice dates that are required, and
10 provides the most affordable option for our customers.

11 Q. You heard in the opening statements from some
12 intervenors concerns about this project, this location.
13 Can you address why the Coolidge Expansion Project is
14 necessary in response to their arguments.

15 A. Well, let me say in general, siting new
16 generation at an existing power plant site offers a high
17 level of environmental compatibility and fewer impacts
18 overall. And this is particularly true when no new
19 transmission is needed except to just connect the plant
20 to existing transmission lines and no new natural gas
21 pipelines are needed.

22 In fact, the most recent generation sited by SRP
23 and approved by the Corporation Commission was at two of
24 our existing plants, one in the city of Tempe and one in
25 the town of Gilbert.

1 With regard to this project, we evaluated all of
2 our existing plant sites for expansion opportunity.
3 Coolidge is the only site that can handle the additional
4 capacity required without additional infrastructure,
5 land, water, or other accommodations.

6 So, in summary, the Coolidge asset is an
7 existing plant site with existing transmission and gas
8 line that can accommodate the expansion. SRP owns land
9 immediately adjacent to the plant site that will
10 accommodate this expansion. There's an existing water
11 supply and existing railroad adjacent to the plant site.
12 And because of the location of this site on the east side
13 of the Valley, it reduces the potential need for new
14 transmission from the Palo Verde marketing hub on the
15 west side of town.

16 Q. Next, I'd like you to address concerns that this
17 project was on a fast track. You heard the opening
18 statement comment that there was no request for proposal,
19 for example. Can you address the timing of this project
20 and why it was so urgent.

21 A. Sure.

22 Well, I would agree that this project's moved
23 along a little bit more quickly than other projects that
24 we've had. A key driver is the accelerating growth in
25 customer demand that we've talked about and the need to

1 take action to ensure that we can meet this demand by the
2 summer of 2024.

3 Another factor that delayed progress on this
4 project was the economic uncertainty that resulted from
5 the outbreak of the pandemic at the beginning of 2020.
6 At that time, we consulted with several economists, and
7 there was really no consensus whatsoever on what the
8 impact to the economy as a result due to the pandemic.
9 And due to that uncertainty and to avoid spending
10 customer money before we needed to spend customer money,
11 we delayed a flexible gas resource that had been in our
12 resource plan since 2018. Had we not delayed the
13 process, there would have been more time for this project
14 to proceed forward.

15 But despite these factors, I can assure you that
16 we've completed a thorough analysis of our options, and I
17 think that will be quite apparent as we hear from other
18 witnesses that we have scheduled in this proceeding.

19 Q. I want to next focus on other claimed options
20 such as simply not building Coolidge and relying on
21 short-term market purchases. Can you address those
22 suggestions.

23 A. Sure.

24 First off, I think it's important to understand
25 that SRP does not rely on short-term wholesale markets,

1 such as the energy imbalance market in California or
2 day-ahead markets that you may have heard about, to meet
3 our resource needs.

4 We utilize those short-term markets primarily to
5 optimize our resource portfolio. So what that means is
6 if we have the opportunity to buy power more cheaply than
7 we can generate it ourselves for a particular hour, then
8 we'll go ahead and do that, and that will provide savings
9 to our customers. On the other hand, if we have excess
10 generation available over a short duration, we'll make
11 the sales to the wholesale market, if there's a positive
12 margin, and then we use that positive margin, again, to
13 offset costs on our customers.

14 Short-term markets are really just simply too
15 volatile both in terms of pricing and availability to
16 rely on as a long-term resource. And so let me give you
17 one recent example.

18 In the summer of 2020, as you know, a heatwave
19 spread across large portions of the West, and it resulted
20 in many utilities that were facing shortages for their
21 reserve margins. And you may recall the California
22 system operator had to initiate rotating blackouts in
23 California. There was simply no power to buy on those
24 markets by either the California ISO or any of the
25 utilities that were short on reserve.

1 Since that time, there have been several
2 independent studies that have been completed and that
3 concluded that the West is currently facing a shortage of
4 resources in the wholesale market.

5 Q. There has been promising work using hydrogen as
6 a fuel source to make electricity. Will the Coolidge
7 facility have the capacity to ultimately use hydrogen?

8 A. Yes. First of all, let me just describe that
9 hydrogen is a carbon-free fuel, and it produces no CO2
10 emissions when it's utilized in a combustion turbine.
11 The type of turbine technology that we're using is called
12 an LM6000. And that technology that we're proposing for
13 this project is already capable of burning about 36
14 percent hydrogen blended with natural gas. General
15 Electric is the original equipment manufacturer for this
16 equipment, and others that provide aftermarket parts for
17 this equipment are working towards solutions that would
18 allow for 100 percent hydrogen combustion in these
19 machines.

20 In talking with General Electric and these parts
21 providers, what I can tell you is there seems to be some
22 optimism around the fact that they think they can get to
23 100 percent hydrogen combustion. Today, however, what I
24 would tell you is that the issues we're facing with
25 hydrogen is that it's not viable on a commercial scale.

1 It's very expensive to produce. There's essentially no
2 pipeline and no storage infrastructure for hydrogen.
3 It's not possible to transmit and store hydrogen except
4 for a small amount of blending that you can do using
5 existing natural gas pipelines.

6 As we look out towards 2050, ultimately, we're
7 going to need additional new technologies to fully
8 decarbonize the grid to get to that net zero. There's a
9 great deal of research being done on hydrogen as well as
10 pilot projects that are either planned or currently
11 operating right now. Hydrogen may be a viable option in
12 the future, but today it's really the timing that's the
13 big unknown.

14 Q. Mr. Coggins, you've been involved in this
15 project, I believe you testified, for roughly the last
16 year or so and had run the entire SRP power generation
17 operations for almost four years. Do you believe that
18 the Coolidge Expansion Project is necessary to reliably
19 meet SRP load, is a sustainable option, and is fiscally
20 responsible?

21 A. Yes, I do.

22 Q. Do you have any concluding remarks from the
23 Committee?

24 A. Maybe just a few comments that I'll add.

25 Again, transformational change is under way in

1 the electric industry, and particularly at SRP, as I
2 described, in order to decarbonize the grid, and that's
3 our goal.

4 SRP is committed to make this change for our
5 customers and communities, making sure that as we make
6 the change, we get it right. We've examined all the
7 options, and in order to be able to meet the reliability
8 needs as I've described, the carbon goals, and maintain
9 affordability, we've selected the Coolidge Expansion
10 Project.

11 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Chairman and Members of
12 the Committee. Mr. Coggins is available for questions.

13 CHMN. KATZ: What I think we'll do is -- it's
14 3:00. We'll take a break until 3:15. Let's reconvene
15 promptly at 3:15.

16 Also, I'm not requiring people to wear masks. I
17 have brought mine, and when I'm in close proximity or on
18 breaks, I'll probably wear it. In this room I don't
19 think it's necessary, but it's your choice. On that bus
20 on Wednesday, we're all going to be wearing masks, so
21 you're going to have to to be welcome on the ride. So
22 just keep that in mind. I just want to make sure we all
23 survive this for the next two weeks and don't go home and
24 get the family and friends sick.

25 We will now take a recess for about 15 minutes.

1 (A recess was taken from 2:57 p.m. to 3:18 p.m.)
2 CHMN. KATZ: We're going to go back on the
3 record.

4 For any of the members of the public that are
5 either present here right now or will be addressing us
6 later or who are appearing virtually, at 5 :30, we're
7 going to begin public comment. If there's a large number
8 of people that wish to participate in that process, we're
9 probably going to limit everybody to a maximum of three
10 minutes to voice a particular position. And then we'll
11 have to stop you so that everybody gets a chance.

12 If we have a huge number of participants, we may
13 consider one other evening for public comment. And if
14 you're going to be here in person, you need to sign in a
15 form with your name -- you need to sign in so we know to
16 call on you. And if you're appearing virtually, we'll be
17 needing to be able to identify you by name for our public
18 record.

19 That being said, are you done with your direct
20 examination?

21 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, I am, thank you.

22 CHMN. KATZ: And what order are we going in? I
23 didn't necessarily firmly establish that. It doesn't
24 matter to me. I'd just like you to stay on a consistent
25 order.

1 MR. RICH: Mr. Chairman, we agreed that Staff
2 would go last, so I'm up next.

3

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. RICH:

6 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Coggins.

7 A. Good afternoon.

8 Q. You're far away. I can almost see you.

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. Well, you covered a little bit of ground there,
11 so let me start -- you talked about a response when we
12 talked about how there was no RFP process. Can you just
13 read that and let us know, what is an RFP, for those who
14 don't know?

15 A. Well, an RFP is a request for proposals. And
16 generally, there's a process by which a utility like SRP
17 would put together a set of requirements that we might
18 have for a resource in the future, and then we would
19 release those requirements and ask for developers and
20 others to bid based on those requirements.

21 Q. Do you agree with me that SRP's IRP -- well, let
22 me back up. Can you just tell us what an IRP is before I
23 take that step.

24 A. Yes. An IRP is an integrated resource plan. So
25 with regard to SRP -- and different companies do it

1 different ways.

2 But with regard to SRP, what we do is we
3 periodically review our resource plans. We do that in a
4 public process, a stakeholder process. And the plans are
5 typically directional in nature, so they're not trying to
6 identify specific resources that may be utilized, but
7 they're providing general direction in terms of things
8 like the carbon reduction goals and types of resources
9 generally that we would intend to utilize with input from
10 the stakeholders.

11 And then at SRP, anyway, typically once we have
12 the IRP, we'll move into what I refer to as kind of the
13 investment horizon. For SRP, that's a six-year year
14 horizon. And then we would make -- in that horizon, once
15 we have the benefit of the IRP and the directions from
16 the IRP, we would then make specific resource decisions
17 within that six-year horizon.

18 Q. Okay. And there's a lot of acronyms probably
19 that we'll get through, but let me ask you questions on
20 the RFP. So RFPs are useful to the utility to compare
21 pricing alternatives of generation; correct?

22 A. Pricing is one of the factors, yes.

23 Q. Would you also agree that another factor is the
24 type of generation that would be used; is that correct?

25 A. That's correct. We would get different

1 proposals with different technologies, yes.

2 Q. And those are the benefits of going through an
3 RFP process; correct?

4 A. They can be, yes.

5 Q. Would you agree that your IRP, the other acronym
6 we just covered, from 2018 says that SRP should go
7 through, not SRP will go through, what they call an
8 all-source RFP for major construction or new contracts
9 for new-build generation? Do you agree with me on that?

10 A. I don't recall that specific language, but
11 generally, we would look at an RFP. And then, as you
12 mention, it could be for alternative resource options or,
13 as you just described there, for construction of new
14 resources.

15 Q. Okay. And what is an all-source RFP?

16 A. "All-source" just means that any technologies
17 might be -- meet the requirement. If they meet the
18 requirements, then any technology could be put into that
19 process by a proposal from a developer.

20 Q. So, for example, an all-source RFP for capacity
21 could have SRP getting bids from a gas plant builder or a
22 battery storage builder or a solar contractor or a
23 combination thereof, correct?

24 A. That's correct, yes.

25 Q. Okay. Does SRP currently have any RFPs that are

1 out on the street, as they say?

2 A. Yes. So we have -- as I described earlier,
3 we've got this need in 2024 and 2025. The Coolidge
4 Expansion Project will not meet all of that need. We're
5 going to need additional resources beyond the Coolidge
6 Expansion Project going forward. So there is an RFP out
7 now for resources to meet that additional need further
8 out in time.

9 Q. Is that an all-source RFP?

10 A. I believe it is. I'm not directly involved in
11 it, but I believe it is an all-source RFP.

12 Q. And do you know what time frame the generation
13 that's sought in that RFP is being requested for?

14 A. I don't specifically know that, but we do have
15 witnesses that can talk about that.

16 Q. Do you know which witness, just so I can make a
17 note who's the best to ask it?

18 A. Probably Grant Smedley.

19 Q. Do you know the size of that RFP, how many
20 megawatts you're seeking?

21 A. I don't know the details, no.

22 Q. Do you know what the largest source of
23 generation that SRP has procured without an RFP? Do you
24 know what that is?

25 A. I don't know.

1 Q. Do you have any sources of generation that SRP's
2 procured without going through an RFP process?

3 A. Well, the -- in my mind, the concept of an
4 all-source RFP has really come about more recently with
5 different technologies that have become available. So
6 without knowing a specific answer to that question, I
7 would say, you know, if we go back ten years or so, there
8 may not have been an all-source type of RFP. There may
9 have been RFPs that are targeted toward a particular
10 technology, for example, natural gas or something like
11 that. So I think it's evolved over time to where we are
12 today with this all-source concept.

13 Q. Okay. Fair enough. So let's say in the last
14 ten years, are you aware of SRP doing a procurement for
15 generation without using an all-source RFP?

16 A. Again, I'm just going on memory here, but I
17 don't recall an all-source RFP being done when the
18 expansions were done at Kyrene, if I remember correctly.

19 Q. In this case, you indicated -- I think that your
20 response to Mr. Acken that this process, quote, moved a
21 little more quickly, end quote, than I guess normal. Do
22 you recall saying that?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And am I right in interpreting your testimony to
25 be that it moved more quickly because you were surprised

1 by increased customer demand?

2 A. Yeah. I don't know that I'd use the word
3 "surprised," but it was a significant acceleration and
4 demand and it occurred over time. So each time we looked
5 at our load forecast, we saw additional demand come in.

6 The other big factor that we face is that it's a
7 number of large industrial customers that are interested
8 in moving into the SRP territory. So understanding, you
9 know, how likely those projects were to move forward
10 could change the load forecasts that we have fairly
11 quickly if somebody did commit to moving forward.

12 Q. So SRP dedicates significant resources to
13 planning, I assume, correct?

14 A. Yes, we do.

15 Q. And how many -- do you have an estimate how many
16 folks work in resource planning?

17 A. Just a rough number might be 15 or so.

18 Q. Okay. And -- so this project is how many
19 megawatts?

20 A. Well, this is an 800-megawatt addition, roughly.

21 Q. So with the Resource Planning Department at SRP,
22 I guess I'm trying to figure out how we're off by 800
23 megawatts such that we need to all the sudden move more
24 quickly.

25 A. Well, I wouldn't describe it as being off by 800

1 megawatts. So as I mentioned previously, there's a part
2 of our load forecast that's really based on the overall
3 economy and is more statistical in nature. And so that
4 would be the residential and small commercial growth. So
5 we have processes to monitor that. We get input from a
6 variety of economists and universities and consultants
7 who provide input on that. Although, you know, we do see
8 changes in that, the changes there typically are not
9 dramatic in the sense of, you know, something large
10 coming along like an industrial customer.

11 So we can have an individual industrial customer
12 that might have a site that's 400 megawatts or 600
13 megawatts. So if you think about the Intel expansion --
14 you may have read about that in the newspaper. So Intel
15 is expanding their existing site in Chandler, and we're
16 going to be looking at about 400 megawatts of load just
17 at that one site.

18 So those are the types of things that can cause
19 a pretty sudden change in our load forecast. I wouldn't
20 call it a surprise. We have folks that are engaged in
21 economic development activities that that's their
22 full-time job. We have customer service reps that are
23 with existing customers that are always talking to those
24 customers to try to understand their plans.

25 But when a big announcement like that comes out,

1 it does have an impact on the load forecast, and then we
2 have to adjust that forecast. So we're in a situation
3 where we have several customers, large customers -- the
4 Intel is a great example of that -- where they've come
5 forward and announced their plans to expand in the SRP
6 service territory. So that's a big component of the
7 growth that we're talking about now.

8 Q. So is it your testimony that this plant is being
9 built because of Intel?

10 A. This plant is being built to service all of our
11 customers. So we're seeing growth across all of the
12 customer segments, residential, small commercial, and
13 industrial. So all of those segments are growing. So
14 this plant will help support all of that growth.

15 When I was talking about individual large
16 customers, I was just doing that to provide some context
17 for why the load forecast could change fairly suddenly by
18 an announcement by a large customer.

19 Q. Well, I certainly understand that all of your
20 customers have a potential to take energy that's
21 generated by the plant. But if Intel were not moving
22 forward with its new project, would you not be building
23 this gas-fired power plant?

24 A. I don't know that that's the answer. Again,
25 I'm not responsible for the forecast, but we have a

1 number of large customers that are moving forward. It's
2 not just Intel.

3 MR. RICH: Give me just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Take your time.

5 Q. BY MR. RICH: Let me follow up on your
6 characterization that this process is moving a little
7 more quickly. What are the steps that you are not taking
8 that result in this moving more quickly than a typical
9 process?

10 MR. ACKEN: Objection; foundation. It assumes
11 steps weren't taken.

12 MR. RICH: Well, he can tell me if -- that's
13 what I'm trying to find out with the answer.

14 CHMN. KATZ: Well, I'll allow the question to be
15 asked. We don't have formal rules, but, obviously, I
16 think you ought to -- well, you can ask the question and
17 then follow up, and there will be redirect allowed if
18 necessary.

19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think, you know, the
20 main -- well, No. 1, there's a number of steps that we go
21 through when we look at a project like this. There's an
22 evaluation of alternatives. There's stakeholder groups
23 that we interface with. There's a process that we go
24 through with our own board in making these decisions. So
25 those are just a few of the steps that would be involved.

1 In this particular case, what I would say is the
2 process with the SRP board, we did have one or two board
3 members, as I recall, requested potentially another month
4 to evaluate the project. At the time, management
5 recommended against that. And as you've already heard,
6 the other board members agreed with that approach, so the
7 project is moving forward. But we did have a couple that
8 asked for maybe another month. And our board meets
9 monthly, so it would be one more board meeting.

10 And so I think if we were in different
11 circumstances, we probably could have absorbed another
12 month in the schedule, and we would have said that's
13 fine. But in this particular case, we felt that we
14 needed to move forward to ensure that we could have the
15 capacity online on time to meet the customer demand. So
16 it was really around the board process where that extra
17 month, I think we typically would have been able to
18 absorb that in the schedule.

19 Q. BY MR. RICH: Okay. So one of the things I
20 heard you say is that you didn't give the board an extra
21 month when a board member requested it.

22 As far as accelerating the process, also you
23 would agree that not having the RFP is one of the things
24 that SRP did to accelerate this process, correct?

25 A. Well, I think that's a mischaracterization from

1 my perspective. It's important to keep in mind that we
2 have RFPs that are issued, lately on an ongoing basis,
3 because of the all the demand that we're seeing. So we
4 had already issued an all-source RFP earlier.

5 And the -- a couple things. We went ahead and
6 moved forward with some of the responses in that RFP. We
7 also asked some of the respondents if they could extend
8 their bids to allow us more time so that we could -- as
9 this load forecast was evolving, that we could
10 potentially use those same bids that had already come in
11 on the previous RFP to utilize for this project.

12 In addition, we also sent out what's called an
13 RFI, which is a request for information, because we
14 wanted to specifically learn more about wind resources
15 that might be available. So this is a little different
16 process, but the concept is exactly the same, where we're
17 going to request information from wind developers and --
18 with regard to projects that we may have available,
19 timing, costs, etc. So we also gathered that
20 information.

21 So between the extension that we had already
22 gotten from the previous RFP and the RFI that we did for
23 wind, we felt that we had more than adequate information
24 to understand what the market is for resources that could
25 serve our needs.

1 Q. Let me ask you -- maybe I didn't word that well.
2 I could just ask you a yes-or-no question, I guess, and I
3 didn't do that.

4 But SRP did not issue an all -- a competitive
5 all-source RFP associated with the procurement of this
6 project and these megawatts, correct?

7 A. We did not issue a new one. We had one that was
8 already in place that we utilized for this analysis.

9 Q. However, that one that you're talking about was
10 not issued for this project, correct?

11 A. Not specifically for this project.

12 Q. Thank you.

13 You mentioned the vote of the board -- or you
14 mentioned SRP board members and their request. Can you
15 confirm for the record that the vote of the board was
16 eight to six in favor of moving forward with this
17 project; is that correct?

18 A. Yes, I believe that's correct.

19 Q. So a single vote among the board members was the
20 difference of the SRP board moving forward; is that
21 correct?

22 A. Yes, that's correct.

23 MR. RICH: I think most of my questions are
24 better aimed at some of the later witnesses, so I
25 appreciate your time.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much. Mr. Stafford.

2 MR. STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3

4

CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. STAFFORD:

6 Q. Good afternoon. I can barely see you there
7 across the room, Mr. Coggins.

8 In your testimony, you mentioned SRP's 2035
9 sustainability goals, correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And what is SRP's goal for reducing carbon
12 dioxide output for this generating source?

13 A. Well, those are the carbon reduction goals that
14 I described. A 65 percent reduction in carbon intensity
15 by 2035 and a 90 percent reduction by 2050.

16 Q. And what does that translate to on a mass basis?

17 A. I don't have the specific numbers memorized, but
18 we do track both mass and intensity. And maybe for the
19 Committee Members, intensity is a measure of carbon
20 emissions per unit of electricity produced, as opposed to
21 mass is simply just the amount of emissions that are
22 emitted. So there was quite a bit of discussion during
23 the stakeholder process related to those carbon reduction
24 goals on whether to use a mass goal or an intensity goal,
25 and the group consensus was to use the intensity goal for

1 a couple of reasons.

2 One, there was an understanding at that time,
3 although not as much as we know now, that in general,
4 SRP's service territory is in an area that's growing
5 quickly. And so looking at an intensity target takes
6 into account growth that's going to occur in terms of
7 setting goals.

8 Secondly, I think one of the big benefits that
9 came out of the discussions that were held, the
10 stakeholder processes that were held, is to really
11 establish a glide path, I'll call it, a path towards 2050
12 that, you know, produces significant emissions --
13 emissions reductions and at the same time takes into
14 account the technologies that are available to achieve
15 those reductions.

16 And so the panel, the stakeholder panel, looked
17 at, you know, not only the reductions that were desired
18 but also took a look at different resource portfolios
19 that could be implemented to meet those reductions. And
20 so I think the intensity targets were kind of a way to
21 again establish a strong glide path with meaningful
22 reductions in carbon but recognize the limits of
23 technologies and the fact that SRP was going to continue
24 to have growth. And so the consensus was around the
25 intensity-style target.

1 Q. So you don't know what the mass basis is for the
2 65 reduction to the rate?

3 A. I don't have those numbers memorized, no.

4 Q. Are you aware of those numbers changing at all
5 in the past year or two?

6 A. The mass numbers, you're saying?

7 Q. Yes, the mass equivalent.

8 A. Sure, the mass emissions will vary over -- from
9 year to year, yes.

10 Q. Well, that wasn't my question.

11 So you don't recall what the mass translation --
12 is it -- does it sound right that you're saying that SRP
13 is saying that the 65 percent reduction to the rate
14 equates to about 35 percent reduction in mass today?

15 MR. ACKEN: I'm going to object on foundation,
16 and it's also unclear what the question was. Maybe
17 perhaps it could be restated, but I'm not sure where some
18 of these numbers are coming from. There's been no
19 foundation established.

20 CHMN. KATZ: I will just ask you to try to
21 refine the question so at least the Committee and all the
22 participants better understand what you're asking.

23 MR. STAFFORD: Okay. Chairman, Members of the
24 Committee, what I'm trying to get at is when SRP
25 originally put out its sustainability goals, the 65

1 percent reduction was equated to a 40 percent reduction
2 in mass, approximately. That was back in 2020, in July
3 of 2020, in a presentation they gave.

4 Subsequently, I've been informed that that mass
5 basis for the 65 percent reduction is now 35 -- a 35
6 percent reduction to mass. I'm trying to elicit that
7 from the witness, but he doesn't seem to know what --

8 CHMN. KATZ: If he's not capable of answering
9 the questions, he can indicate as much. But if he does
10 understand, he should do his best to answer the questions
11 as asked.

12 THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm just, again, not
13 familiar with the specific mass numbers. We do have
14 other witnesses that can speak to that, but I'm not --
15 you know, off the top of my head, I don't know what those
16 numbers are.

17 Q. BY MR. STAFFORD: Which witness would be the
18 best one to question on this?

19 A. Kristin Watt probably would be the best one for
20 that. That's on the second panel.

21 Q. I didn't hear what you said. Kristin what?

22 A. Kristin Watt, second panel following my
23 testimony.

24 Q. Moving on. You testified that SRP is
25 researching new technologies. What are the new

1 technologies that are being studied by SRP?

2 A. Well, that's a long list. So in terms of
3 utility-scale renewables, we have -- we've already talked
4 about batteries and the significant commitment that we're
5 making to utility-scale batteries. Wind generation is
6 another new technology. Geothermal resources is another
7 fairly new technology for SRP. We also are looking at
8 rooftop solar, as I described earlier, and how we can
9 integrate more rooftop solar into the system without
10 creating any power quality or reliability concerns.

11 In addition to the resources themselves, I think
12 it's important for the Committee to understand there's a
13 lot of -- I refer to them as "supporting technologies"
14 that are required. So those would be things like
15 communication systems. So in order to be able to control
16 the power system, the power grid, we have to be able to
17 communicate with devices that are out on the grid. And
18 so we've done a tremendous amount of research in terms of
19 what type of communication systems will help us to do
20 that.

21 With a lot of the wind and solar-type resources,
22 they use a device known as an inverter. An inverter is
23 essentially a computer. And so we need to understand
24 what the capabilities are of those computers, those
25 inverters. We need to understand how they interact with

1 our system currently, and we need to understand how we
2 might be able to communicate with them and control them.

3 And so that kind of leads me to another major
4 area of supporting infrastructure and technology, and
5 that's our control systems. So, today, we have control
6 systems that are designed for the traditional types of
7 generation that we have in place. So that's large
8 generators with rotating generators and rotating
9 turbines. And we're moving away from those. As I
10 mentioned, we're shutting down our coal plants, and we're
11 moving to new types of generation that have these
12 inverters, and they're really controlled by electronics.

13 And so they do have a lot of interesting new
14 capabilities that we're interested in pursuing. But at
15 the same time, we need to make sure that our control
16 systems can interface properly with those new control
17 systems that are part of those new types of resources.
18 So that's another example of the supporting technologies
19 that we need to have in place in order to make all of
20 this work as we go forward.

21 Q. What about long-term storage?

22 A. Well, I mentioned in my remarks already that we
23 are pursuing long-term storage. There's a number of
24 different options . Long-storage hydro is not a new
25 technology, but that's one that we'll be pursuing. There

1 are some other technologies not very far along in terms
2 of the development and deployment of those technologies,
3 but there are storage technologies available, and we'll
4 be pursuing those.

5 Another good example which I've already
6 mentioned is hydrogen, of course, and we have an
7 extensive program going on related to hydrogen not only
8 looking at the generators themselves and the capabilities
9 for those generators being able to burn hydrogen and
10 utilize hydrogen, but also, as I mentioned, how do you
11 produce hydrogen and what type of storage systems and
12 pipeline systems and storage systems might you need for
13 hydrogen. So there's extensive research going on right
14 now around that technology as well.

15 Q. That's a nice segue. Did I hear you correctly
16 when you testified that the proposed units at the
17 expansion are capable of burning up to 35 percent
18 hydrogen mix with gas now, as they currently are?

19 A. My understanding from the manufacturer I think
20 35 percent, is what I mentioned.

21 Q. And what would it take to convert them to 100
22 percent hydrogen, assuming you had a way to get hydrogen
23 to them? Do you have to convert the entire components of
24 them, or what does it take to convert that?

25 A. Well, that's the part where I think there's a

1 lot of optimism around that because this particular
2 technology, the LM6000 combustion turbine technology,
3 really only requires one component to be redesigned, and
4 that's the component known as a combustor. So that's
5 where the fuel comes into the machine and the actual
6 combustion of the fuel takes place. And then,
7 essentially, hot air moves down into the turbine to
8 produce mechanical energy, which creates electrical
9 energy. So for the LM6000 machine, the changes that are
10 required are really to just those combustors.

11 So I don't want to minimize the effort that it
12 will take, but if the manufacturers can develop a new
13 combustor, we can basically use the entire rest of the
14 machine to utilize hydrogen in those particular turbines.

15 Q. You testified that SRP's peak load growth today
16 is about 7,500 megawatts, correct?

17 A. That's our current peak load.

18 Q. Is that the peak that you reached in 2021 or
19 what you predict for 2022?

20 A. That is the peak that we reached last summer and
21 the summer before. So the last two summers were right in
22 that same ballpark.

23 Q. So you said 2021 and 2020?

24 A. Yes, correct.

25 Q. Now, did your peak in 2020 coincide with the

1 heat storm that led to the rolling blackouts in
2 California?

3 A. I don't recall specifically. And the reason
4 I'll say that is we had a -- kind of a long-duration
5 heatwave in the Western United States. So I don't recall
6 if our peak actually occurred on a day when California --
7 there were actually two days when California had rolling
8 blackouts. I don't recall if our peak was on that same
9 day or not -- one of those same days or not.

10 Q. And what is SRP predicting that the peak load
11 will be in 2022? Is it 7,500 megawatts or greater than
12 that?

13 A. Well, I don't know the exact number. It would
14 be in the range of maybe 78, somewhere around there,
15 7,800.

16 Q. You talked a lot about load growth. Did I hear
17 correctly that the load growth is driven mainly by large
18 new commercial customers?

19 A. No, I don't think that's the right
20 characterization. So, again, it's driven by all of our
21 customer segments. So residential, small commercial, and
22 then either large commercial or industrial. So all of
23 those customer segments are growing.

24 What I was referring to earlier is sometimes
25 with large industrial customers, they kind of come in big

1 chunks sometimes. So it can be a step change that occurs
2 when a customer -- a large customer commits to moving
3 forward with a particular project.

4 Q. And you mentioned the Intel expansion in
5 Chandler being a 400-megawatt load increase. Is that --
6 do new large commercial customers you're seeing come onto
7 your system, are they -- do they tend to be that size?
8 Bigger? Smaller?

9 A. Just to clarify, the Intel with the expansion
10 would be 400 megawatts, roughly. So it's not a
11 400-megawatt increase, but it's about double what they
12 have, the load that they have today.

13 The large industrial customers can be a wide
14 range of loads. So large industrial could be a
15 20-megawatt load. A large industrial customer could be a
16 700-megawatt load. So there's a wide range there. It
17 really just depends on the particular customer that's
18 looking to come into the service territory.

19 Q. So is that -- so is Intel's expansion, is that
20 the biggest single growth for a single customer you've
21 had?

22 A. I would say today, that's probably the case,
23 although, again, there's a number of other large
24 customers I'll just say in the pipeline that would --
25 that would be potentially larger than Intel.

1 Q. So Intel's kind of the biggest one so far, but
2 there's bigger ones on the horizon?

3 A. Yes, that's correct.

4 Q. Are you getting in more, like, datacenter
5 customers coming into your system?

6 A. We have a variety. So datacenters do make up
7 one type of customer that's looking to move here.
8 Electric vehicle manufacturing, chip manufacturing --
9 besides Intel, additional chip manufacturers. Battery
10 manufacturers.

11 So I would characterize it as predominantly
12 high-tech manufacturing and also some datacenters that
13 are also interested.

14 Q. I'm assuming all these different types of
15 customers have different load factors. Do manufacturing
16 or the datacenters have a higher load factor?

17 A. Well, generally, yes. Datacenters do have a
18 higher load factor, so they operate around the clock.
19 Manufacturing facilities might also have a higher load
20 factor, depending on the type of manufacturing they do.
21 Again, they'd be an around-the-clock type of operation.

22 MR. STAFFORD: Thank you. No further questions.

23 CHMN. KATZ: If you are ready, Counsel.

24 MS. POST: Thank you, sir.

25

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. POST:

3 Q. Does SRP provide electricity to Randolph
4 residents?

5 A. No, we do not.

6 Q. Do you provide electricity to Coolidge?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Are you aware of an explosion in August of 2021
9 at the pipeline at the El Paso Gas Plant in Randolph at
10 5:30 a.m. on a Sunday that killed two people?

11 A. I am aware of the incident, yes.

12 Q. This was a natural gas line, was it not?

13 A. Yes, it was.

14 Q. Does El Paso Gas provide gas to SRP?

15 A. El Paso Gas is one of two major pipeline
16 companies that provides natural gas to SRP. This
17 particular line that we're talking about did not provide
18 gas to SRP or the Coolidge facility.19 Q. And according to Kinder Morgan, this explosion
20 was due to a pipeline failure; is that correct?21 A. Well, we don't operate the pipeline, so I really
22 don't have any information other than maybe what was in
23 the media. I know that there's an investigation that's
24 ongoing. It's being overseen by the regulatory
25 authorities that are responsible for pipelines in

1 Arizona, and I have not seen a report or any information
2 or updates on what the status of that investigation might
3 be.

4 Q. Do you know how far away the house that exploded
5 and burned was from the pipeline explosion?

6 A. I do not, no.

7 Q. Which of your staff would know that?

8 A. I don't know that necessarily anybody would. I
9 know it was close by, but I don't know the distance.

10 Q. Okay. How far away are houses from your
11 existing plant?

12 A. Well, I would look at, for example, the Santan
13 facility and then --

14 Q. No, I don't mean Santan. I mean the one in
15 Coolidge. Your existing plant in Coolidge, how far away
16 are the houses?

17 A. From the boundary of the plant site to the
18 nearest neighborhood, I'm just estimating maybe a quarter
19 mile.

20 Q. And if this expansion plant goes forward, how
21 close will existing houses be to this expansion plant?

22 A. Well, the expansion will be part of the existing
23 site, so I don't think the distance will change. But if
24 you're referring to, you know, where will the turbines
25 themselves be located on the site and what the distance

1 between the turbines and the neighborhood is, again, I
2 don't know the exact distance. I would estimate maybe
3 half a mile, something like that.

4 Q. The expansion plant is set to go south of the
5 existing plant; is that correct?

6 A. Yes, uh-huh.

7 Q. Are there houses now in existence south of the
8 existing plant?

9 A. Well, SRP owns the property immediately south of
10 the existing plant, so I don't -- there's no houses in
11 that location. I've driven through the area. I can't
12 recall if there's houses beyond the land that SRP owns.
13 I don't know.

14 Q. Have you driven on Kleck Road?

15 A. I have, yes.

16 Q. Are there houses on Kleck Road?

17 A. Yes, as I recall.

18 Q. Isn't Kleck Road just south of the land that SRP
19 currently owns where you intend to put the expansion
20 plant?

21 A. Well, what I'm referring to is, you know, are
22 there houses on Kleck Road that are immediately south of
23 the plant site? And I don't know the answer to that
24 question. I could look on a map, and we could find out.

25 Q. Who would know the answer to that question?

1 A. Bill McClellan. Yeah, I would say Bill
2 McClellan might be best.

3 Q. You say that you live in Tempe, correct?

4 A. No, I do not live in Tempe.

5 Q. Where do you live?

6 A. My business address is in Tempe. I live in
7 Mesa.

8 Q. How far away from the existing plant in
9 Coolidge/Randolph do you live? In miles.

10 A. Yeah, I don't know the exact number. I would
11 estimate maybe 40 miles, something like that.

12 Q. To your knowledge, do any of your executive
13 staff live within a mile of the current plant or the
14 expansion intended to be built plant?

15 A. I don't believe they do.

16 MS. POST: No further questions.

17 CHMN. KATZ: I just had one, and I don't know if
18 the Committee has any other, and then we'll allow some
19 redirect, but --

20 MR. EMEDI: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

22 MR. EMEDI: Sorry to interrupt you. Commission
23 Staff hasn't had a chance.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Oh, I'm sorry about that. Please,
25 go ahead. I just have one question, and I can definitely

1 hold my peace. So go ahead.

2 MR. EMEDI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3

4

CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. EMEDI:

6 Q. I only have a few questions for you,

7 Mr. Coggins.

8

9 Would SRP be able to meet its reliability
10 requirements both now with the rapid growth in this area
11 as consistently without the Coolidge Expansion Project?

12 A. No, I don't believe so.

13 Q. Is SRP -- or are you aware of any other battery
14 storage facilities in the country with a similar amount
15 of capacity as the Coolidge Expansion Project that would
16 be needed to meet SRP's current and future demand?

17 A. No, I don't believe there's any in existence
18 that would be that size.

19 Q. With the increased adoption of renewable
20 resources in the electrical grid, including batteries,
21 wind, solar, etc., would the Coolidge Expansion Project
22 help or hurt SRP's ability to meet intermittent demand
23 when those renewables are not producing?

24 A. Well, as I mentioned in my previous remarks,
25 that's precisely one of the reasons that we need to build
the Coolidge Expansion Project. So we need a way to back

1 up intermittent renewables and balance the intermittency
2 of those renewables, and the Coolidge Expansion Project
3 provides those types of services to the grid.

4 Q. And would the Coolidge Expansion Project allow
5 for the additional -- or additional renewables to be
6 brought onto the grid?

7 A. Yes, it would. So, internally, we use the name
8 "reliability backbone." So this quick-start,
9 fast-ramping, flexible generation provides the backbone
10 that we need in order to continue to generate more
11 renewables onto the grid. So, yes, it does.

12 Q. Is it true that natural gas and methods you had
13 mentioned, that's compared to coal, diesel, or other
14 fossil fuels?

15 A. Yes, that's correct.

16 Q. And does SRP conduct its resource planning
17 process, or I think it was referred to as IRP, through
18 its elected board?

19 A. Yes, it does.

20 Q. To your knowledge, is that resource planning
21 process overseen by the Arizona Corporation Commission?

22 A. No, it is not.

23 MR. EMEDI: Thank you.

24 Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

25 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you. And I just have one or

1 two.

2 That is, you described very generally the type
3 of new generators that you will be installing as part of
4 this project. What, if any, technologies are
5 incorporated into those generators to deal with carbon
6 emissions and methane emissions, if you know?

7 THE WITNESS: Yeah. In terms of carbon
8 reduction, it's really mainly just the fuel that
9 determines the carbon emissions from those particular
10 machines. So it would have to be a change in the fuel,
11 which, hydrogen, which we've already discussed, would be
12 one option to help reduce carbon emission.

13 CHMN. KATZ: So as far as you know, there's no
14 carbon capture mechanisms that are part of the generator?

15 THE WITNESS: That's an excellent question. I
16 probably should have mentioned that previously when we
17 were talking about what technology we're researching.
18 But carbon capture is another alternative. That's not
19 really a new technology in terms of the research that's
20 been done. It's been going on for quite a number of
21 years.

22 Some of the challenges with the carbon capture
23 and storage, the capture part of that, we're capturing
24 the CO2 emissions where the resource is -- I would say it
25 is viable. The more difficult part is the storage

1 component of that. And so it's what do you do when you
2 capture those carbon emissions. And, typically, what's
3 looked at is some form of underground storage. So that
4 could be, for example, the same type of storage facility
5 that you might use for natural gas, or it could be other
6 types of geological formations that may be able to
7 accommodate the storage of the carbon.

8 So there's a technology component to that that
9 makes it difficult to store carbon, and then there's some
10 regulatory concerns that need to be addressed as well.
11 So, for example, if carbon is stored underneath the
12 ground, what if it leaks, and what are the implications
13 of that. How do we manage that. Those are some
14 regulatory concerns that have come up. So there have
15 been some pilot projects with regard to carbon capture
16 and storage. It's not -- so far, anyway, it's not been
17 seen as a strong possibility. But, again, I think as we
18 move forward in time and as we look out towards 2050 and
19 getting to net zero, we're going to have to look at
20 everything. So that may reemerge, and it already is
21 starting to reemerge in terms of research that's going on
22 to see if we can make that viable.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Just one more question. I know
24 that you have currently, I believe, operating 12
25 generators on the site, correct, and you're adding 16.

1 THE WITNESS: Yes. That's right, yes.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Are those going to be running full
3 time? And how are they going to be used -- integrated
4 into the existing energy from that facility?

5 THE WITNESS: Well, this facility, as a general
6 name, is what we call a peaking facility. So it's not
7 designed to run as a baseload facility. It's really only
8 designed to run maybe for a few hours a day. And,
9 typically, we don't run all the units at the same time.
10 So we do hold some of those units back in reserve because
11 they can start so quickly. So those are a great resource
12 for us for reserves, and they provide value to the grid
13 even when they're not running.

14 But when they do run, they're running for those
15 few peak hours. And as we go forward, and as I
16 discussed, we're adding extensive amounts of renewable
17 generation. We'll need something that can back up that
18 renewable generation.

19 A good example would be cloud cover. So if we
20 have large solar fields and clouds come in, then that
21 generation is going to drop off, and we need something
22 very quickly that can ramp up and provide an alternative
23 to that solar generation. So that's one of the ways we
24 could use these. So primarily peaking and backup for the
25 intermittent renewables.

1 And then the last one I'll just mention -- and
2 these are events that don't happen very often. But when
3 they do, kind of on challenging days when we're operating
4 the grid, we need a resource that can respond to other
5 outages on the grid. So that might be generation outage,
6 that might be transmission outage, it could be due to
7 things like wildfire impacts on a transmission line and
8 those types of things.

9 So, again, this is a resource that can start up
10 quickly, come online quickly, support us when we have
11 those reliability-type events. And it's also important
12 to note that sometimes those events have a fairly long
13 duration. So it's not just an hour or two. It might be
14 eight hours or ten hours. And so we need something that
15 can run a long time, relatively long time, to respond to
16 those types of events. And so these machines have all
17 those capabilities. And so that's how they would be
18 utilized.

19 CHMN. KATZ: Do any of our Committee Members
20 have any questions for this particular witness?

21 Mr. Palmer.

22 MEMBER PALMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 Just an observation that I had that I would like
24 Mr. Coggins to comment on or perhaps shed some light on.
25 We often hear and have heard today and it's very common

1 to hear that this transmission line or this generation
2 facility is in my neighborhood. I'm not even taking
3 power from it. It shouldn't be here.

4 And as I hear that each time, something
5 resonates with me. When I woke up this morning to get
6 ready to make the trip from Graham County to come here, I
7 turned on the lights, and the power I was using comes
8 from Cochise County. I suspect the folks in Coolidge
9 woke up this morning and turned on the lights, and that
10 may have come from Apache County or Navajo County.

11 I'd just like your observations on that fact
12 that, in fact, we all use electricity that in all
13 probability is produced or transmitted through someone
14 else's backyard and get your feelings on that.

15 THE WITNESS: You're precisely right there with
16 those comments.

17 So, you know, my understanding, for an example,
18 the utilities that serves the Coolidge area, they have
19 resources that are on the west side of town, for example.
20 So very common.

21 You know, the way to look at the grid is it's a
22 network. And so we have resources that connect to that
23 network that might be located in many different
24 locations. And then that network delivers that power
25 ultimately to where it's needed. And it's all one big

1 network. And so we all benefit from the network. And
2 you're right, we all have resources nearby us that may be
3 serving somebody else's load outside the region where we
4 live or we work. So that's very common.

5 And part of the reason for that is the diversity
6 that that creates and the reliability that that creates
7 by having resources that are not concentrated in one
8 particular area where, if you have some kind of an issue
9 that comes up, you may be out of luck. But if you have
10 resources that are in different locations and provide
11 different values and different benefits to that network,
12 then all of us benefit from that type of a structure. So
13 that's what we have in place today.

14 MEMBER PALMER: Thank you.

15 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Gentles.

16 MEMBER GRINNELL: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHMN. KATZ: Yes. Is that Mr. Grinnell? Do you
18 have a question? You can go ahead, and then we'll
19 have --

20 MEMBER GRINNELL: Yes.

21 CHMN. KATZ: That's fine. You can go ahead, and
22 then we'll have Member Gentles express himself or ask his
23 question. And Ms. Little has one as well. We'll take
24 you one at a time.

25 MEMBER GRINNELL: All right. Well, thank you.

1 I appreciate the desire for us to move to a
2 fossil-free environment by 2050, but do we have enough
3 capacity outside of fossil fuel and enough backup
4 available to be able to step up between now and then to
5 really adequately supply the energy needed, power needed,
6 in the event of a major solar lapse or something of this
7 nature? Am I making sense?

8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. I think I would respond to
9 that a couple of ways. You know, we talk about SRP's
10 carbon reduction goals and that the process by which we
11 developed those goals, we looked at different resource
12 portfolios that could help achieve those carbon reduction
13 goals. And I think for SRP and really more broadly for
14 the utility industry right now, we can see portfolios
15 with the technologies that we have today that can get us
16 down, in our case, to the 65 percent reduction by 2035.

17 But when you move out beyond that, as you
18 approach 2050 and we're trying to get down as close to
19 zero as we can, today, I would say it's hard to see how
20 we will get there. We're going to need some kind of new
21 technologies that will help us get there.

22 And so an example we've been talking about is
23 hydrogen. What hydrogen does for us, it's carbon-free,
24 and it allows for resources that are fully dispatchable
25 and flexible, not dependent on weather conditions, that

1 have longer durations than, for example, a four-hour
2 battery has, that won't need to be charged like a
3 battery. We need new types of resources.

4 So with the resources that we see today and that
5 we're implementing today, we can get most of the way
6 toward that net zero where we all want to be. But that
7 last 20 percent or so, that's going to be tough. And,
8 again, we're going to need some new technologies, and
9 we're going to have to do a lot of work with regard to
10 research and development to make those real and be able
11 to make that happen in the future.

12 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Gentles.

13 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
14 Mr. Coggins, can you, for the Committee, describe the SRP
15 service area.

16 THE WITNESS: Well, just as a general
17 description, it's primarily the Metro Phoenix area, and
18 then our service territory extends into the east into
19 Pinal County. And then also we do serve -- we call it
20 the eastern mining area, where we serve the mines that
21 are further east in Gila County. So the bulk of the load
22 is Metro Phoenix, if you will, with the emphasis on the
23 east side of town and then the eastern area.

24 MEMBER GENTLES: And then just following up on
25 Member Palmer's question on the use of energy from other

1 locations. So SRP draws on the energy it produces at
2 various facilities around your network, right?

3 THE WITNESS: That's right.

4 MEMBER GENTLES: And sends it throughout the
5 network?

6 THE WITNESS: That's right.

7 MEMBER GENTLES: So you might have a plant in
8 the East Valley that produces energy for a location
9 outside of the East Valley?

10 THE WITNESS: That's correct. And, in fact, you
11 know, we have resources that are quite a distance outside
12 the Valley that help support the Valley as well. So it
13 is a networked system with resources at various
14 locations, and those resources serve a variety of
15 different customers by many different utilities.

16 MEMBER GENTLES: And SRP is charged with
17 providing power or energy to its customers in that
18 network. That's basically correct, right?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes. The only addition I would
20 say is our portion of the network that we operate and we
21 use to meet our customers' load, we operate resources to
22 do that. But, again, the network doesn't know boundaries
23 between utilities. The network is all connected
24 together, and all those resources from all the different
25 utilities come into the network and then are distributed

1 out to the various loads.

2 MEMBER GENTLES: So that network doesn't include
3 providing power or any resources to Coolidge or the
4 surrounding community?

5 THE WITNESS: The network does, yes.

6 MEMBER GENTLES: I'm talking about the power
7 that SRP generates.

8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. So the power that SRP
9 generates is used to serve the customers that are in our
10 retail service territory. But as we described before,
11 some of those resources are within our territory, some
12 are not. And, similarly, for other territories, for the
13 area they serve, some of their resources are inside their
14 territories and some of those resources are not. So it's
15 a mixture.

16 MEMBER GENTLES: And just one more question,
17 Mr. Chair.

18 So does SRP have generating facilities in other
19 communities in which they don't serve?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 MEMBER GENTLES: They do. Okay.

22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

23 MEMBER GENTLES: Can you tell us which ones just
24 for our understanding?

25 THE WITNESS: Sure.

1 Palo Verde would be a large and ample one that's
2 outside of our service territory but is used to serve
3 customers in our area. The Coronado Generating Station
4 is located at Central or Eastern Arizona.

5 MEMBER GENTLES: You're participants in that
6 with other utilities, right?

7 THE WITNESS: For which ones?

8 MEMBER GENTLES: The ones that you described
9 there.

10 THE WITNESS: For Palo Verde, we are owners
11 along with many other owners. So some of those utilities
12 are serving load all over. Some of it's in California.

13 And then for Coronado, we're the sole owner of
14 that plant.

15 MEMBER GENTLES: Okay. Thank you.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Any other Members of the Committee?
17 Member Little, do you have a question?

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Mr. Coggins, thank you very much for your
20 testimony.

21 If we assume that SRP determined in its planning
22 that it needed the fast-start generation to meet its
23 reliability and load requirements, were any other
24 locations considered for siting that generation?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes. As I mentioned, we looked at

1 all of our existing plant sites here in the Valley. So
2 gas plants, in particular. And our evaluation showed
3 that none of those were able to support the new capacity
4 that we needed.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: No new sites, though?

6 THE WITNESS: There was one -- when you say "new
7 site," there was one additional site that's not an
8 existing plant site. I refer to it as the Abel site.
9 And that one, there were limitations again. One of the
10 key limitations there was that site needed a new gas
11 pipeline to be built. Another limitation, as I recall,
12 is there were size limitations in terms of being able to
13 fit the new infrastructure in that we need to fit in.

14 And then the last piece, there's a couple
15 different parcels of land in that location. And as I
16 recall, the parcel that we were looking toward was an
17 undisturbed parcel of land, so there could be additional
18 environmental concerns that we'd have to address using
19 undisturbed property like that.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

21 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Gentles has one more.

22 MEMBER GENTLES: Mr. Coggins, so you said you've
23 been at SRP for 37 years?

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

25 MEMBER GENTLES: So you were around when this

1 project was initially built by TransCanada?

2 THE WITNESS: Yes.

3 MEMBER GENTLES: And you -- I didn't get a
4 chance to go back and read the transcripts of those
5 hearings, but can you just generally tell us what that
6 siting decision was when TransCanada -- well, I guess you
7 guys bought it from TransCanada, right?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes. TransCanada built the
9 project and owned and operated the project for a number
10 of years. We just recently purchased it from them in --
11 I believe it was 2019.

12 We do have a witness that can provide a little
13 more background on that topic, and that -- she'll be on
14 the second panel following me and could cover some of
15 that.

16 MEMBER GENTLES: Okay. Yeah, that might be
17 helpful, at least it will be to me, because there's --
18 obviously, when that project originally was constructed
19 there, I assume there was some robust outreach and
20 discussion with the community before it was sited there.
21 And I'd certainly like to understand what that
22 conversation was or at least the general context of the
23 takeaways.

24 MR. ACKEN: And, Chairman Katz, Member Gentles,
25 if I could just interject. Yes, as Mr. Coggins

1 testified, we will have Kenda Pollio on our third panel,
2 so the second one following John. Ms. Pollio was
3 involved in the siting and the public outreach and
4 testified in the original TransCanada process. So she'd
5 be the perfect person to ask those questions.

6 MEMBER GENTLES: Thank you.

7 CHMN. KATZ: I don't see any other hands raised.
8 Do you have any follow-up on this witness,
9 Counsel?

10 MR. ACKEN: No redirect. Thank you.

11 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Coggins, thank you very much
12 for being here. You're more than welcome to sit through
13 these entire proceedings if your time permits, and you're
14 free to leave us if you'd like.

15 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

16 (The witness was excused.)

17 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, would you like us to
18 call our next panel at this time?

19 CHMN. KATZ: I think we can at least get started
20 for the next 20 or 30 minutes.

21 MR. ACKEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 SRP calls our Panel No. 2, which is Bill
23 McClellan, Grant Smedley, and Angie Bond-Simpson, all of
24 whom will testify collectively as a panel.

25 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. And they can all come

1 forward, and I'll ask if everybody wants an oath or
2 affirmation, or whether we have a divided house.

3 Since we don't have nametags up yet, from my
4 left or your right, just state your respective names.

5 MS. BOND-SIMPSON: Angie Bond-Simpson.

6 MR. MCCLELLAN: Bill McClellan.

7 MR. SMEDLEY: Grant Smedley.

8 CHMN. KATZ: And I'd ask you, if you would, to
9 stand and raise your right hands, and we'll administer
10 the affirmation.

11 (Angie Bond-Simpson, William McClellan, and
12 Grant Smedley were affirmed by the Chairman.)

13 CHMN. KATZ: You may be seated. And we'll
14 probably plan on breaking sometime between now and 5:00.
15 And, Carolyn, if you get tired or need a break sooner,
16 please just let us all know.

17 MR. ACKEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Are you
18 ready for us to proceed?

19 CHMN. KATZ: Whenever.

20 MR. ACKEN: Just to orient the Committee, we
21 will be using a slide presentation for both this panel
22 and Panel 3. It's been marked for identification as SRP
23 No. 2. SRP No. 1 is the CEC application itself, and then
24 the slide presentation is SRP No. 2.

25 We have a few hard copies for members that may

1 want to see a hard copy, but, of course, we will be
2 showing it on the screens here as well. We will be using
3 a convention with which this Committee is familiar. Left
4 screen/right screen concurrently to help the witnesses
5 present their testimony.

6 I'll ask my panel to let me know when they're
7 ready to proceed. Give me a thumbs up.

8

9 ANGIE BOND-SIMPSON, WILLIAM MCCLELLAN,

10 AND GRANT SMEDLEY,

11 called as witnesses as a panel on behalf of Applicant,
12 having been previously affirmed by the Chairman to speak
13 the truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and
14 testified as follows:

15

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. ACKEN:

18 Q. Mr. McClellan, let's start with you.

19 Please state your name and business address for
20 the record.

21 A. (Mr. McClellan.) Sure.

22 Bill McClellan, and my business address is 1500
23 North Mill Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85281.

24 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

25 A. (Mr. McClellan) I'm employed by the Salt River

1 Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, and
2 I'm a project manager for the Coolidge Expansion Project.

3 Q. Please provide a summary of your educational
4 background and work experience. I believe that we have
5 some information shown on the slide on the left, which
6 has been marked as No. 5.

7 A. (Mr. McClellan) Sure.

8 I've got a bachelor in physics from William
9 Jewell College, and I've also got a bachelor in science
10 and a master in science. The bachelor's is in civil
11 engineering and the master's is in special engineering,
12 and both of those are from Washington University in St.
13 Louis.

14 I've been at SRP for about 13 years and in the
15 utility industry for approximately 16 years.

16 During my time at SRP, I've been in major
17 projects, generation engineering, and also worked in air
18 quality services prior to becoming project manager for
19 the Coolidge Expansion Project.

20 Q. Describe your role as project manager for this
21 expansion project.

22 A. (Mr. McClellan) So as project manager for the
23 expansion project, I really coordinate the various teams
24 in certain aspects as well as the preliminary design of
25 the project, putting together the certificate for

1 compatibility and application and other permit activities
2 such as for the air permit and the Aquifer Protection
3 Permit. And really just coordinating those teams to put
4 together the various activities and documents for the
5 siting and permitting process.

6 Q. And to orient the Committee, though I may need
7 to ask again tomorrow, depending on how far we get, what
8 topics will you cover in your testimony?

9 A. (Mr. McClellan) So my testimony will cover the
10 project description. Also, I'll be guiding you through
11 the virtual tour as well as the site tour that we'll do
12 on Wednesday. And I'll also cover some of the benefits
13 of the project as well.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 Next, Mr. Smedley, if you would, please state
16 your name and business address for the record.

17 A. (Mr. Smedley) Sure.

18 Grant Smedley. My business address is 1500
19 North Mill Avenue, Tempe, Arizona 85281.

20 Q. And by whom are you employed and what capacity?

21 A. (Mr. Smedley) I'm employed by the Salt River
22 Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District. And
23 I'm the director of resource planning, acquisition, and
24 development.

25 Q. We're getting a little feedback. Maybe lower.

1 At least that's what I tried.

2 A. (Mr. Smedley) Is that better?

3 Q. Much.

4 A. (Mr. Smedley) Thank you.

5 Q. All right. I'd like you to next describe your
6 educational background and work experience. And we have
7 a slide as well for that.

8 A. (Mr. Smedley) Sure.

9 So that's shown on the slide. I have a
10 bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from McGill
11 University, a master's degree in mechanical
12 engineering from the Massachusetts Institute of
13 Technology.

14 I've worked at -- in the utility industry about
15 18 years. 14 of those have been with SRP. And at SRP,
16 I've served in a variety of different roles in
17 leadership, roles in different departments, including
18 power delivery engineering, research and development,
19 environmental services, and water rights and contracts,
20 before moving into my current role as director of
21 resource planning.

22 Q. And as director of resource planning, what has
23 been your role in this project?

24 A. (Mr. Smedley) So as the director of resource
25 planning, I'm responsible for overseeing the development

1 of the project, including the siting and permitting and
2 some of the early design of it.

3 Q. And have you testified previously before the
4 Siting Committee?

5 A. (Mr. Smedley) I have. I served as the project
6 manager for the siting of a new 230kV transmission line
7 project in East Mesa called the Southeast Power Link
8 Project.

9 Q. And what topics will you be covering in your
10 testimony as part of this panel?

11 A. (Mr. Smedley) So I'll be discussing the need
12 for the Coolidge Expansion Project, and I'll explain that
13 SRP has a critical need for this project in order to
14 reliably serve the needs of our customers beginning in
15 2024 and really in light of the significant growth that
16 we're seeing in our service territory as well as to get
17 more renewable energy into our portfolio.

18 Q. Thank you, Mr. Smedley.

19 And last, certainly not least, Ms. Bond-Simpson.
20 Please state your name and business address.

21 A. (Ms. Bond-Simpson) My name is Angie
22 Bond-Simpson. Business address is 1500 North Mill Road,
23 Tempe, Arizona 85281.

24 Q. And you may need to do the same thing, lowering
25 that. Thank you.

1 And by whom are you employed and what capacity?

2 A. (Ms. Bond-Simpson) By the Salt River Project
3 Agricultural Improvement and Power District. I'm
4 currently the director of integrated system planning and
5 support at SRP.

6 Q. And please provide a summary of your educational
7 background and work experience, as shown on Slide 9 on
8 the left.

9 A. (Ms. Bond-Simpson) I have a Bachelor of Science
10 degree in geology from St. Louis University, a master's
11 in science and geology from Arizona State University.

12 And for the last 19 years, I worked at SRP in a
13 number of utility planning roles. This includes
14 groundwater resources and geohydrology, fuels, resource
15 planning. And most recently, that includes the 2014 and
16 2017 integrated resource planning processes.

17 Q. And next describe your role in this project.

18 A. (Ms. Bond-Simpson) So I oversaw the -- I
19 oversaw the alternatives analysis for this project.

20 Q. And what topics will you cover in your
21 testimony?

22 A. (Ms. Bond-Simpson) I'll cover planning for
23 reliability, different capacity values of generating
24 resources, and the economics of the alternatives
25 analysis.

1 Q. Thank you, Panel.

2 MR. ACKEN: We're going to start off with a
3 project description with Mr. McClellan. You've already
4 heard quite a lot about the need for this project, and
5 you've heard concerns from the intervenors.

6 Q. BY MR. ACKEN: Go ahead and orient us and talk
7 about projects for you -- the project for which SRP is
8 seeking a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility.

9 But before we do that, Mr. McClellan, I'd like
10 you to briefly explain the existing Coolidge Generating
11 Station.

12 A. (Mr. McClellan) Sure.

13 So the existing Coolidge Generating Station is
14 located in the Southeast Valley. It is located in the
15 city of Coolidge. It's about 5 miles south of the
16 Coolidge city center. It's located near the
17 intersections of Randolph Road and Arizona Boulevard.

18 It was actually constructed by TransCanada in
19 the 2008 to 2011 time frame. And SRP was the offtaker
20 from the power facility until they purchased it in 2019.

21 When SRP purchased the facility, it came with
22 some additional land, which is the location for the
23 Coolidge Expansion Project. And if you look at the slide
24 on the right, I'll just point out some of those locations
25 for you.

1 So up here, this would be to the northwest of
2 the project, this is the intersection of East Randolph
3 Road. And it's labeled 87 here, but that's also called
4 Arizona Boulevard.

5 And if you look at this inset, the northern part
6 of the project site is actually the existing Coolidge
7 Generating Station. And then this southern portion
8 outlined in this blue outline is the additional 100 acres
9 that came with the purchase from TransCanada in 2018
10 where the location of the proposed Coolidge Expansion
11 Project would be.

12 The existing Coolidge Generating Station is --
13 consists of 12 simple-cycle natural gas-fired combustion
14 turbines. The nameplate capacity is about 620 megawatts
15 for those combustion turbines. In addition to the
16 combustion -- I'll show the locations of some of this
17 equipment on the next slide. It's a little bit closer
18 and you can see it better.

19 In addition to those 12 combustion turbines,
20 they tie into an existing switchyard. It ties into the
21 350kV system. And that's called the Randolph Switchyard.
22 And then it ties into the existing 230kV transmission
23 lines that run along the west side of the site.

24 In addition to that combustion equipment and the
25 switchyard, there's also some evaporation ponds that are

1 located in the northwest portion of the site as well as
2 some additional axillary equipment, water treatment
3 buildings, admin/warehouse buildings as well, and then
4 some additional what we call balance of plant, which is
5 really just auxiliary equipment to help us operate.

6 Q. So our current location -- well, before you move
7 ahead, let me go back one slide.

8 Our current location -- well, let me ask this
9 different. Can our current location be shown on the
10 existing map, the location of the hearing itself?

11 A. (Mr. McClellan) It cannot.

12 Q. So approximately how far away are we currently
13 from the -- both the existing plant and the proposed
14 expansion?

15 A. (Mr. McClellan) We're probably 15 to 20 miles.

16 Q. Thank you.

17 And that would be located to the east of our
18 current location?

19 A. (Mr. McClellan) To the west. Oh, I'm sorry.
20 We are located to the west. The project location is to
21 the east, yes.

22 Q. Thank you.

23 MR. ACKEN: I just wanted to give the Committee
24 a little orientation to where this project is in relation
25 to where we are today.

1 Q. BY MR. ACKEN: And perhaps you've got a better
2 map at some point in this presentation to show that. And
3 if so, please do.

4 Next, I'd like you to give an overview of the
5 expansion project.

6 A. (Mr. McClellan) Sure.

7 So -- and before I get into the expansion
8 portion of the project, I did want to point out the
9 location of some of those existing elements that I just
10 mentioned.

11 Looking at the slide on the right -- and this is
12 sort of -- this is the top portion where the existing
13 generating station is located. Here in the middle, the
14 north middle of the existing site, that's where those 12
15 simple-cycle natural gas turbines are located.

16 To the west, you can see this is connected over
17 to the existing Randolph Substation, which then connects
18 into the existing 230kV transmission system that runs
19 along the west side of the site.

20 In addition, in the northwest corner, that's
21 where the existing evaporation ponds are located.

22 And then I also mentioned some additional
23 auxiliary equipment. That's some admin and warehousing
24 to the north of the generators, and then the water
25 treatment equipment is kind of to the east of the

1 existing generators.

2 Now focusing on the Coolidge Expansion Project,
3 the proposed Coolidge Expansion Project, in the southeast
4 corner of the site, and this is approximately that 100
5 acres --

6 CHMN. KATZ: Let me interrupt. Is there any way
7 that we can have a cursor following that in addition to
8 the laser so that those who are appearing remote can see
9 what we're talking about? I know we've done that in
10 previous hearings.

11 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm looking to our AV
12 team. I see heads nodding yes, so I will ask them to do
13 that. Do your best to follow the laser pointer that we
14 have in the room with the cursor so that those following
15 virtually are able to track that as well.

16 Thank you.

17 CHMN. KATZ: And I don't need you when we do
18 that to repeat everything that's illustrated, but you
19 might want to just generally show the location of the old
20 and the new.

21 MR. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

22 So getting back to the slide on the right, I did
23 forget to mention that the new project elements are
24 outlined in yellow here.

25 The northwest portion in the middle, that's

1 where the existing equipment is located.

2 And then turning to the proposed equipment for
3 the Coolidge expansion, the 16 new simple-cycle
4 combustion turbines are located in the southeast corner
5 of the project site. And those are going to be oriented
6 in blocks of four.

7 (Off the record for technical issue.)

8 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but
9 maybe we should, if it's not too early, take our evening
10 recess and see if we can get this technology working a
11 little more smoothly tomorrow morning so that we can
12 accomplish exactly what you asked and be ready tomorrow
13 morning.

14 CHMN. KATZ: Well, we'll probably only go for
15 another ten minutes. Is there any objection from the
16 Committee to recessing a little earlier than expected?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN. KATZ: I'm hearing no specific objection,
19 so we'll recess for the day. At 5:30, though, we will
20 resume for public comment.

21 Any members of the public who are physically
22 present here need to sign in, and there are sign-in
23 sheets on the table to my left at the wall. And if
24 you're appearing virtually, you will need to identify
25 yourself before you begin speaking. You also need to

1 make sure if you're physically here or if you go on the
2 tour tomorrow that you don't need to get into
3 conversations with me or any of the other Committee
4 Members because that would be a violation of the Arizona
5 Open Meeting Law. So everything we do has to be in here
6 and on the record as a general rule.

7 And we'll see everybody back here to wants to
8 participate or needs to participate on the public comment
9 session just before 5:30.

10 MR. ACKEN: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, sir.

12 MR. ACKEN: Before we close the record, I think
13 you mentioned the tour tomorrow. It's actually going to
14 be Wednesday.

15 CHMN. KATZ: Right. If I misspoke, the tour
16 will be on Wednesday. And we'll probably leave here at
17 about 9 -- 9:00 or 9:30. And if anybody's planning on
18 meeting us, they'll let us know. We have at least one of
19 our members that will be doing that.

20 And that being the case, Mr. Grinnell, we'll let
21 you know so you can plan on meeting us directly at the
22 facility or if you want to meet us here and drive across
23 town.

24 You're muted. We can't hear you, Mr. Grinnell.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman?

1 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: His question is, are we using
3 the same Zoom link for the public comment this evening?
4 And I had the same question.

5 CHMN. KATZ: I think I'm seeing a "yes." The
6 answer is yes. And if we have a large number of
7 participants, with the help of our technical crew, I'll
8 get a hand signal when we're approaching or at three
9 minutes. I hate to cut you off, but if we have a large
10 number of people, I need them to be as focused as
11 reasonably possible. And if for some reason, within a
12 reasonable period of time, we can't get to everybody, we
13 may set another session this week or next week for
14 additional public comment.

15 Thank you. We stand in recess till 5:30.

16 (A recess was taken from 4:42 p.m. to 5:31 p.m.)

17 CHMN. KATZ: We have about 20 people that have
18 filled out forms to testify here or to talk to us here in
19 person, and we had about 10 or 12 parties -- maybe more
20 now. 20? -- that are appearing virtually.

21 And what I'm going to do is first I'll deal with
22 a gentleman, the Coolidge city manager, Rick Miller,
23 who's, I believe, here in person. And then I'm going to
24 call upon a member of our Phoenix City Council, who is
25 Yassamin Ansari. And then we'll just go through the

1 paper people that are appearing here in person after we
2 hear from those two.

3 And as a general rule, I want to limit comments
4 to about three minutes per person. I wish we had more
5 time to give you each a half an hour or so, but we just
6 can't do that. And there isn't going to be any
7 questioning by the members of the public of myself or any
8 of the lawyers or parties in this case. It's just your
9 opportunity to express your concerns, be it for or
10 against or neutral.

11 Anyway, the first person, if he's available --
12 and I'll ask you to used the microphone -- would be
13 Mr. Rick Miller, the Coolidge city manager, if he is
14 present.

15 Yes, sir. If you're ready, you may proceed.

16 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Members of the Line
17 Siting Committee. Thank you to everyone who's here
18 participating in this hearing process. I appreciate your
19 time. You have a difficult job doing these hearings and
20 hearing all the pros and cons of these matters.

21 I am Rick Miller, city manager of the City of
22 Coolidge. I've been there since about 2012. Prior to
23 that, I was a city manager -- or the planning and
24 development director here in Casa Grande for a number of
25 years. 42 total years in public service in planning and

1 development and city administration. I'm not unfamiliar
2 with land use controversies and things like this.

3 Just a few miles to the north and west of here,
4 we have the SRP Generating Station. I was here when that
5 plant was sited. It includes we have an APS Generating
6 Station, a peaking plant. Of course we have your SRP
7 plant there in Coolidge.

8 Just briefly, the keys to this location, I
9 think, are obviously what have been described: The
10 location of gas, of natural gas infrastructure, your
11 generating lines, your power lines, and property that's
12 properly zoned for this type of use. And that's what I'm
13 here to talk about.

14 The city council, back when TransCanada
15 purchased this property, acted even prior to that on an
16 annexation of the City of Mesa. TransCanada came in, got
17 the property rezoned, did a site plan. The council
18 approved the TransCanada generating station, which SRP
19 just recently purchased.

20 As part of that process, there was 100 acres
21 south of where they currently have their facility and
22 where SRP is operating now that was always envisioned for
23 what you're considering today. I met personally with
24 members of TransCanada that came in and said, Hey, we're
25 about ready to launch off on our expansion. And the

1 council was very aware of this expansion plan.

2 There was a process that the city council went
3 through. The public was notified. The public had every
4 opportunity to comment. Everybody within a certain
5 distance of that site had the privilege of coming up and
6 speaking in opposition or in support of this plan.

7 Our general plan land use is what really
8 dictates how property is zoned in Coolidge. This entire
9 corridor along the Union Pacific Railroad on the 500kV
10 power line is currently designated as industrial. And it
11 stretches -- it includes major manufacturers like Stinger
12 Bridge & Iron, which just built the Gerald Desmond Bridge
13 over in the Port of Long Beach.

14 Further south, we have the Inland Port, Arizona,
15 where Nikola Motor Company is manufacturing zero-emission
16 semi trucks. I think they produced 38 of them today.
17 And they're delivering those to other ports. They're
18 working on hydrogen infrastructure in that facility.
19 They'll hopefully, someday, generate hydrogen fuel.
20 They've built a few prototypes, but one of their main
21 products will be a hydrogen fuel cell semi that will have
22 water vapor coming out. So we're very honored and
23 privileged to have that company in our community, as we
24 are for SRP.

25 We're very grateful to SRP for the partner

1 they've been in our community. Upon --

2 CHMN. KATZ: Time is about up. If you need
3 another 30 seconds or so, that's fine.

4 MR. MILLER: A couple things. I guess the point
5 I really want to make here, drive home, is that the
6 council -- mayor and city council previously considered
7 this request, and nothing should be a major surprise.
8 It's just a different time and a different company. But
9 the zoning is in place. Land use is in place to support
10 what is being proposed by your Committee today.

11 Thank you.

12 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

13 Next, we have online -- and I'm taking care of
14 some of our representative people first. I believe we
15 have Councilwoman Yassamin Ansari of the Phoenix City
16 Council present. And if she is present, she may identify
17 herself and continue to give us her input.

18 MS. ANSARI: Thank you so much. Good evening,
19 Chairman Katz, Members of the Arizona Line Siting
20 Committee. I am Yassamin Ansari, and I represent
21 District 7 of the Council.

22 I'm here today on behalf of the hundreds of
23 thousands of citizens who live and work in my district,
24 many of whom are SRP customers.

25 Last week, I sent a letter to the Committee

1 outlining more than 30 questions I have about this
2 project's costs, its consumers, and the environmental
3 impact and the process that led us here today.

4 When it comes to affordability, SRP customers
5 deserve to know how much their bills will increase, who
6 will bear those costs, and what protections will be put
7 in place to safeguard our most vulnerable.

8 When it comes to the process, SRP customers
9 deserve to know why a competitive bidding process was not
10 instituted and why only three weeks passed between when
11 this proposal was first publicly announced and when the
12 SRP board voted it through forward.

13 When it comes to environmental impacts, SRP
14 customers deserve to know if gas high costs, water
15 scarcity, and the impact of carbon and methane emissions
16 were factored into internal analyses. And the residents
17 of historically disadvantaged communities at Randolph and
18 Coolidge deserve to have a say in a project that could
19 affect their health for years to come.

20 Phoenix, like many other local governments, also
21 recently passed our Climate Action Plan. Local
22 governments deserve to know how the project will affect
23 our climate goals. I'm asking that this Committee vote
24 to deny the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility
25 and make sure that the many questions that I and others

1 have raised get answered.

2 SRP did not make sure that the data backs up
3 this plant expansion and that it can withstand
4 independent third-party review. They also did not make
5 sure that stakeholders, customers, and especially the
6 communities bordering this project felt adequately
7 listened to and were true contributors to their
8 processes.

9 SRP did not institute a competitive bidding in
10 which they considered all of the options and select the
11 affordable choice for SRP customers.

12 Please vote no today to adequately protect those
13 you serve and the planet that we all call home.

14 Thank you very much for your time and
15 consideration.

16 CHMN. KATZ: And thank you very much for your
17 participation.

18 Now I'm going to go to the paper sheets, and I
19 just have them in whatever order I received them in.

20 And I believe it is a Charles Fanniel. And if I
21 mispronounce your name, don't hesitate to correct me.

22 MR. FANNIEL: That's quite all right.

23 Good evening, everyone. My name is Charles
24 Fanniel, and I'm here in support of the Pinal County
25 NAACP Branch. I serve as state president of the Arizona

1 State Conference NAACP.

2 I'm here to voice my concern about the total
3 impact that this plant would have on this community in
4 terms of emissions to the air, noise of the turbines,
5 and, most importantly, what benefit will the community
6 receive as a result of this plant being in their
7 community.

8 I know it's not a big community, but the
9 community people should be receiving some type of
10 support, infrastructure, what have you. I don't know if
11 that has been considered or if anything has been
12 requested in that area, but those are things that I would
13 certainly hope that this board will consider as you make
14 your vote.

15 So thank you very much, and I hope that you all
16 will consider the wishes of the people. Thank you.

17 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

18 MS. MASER: I also just learned that we have
19 another representative from the Arizona Legislature who
20 is present. I will allow the folks who are controlling
21 the electronic participation to identify the gentleman
22 who wishes to speak.

23 David Cook, Arizona State representative.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Cook, you may go ahead and
25 introduce yourself and present us with information you

1 wish to share with those who are present.

2 MR. COOK: Well, I would like to thank you all
3 for what you're doing here, and I've listened to some of
4 the comments so far, and I will continue to listen to the
5 remaining comments.

6 But these are the facts:

7 The facts are that Arizona is a -- one of the
8 fastest and largely growing states in our country. And
9 what we're doing here is we are trying to stay out in
10 front of making sure that families, from the elderly to
11 young families, have a reliable power source in the
12 future of our state.

13 Now, there's been great -- when you talk about
14 green energy, we have great stands of the coal plant
15 that's going way up in Northern Arizona. The reality is
16 that customers need electricity, and they need it to be
17 affordable electricity. And I know that I've gone on
18 record before is that what Salt River Project is doing
19 here, is they are investing in the infrastructure that is
20 needed for this state, and we should be thanking them for
21 looking down the road to the future needs.

22 This is exactly the kind of thing that happened
23 in Texas. We had electricity companies, and they are not
24 on the expanded grid and did not make the infrastructure
25 investments that was needed in the times that they were

1 needed, and look what happened to that state. And we
2 don't need to be Texas. We need to be Arizona.

3 So I want to say thank you to those in boards
4 that are making these huge, million-dollar investments to
5 make sure that we are having reliable and affordable -- I
6 can't say that word enough -- affordable energy in this
7 state.

8 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Cook. I appreciate
9 you taking the time to join us.

10 MR. COOK: Thank you, and I'll continue to
11 listen.

12 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

13 Is it Quiana -- it's Dickenson --

14 MS. DICKENSON: Quiana.

15 CHMN. KATZ: Quiana. And please use the
16 microphone. And, again, I can't always read everyone's
17 writing, and I don't necessarily know the proper
18 pronunciations.

19 MS. DICKENSON: That's quite all right. Thank
20 you.

21 My name is Quiana Dickenson. I am the vice
22 president of the Pinal County NAACP and a 15-year
23 resident of Pinal County.

24 Representative Cook mentioned that we should be
25 grateful to SRP for their forward thinking and the energy

1 that we need and how their anticipation of the needs is
2 what we should all be grateful for.

3 You know what else the residents of Pinal County
4 and the residents of Randolph should need, what they
5 deserve, what they are worthy of? Air. They are worthy
6 of clean air.

7 They're worthy to have their children play in
8 areas where runoff water is not contributing to illness
9 and diseases. They deserve jobs. They deserve lights in
10 their community. What they're getting is smog. What
11 they're getting is an inadequate education, inadequate
12 situations happening even in their own community.

13 Even our own city manager for the City of
14 Coolidge mentioned that there was adequate opportunity
15 for people to voice their concerns. These citizens in
16 Randolph have been there for 70-plus years. How often
17 have any of these representatives visited this community?
18 Because what is their adequate representation when you
19 have not visited the city or the people of Randolph,
20 Arizona.

21 They deserve more. They are worthy of more.
22 And if nothing else, would you be okay with this if this
23 was your children in your community.

24 Thank you.

25 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

1 Richard Lerma.

2 MR. LERMA: Yeah. My name is Richard Lerma.
3 I'm with the boilermakers union.

4 Primarily, we drive on the coal-fired power
5 plants, building them and stuff. With them shutting
6 down, it's taken a lot of work away from us. We don't
7 have a lot of work in wind and solar and stuff like that,
8 but wind and solar is not all as you expect it to be. I
9 mean, once you build those plants, there's no jobs, I
10 mean, no maintenance jobs and stuff like that.

11 I just want to say to the people of Randolph,
12 just with the tax incentives and the jobs it might
13 provide you guys. I mean, there are jobs like that. I
14 mean, to us boilermakers, it could possibly put food on
15 our tables and stuff, building these plants and stuff
16 like that.

17 For us, it's good. We look forward to that
18 stuff. But like I said, not all green energy and all
19 that is good. You've got to pick your poison. Down the
20 road, I mean, those materials in the solar panels and
21 stuff, like the windmills, all the materials ain't good.
22 I mean, eventually, you're going to have to decommission
23 them. You're going to have to put that stuff in the
24 ground. I mean, the battery storage, you're not going to
25 know what that's going to entail down the road and stuff

1 like that.

2 But I thank you for your time.

3 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

4 The next card I have in front of me is of -- I
5 think it's Jacob Evenson.

6 MR. EVENSON: Yes, it's Jacob Evenson.

7 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, sir.

8 MR. EVENSON: Good evening. My name is Jacob
9 Evenson. I'm the business manager secretary-treasurer
10 for the boilermakers, Local 627. I am a third-generation
11 boilermaker here in Arizona.

12 Am I -- I'll step back. Step forward? All
13 right. Is that a little bit better? So I'm a
14 third-generation boilermaker here in Arizona. I grew up
15 in Tucson, Arizona. I've traveled all over Arizona
16 working on the coal-fired power plants. I'm a graduate
17 apprentice with the Boilermakers Local 627, and most of
18 our work is in the coal-fired power plants here in
19 Arizona.

20 We are looking for a transition to move over
21 into different types of energies, different types of
22 fields, as the coal-fired power plants are shutting down.
23 So we're looking for -- to bring our skilled and trained
24 workforce over to other projects and where we can put our
25 workforce to work.

1 We do have workers -- I represent 480 workers
2 across all of Arizona and into Farmington, New Mexico. I
3 have also submitted a bill in the Arizona State
4 Legislature that we're going to work on a carbon capture
5 storage task force where we can see if -- for the State
6 of Arizona to see if carbon capture can be utilized here.
7 And so we are looking at all different avenues to find
8 jobs for our members.

9 And for this project, we are in support of it.
10 We currently are working on four of these for SRP right
11 now. One of our contractors has won the project, and we
12 are putting Arizonans to work. We recruit to our
13 apprenticeship program from West-MEC Welding School. We
14 recruit from RSI Welding School in Phoenix. And we try
15 to put Arizonans to work.

16 So I'd like to thank you-all for my time, and I
17 support this project.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Evenson.

19 Barry Thompson is the next candidate.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Hi. I was raised in the Metro
21 Phoenix area. Currently reside there. I'm also a
22 journeyman boilermaker, Local 627. So far the majority
23 of my career has been spent on the coal-fired plant, and
24 we all know that most of those are going away.

25 I -- personally, I'm a fan of renewables, but I

1 do see gas -- natural gas power generation as a bridge to
2 those cleaner technologies in the future. And it doesn't
3 take long traveling around just about anywhere in any
4 metro area of Arizona to see the growth and to see the
5 power generation that's going to be needed to support
6 that growth. So I'm definitely a fan of the project.

7 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you.

8 The next individual would be Randy Miller.

9 MR. MILLER: Hi there. My name is Randy Miller.
10 I'm a resident in Tempe. I am an SRP board member. I am
11 one of the six that voted against this. I wanted to make
12 sure that I say that what I'm saying today is my own
13 thoughts and opinions and has nothing to do with the SRP
14 board or SRP management. I am just a ratepayer of SRP
15 right now.

16 So one of the problems that I really have with
17 this is that we're here to, you know, have you decide
18 whether or not we should site this expansion here in
19 Coolidge. And one of the problems that I have is that
20 we've already bought -- SRP has already bought the
21 turbines for the project. And during the board meeting,
22 I said, Well, what happens if the Line Siting Committee
23 or the ACC turns it down? And they said, Oh, we'll just
24 resell them on the market.

25 So I'm not sure why SRP decided that they should

1 be, you know, reselling turbines on the market. That
2 seemed like an absurd comment, to my opinion. So just
3 wanted to make sure everybody knows that.

4 One of the comments that was brought up through
5 today is the carbon intensity versus the carbon rate.
6 Rate is the amount of massive greenhouse gases that we're
7 emitting into the air. Nowhere in the CEC application
8 does it tell you how many tons of carbon is being emitted
9 by this gas plant. We need to have actual scientific
10 data for this.

11 They talk about, well, it could be this many
12 BTUs if it runs for this long, but they don't tell you
13 how long they're planning on running it. They don't tell
14 you how -- I mean, they keep saying it's a peaker
15 facility, but it doesn't say that they are only going to
16 run it at 10 percent capacity.

17 So that's a concern. How much time, you know,
18 it's going to run really impacts the amount of emissions
19 that we put into the air. So we need to really drill
20 into that and figure out what is the actual impact from
21 the total environment. Baseload versus peaking. So they
22 keep saying we have this tremendous growth. 100 percent
23 agree. We need to keep the lights on. 100 percent
24 agree.

25 The issue is that these, you know, large

1 customers that they keep talking about, Intel and the
2 datacenters and things like that, they're all baseload
3 customers. They're increasing the baseload, which I do
4 understand increases the peak. But these -- this
5 facility is being bought as a peaking facility. And they
6 keep saying that over and over, it's for peaking,
7 peaking. Well, what's going to run the baseload, then?
8 Because you buy different -- buy different turbines and
9 you use different technologies depending on what you want
10 for base load or you want for peak. So you can't do
11 baseload and peak at the same time. That's what they're
12 kind of trying to say right now, which bothers me a lot.

13 CHMN. KATZ: And you're at about three minutes,
14 so try to wrap it up fairly quickly.

15 MR. MILLER: One more thing.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Sure.

17 MR. MILLER: There were zero alternatives
18 presented to the SRP board for the siting, where at,
19 where to put it, or technology.

20 As a board member, I was told, basically, that
21 we're going to spend \$853 million. I asked for
22 alternatives, I asked how they came up with this number,
23 and I was told that I could not have that data. There
24 was a third-party consultant that was involved, and that
25 report was never provided to me.

1 Thank you very much. I appreciate all of you.
2 I know you have a very difficult decision ahead of you.

3 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

4 Mr. James -- is it Horlacher?

5 MR. HORLACHER: Yes, sir. Thank you.

6 CHMN. KATZ: And thank you.

7 MR. HORLACHER: I come here as a common worker.
8 We build these power plants, and we build them all over
9 the United States. My daddy is a retired boilermaker,
10 and my son's just graduating from the apprenticeship.
11 This is the first time as a worker that we've ever come
12 here at Coolidge and worked here at home. I can lay my
13 own head on my own pillow at night.

14 We resided in -- I live in Coolidge, five miles
15 away. Me and my family has been here over 70 years. We
16 do -- me and my son are going to get hired in over at
17 Casa Grande, and we love it. This is what we do. We're
18 qualified to do the work, to build these power plants,
19 and this is the first time in our community that we get
20 to be at home next to our families and to work.

21 So I'm one of the common workers. I'm from the
22 ground-up workers. Me and my family and 627, this means
23 a whole lot to us to be able to work here with our
24 families and to do our trade that we're qualified for and
25 that we went to school for. So I approve this

1 100 percent.

2 Thank you.

3 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you. Thanks.

4 Constance Jackson, please.

5 MS. JACKSON: I'm Constance Jackson, and I'm the
6 president of the Pinal County NAACP. I live in the city
7 of Maricopa. I've been in Arizona for 15 years. So that
8 means I'm in Pinal County, and you say this is all good
9 for Pinal County.

10 But I have friends that live in Randolph, and I
11 consider them dear to my heart. And for some reason,
12 putting something in their backyard without really
13 consulting them or asking them truly how they feel is
14 wrong.

15 Now, I -- when I moved to Arizona, I left four
16 children back on the East Coast. But three out of my
17 four children live here in Arizona and grandchildren, so
18 I want it to be safe here for them. But if Pinal County
19 is growing at such a rapid rate that you're going to put
20 our health at risk, and especially the health of the
21 people in Randolph, I'm against this.

22 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much for your
23 comments.

24 Mr. Tom Bean.

25 MR. BEAN: Thank you, Members of the board. Tom

1 Bean of Casa Grande.

2 I think it was the year 2000 that I attended a
3 meeting very, very similar to this. It took place -- and
4 I don't remember where, but it was about Randolph. There
5 was a corporation that wanted to come to Randolph and
6 make caustic liquids. It scared a lot of people. And we
7 attended these meetings, and they assured us, Oh, there
8 will never be any spills, no problem, nothing to worry
9 about. Don't worry about the odors. Everything will be
10 just fine.

11 About 15 years later, they shut down. They left
12 town. I'm told that the warehouse that they use is still
13 filled with caustic materials. 55-gallon barrels
14 probably rotting away. I guess we trusted them, because
15 it went through.

16 Now, here we are again. When TransCanada came
17 to Randolph, they got the Randolph land. It was not
18 Coolidge at the time. Randolph does not have a mayor,
19 does not have a city council, does not have a county --
20 or, excuse me -- a city attorney. They don't have
21 lawyers. They're vulnerable. Why not go to Randolph and
22 try and see what you can do.

23 I don't believe that this is the only option
24 that is open. I do believe there's open land. There's
25 state land, federal land, county land that surely can be

1 taken and used without risking people's lives.

2 Thank you.

3 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

4 Mr. Jeffrey Jordan.

5 MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
6 Committee Members. My name is Jeff Jordan. I live at
7 5160 East Kleck Road in Randolph.

8 I have lived in this area my entire life. I've
9 been there for 62 years. I have something unique over
10 everyone that's in here. I've been there longer than
11 anyone here. I have lived there, and I've seen a lot.

12 I'm asking this Committee to deny this approval
13 for this plant, and I'm going to give you some reasons
14 why. I'm not against jobs, as these gentlemen have
15 pointed out. But my reasons are the following, and these
16 are facts. These are not something that's made up. I've
17 lived there my entire life.

18 The proposed site is less than 400 feet from my
19 house. And the reason why is health impacts on my
20 grandchildren, myself.

21 The second reason is it is a predominantly
22 minority community, Randolph, Arizona, that's made up of
23 Blacks; Hispanics; Native Americans such as myself, from
24 the Gila River Indian Community; and also members from
25 the Tohono O'odham Nation that live there.

1 The devaluation of my property and my assets
2 will go down.

3 The damage that it causes to the environment.

4 The fifth reason, I see that this problem has
5 been politically driven. It has been fast-tracked. It
6 hasn't given individuals a time to comment on it.

7 And the sixth reason that I want to bring out
8 that I'm against, and primarily the hardest reason, is
9 this one: We have asked the regulatory agencies, and
10 that is, who manage the air quality in Randolph, Pinal
11 County Air Quality, Arizona Department of Environmental
12 Quality, and the Federal EPA in Region 9. We have got
13 absolutely no help. None.

14 And I want to emphasize something to all of you.
15 And normally I'm not this type of a person who would say
16 something like this. But what they have done to
17 Randolph, Arizona, is a horrible and a despicable act of
18 air quality. That is a fact. I've lived there for 62
19 years. I've witnessed it. I've seen my children witness
20 it, my grandchildren witness it. It's horrible.

21 I don't condemn people having jobs. We need
22 jobs in this state. We do. But we have to find
23 something where everybody's happy, all of us.

24 I'm asking you , as this Committee, to deny this
25 permit based upon these facts.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

2 The next individual is Carlos -- I think it's
3 Vargas. And if I can't -- or is it V-a-y-o-s --

4 MR. EVENSON: I think Carlos left a little
5 earlier ago.

6 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. Dorothy Wright.

7 MS. WRIGHT: First of all, I'd like to say --
8 thank the board for allowing us to come in and speak. My
9 name is Dorothy Wright. I was born and raised in
10 Randolph. I'm retired from the prison from 17 years, and
11 I would like to say the people in Randolph are good
12 people, hard-working people.

13 My mother was there. She bought land there so
14 that her children would have someplace to come to, to
15 always have someplace they can go back and call home.
16 And so I am one of the citizens, and I'm also a homeowner
17 in Randolph.

18 I'd like to say I am totally against it. And I
19 respect the fact that there are jobs. I respect that.
20 But do it have to be in my backyard?

21 If I was younger, I could stand on my property
22 and throw a rock and probably hit the plant. Do it have
23 to be so close? Do it have to? Because the only thing
24 the residents of Randolph is looking to gain is air
25 pollution, noise pollution, light pollution, cancer,

1 respiratory problems. There's nothing, no benefits,
2 going to the resident, to the homeowners, in Randolph.
3 Nothing. They have offered sidewalks and a fire hydrant.

4 We deserve to speak up. We, as a people,
5 deserve to stand up and say no. No. We've always been
6 overlooked in this little bitty town full of minority
7 people, hard-working people. People just living to just
8 try to do right by themselves and their families. So
9 we're standing and saying, not in our backyard. Arizona
10 is full of property and land that does not have to be
11 where it's going to endanger the people and the residents
12 of Randolph.

13 Thank you.

14 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

15 I now have a couple that wanted to address us,
16 Nicholas Bauer and -- is it Naomi Schwartz-- -- I can't
17 read the full name, but you're both welcome to --

18 MR. BAUER: Hi. My name is Nick. I'm the 51st
19 employee of the Nikola Corporation. I was the first
20 employee hired in Arizona for the Nikola Corporation.
21 I'm was also the first employee not to get \$4.2 million
22 in the IPO.

23 But there's not a lot of hydrogen control
24 systems and the high-voltage distribution systems used on
25 a truck currently. And when COVID hit, we were kind of

1 homeless. We were kicked out of our home. And we had
2 this crazy RV, and I was looking for land to park it and
3 build a home. And I found two acres in Randolph,
4 Arizona.

5 We both live at 5006 East Kleck Road. And the
6 plant is a half mile away from where we currently reside.
7 Very scared of the plant because on August 15th, I woke
8 up at 5:30 in the morning screaming because our house was
9 moving like all around and the washing machine was moving
10 and all the dishes and everything. And she was in a room
11 nursing her child. And I was like, We need to get in the
12 bathtub right now.

13 Because it was the craziest thing we've both
14 ever experienced when a 30-inch pipeline, operating at
15 863 PSI a mile from our home exploded and tragically
16 burned two people to death, including a 14-year-old
17 child, in their home, alive. It was the craziest thing.
18 After two minutes, I went outside and opened the back
19 door and saw a huge fireball like a couple miles wide,
20 like a mile tall.

21 And we were both, like, naked and, like, jumped
22 in my Civic like rolling as fast as we could out of
23 there, fearing a secondary explosion. And the nightmares
24 that we both have from the event is pretty crazy.

25 So we would just like to ask the Arizona

1 Corporation Commission to not build this so close to the
2 community. I know the pipeline doesn't serve the area,
3 but it is like commercial and it exploded. And, you
4 know, commercially zoned property doesn't belong 381 feet
5 away from residential property. You know, we don't want
6 an LM6000 compressor turbine blade in the side of our
7 house.

8 Thank you.

9 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

10 We now have Ms. Penny Bagnall.

11 MS. BAGNALL: Hi. Good evening.

12 CHMN. KATZ: Good evening.

13 MS. BAGNALL: My family came to Coolidge in
14 1964. Very small town, very loving community. We were
15 all family back then. The people of Randolph, I rode the
16 bus with them. I've known them my whole life. They
17 don't want this there. It's inappropriate for this
18 hearing to be held in Casa Grande at 5:30. You're not
19 seeing the people who really can't be here to say, I
20 don't want it. It's inappropriate on all levels.

21 People matter. These people matter. They don't
22 want it. They feel that it's unsafe. They need to be
23 heard. My suggestion is let's table this crap. Let's
24 get the meeting in Coolidge. Have it at 6:30, 7:00 ,
25 where working people can feed their kids and come to the

1 meeting. This is inappropriate on all levels. It's
2 wrong. They don't want it. They feel that it's unsafe.
3 We're sick and tired of the locust energy companies
4 coming in and destroying us. They've already destroyed
5 my farm, the solar farms. I am not about to stand by and
6 allow these people to lose what has been theirs in some
7 cases five generations. We have roots. We don't have
8 wings.

9 Thank you.

10 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

11 And I don't know if it's Tom or Thomas Bagnall.
12 And if I mispronounced it, my apologies.

13 MR. BAGNALL: Good evening. My name is Tom
14 Bagnall. With the exception of three years, I've lived
15 in Coolidge all my life, or the Coolidge area. And, as a
16 matter of fact, Mr. Jordan over here, he and I played
17 little league baseball together. He was the pitcher. I
18 was the catcher. We were good too.

19 But I just want you to know that, you know, as
20 the crow flies, we're about 2 1/2 miles away from this,
21 and that's still too close. And I can -- and I feel for
22 the folks in Randolph. We came up with just the same
23 thing with these SRP-commissioned solar farms.

24 As my wife said, we have one to the south of us.
25 We got run over with that one by SRP and their partners.

1 We've got one to the west of us that we thought we would
2 have a voice in, but -- by being annexed into the city of
3 Coolidge, and we had to fight for a greater setback
4 there. But we're still going to have our property ruined
5 because of SRP and all their partners.

6 I don't think anybody here is against having a
7 gas-fired power plant. Just not a gas-fired power plant
8 or an expansion of one outside of Randolph. It's wrong.
9 Like my wife said, it's completely and totally wrong.

10 And I'm not thanking SRP for anything. I don't
11 know why Mr. Cook feels there is a need to thank them for
12 putting this garbage in our county, in our community.
13 And it's time it stops. And it has to start with you
14 folks. Do the right thing. Make them put this someplace
15 else. I'm not against it. I'm just against the
16 location.

17 Thank you.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

19 The last speaker, at least that's handed me --
20 handed us a note, is Aris Correa.

21 MR. CORREA: Thank you, Chairman and Members of
22 the Committee, for giving me this opportunity to speak.
23 My name is Aris Correa. I'm the advocacy director for
24 Rural Arizona Action, a Coolidge-based nonprofit that
25 advocates for just and equitable treatment for all rural

1 Arizonans.

2 I am urging you to deny SRP's Certificate of
3 Environmental Compatibility for this Coolidge Expansion
4 Project. I work in Coolidge, have family and friends in
5 Coolidge, and I'm worried about the health and safety of
6 them and myself as well.

7 There's a couple reasons I'm opposed to this
8 expansion just with regards to its threat to our health.
9 These gas companies, like SRP, gain profit from our
10 community, and they neglect to tell us that the gas emits
11 harmful pollutants into the air and contributes to
12 respiratory illnesses such as asthma.

13 Second is the threat to our safety. When a gas
14 line leaks or ruptures, becomes damaged, it presents a
15 huge risk. And the plant, or the expansion, is right
16 next to the Randolph community.

17 And then this plant is a threat to our economy.
18 Relying on gas to power Arizona's homes and buildings is
19 unsustainable for our communities. And committing to
20 this expansion for this plant, you know, this takes away
21 other opportunities for our state to focus on clean
22 energy and create future jobs here in Coolidge and for
23 the rest of Arizona. And, essentially, this expansion
24 keeps Coolidge living in the past and locks Coolidge into
25 decades of additional pollution.

1 And so our region is already experiencing
2 harmful effects of air pollution, drought, extreme
3 weather, and other public risks. And so expanding fossil
4 fuels is, I believe, taking a huge step backwards. Our
5 community, especially the residents of Randolph, deserve
6 to breathe clean air and not to suffer from these
7 long-term environmental and health consequences.

8 So please deny this certificate, and hopefully
9 we can demand from SRP cleaner energy solutions. And
10 thank you very much for your time.

11 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

12 I have two new requests. One is from a Dennis
13 Rushing.

14 MR. RUSHING: Good evening.

15 CHMN. KATZ: Good evening.

16 MR. RUSHING: I, like Jeff and Dorothy, was born
17 and raised in Randolph. Been there all my life. We've
18 dealt with different companies that the City of Coolidge,
19 City of Casa Grande, and Pinal County helped brought into
20 our community. We've had relatives, our ancestors, that
21 were in perfect health, and when these companies started
22 moving in all of a sudden started developing respiratory
23 problems. They're no longer with us.

24 We have fought with the state air quality
25 control and different agencies that were supposed to have

1 been monitoring this stuff, but they're monitoring it
2 from Phoenix. And we had a guy come that worked at
3 Proler when they were there -- or I'm sorry, Sunbelt,
4 when they were there, that brought to our attention of
5 changes he had made to their monitoring devices on behalf
6 of that company. And that was the way we got ADEQ to
7 come down and check it out. They found what he had said
8 was true. And they fined the company. But the people of
9 Randolph didn't benefit one way or another.

10 Every evening, we would have clouds of dust,
11 which was rust, coming in off the metal where they were
12 doing the refinery out there at Proler, which is near
13 where Jeff lives. It would settle over Randolph every
14 evening. The odors that was -- had been emitted from
15 Sunbelt.

16 The explosion that we had here a few months ago
17 to where that young girl and her dad was killed and her
18 mother was seriously burnt.

19 We've had all kind of stuff that have gone on,
20 and like I said, the City of Coolidge and the City of
21 Casa Grande have backed these companies with the promise
22 of bringing in jobs. Very few people from Randolph and
23 the surrounding area have been employed.

24 When they were doing Sunbelt, they had
25 Mr. Turner, who was a resident of Randolph, in his 80s,

1 off in one of the tanks sandblasting. A classmate of
2 ours worked out there at Proler. And he was cleaning up
3 around a vat, slipped and fell in that vat of acid, and
4 had to have skin grafts from his neck down.

5 These are some of the issues that I have with
6 these companies coming here. They promise jobs. But the
7 people that get the jobs are the people that they're
8 bringing in.

9 A few tax dollars is not worth the lives of the
10 people that we've lost. And it's not worth the lives of
11 the people that we stand to lose in the future by
12 allowing these companies to come into our backyards. And
13 for those reasons and many more, which I can go on and
14 on, I'm totally against it. And I can vouch for the
15 majority of the people in Randolph, that they're totally
16 against it.

17 And you guys set these meetings up to where a
18 lot of the people from Randolph who are still working --
19 which I'm retired after 28 years with the Sheriff's
20 Office. But there's a lot of people that still has
21 everyday jobs, have young children that they're taking
22 care of and have to feed in the evening time, and the
23 meetings are set up usually around the time that these
24 people are getting off work and don't have time to make
25 it.

1 Thank you.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

3 I don't have any more written requests. We have
4 a number of people that are participating virtually.

5 I did receive three comments that were written.
6 One is from a Tracy Bigthumb that says: My organization
7 will appreciate and be more than happy if this project
8 goes through and becomes a reality in the near future. I
9 can retire with this job.

10 That was one comment.

11 I have another one from a Luis Hidalgo: I
12 support this project. It is good for this area.

13 And lastly, from a Carlos -- I think Carlos has
14 already presented oral testimony or input, so I don't
15 think we need to read that. Again, he just indicated his
16 support for the project.

17 Oh, Carlos Vargas did leave, and that's why he
18 left this. And Carlos did say: I support this project.
19 Is good for this area 100 percent.

20 And those were all of the written requests that
21 we received.

22 FEMALE SPEAKER: You didn't get any rejection
23 letters?

24 MR. BENSON: I gave you my card too, just after
25 him. Ryan Bentz.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Oh, yeah, go ahead. I apologize.
2 I got distracted after that last comment, but thank you
3 kindly for being here.

4 MR. BENTZ: Thank you. You're welcome.

5 So, Chairman and Committee Members, thank you
6 for allowing me to speak here today. I've already
7 submitted my written comments as a concerned and proud
8 Coolidge resident, but I would like to speak here today
9 to emphasize the points that I have already made.

10 First, I want the position to be clear, I'm
11 opposed to the current project before you and the
12 certificate of environmental capability application.
13 Given the global climate crisis, the State of Arizona
14 should not be permitting any new fossil fuel power
15 generation plants at this scale or at this concentration,
16 especially when the process has been so poorly executed
17 by SRP. Power generation should be expanded in a way
18 that is consistent with the Environmental Protection
19 Agency's definition of environmental justice where a
20 demographic has a greater exposure to environmental
21 toxins and health hazards. As such, allowing this
22 application to move forward is contrary to that
23 definition.

24 As you know, A.R.S. 40-360.06 has spelled out
25 the criteria and factors you are to use in determining if

1 an EC's approval is warranted. Of these, (A)(6) is the
2 total environment of the area.

3 According to the engineering firm WSP's website,
4 the firm who provided the design and construction of the
5 existing plant, Coolidge Generating Station is already,
6 quote, one of the largest peaking plants in the United
7 States, unquote.

8 And here we are today, attempting to more than
9 double it to an enormous size of 28 gas turbines, which
10 could possibly make it the largest peaking plant in the
11 United States.

12 Furthermore, when we factor in the other ten
13 simple gas turbines, generators at APS's Sundance power
14 station, our community will be burdened by the
15 environmental impacts of 38 gas turbines emitting acid
16 rain and ozone-generating NOx gases within a 5-mile
17 radius of Coolidge proper and my home.

18 The fact that the Coolidge Generating Station is
19 a peaking plant does not preclude it from running
20 consistently 24 hours a day, seven days a week, should
21 energy markets warrant it. In fact, Mr. Hummel has
22 acknowledged this fact in his response to Commissioner
23 Kennedy. SRP has total discretion as to how much or
24 little they choose to run the plant.

25 This scenario alone is alarming. At this moment

1 in time, this project is run for SRP's customers, and
2 it's wrong for residents of me like Coolidge and the
3 neighborhood of Randolph.

4 Please deny this application and ask that SRP
5 involve the residents of Coolidge and Randolph before
6 making any decisions that impact us, and require SRP to
7 submit more efficient, sustainable, and cost-effective
8 design alternatives for our community.

9 Thank you.

10 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Bentz.

11 Now, just to make sure, did I skip anybody's
12 written request to speak that is present here?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN. KATZ: Seeing no hands or hearing no
15 voices speaking out, I'm going to have one of our
16 technical people call the next several folks.

17 How many people do we have appearing virtually
18 that wish to speak?

19 MS. MASER: Currently, there's 34.

20 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. We'll get started. If for
21 any reason we can't finish in relatively good order, we
22 may have to open up another night for comment. But right
23 now, we can go ahead, and I'll have to strictly limit
24 everybody to a maximum of three minutes.

25 MS. MASER: First up, Caryn Potter.

1 MS. POTTER: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

2 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, we can.

3 MS. POTTER: Good evening, Chairman Katz, and
4 Members of the Arizona Power Plant and Line Siting
5 Committee. My name is Caryn Potter, and I'm speaking
6 today on behalf of SWEEP, the Southwest Energy Efficiency
7 Project.

8 SWEEP is a nonprofit that works to cut costs for
9 all Arizonans by supporting policy and programs that make
10 our power and transportation systems more energy
11 efficient. And I'd like to thank the Committee for the
12 opportunity to speak today.

13 SWEEP has two major concerns about the Coolidge
14 Expansion Project:

15 First, SRP did not issue a competitive
16 all-source bid for this project, which impacts the
17 results show before the Committee today. Issuing a
18 competitive all-source bid overseen by an independent
19 monitor is an industry standard in an environment where
20 technologies and cost are rapidly changing and can
21 significantly impact the cost of the type of additional
22 transmission and line siting that are needed to meet
23 electric customers' needs.

24 A competitive all-source bid also ensures that
25 the utility's investing in the most economical and

1 economically advantaged options for the residents and for
2 businesses at large. Since SRP did not issue an
3 all-source bid for these specific load growth needs, it
4 may not have considered the full suite of options
5 available to it, including alternatives that are cheaper,
6 using less water, and cause less pollution.

7 Second, the timing and information made
8 available to thoroughly vet this project were
9 insufficient.

10 For example, SRP's management did not provide a
11 rate impact analysis or details on the scope and breadth
12 of the alternative scenarios it considered.

13 The utility's load forecast also changed
14 considerably by almost 1 gigawatts since last year. This
15 is not just a near-term investment, but something that
16 will likely be on SRP's books for years to come while
17 ratepayers foot the bill. This deserves much greater
18 scrutiny, especially in the time when far too many
19 Arizonans are making painful economic decisions and
20 falling behind on their electric bills.

21 It is essential that we get things right, take a
22 critical look, and especially when the price tag is
23 nearly a billion dollars. And for these reasons, SWEEP
24 respectfully urges the Committee to pause the review of
25 this project until SRP has conducted a competitive RFP

1 process to determine the most affordable option to
2 address system needs.

3 Thank you so much for your time. I'm available
4 for any comments or questions.

5 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

6 Next, please.

7 MS. MASER: Next is Taryn Phoenix Bell.

8 CHMN. KATZ: Taryn Phoenix Bell.

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN. KATZ: I'm not hearing anything. I don't
11 know if she -- I don't know if it's a man or a woman.
12 But we can go to the next participant. And if this
13 person rejoins us, we'll call on him or her.

14 MS. MASER: The next one is a telephone number.
15 737-080-4833.

16 CHMN. KATZ: If that's your phone number, I'll
17 need you to identify yourself by name, and then feel free
18 to comment.

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN. KATZ: Read the phone number one more
21 time, please.

22 MS. MASER: 737-080-4833.

23 Looks like they're unable to connect. They're
24 trying to connect, but they're not --

25 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. Well, we can -- if she's not

1 able to connect right now, we can come back to her once
2 she is fully connected.

3 MS. MASER: Next is Ronda Seifert.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Ronda Seifert, please.

5 MS. SEIFERT: Thank you. Can you hear me?

6 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

7 MS. SEIFERT: Good evening, and I thank you for
8 this opportunity to provide public comment. My name is
9 Ronda Seifert, and I'm a public health nurse specializing
10 in maternal and child health. I live in Phoenix,
11 Arizona, and grew up here.

12 I ask that the Siting Committee deny approval of
13 the Certificate of Environmental Compatibility for the
14 Coolidge Expansion Project.

15 Newer scientific studies have shown that some
16 pollutants can harm public health and welfare even at
17 very low levels. This natural gas power plant will
18 produce pollutants that form ground-level ozones, which,
19 along with this particulate matter, lead to known health
20 harms.

21 As a nurse, I think about how these kinds of
22 pollutants harm health, and I am glad that we are
23 starting to improve our ability to measure pollution at
24 the neighborhood level and increase accountability for
25 polluters. I think about a pregnant mom who inhales

1 those pollutants, causing inflammation that makes it hard
2 for her body to protect and care for her baby. They're
3 both at increased risk for premature birth, low birth
4 weight, and even stillbirth.

5 I think of little ones playing outside,
6 breathing in pollution that damages their developing
7 lungs, leaving them with respiratory issues, including
8 childhood asthma.

9 I think of the adults, maybe a parent or
10 grandparent, who have spent their lives working hard, and
11 now, simply from breathing air, they're at increased risk
12 for COPD and even nonsmokers lung cancer.

13 I see the Randolph community, a historic Black
14 community, and know that recent studies show higher
15 pollution violations in low income and communities of
16 color. And I suspect racial injustice in this unfair
17 pollution burden that they are being asked to carry.

18 I see the heat-trapping gases from this power
19 plant rising up far into our atmosphere, where they
20 contribute to our rising global temperatures and
21 worsening drought and severe weather not only here in
22 Arizona, but all across our planet, leaving more children
23 and their communities in harm's way.

24 There is no reason to contribute to these health
25 impacts. There are less costly, clean, and reliable

1 options available that will help attract businesses to
2 Arizona, keep our nation competitive in the renewable
3 market, and most importantly, have immediate public
4 health benefits for the people of our planet because of
5 clean air and water.

6 I am asking you, as a nurse and as a mother, to
7 deny approval of this Certificate of Environmental
8 Compatibility.

9 Thank you so much for your time.

10 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much. Take care.

11 Our next individual that might wish to talk.

12 MS. MASER: Hailey Baker.

13 CHMN. KATZ: Hailey Baker.

14 MS. MASER: You need to unmute yourself.

15 CHMN. KATZ: Bailey Baker, are you with us?

16 MS. KRAFT: Sorry, I'm not Hailey, but I just
17 wanted to let you know that there's a group of students
18 on that are just here to support classmates, but they're
19 not planning on commenting. So I don't know if it would
20 be easier to like have us raise hands if we're planning
21 on commenting.

22 CHMN. KATZ: And you are who?

23 MS. KRAFT: Kelcie Kraft.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. Thank you.

25 MS. MASER: Kelly Trombley.

1 CHMN. KATZ: Yes.

2 MS. TROMBLEY: Good evening, Chairman Katz and
3 Members of the Arizona Power Plant and Line Siting
4 Committee. My name is Kelly Trombley, and I am a manager
5 of state policy with Ceres.

6 Ceres is a national sustainability nonprofit
7 working with the most influential investors and companies
8 to build a more sustainable economy. And we run a
9 coalition of nearly 85 major employers, large electricity
10 customers, leading consumer brands, and Fortune 500s,
11 including many with operations, facilities, and business
12 interests in Arizona.

13 I am grateful for the opportunity to speak
14 before you today to share some perspectives on the
15 private sector's concerns with the Coolidge Expansion
16 Project.

17 As large employers and major energy consumers,
18 our members understand firsthand how energy resource
19 decisions affect the cost of doing business. They have
20 concerns about this project because SRP never issued a
21 competitive RFP or bid. As a result, it is likely that
22 cheaper, less polluting options were never fully
23 considered.

24 Our members also recognize that climate change
25 poses a significant risk to their long-term economic

1 success. Threatening the health and livelihood of the
2 communities in which they operate and disrupts the value
3 chains on which they rely. Because of these risks,
4 companies in Arizona and all over the country are making
5 significant commitments to reduce their emissions.

6 Unfortunately, the Coolidge Expansion Project
7 does the opposite of that. Meanwhile, energy pathways
8 that prioritize gas may hinder investment in renewable
9 energy, storage, and demand-side management, while
10 increasing the likelihood of stranded assets in the
11 future.

12 Thank you again for the opportunity to speak
13 today. I hope you consider the clean energy preferences
14 of Arizona businesses as you evaluate the application
15 before you.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you. Is there anybody else
17 from your group that wishes to address the Committee? If
18 not, we'll go on to our next caller.

19 MS. MASER: Next is Beth Bremer.

20 CHMN. KATZ: Beth Bremer, please.

21 MS. BREMER: Hi. I am listening to the
22 testimony, so I won't be commenting. Thank you so much.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

24 Next.

25 MS. MASER: Next is a phone number.

1 480-620-5323.

2 CHMN. KATZ: If that's your phone number and you
3 recognize it, please identify yourself by name and feel
4 free to comment.

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN. KATZ: Would you please read the number
7 one more time.

8 MS. MASER: 480-620-5323.

9 CHMN. KATZ: If the individual with that phone
10 number wishes to address us, I need you to speak up
11 promptly or we'll go on to the next caller.

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN. KATZ: Please call the next person waiting
14 in line.

15 MS. MASER: Next is another phone number.

16 520-560-2269.

17 CHMN. KATZ: If you recognize that 520 phone
18 number, please identify yourself and feel free to
19 comment.

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN. KATZ: Please read the number one more
22 time.

23 MS. MASER: 520-560-2269.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Hearing or seeing no response, we
25 will go to the next participant.

1 MS. MASER: Next one is Briana. No last name.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Briana?

3 BRIANA: Oh, good evening. I'm only an observer
4 for here tonight.

5 CHMN. KATZ: That's fine. Feel free to continue
6 to join us. Thank you.

7 BRIANA: Okay. Thank you.

8 MS. MASER: Next one is Bruce Plenk.

9 CHMN. KATZ: Bruce Plenk.

10 (No response.)

11 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Plenk.

12 MR. PLENK: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. I'm
13 hoping that you can hear me all right. My name is
14 Bruce --

15 CHMN. KATZ: We can hear you just fine.

16 MR. PLENK: Thank you. I'm a resident of
17 Tucson.

18 I wanted to urge the Line Siting Commission to
19 deny SRP's request for the same reasons that many other
20 speakers this evening have articulated. Health and
21 safety reasons, basic thinking in terms of what we should
22 be doing to deal with climate change, namely, not locking
23 in gas power plants for the future but putting our
24 attention, energy, money, and hopes into solar batteries,
25 wind, and future developments in other renewable

1 resources.

2 Any money spent on gas plants such as these
3 plants and the pipelines and other parts to go with these
4 will basically be taking the state of Arizona backwards.
5 It will have a very definite negative impact on Randolph
6 and the immediate neighborhood, which I think is the
7 perfect example of environmental injustice that should be
8 included in the Committee's decision-making. And I think
9 that this is an opportunity for the Line Siting Committee
10 and the Corporation Commission to clearly state that
11 these kind of proposals by, in this case, SRP, but
12 certainly in the future by any other utilities that are
13 regulated more fully by the Commission, should not be
14 moving the direction of any further gas plants or
15 anything that goes along with them.

16 So I would urge you to deny the request.

17 Thanks very much.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you, sir.

19 Whoever's next, please.

20 MS. MASER: Courtney Coolidge.

21 CHMN. KATZ: Courtney Coolidge.

22 MS. COOLIDGE: Can you hear me?

23 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, we can.

24 MS. COOLIDGE: Great. Thank you for the
25 opportunity to speak this evening. My name is Courtney

1 Coolidge, and I'm the vice president of government
2 affairs for the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

3 The Arizona Chamber would like to extend its
4 support for Salt River Project's application of the
5 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility for the
6 Coolidge Expansion Project. The Chamber believes that
7 Arizona's ability to meet the energy demands of job
8 creators is an essential part of the state's overall
9 economic development strategy. We are fortunate that
10 leaders like SRP are meeting the industry demands with
11 solutions that not only ensure the affordable delivery of
12 reliable power but are also doing so in an
13 environmentally responsible way that helps wean us off of
14 carbon-intensive sources, as SRP maintains its commitment
15 that nearly half of all retail energy it delivers will
16 come from zero carbon sources within the next 40 years.

17 The Chamber is pleased that the Coolidge
18 Expansion Project will also be conducted in a manner that
19 underscores SRP's long history of wise water stewardship.
20 The Coolidge Generating Station will use only Central
21 Arizona Project surface water that SRP previously stored
22 underground and will not rely on groundwater.

23 As you all know, states across the West have
24 recently grappled with inconsistent power delivery to
25 customers, resulting in brownouts and outages, sometimes

1 for a sustained period and with devastating consequences.
2 The infrastructure modernization contemplated by the
3 Coolidge Expansion Project will help ensure Arizona does
4 not suffer the same fate.

5 The Chamber supports an Arizona energy portfolio
6 that includes solar and wind power generation and we're
7 excited by the potential of large-scale battery storage,
8 but the state also requires energy sources that can be
9 counted on around the clock and regardless of weather.
10 Natural gas and the Coolidge Expansion Project are
11 crucial in achieving that goal.

12 We urge your support of this application by SRP.
13 This project is environmentally responsible, meets the
14 needs of today of Arizona's economy, prepares us for
15 anticipated job growth, and ensures predictability for
16 electricity customers. We thank you in advance for your
17 consideration.

18 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

19 Whoever might be next.

20 MS. MASER: Dawn Abel.

21 MS. ABEL: Hi. I'm an SRP ratepayer, and I'm
22 very concerned about, No. 1, being charged extra, because
23 the money's got to come from somewhere to pay for this
24 billion-dollar project.

25 And I'm also concerned that the residents of

1 Coolidge and Randolph have had no opportunities to give
2 input on this project. It would seem to me, this being
3 in their backyard, they should be the predominant voice
4 in whether you approve or oppose this project.

5 I am a senior, No. 2, and I have health issues.
6 I don't live exactly close to Coolidge, but we do get
7 upwinds, you know, during the haboob season and all, and
8 I have very severe respiratory problems. This just
9 continues to increase the problem that we're currently
10 having with fossil fuels.

11 And the last thing I want to say is SRP, because
12 of the nature of this business, seems to appear to be
13 unaccountable for most of their decisions. And I really,
14 really feel that this is probably the only chance that we
15 have to make them accountable. And I would ask that the
16 Line Siting Committee not approve this environmental
17 certificate until we get a little bit more transparency
18 and really understand what the last person seems to be
19 expressing with all of her confidence. I don't think the
20 rest of us have actually had a chance to actually review
21 any of the plans and really see where this project is
22 going.

23 Thank you very much.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

25 Whoever might be next, we can call.

1 MS. MASER: Next up is Debbie, no last name.

2 CHMN. KATZ: Debbie without a last name, we need
3 you to state your full name if you're here, and we
4 welcome your comments.

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN. KATZ: Debbie?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN. KATZ: Hearing silence, we'll move on. If
9 she stays on the line and wishes to speak, we'll try it
10 again later.

11 MS. MASER: Next in line is Dorcas, and I'm not
12 going to pronounce the last name.

13 CHMN. KATZ: How do we spell the first name, if
14 you can read it?

15 MS. MASER: Dorcas is D-o-r-c-a-s.

16 CHMN. KATZ: Dorcas, whoever you might be,
17 please identify yourself, but with your full name, and
18 feel free to address the Committee.

19 MS. NAA AKU SHIKA QUARSHIE: My name is Dorcas
20 Naa Aku Shika Quarshie, and I'm just observing tonight.
21 Thank you.

22 CHMN. KATZ: Okay. Thank you for your patience
23 and for joining us. Have a good night.

24 MS. MASER: Next up is Doug Bland.

25 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Bland.

1 MR. BLAND: Thank you for the opportunity to
2 speak today. I'm Reverend Doug Bland, the executive
3 director for Arizona Interfaith Power and Light, a
4 spiritual response to the climate crisis.

5 I ask that the Arizona Power Plant and Line
6 Siting Committee deny approval of the Certificate of
7 Environmental Compatibility for the expansion of the
8 Coolidge Generating Station.

9 Once upon a time, the decision to meet peak
10 energy by burning fossil fuels may have been a
11 straightforward, technical, economic engineering problem
12 that could be solved in a board room with spreadsheets,
13 cost-benefit analysis and engineering schematics. I'm
14 imagining a climate-controlled board room with
15 comfortable leather chairs and no windows. That's the
16 only way I can imagine proposing the SRP gas plant in a
17 time when the climate scientists say is red alert for
18 humanity and much of life on the planet.

19 If decision-makers had access to windows,
20 certainly, they would have seen the dangerously
21 diminished reservoirs, the tinder-dry forests and raging
22 wildfires.

23 With windows, they would have seen that last
24 summer was the second hottest on record. 520 people in
25 Arizona died of the heat.

1 With windows, they would have noted rising costs
2 of intensive heat to our economy, to our most vulnerable
3 communities, to our polluted air and water.

4 With windows, the proposal to burn more fossil
5 fuels would never have seen the light of day.

6 The plant will harm public health, perpetuate
7 environmental injustice, contribute to climate-harming
8 pollution, and use much more water. There are much
9 cleaner, less environmentally harmful and affordable
10 options available, including solar with storage, wind,
11 and energy efficiency. Building a large gas plant that
12 uses groundwater, that pollutes our air and harms our
13 climate is not sustainable. This will cause significant
14 harm to the total environment of the area.

15 Before you allow SRP to proceed with this bad
16 plan, please just find a window and look out. Please
17 deny this CEC to site its additional 820 megawatts of gas
18 in the Coolidge gas plant.

19 Thank you.

20 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

21 MS. MASER: Next is Erica Rackley.

22 MS. RACKLEY: Thank you. I'm just here to
23 listen. I don't have a comment to share.

24 CHMN. KATZ: Okay.

25 MS. MASER: Next up is Hazel Chandler.

1 MS. CHANDLER: Hi. I'm Hazel Chandler, and I
2 thank you for allowing us to speak tonight.

3 I'm a volunteer for Elders Climate Action. I
4 have consulted with Moms Clean Air Force and Union of
5 Concerned Scientists and other groups. I'm the organizer
6 of the Arizona Climate Action Coalition.

7 As Doug said and as our previous speakers said,
8 we are in code red for humanity. We have a choice that
9 we have to make and a choice that has to be made fast,
10 and that is to wean ourselves off of fossil fuel. It is
11 totally irresponsible to approve this particular
12 expansion in a time when we know that it's going to have
13 serious negative impacts on our future and the future
14 for our children and grandchildren.

15 We know that there's cleaner, cheaper
16 alternatives that are available that were not seriously
17 considered that would mitigate most of the greenhouse
18 gases going into the atmosphere and also the air
19 pollution issues that especially the community of
20 Randolph and Coolidge and other areas are facing.

21 Every person deserves to be able to live a
22 healthy life and breathe clean air. And expansion of
23 this plant is absolutely moving in the wrong direction.
24 Randolph and the people of Randolph that we heard tonight
25 have serious stories about their health being impacted

1 already, and this is going to make it just way worse.
2 This community has been an environmental injustice for
3 many years. Nobody considers the impact on these
4 people's lives.

5 I have a new grandbaby that lives in Pinal
6 County, and her lungs are developing just like the lungs
7 of all the other children living near that plant. And we
8 have to say no, no, no. No more fossil fuels. We need
9 to think about my granddaughter Ava and all the children
10 and please deny the approval of the Certificate of
11 Environmental Compatibility.

12 I want to thank you for your time.

13 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you for participating.

14 MS. MASER: Next up is JoAnna Strother.

15 MS. STROTHER: Good evening, Chairman and Line
16 Siting Committee. My name is JoAnna Strother, and I
17 serve as a senior director of advocacy for the American
18 Lung Association.

19 As a health organization, we urge the Line
20 Siting Committee to deny approval for the Coolidge
21 Expansion Project. This project has lacked a robust
22 public input process, didn't consider the health and
23 climate implications of continued use of fossil fuel
24 power. Our 2021 State of the Air Report gave Pinal
25 County an F grade for both unhealthy ozone and

1 particulate pollution days. So it's critical that our
2 decision-makers are taking key actions to reduce
3 emissions and improve air quality.

4 Air pollution injures lung health and
5 exacerbates respiratory and heart conditions and is
6 especially harmful to children, persons with asthma and
7 COPD, and those with diabetes.

8 Fossil fuels are the root of our air pollution
9 and climate burdens. Expanding gas generators into
10 Coolidge will contribute to Pinal County's pollution
11 burdens and perpetuate environmental injustice where
12 200,000 people of color and 53,000 low-income individuals
13 live in. A 1 billion expansion of fossil fuels needs
14 exploration of alternative investment options that
15 complement statewide clean energy and sustainability
16 goals.

17 Investment in a healthier future mean projects
18 that will drive down emissions and protect the health of
19 all Arizonans and a thoughtful exploration of
20 alternatives to harmful fossil fuels.

21 The American Lung Association released a poll in
22 December of 2021 which revealed 84 percent of Arizona
23 voters view air pollution as a serious health problem.
24 Further, a majority of voters support a transition away
25 from fossil fuel electricity. 80 percent of voters want

1 more solar power, and 63 percent support more wind power.

2 We urge the Line Siting Committee to reject the
3 Certificate of Environmental Compatibility so that SRP
4 can further explore the climate and health impacts of
5 this project and to consider input from the public and
6 key stakeholders on renewable energy and alternatives.
7 As representatives of the American Lung Association, we
8 value our partnership, and we hope to continue
9 collaboration to safeguard Arizona's health and secure a
10 climate-resilient future.

11 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

12 MS. MASER: Next up is John M. -- and this is
13 another name I'm not going to try to pronounce.

14 MR. FEGYVERESI: Fegyveresi. John Fegyveresi.

15 I'm a climate scientist at Northern Arizona
16 University. And I'm actually here with a lot of my grad
17 students, climate science grad students. So I don't
18 personally have a comment, but I know that Kelcie is
19 going to speak on behalf of the climate science grad
20 students. Kelcie Kraft.

21 CHMN. KATZ: That's fine.

22 MS. MASER: I'm just keeping track.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Who is next?

24 MS. MASER: Next up is John Penry.

25 MR. PENRY: Good evening. Thank you. First up,

1 thank you for allowing me to speak. I really appreciate
2 it.

3 My concerns are twofold:

4 First, the length of time that this investment
5 is expected to last, I'm thinking 35, 40 years, it seems
6 quite possible that in about ten years' time, this
7 investment will become a stranded cost, which means that
8 the ratepayers, or us, will end up having to pay for this
9 long after the viability of this power plant is useless.
10 From that perspective, it would be nice that SRP does go
11 and investigate more in other alternatives to using this
12 natural plant idea.

13 Secondly, when Arizona produces electricity,
14 we're basically sending water through a power line. If
15 we sell this electricity to the markets in California or
16 elsewhere, that's our water going there. So I appreciate
17 SRP being a good steward of our water resources, but at
18 the same time, this plant will use a lot of that.

19 So, again, I ask that the Line Siting Committee
20 not approve the certificate, and I appreciate having the
21 time to speak.

22 Thank you very much.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

24 Next, please.

25 MS. MASER: Next up is Kelcie Lynn Kraft.

1 MS. KRAFT: Hi. My name is Kelcie Kraft.
2 Myself and my classmates are here tonight representing
3 the Climate Science and Solutions Master Program here at
4 Northern Arizona University. And we are asking that the
5 Siting Committee deny approval of the Certificate of
6 Environmental Compatibility for the Coolidge Expansion
7 Project.

8 With an additional 16 natural gas units
9 operating at a capacity factor of 7.86 percent, which was
10 the operating capacity in 2020, the plant would produce
11 an additional 103,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide
12 equivalent emissions annually based on the Climate
13 Registry's 2021 emission factors in the global warming
14 potentials found in the IPCC AR5 report. This is the
15 equivalent of approximately 22,000 cars on the road per
16 year according to the EPA.

17 Estimating the lifespan of the planet, after 50
18 years, that would be a total of 5,144,000 metric tons of
19 carbon dioxide-equivalent emissions. That's 5 million
20 metric tons of emissions away from carbon neutrality.

21 Additionally, when linkages of methane produced
22 during production, transportation, and maintenance are
23 factored into the total emissions for natural gas power,
24 emissions are often in line with or even exceed those of
25 coal.

1 According to Randolph and Masters, Energy for
2 Sustainability, a 2 percent well-to-plant methane leakage
3 results in virtually the same emission rate as a
4 coal-fired power plant.

5 A recent study by the Environmental Defense Fund
6 found that approximately 3.7 percent of natural gas
7 produced in the Permian Basin in Texas leaked into the
8 atmosphere. That is enough to completely erase the
9 greenhouse gas benefits of quitting coal for gas.

10 Finally, the proposed natural gas expansion
11 directly contradicts SRP's own stated plan for a
12 sustainable energy future. SRP features its commitment
13 to sustainable energy prominently on its website. As
14 stated on the SRP webpage: We're planning for a more
15 sustainable future by working to modernize our grid,
16 expand our renewable energy offerings, curb our carbon
17 footprint, and conserve our natural resources.

18 Natural gas is not sustainable, not renewable,
19 increases carbon emissions, and destroys natural
20 resources.

21 In my own voice, speaking for myself, I would
22 also like to add a "shame on you" to Representative Cook
23 for fearmongering and comparing the situation in Arizona
24 to the situation in Texas. The energy ecosystems in the
25 two states are not remotely similar. And even if they

1 were, your analogy would fall flat because what happened
2 in Texas was due to a failure in the natural gas
3 infrastructure. Climate change is the crisis we should
4 be concerned about, not a failure in the fossil fuel
5 infrastructure.

6 Because of these reasons, we are asking that you
7 deny the approval of the Certificate of Environmental
8 Compatibility.

9 Thank you.

10 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly.

11 I just -- before we call our next person, how
12 many more do we have likely to be called just to figure
13 out timing?

14 MS. MASER: Let's see.

15 CHMN. KATZ: And primarily the reason I'm asking
16 is it we've been going for about an hour and a half, and
17 I don't want to beat our court reporter down into the
18 ground. So we may take a break or we may need to
19 continue things for another evening.

20 MS. MASER: There's -- it looks like nine people
21 are left. Perhaps have them raise their hand if they
22 would like to speak.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Can you see them? Because I
24 certainly can't.

25 If we have only nine, we can probably do it.

1 That's about less than a half an hour.

2 MS. MASER: It looks like only three people have
3 raised their hand, but we can't tell who.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Why don't we just go ahead and call
5 those nine people. And if they just wish to be
6 observers, so be it. And if not, they'll comment.

7 MS. MASER: Next up is Maren Mahoney.

8 MS. MAHONEY: Yes, hello. Thank you so much.

9 Good evening, Members. My name is Maren
10 Mahoney, and I am a resident of Phoenix.

11 I want to thank you for the opportunity to make
12 in comment in opposition to the SRP Coolidge Expansion
13 Project, which will cost ratepayers about \$1 million and
14 which was only approved by the SRP board by a slim
15 margin.

16 The Line Siting Committee should deny this
17 application for many reasons. I will speak to the
18 long-term water and air quality emissions impact this
19 expansion will have on local communities and natural
20 resource supplies.

21 Pinal County is facing a critical water storage
22 already. This plant will require long-term water
23 commitments, water that could be used by residents of
24 Randolph and Coolidge and other local areas.

25 Gas plants emit significant amounts of nitrous

1 oxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and carbon
2 dioxide. The people who live in the area of the plant
3 will bear the brunt of these emissions to their health
4 and to their property values.

5 It's not much of a coincidence that this plant
6 is sited in a historic Black community in a state where
7 the Black population is just 4.5 percent. Indeed, Black
8 communities through the U.S. are significantly greater
9 health burdens than communities that are majority white
10 due to power plant sitings in their communities.

11 I'll add that Arizona is already out of
12 compliance with federal air emission standards, even
13 without the expansion, and this is going to cost Arizona
14 billions of dollars. If Arizona is going to be an engine
15 of economic expansion, we are going to have to grapple
16 with this fact sooner or later.

17 And, finally, contrary to a previous commenter's
18 assertion, gas is not a more reliable resource that can
19 be relied on around the clock regardless of weather.
20 Both the California summer outage and the Texas winter
21 outage are were caused by gas failures. In California,
22 the gas plant tripped off unexpectedly. And in Texas,
23 the well stopped producing, as the commenter before me
24 pointed out also.

25 For these reasons and the reasons many of my

1 fellow commenters have made, I believe that SRP's
2 application for Certificate of Environmental
3 Compatibility should be denied.

4 Thank you again for this opportunity.

5 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you for your participation.

6 MS. MASER: Next up is Natalie Rae Pierson.

7 MS. PIERSON: Hello. My name is Natalie. I'm
8 just a grad student from NAU.

9 I will say briefly that I do oppose this
10 project. I couldn't say it any better than a classmate
11 Kelcie or the many others who oppose this project. I
12 wish more of the residents of Randolph would have been
13 here tonight to state their perspective because I believe
14 they deserve to be heard.

15 Thank you and have a good night.

16 CHMN. KATZ: You too. Thank you very much.

17 MS. MASER: Next up, Noah Humphrey.

18 MS. HUMPHREY: Yes. Thank you.

19 I would just like to say that I oppose this
20 project, and this is a prime example of needing to choose
21 a difficult right over an easy wrong. Many commission
22 members and people involved in the project directly know
23 what choice needs to be made for a sustainable future of
24 energy production and supply.

25 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly. Have a good

1 night.

2 MS. MASER: Next up is Richard Sigler.

3 CHMN. KATZ: Sigler.

4 MR. SIGLER: Can you hear me?

5 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, we can.

6 MR. SIGLER: I just want to say that fossil
7 fuels are basically a dinosaur, and we should not be
8 investing this kind of money in something that is going
9 to be obsolete in the next 30 years as well as harming
10 our health.

11 As far as the jobs go, I completely understand
12 people want jobs, definitely. But putting our emphasis
13 on jobs and fossil fuel projects is not going to be -- is
14 taking us back and not helping us move forward into the
15 future, which is the renewable energy sector.

16 So just as an example, when the steam shovel was
17 invented, it took a lot of jobs away from people who just
18 use a shovel. But does that mean we get rid of the steam
19 shovel? No. We adapt and try to find jobs in other
20 areas that the steam shovel could do.

21 So I'm all for people having jobs. But I think
22 putting your life and your job in the fossil fuel
23 industry is something that is obsolete. And for that
24 reason, I deny this -- the approval for this project.

25 Thank you.

1 CHMN. KATZ: And thank you for being with us.

2 MS. MASER: It looks like last up is Robert
3 Wall.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Robert Wall, please.

5 Mr. Wall, are you with us?

6 Yeah, you're with us now.

7 MR. WALL: Can you hear me?

8 CHMN. KATZ: Yes, sir.

9 MR. WALL: Good. Thank you. Good evening. My
10 name is Robert Wall. I live in Glendale, Arizona, and
11 for much of my adult life, I have been an SRP customer.

12 I'm an active member of the Franciscan Center
13 Care for Creation Ministry, and I'm also a member of the
14 Arizona Climate Action Coalition.

15 Being an Arizona resident and native, I'm deeply
16 troubled by the SRP board members' proposal to expand
17 this dangerous gas plant in Coolidge knowing full well
18 what we do today, like many of you, though I will not be
19 living in Arizona in the decades ahead. My grandchildren
20 and great-grandchildren should be, providing Arizona even
21 remains habitable.

22 Each of us know full well that what our
23 decisions today are will create the future for the next
24 generations of Arizona. We can no longer deny that we
25 hear the voices of prophets shouting loud and clear

1 across Arizona from the bone dry wells and receding
2 waters of both Lake Powell and Lake Mead, in the midst of
3 our worst recorded drought, in the midst of our rising
4 temperatures and rising heat and enduring the devastation
5 of increasing wildfires and forest fires. Besides seeing
6 it with our own eyes, the signs of the prophets are also
7 shouted from our world's top climate scientists.

8 We must no longer deny that the SRP expansion
9 would hasten to bring this dread prophecy into
10 fulfillment. We know that the expansion of these
11 proposed 16 units will harm public health, as has been
12 stated, or perpetuate injustice in using precious amounts
13 of our water in the neighboring Arizona communities and
14 across all of Arizona.

15 Expanding a large gas plant that uses precious
16 groundwater, pollutes our air, and harms our climate is
17 not sustainable. There are much cleaner, affordable, and
18 healthy energy-efficient options available, including
19 solar and wind. Because they are sustainable and protect
20 the environment, these options would create healthy
21 employment for Arizonans, and we would lower the cost of
22 citizens and business. They've really not even been
23 considered by the board. They need serious
24 consideration.

25 For this reason, I ask that the Siting Committee

1 deny the approval of the Certificate of Environmental
2 Compatibility for the expansion of the Coolidge
3 generation station.

4 Thank you much for listening to my concerns.

5 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much for expressing
6 them.

7 MS. MASER: Mr. Chairman, I misspoke. There's
8 four more people.

9 CHMN. KATZ: That's fine.

10 MS. MASER: First up is Mark Weathers.

11 CHMN. KATZ: Mr. Weathers.

12 MR. WEATHERS: Hi. My name is Mark Weathers.
13 I'm an SRP ratepayer in Phoenix.

14 I work in a manufacturing company that supports
15 a couple hundred people, and I'm a climate activist
16 because I have kids. I'm a father.

17 This is a very difficult decision. We
18 appreciate your time to listen to public opinion, and I
19 don't envy you having to make such a difficult decision.
20 There are clearly ramifications either way. After
21 listening to the testimony tonight, it's got to be very
22 tough.

23 But I urge you to remember that this is a
24 decision about environmental compatibility. To think of
25 spending a billion dollars in the sunniest state in the

1 country at this point in the evolution of climate change
2 is ridiculous. Somebody has got to take a stand and do
3 something. As leaders, I urge you to turn down this
4 proposal.

5 Ten or twenty years ago, it was very difficult
6 to believe that these effects were real, but they're
7 happening all around us every day. Right here in this
8 state, as we're speaking, there are fields that are not
9 planted because our farmers have water restrictions
10 because of what's happening with the climate.

11 Please do the right thing and deny the
12 environmental compatibility permit.

13 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you kindly for your
14 participation.

15 MS. MASER: Next up, Shelly Gordon.

16 MS. GORDON: Yes. Thank you. Thank you for the
17 opportunity to speak.

18 I, too, oppose the Coolidge Expansion Project.
19 First, I am an SRP customer. I'm concerned about this
20 \$900 million expansion that will be passed on to
21 ratepayers. That hasn't been discussed.

22 I attended the original board meeting where the
23 board rather quickly approved this project. It was like
24 a rubber stamp without board members having an
25 opportunity to review the project. That was the first

1 alarm for me.

2 This is a huge investment that the public should
3 have been allowed to weigh in on. Were there city
4 council meetings in Coolidge and Randolph to discuss
5 this? Ratepayers and the community should have a chance
6 to give feedback before this went for a vote to the SRP
7 board, which it didn't.

8 Secondly, utilities are the second biggest
9 source is of global warming after transportation. The
10 fact is that today was about 75 degrees in the month that
11 should be the coldest month of the year, even here in
12 Arizona. It has everything to do with carbon emissions
13 from fossil fuels and the methane leaks from natural gas.
14 Solar, wind, and storage are the antidote.

15 SRP has pledged to reduce carbon emissions by 60
16 percent by 2035 and by 90 percent by 2050 based on 2005
17 levels. How do you reconcile this nearly billion-dollar
18 investment in gas with your carbon emission reduction
19 goals.

20 SRP stated that with solar prices dropping about
21 80 percent in the past eight year, which was as of 2020,
22 and then took the opportunity to enter into solar power
23 purchase agreements that produce 1,000 megawatts of
24 renewable energy for more than 20 large commercial
25 customers. Apple for one, in Mesa, where I live, is

1 operating its campus with 100 percent renewable energy.
2 Why aren't there similar initiatives for residents and
3 businesses in our state in SRP territory?

4 And the other thing is natural gas is not
5 produced in Arizona. It has to be piped into the state
6 where energy from the sun is free and there are no
7 transportation requirements.

8 Million of tons -- we haven't really talked
9 about this -- well, one person did. Millions of tons of
10 methane are released into the atmosphere every year from
11 oil wells and gas plants.

12 A new report came out a few days ago that said
13 that oil and gas companies are routinely venting huge
14 amounts of methane into the air. Most of those are
15 focused on carbon emissions, not methane. But methane
16 traps 90 times more heat than CO2 and breaks up quickly .
17 Actually, much faster than CO2. So the best way to
18 attack climate change is to reduce or plug up methane
19 emissions. Obviously, this project is doing just the
20 opposite.

21 There's also new evidence that shows that oil
22 and gas companies are routinely venting huge amounts of
23 methane into the air. There are satellites that can see
24 what's happening. And as somebody earlier stated, gas
25 production is about to exceed the emissions of coal

1 production. How is this project going to prevent methane
2 leaks?

3 Thank you for your time.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

5 Next, if we have someone.

6 MS. MASER: Next up is MaryAnn -- I'm not
7 pronouncing her last name either.

8 MS. GRAFFAGNINO: That's okay. My name is
9 MaryAnn Graffagnino, and I am a climate activist.

10 And I am grateful for the excellent information
11 and statistics given by the many opponents to this bill,
12 the lack of transparency of this project. And I'm
13 particularly struck by this is a red alert for humanity
14 and the fact that other options have not been looked
15 into.

16 So, therefore, I do ask that the Siting
17 Committee deny the approval of the Certificate of
18 Environmental Compatibility for the Coolidge Expansion
19 Project.

20 Thank you very much.

21 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you very much.

22 MS. MASER: Next up is Peggy Chaikin.

23 CHMN. KATZ: Ms. Chaikin.

24 MS. CHAIKIN: Hello. Thank you so much. Good
25 evening. My name is Peggy Chaikin. I'm a retired

1 teacher of young children of special needs and a
2 grandparent. I live in Northern Arizona. Thank you for
3 this opportunity. I'm a trustee of Keep Sedona Beautiful
4 and volunteer with the Northern Environment Climate
5 Change Alliance.

6 We are working as a coalition to help reduce
7 Sedona's carbon footprint and produce our action plan
8 goal of 50 percent reduction in carbon by 2030.

9 I spend my time learning, like I am tonight, and
10 working to protect the well-being of current and future
11 Arizonans. You can help all Arizonans achieve a future
12 with reduced carbon by denying the Certificate of
13 Environmental Compatibility for the Coolidge Expansion
14 Project.

15 Times have changed since gas was considered a
16 clean source of energy bridging. Change is on the
17 horizon. SRP needs to present alternatives to the plan
18 and embrace healthy change. Arizona needs to commit to
19 investment in our most plentiful resource, solar energy,
20 instead of fossil fuels.

21 Now is the time. Your denial of this
22 certificate will help the community of Randolph and other
23 communities help escape water-wasting, climate altering
24 practices. Please deny the certificate.

25 Thank you so much to all of you who have

1 participated. I've learned so much from all of you, and
2 I appreciate your patience and listening to the
3 community. Thank you so much.

4 CHMN. KATZ: Thank you so much.

5 MS. MASER: We have one more, Stacey Champion.

6 MS. CHAMPION: Hello to the Power Plant and Line
7 Siting Committee, and thank you for allowing us this time
8 to make public comments.

9 I hope you were especially paying attention to
10 the residents of Randolph, who are most directly impacted
11 by this inane and backward methane gas expansion by SRP.

12 This is truly an environmental justice travesty.
13 Is SRP willing to pay for every medical bill for every
14 Randolph and Coolidge resident, including those who
15 experience premature births, methane gas pollution for
16 the duration of these people's lives? My guess is no.
17 But perhaps you could ask SRP for me.

18 Please deny SRP the Certificate of Environmental
19 Compatibility for the Coolidge Expansion Project. And
20 shame on SRP.

21 Thanks, and have a nice evening.

22 CHMN. KATZ: Thanks, and you as well.

23 Is there anybody that we called on earlier that
24 wasn't able to connect that now is listening to us and
25 wants to say anything?

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN. KATZ: I think we've exhausted the
3 participants in this matter. It's been a long session.
4 I appreciate the input from various community members.
5 This isn't going to be an easy decision for any of us to
6 reach. I wish we could wave a wand and live in a
7 completely healthy environment.

8 That being said, we'll stand in recess until
9 9:00 tomorrow morning. Feel free to Zoom in or come in
10 to the proceedings and observe the continuing testimony,
11 because I think all of us on the Committee have a lot yet
12 to learn from a number of witnesses being called by the
13 respective parties.

14 We do stand in recess. Everybody take care, and
15 we'll see you tomorrow morning.

16 (The hearing recessed at 7:18 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
)
 2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

3 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were
 taken before me; that the foregoing pages are a full,
 4 true, and accurate record of the proceedings, all done to
 the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings
 5 were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced
 to print under my direction.
 6

7 I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the
 parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the
 outcome hereof.
 8

9 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical
 obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and
 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) and (2). Dated at Phoenix,
 10 Arizona, this 18th day of February, 2022.

11

12

13



14

CAROLYN T. SULLIVAN
 Arizona Certified Reporter
 No. 50528

15

16

17

18 I CERTIFY that COASH & COASH, INC., has complied
 with the ethical obligations set forth in
 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) through (6).
 19


19

20

21

22

23



24

COASH & COASH, INC.
 Arizona Registered Firm
 No. R1036

25