

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT LS-397

2 AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

3

4 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION )DOCKET NO.  
 4 OF SALT RIVER PROJECT )L-00000B-24-0223-00239  
 AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT AND )  
 5 POWER DISTRICT, IN CONFORMANCE )LS CASE NO. 239  
 WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA )  
 6 REVISED STATUTES §40-360, ET )  
 SEQ., FOR A CERTIFICATE OF )  
 7 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY )  
 AUTHORIZING THE SOUTH MOUNTAIN )  
 8 TRANSMISSION PROJECT, WHICH )  
 INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO )  
 9 NEW 230 KV DOUBLE-CIRCUIT )  
 TRANSMISSION LINES THAT WILL )  
 10 INTERCONNECT THE EXISTING )  
 DOUBLE-CIRCUIT ANDERSON-ORME )  
 11 TRANSMISSION LINE TO A NEW )  
 SUBSTATION, EACH LOCATED WITHIN )  
 12 THE CITY OF PHOENIX, MARICOPA )  
 COUNTY, ARIZONA. )EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
 13 \_\_\_\_\_ )

14 At: Laveen Village, Arizona

15 Date: November 14, 2024

16 Filed: November 19, 2024

17

18 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

19

VOLUME III  
(Pages 446 through 681)

20

21

22

GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC  
Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing  
1555 East Orangewood Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85020  
602.266.6535 admin@glennie-reporting.com

23

24

25

By: Jennifer Honn, RPR  
Arizona CR No. 50558

GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC 602.266.6535  
www.glennie-reporting.com Phoenix, AZ

1	VOLUME I	November 12, 2024	Pages 1 to 233
	VOLUME II	November 13, 2024	Pages 224 to 445
2	VOLUME III	November 14, 2024	Pages 446 to 681

3

4

INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

5	ITEM	PAGE
6	Opening Statement of Mr. Derstine	10
7	Opening Statement of Ms. De Blasi	26
8	Presentation of Virtual Tour	194
9	Public Comment Session	223
10	Closing Statement of Mr. Derstine	553
11	Closing Statement of Ms. De Blasi	561
12	Deliberations	563
13	Vote	676

14

15

16

INDEX TO THE TOUR

17	STOP	PAGE
18	1	241
	2	276
19	3	286
	4	288
20	5	314

21

22

23

24

25

1 INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

2 WITNESSES PAGE

3 Zack Heim, Rick Hernandez, Kenda Pollio, and  
 4 Samantha Horgen - for the Applicant

5 Direct Examination By Mr. Derstine and Ms. Gilbert 32

6 Troy Freeman - for Banner Health

7 Direct Examination By Ms. De Blasi 521

8

9

10

11

12 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

13 NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
14 BH-1	Testimony Summary of Troy Freeman	28	550
15 BH-2	Witness Presentation	28	550
16 BRIO-1	Notice of Limited Appearance	29	29
17 SRP-1	Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility filed September 26, 2024 - title page only	90	520
18			
19			
20 SRP-2	Witness Summary of Zack Heim	--	520
21 SRP-3	Witness Summary of Rick Hernandez	--	520
22 SRP-4	Witness Summary of Kenda Pollio	--	520
23			
24 SRP-5	Witness Summary of Samantha Horgen	--	520
25 //			

## 1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
3	SRP-6	Slide Deck - Left Screen	333	520
4	SRP-7	Slide Deck - Right Screen	333	520
5	SRP-8	Affidavits of Publication of Notice of Hearings	415	520
6				
7	SRP-9	Proof of Service to Affected Jurisdictions	415	520
8	SRP-10	Map of Sign Locations and Notice of Hearing Sign	415	520
9				
10	SRP-11	Tribal Responses	376	520
11	SRP-12	SRP's Proposed Certificate of Environmental Compatibility	416	520
12	SRP-13	Proposed Route Tour Schedule and Map	415	520
13				
14	SRP-14	SRP's Responses to Staff's 1st Set of Data Requests (does not include the confidential attachment)	518	520
15				
16	SRP-15	Confirmation of Delivery of Application to Libraries	415	520
17				
18	SRP-16	Letter from Chairman to ACC Staff re Project	518	520
19	SRP-17	ACC Staff Response	518	520
20	SRP-18	Public Involvement Summary through November 6, 2024	148	520
21				
22	SRP-19	Proof of Website Posting	415	520
23	SRP-20	Social Media Posting	415	520
24	SRP-21	Additional Mailings made after filing of the CEC Application	415	520
25	//			

1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
3	SRP-22	Letter from City of Phoenix dated November 7, 2024	163	520
4	SRP-23	Letter from Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce dated November 7, 2024	412	520
5				
6	SRP-24	Letter from Great Phoenix Economic Council dated November 3, 2024	412	520
7				
8	SRP-25	Communication with Arizona Department of Transportation	453	520
9				
10	SRP-26	Industrial Land Use Map	453	520
11	SRP-27	Preferred Project Map	453	520
12	SRP-28	Letter from Greater Phoenix Chamber dated November 8, 2024	454	520
13				
14	SRP-29	Letter from Arizona Chamber of Commerce & Industry dated November 11, 2024	454	520
15				
16	CHMN-1	Proposed Form of CEC	587	For Reference
17	CHMN-2	CEC with Edits	587	For Reference

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
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 15091 South Komatke Lane, Laveen Village,  
5 Arizona, commencing at 9:21 a.m. on November 14, 2024.

6

7 BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Chairman

8 GABRIELA S. MERCER, Arizona Corporation Commission  
9 LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality  
10 DAVID FRENCH, Arizona Department of Water Resources  
(via videoconference)  
11 NICOLE HILL, Governor's Office of Energy Policy  
12 R. DAVID KRYDER, Agricultural Interests  
13 ROMAN FONTES, Counties (via videoconference)  
14 MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public  
(via videoconference)  
15 JOHN GOLD, General Public

16 APPEARANCES:

17 For the Applicant:

18 Matt Derstine  
19 SNELL & WILMER  
20 One East Washington Street  
21 Suite 2700  
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

23 and

24 Alysha Y. Gilbert, Esq.  
25 SALT RIVER PROJECT AGRICULTURAL IMPROVEMENT  
AND POWER DISTRICT  
P.o. Box 52025, PAB381  
Phoenix, Arizona 85072

26

27

28 //

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 For Banner Health:

3 Michelle De Blasi  
4 LAW OFFICE OF MICHELLE DE BLASI  
5 7702 East Doubletree Ranch Road  
6 Suite 300  
7 Scottsdale, Arizona 85258  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the  
2 record.

3 Mr. Derstine, I believe you had little more  
4 direct testimony for us.

5 MR. DERSTINE: I do.

6 Good morning, Chairman, Members.

7 I'll give you maybe a walk-through of where  
8 we're going to go here. We have had a couple additional  
9 exhibits that were marked overnight. SRP-25 are the  
10 e-mails that we agreed to copy and mark as an exhibit.  
11 And we're going to cover those with Mr. Hernandez here on  
12 his discussions with ADOT since, well, going back several  
13 months over the potential for using the retention basin  
14 on the east side, which would be our S4 route. And then  
15 so that's marked as SRP-25.

16 SRP-26 is the -- is what makes Mr. Heim  
17 very happy in terms of his new map that we looked at  
18 yesterday on the screen, and it's marked as an  
19 Exhibit SRP-26. And he wanted me to acknowledge for the  
20 record that it was helpful, and it was.

21 We have SRP-28, which is -- 27, I  
22 apologize, which is simply a revised map that we'd like  
23 the committee to consider as an exhibit to the CEC when  
24 we get there.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: I have to say,



1 Mr. Derstine, I do like this exhibit. This is what I was  
2 contemplating asking for from you.

3 MR. DERSTINE: All right.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: This is much clearer and I  
5 think very helpful. Thank you.

6 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. Good. I'm glad to  
7 hear that.

8 I will simply say that I had nothing to do  
9 with it, but the good folks on our team are good to  
10 reading the room and hearing your concerns, and so we  
11 made an effort to come up with a simpler exhibit for the  
12 CEC.

13 And then Exhibits SRP-28 and 29 are  
14 additional letters of support which just for the project  
15 just came in. SRP-28 is a letter dated November 8 from  
16 the Greater Phoenix chamber.

17 And SRP-29, Arizona Chamber of Commerce &  
18 Industry, which I guess is a separate chamber,  
19 Ms. Horgen?

20 MS. HORGEN: Yes.

21 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. So both of those are  
22 new letters of support from two of our area chambers of  
23 commerce. So we submitted those for the record, again,  
24 marked SRP-28 and 29.

25 //

1 BY MR. DERSTINE:

2 Q. So, you know, at the close of the hearing  
3 yesterday, Mr. Hernandez, we had Member Little raised her  
4 concern that we were too quick to give up -- my words. I  
5 don't think those were hers, but I think words to that  
6 effect on the route along the east side of the 202, which  
7 we've -- is marked as or identified as S4. That's the  
8 potential for routing the transmission line from Node D  
9 up to G up to I and up to K along the east side of the  
10 202 and the retention basin.

11 And you indicated that you had had ongoing  
12 discussions with ADOT about that route option and trying  
13 to get ADOT to consider and approve utilizing that route.  
14 And so we ask that you go back to your -- pull up your  
15 e-mails documenting your communications with ADOT, and  
16 that's what's collected. We've got multiple pages. And  
17 I didn't count them, but multiple pages that have been  
18 marked collectively as SRP-25.

19 Rather than -- so starting at the back I think  
20 is the earliest communication that we've copied as part  
21 of SRP-25, but I think you even had communications going  
22 back earlier. But we started there because that outlined  
23 the options that are referenced in later communications  
24 with ADOT.

25 Do that I have right?

1 A. (Mr. Hernandez) That is correct.

2 Q. Rather than have you walk through every page --

3 MR. DERSTINE: And let me just ask,  
4 Mr. Chairman, in terms of the members who are appearing  
5 virtually, have they received SRP-25?

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, they have.

7 Member Little, you have your hand raised.

8 MEMBER LITTLE: I do. I can't open SRP-25  
9 in the e-mail that Tod sent. I can open the maps. I  
10 can't open the -- that particular exhibit. Not sure why.  
11 Maybe too big. I don't know.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. I'll text Tod  
13 and see what he can do.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Let me try my other  
15 computer too. Of course, it refreshed and --

16 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, would it be  
17 helpful if we pulled it up on the screen and just kind of  
18 narrated the conversation?

19 CHMN STAFFORD: I think it's -- how many  
20 pages is it, like 20 or something? I think there's --

21 MR. DERSTINE: 45 pages.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I think just  
23 probably a few pages -- because I looked through it and I  
24 think the one that was probably most interested to see is  
25 the one where the ADOT says that they don't want it for

1 that segment from D to K, the S4 route.

2 MR. DERSTINE: That's right. That's --  
3 that was kind of the main takeaway.

4 But as Mr. Hernandez can go through and  
5 kind of summarize those discussions maybe while Member  
6 Little's trying to get the document open.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Can you pull that up on the  
8 screen?

9 MR. DERSTINE: I think we can. Let me ask  
10 the -- I'm seeing nods.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

12 MEMBER LITTLE: I do -- I did open it on my  
13 other computer, so --

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Problem solved. Thank you.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: I got it.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: All right.

17 MR. DERSTINE: All right. Very good.

18 Well, and we'll -- I'll have -- Member  
19 Little, I will have Mr. Hernandez kind of speak to the  
20 kind of the high points in that chronology of  
21 communications that's contained in SRP-25.

22 And then if you have any specific questions  
23 about particular e-mails or portions of e-mails, we're  
24 happy to address those.

25 //

1 BY MR. DERSTINE:

2 Q. So, Mr. Hernandez, can you kind of give us the  
3 high-level walk-through of the 45 pages that make up  
4 SRP-25 in your chronology of communications with ADOT.

5 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Sure. And I'll take one  
6 step -- one step back before we even engaged ADOT in any  
7 discussion regarding either the utilization of their  
8 right-of-way or even crossing the right-of-way.

9 So early on in the project prior to the public  
10 process, which started in late May of this year, we had  
11 actually considered the ADOT right-of-way, both the west  
12 and the east side of the ADOT right-of-way, as a  
13 potential alignment for the project for one or two  
14 transmission lines.

15 And based on our initial analysis, we felt it  
16 was just too constrained on both sides of the freeway  
17 really because the west side was very narrow in terms of  
18 available right-of-way, and the east side was occupied  
19 mostly with drainage channels or retention areas.

20 And so we did not -- we made a decision at that  
21 point -- again, this would have been spring of this  
22 year -- not to move forward with an option presented on  
23 the map that was going to be presented before the public  
24 as part of the public process for them to consider an  
25 option along the right-of-way because of that reason.

1 And so after the Phase 1 public process started,  
2 we quickly learned from the community that they had  
3 interest in us at least considering an alignment along  
4 the ADOT right-of-way.

5 And so that's really where the engagement with  
6 ADOT began. We reached out to ADOT in early June. This  
7 would have been -- or mid-June after the first series of  
8 virtual open houses and were able to get a meeting  
9 scheduled with ADOT June 21.

10 On June 21, we talked about three options that  
11 we presented to ADOT. Those options are attached, and  
12 I've got them flagged. I don't think they're numbered,  
13 but they're in the back of Exhibit 25. They are  
14 described as Option Number 1, Option Number 2, and Option  
15 Number 3.

16 Option Number 1 includes us --

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Which dates are you looking  
18 at, Rick? So I can catch up with you.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Which dates or which pages?

20 MEMBER KRYDER: Dates on the e-mails.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: So that was dated June 21.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Thanks.

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: The attachments we  
24 reference on that June 21 e-mail in regard to Options 1,  
25 2, and 3 are included as part of Exhibit 25 are in the

1 back. They kind of look like these aerial site plans.

2 And so I'll describe at a high level  
3 Options 1, 2, and 3 that presented.

4 MR. DERSTINE: And, Mr. Hernandez, for the  
5 record within SRP-25 you're directing our attention to  
6 your e-mail dated June 21, 2024, which I'm being told the  
7 first 31 pages are numbered, and that's page 29 in the  
8 PDF stack. And then after the 31st page, they're kind of  
9 a separate PDF.

10 But did you find that?

11 MEMBER HILL: I did. Thank you,  
12 Mr. Derstine.

13 I do actually think this is a situation  
14 where it would be nice to show the page that you're  
15 referencing on the screen just so we're all on the same  
16 page.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little, you have  
18 your hand up.

19 Is that from before, or do you have another  
20 question?

21 MEMBER LITTLE: No. That's from before.  
22 Sorry. I got too many screens open here --

23 CHMN STAFFORD: We've all been there.

24 MEMBER LITTLE: -- to see what I am on.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: If you don't mind, I'd like

1 to correct the record.

2 I stated we met on June 21. The e-mail was  
3 sent on June 21. The actual meeting occurred on June 7.

4 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: And the e-mail capturing  
6 what was discussed was sent on June 21, including the  
7 attachments I just referenced in SRP-25.

8 BY MR. DERSTINE:

9 Q. Okay. So I think we're -- the AV team is making  
10 an effort to pull that up.

11 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So as they're pulling up the  
12 e-mail on the screen, I'll just quickly kind of summarize  
13 what was discussed in the meeting.

14 And so as noted on the e-mail image in front of  
15 you, I remind ADOT that we are looking at constructing  
16 two separate 230kV transmission lines. And our ask is  
17 for them to consider the three options presented.

18 I was hopeful that they would agree to two of  
19 the three options presented knowing that we needed two  
20 transmission lines. But I also state in the body of that  
21 e-mail, and it may be at the -- towards the bottom of the  
22 e-mail that at a minimum we need at least one option  
23 approved by ADOT to continue to move forward with the  
24 project.

25 Q. An option that allows for one transmission line



1 at a minimum.

2 You asked for two, but you're saying at minimum  
3 I need one?

4 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Correct.

5 Q. Okay.

6 A. (Mr. Hernandez) And so we provided three  
7 attachments describing three different scenarios.

8 Option 1, the first attachment, would include  
9 building a transmission line, a double-circuit  
10 transmission line, on private property hugging the  
11 western boundary of their western right-of-way.

12 The attachment shows the poles approximately  
13 located about 10 feet off their fence line, which would  
14 mean the conductors would essentially hang over aerially  
15 into their right-of-way. And we would need to utilize  
16 their right-of-way to maintain our line. That's Option  
17 Number 1.

18 Option Number 2 also on the west side of the  
19 Loop 202 freeway would require the poles being actually  
20 located in their right-of-way. The difference between  
21 this option when compared to Option Number 1 is not only  
22 the location of the poles but how the conductors would  
23 hang on the poles.

24 For Option Number 2 we had proposed to place the  
25 conductors on the west side of the poles essentially

1 hanging over into private property, so reverse from  
2 Option Number 1.

3 The last option -- I'm sorry, was there a  
4 question?

5 The last option, Option Number 3, would require  
6 us constructing a transmission line, a single  
7 double-circuit transmission line, on the east side of the  
8 freeway and within the ADOT right-of-way.

9 Initially in June on June 7 when we had  
10 discussed this, we had talked about placing the poles --  
11 I'm sorry, we had talked about building the transmission  
12 line only between Dobbins -- Dobbins Road and the LACC.  
13 That was Option Number 3.

14 Q. So I want to make sure I'm understanding and I'm  
15 not necessarily reading as we go along. Option 1 and 2  
16 or options that addressed placing the line on the east  
17 side of the 202 --

18 A. (Mr. Hernandez) On the west side of the 202.

19 Q. Option 1 and 2 are both on the west side of the  
20 202?

21 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Correct.

22 Q. And Option 3 is on the east side?

23 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Correct.

24 Q. Okay.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Is Option Number 3 the one  
3 that was mentioned yesterday that was brought up in  
4 conversations with the school district and the person  
5 that's on the planning committee from the -- where the  
6 crossing would be at FG?

7 MR. DERSTINE: It looks like Ms. Horgen can  
8 address that.

9 MS. HORGEN: Member Little, she was  
10 bringing up the crossing on Dobbins at E, F. That's one  
11 of the --

12 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. I think that's  
13 called basically Option Number 3 right between -- well,  
14 it would be, excuse me, on the east side between Dobbins  
15 and --

16 MS. HORGEN: It would be east of the Loop  
17 202, or is that what you're saying?

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. It would be. That's  
19 what they were suggesting; right?

20 MS. HORGEN: She was saying E to F and then  
21 stay on the left side or the west side of the Loop 202.

22 MEMBER LITTLE: Oh, oh. My apologies.  
23 Thank you for clarifying that for me.

24 MS. HORGEN: Sure.

25 //

1 BY MR. DERSTINE:

2 Q. Okay. So you had a meeting on the 7th. You  
3 then followed up on that meeting on the 7th with your  
4 e-mail of June 21 that kind of reconfirmed the options  
5 that you had presented to ADOT in that meeting.

6 Where was your next point of contact or next  
7 time of communication?

8 And can you summarize that?

9 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So the next time we heard back  
10 from ADOT would have been on August 5th, and ADOT's  
11 response -- and I'll reference what page that's on --  
12 that is on page 15 of SRP-25.

13 And ADOT's response was essentially they would  
14 be open to supporting Option Number 1.

15 Q. And, again, Option Number 1 is what?

16 A. (Mr. Hernandez) The locating one double-circuit  
17 transmission line west of their right-of-way but  
18 overhanging into their right-of-way, which would allow us  
19 to minimize the footprint to the private property owners  
20 west of the 202.

21 Q. So, again, Option 1 deals with the transmission  
22 line on the west side of the 202, and you're talking  
23 about that ADOT was supportive of placing it along the  
24 west side of their right-of-way on the west side of the  
25 202?

1 A. (Mr. Hernandez) That is correct.

2 They also stated that they had concerns about  
3 Options 2 and 3, which was the option within the  
4 right-of-way on the west side of the 202 for Option 2 for  
5 a transmission line. And Option 3 being a transmission  
6 line located within their right-of-way on the east side  
7 of the 202.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So at that point, we internally  
10 decided because we were up against a pretty -- a pretty  
11 tight deadline at that point in terms of finalizing our  
12 maps that would be generated to go public for the second  
13 phase of open houses that we had scheduled in late  
14 September and early to mid -- I'm sorry, late August and  
15 early to mid October.

16 And so we were at a point where we really had to  
17 make a decision internally do we continue to, you know,  
18 pursue this with ADOT, or do we pause at this point and  
19 move forward with representing Option Number 1 on the  
20 maps?

21 And we decided with the latter. Let's move  
22 forward with updating the maps and presenting Option 1 to  
23 the public, which is essentially the S3 or S5 route,  
24 which is, you know, the transmission line on the west  
25 side of the 202.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So we entered the second phase  
3 of the public process. And I'm looking over at  
4 Ms. Horgen because I don't recall of -- I want to say  
5 those events occurred in late August and early September.

6 A. (Ms. Horgen) September.

7 A. (Mr. Hernandez) And so, again, after going  
8 through the second phase of the public process, learning  
9 about -- hearing again from the community in regards to,  
10 you know, why isn't, you know, SRP looking at placing  
11 their transmission line on the east side of the 202, we  
12 then regrouped and decided to propose route S4 to ADOT,  
13 which is captured in the e-mail dated September 20, which  
14 is page -- starts at the bottom of 12 and continues on to  
15 page 13.

16 And in this e-mail, I describe that as part of  
17 the public process, you know, we decided to add that  
18 additional S4 route on the east side of the 202.

19 And I go on to describe what that S4 route  
20 alignment looks like, how long it is, and where it could  
21 potentially be located within their eastern side of the  
22 right-of-way.

23 That S4 route map that was attached to that  
24 e-mail is also included in SRP-25 and is -- it is not  
25 numbered, but it looks similar -- there it is. That is

1 the map that I included as an attachment in my e-mail to  
2 ADOT on September 20 describing how we plan on moving  
3 forward with the S4 route for consideration and would  
4 like ADOT to provide input in regard to the possibility  
5 of constructing that route.

6 BY MR. DERSTINE:

7 Q. And I think the members who are looking at the  
8 PDF of SRP-25, I think that's on page 42. If you have a  
9 paper copy, I'm not sure there is a page number. There  
10 is not.

11 But we have it up here on the screen in the  
12 hearing room.

13 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So that was September 20.

14 I eventually heard back from ADOT on October 10.  
15 That is page 9 of the SRP-25.

16 And ADOT's response was based on their internal  
17 review they could not support a transmission line in the  
18 right-of-way, especially on the east side along the  
19 drainage channel.

20 And, again, that was in response to the entire  
21 S4 route from the LACC to Olney Avenue as we had  
22 represented on the map, so essentially between Nodes D,  
23 G, I, and K. They were not in favor of that entire  
24 length within the right-of-way.

25 So that was on October 10. And so that same day

1 I responded to ADOT on October 10 asking them if they  
2 would -- if they would consider a shorter segment in the  
3 right-of-way and not the entirety of S4 route being  
4 between Nodes D, G, I, and K, but would it consider a  
5 shorter segment between Nodes I and K.

6 I sent several exhibits. I sent  
7 several exhibits. I sent, sorry, several maps depicting  
8 what that could potentially look like.

9 On the screen in front of you is a snapshot of a  
10 KMZ file identifying that there would be a total of three  
11 poles located within ADOT right-of-way between Nodes I  
12 and K.

13 I also sent an aerial highlighting -- I think it  
14 might be the next page -- an aerial highlighting -- it's  
15 actually included in the e-mail string. It wasn't an  
16 attachment. It was actually a snapshot in the body of  
17 one of the e-mails. Let me see if we can find it on  
18 the -- there it is. Yep. If you can go back to it.

19 So I sent this attachment really kind of  
20 highlighting the green line and where that shorter  
21 segment of S4 essentially Nodes I and K would reside in  
22 the right-of-way along the east side of the freeway  
23 highlighted in green there.

24 And I also showed what the red line being the  
25 second transmission line out on the west side of the



1 freeway could look like if we were to construct one on  
2 the west and one on the east.

3 And I described in my mail on October 10 to them  
4 that the reasoning for -- for wanting to, you know, place  
5 a transmission line on the east side was to minimize the  
6 impacts to those three developments on the west side of  
7 the 202. Those three developments being the future  
8 Laveen elementary school, the future multifamily  
9 development, and the Banner Health complex as noted on  
10 the image in front of you.

11 There was some communication between ADOT and  
12 myself after I sent that e-mail. It was via phone calls  
13 regarding getting a meeting scheduled to talk more about  
14 this last proposition I had floated in front of ADOT  
15 being the shorter segment between Nodes I and K.

16 We eventually had a meeting -- we eventually  
17 were able to sync up calendars and met on November 5 to  
18 talk about this option.

19 On page 1 of SRP-25, towards the bottom of the  
20 page, is ADOT's response to the meeting that occurred on  
21 November 5.

22 In short, they essentially asked for me to do  
23 further analysis to work with a firm, a local engineering  
24 firm, that they had recommended that I work with to  
25 perform a full drainage study and to produce some

1 preliminary designs showing what level of modifications  
2 would be completed to accommodate a transmission line  
3 within their right-of-way but also keep adequate space  
4 for them to maintain that drainage channel.

5           And I did want to mention that the firm that  
6 they had recommended that I work with was a firm that  
7 they had recommended early on in our conversations with  
8 ADOT. And, in fact, I had asked that firm to produce  
9 some preliminary analysis looking at the drainage channel  
10 along the east side of the freeway between the LACC and  
11 Olney Avenue and to determine whether or not it would  
12 even be feasible to modify that drainage channel in any  
13 way to accommodate a new transmission line.

14           The firm did perform that preliminary analysis.  
15 And the results of the analysis are shown on page 12.  
16 And I shared this with ADOT, I believe, on September 26.  
17 So after I had sent them the last request to consider the  
18 S4 route on September 20, a few days later, I did follow  
19 up with them and shared the preliminary analysis results  
20 from the firm.

21           In summary, the engineering firm felt that  
22 ADOT's drainage system had ample -- how do I best  
23 describe this -- was oversized -- was oversized and could  
24 be further reduced to accommodate a wider access road.  
25 Again, that was on September 26.

1           Obviously ADOT considered that before replying  
2 to me on October 10 stating they were still not  
3 comfortable with a transmission line being located within  
4 their right-of-way between the LACC and the Olney Avenue,  
5 so essentially between Nodes D, G, I, and K.

6           Q.    And where is that captured where ADOT said  
7 they're still not comfortable between Nodes other than  
8 Nodes I and K?

9           A.    (Mr. Hernandez) So that is -- that is page 1.  
10 That is towards the bottom of page 1 where they summarize  
11 that they met and in short -- I'm sorry, that is not  
12 page 1. That is page 9, October 10. "Based on our  
13 review and input, ADOT cannot support the line going in  
14 our right-of-way, especially in the east side along the  
15 drainage channel." That was September 10.

16                   But, again, I responded September -- oh, no,  
17 on -- I'm sorry, October 10. I responded October 10  
18 asking them to consider a shorter version of the S4  
19 route. In which they were open to hearing. And we  
20 discussed it on November 5. And we left off with ADOT  
21 asking us, SRP, to perform further analysis using the J2  
22 design firm, the local engineering firm, to further look  
23 at what it would take to modify that drainage area to  
24 accommodate the transmission line.

25           Q.    Okay. So based on your testimony and what we're

1 looking at in your communications with ADOT shown and  
2 collected in SRP-25, you've had ongoing communications  
3 with ADOT.

4 They initially rejected any use of the east  
5 retention basin on the east side of the 202 for this  
6 project.

7 You went back to them with what about between --  
8 if we limit the use of the east side between I and K?  
9 They still have not said yes to that. They've told you  
10 to go back and do some more engineering studies and more  
11 detailed work but that they haven't closed the door  
12 between I and K.

13 But they have gone back and, again, expressed  
14 their view that they don't want us on the east side south  
15 of I traveling down to Node G and then to Node D.

16 Do I have that right?

17 A. (Mr. Hernandez) That is correct.

18 They were opposed to the idea of a longer  
19 segment within their right-of-way, which would include  
20 Nodes I to G to D.

21 They're open to the idea of a shorter segment,  
22 which would include Nodes I to K.

23 Q. And the reasoning that you have heard back from  
24 ADOT on their opposition to utilizing the east side of  
25 the 202 between D to G to I is what?

1           A.     (Mr. Hernandez) Two reasons. They were  
2 concerned that the road -- the access road that I'd asked  
3 for was too wide and would require us to modify those  
4 retention basins as such as that they would be losing a  
5 lot of volume because we'd have to essentially extend the  
6 existing roadway along the east side of the boundary,  
7 which varies.

8                     We don't have an exact dimension, but based on  
9 Google Earth, based on what we've seen out in the field,  
10 I would say that those -- that narrow road varies between  
11 12 feet upwards to 20 to 25 feet. It does vary. A lot  
12 of it because the erosion that's occurring in that area.

13                     And so by extending that road wider we had asked  
14 for a road as wide as 80 feet to accommodate the  
15 placement of equipment and trucks that would be needed to  
16 maintain the line.

17                     And ADOT's concern was that if we -- if they  
18 allowed that, that we would reduce that drainage channel  
19 as such that it would not be able to accommodate the  
20 necessary volume that they need for the area. That was  
21 their first concern.

22                     Their second concern was the placement of  
23 transmission poles within the right-of-way could limit  
24 the -- or make it difficult to perform the maintenance  
25 that they do periodically on that drainage channel. I'm

1 not sure what type of equipment they use or size of that  
2 equipment, but they felt that placing transmission poles  
3 could inhibit the ongoing maintenance -- the ongoing  
4 planned maintenance of that channel, specifically in this  
5 segment.

6 Q. Okay. At the end of the day, this is ADOT  
7 right-of-way, and we would have to have their permission  
8 in order to construct along the retention basin whether  
9 it's on the east side or the west side of the 202; right?

10 A. (Mr. Hernandez) That is correct. We'd have to  
11 be there by permit.

12 Q. Okay.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill, you had a  
14 question?

15 MEMBER HILL: Thanks for walking us through  
16 the exhibit. It was a lot to try to digest this morning  
17 just flipping through the pages.

18 So it looks like on page -- oh, forgive me.  
19 I'll get there. So it does look like on page 9 you kind  
20 of got the final answer from ADOT; is that correct,  
21 Mr. Hernandez?

22 He just said based on their review and  
23 input we can't support this right-of-way, but he didn't  
24 articulate the rationale for that.

25 Do I understand that right?

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

2 So what ADOT put in writing was very short,  
3 and it didn't really summarize their concerns.

4 The phone call that I made immediately  
5 after receiving this e-mail, I got further insight around  
6 the concerns I just mentioned in regards to maintenance  
7 of the channel and also the concern about widening that  
8 road to the full extent that we needed it and the  
9 potential impact it could have on the volume for that  
10 channel.

11 MEMBER HILL: Okay. That's helpful.

12 And I just really want to create a record  
13 around this more than anything because I -- it's  
14 impossible for us to -- we weren't there for the  
15 conversations.

16 I just want to confirm that ADOT asked you  
17 to reach out to J2 Designs and talk with this  
18 Mr. Holzmeister for review of the Olney to the Laveen  
19 Area Conveyance Channel for an assessment of whether or  
20 not a transmission line could go in there. And I think  
21 the results of that is on page 12; is that right?

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

23 MEMBER HILL: So their preferred engineer  
24 and who they kind of wanted to take a first look at this  
25 indicated that, number one, the system has significant

1 excess storage volume, so encroaching into the channel or  
2 basin shouldn't be an issue.

3 So the volume issue, the preferred engineer  
4 didn't come to the same conclusion that staff came to  
5 that several poles in the side of the slope of the  
6 channel, if you needed the 50-foot radius, could be set  
7 up. You may need a culvert or route flow around that  
8 setup zone. They need a little more detail, but it  
9 didn't seem inconceivable.

10 That poles in the basin would not be an  
11 issue. There's plenty of excess storage. There's more  
12 commentary on excess storage there.

13 I just keep looking at this list and  
14 thinking their preferred engineer, who you guys reached  
15 out to, and they wanted them to do that analysis  
16 generally just asked a few more questions but made it  
17 sound really feasible in these remarks. That's my  
18 observation.

19 But then ADOT just sent a letter back and  
20 said simply, "Based on the review and input, we cannot  
21 support the line going in our right-of-way, especially on  
22 the east side along the drainage channel."

23 Am I understanding this?

24 What am I missing?

25 And I'm genuinely -- and I know you're --



1 ADOT's not here, and you can't speak to them. But even  
2 the rationale that they gave you over the phone doesn't  
3 make sense based on their preferred engineer's review.

4 Did you come to that same confusion that  
5 I'm coming to?

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: No, not really, Member  
7 Hill.

8 So I guess here's the difference and maybe  
9 I didn't articulate it well is that the preliminary  
10 analysis that you're seeing in front of you, the results  
11 of the preliminary analysis considers placing a  
12 transmission line along the east side of the Loop 202  
13 freeway in the existing state it is in today, meaning  
14 placing transmission poles either in the sloped or at the  
15 bottom of those drainage channels.

16 We talked a little bit about this, I  
17 believe, yesterday in the field and also in my testimony,  
18 I believe, on Tuesday. SRP's preference is to place  
19 poles in a flat surface area to make it easy to -- not  
20 make it easy -- to make it capable of maintaining the  
21 line.

22 What this -- what this response is is based  
23 on existing state and not modifying the retention or the  
24 drainage channel to create a road system wide enough to  
25 accommodate our maintenance needs of that transmission

1 line.

2 MEMBER HILL: Okay. So now I get it.

3 I'm sorry. I was reading his comments and  
4 saying, okay, this totally makes sense. There isn't an  
5 excess storage issue, there isn't these other things.

6 So thank you for clarifying that.

7 I had one more follow-up just because I  
8 wanted to -- oh, Member Little has some questions. I'll  
9 come back if I can think of what the question was.

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Member Little,  
12 you had a question.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Thank you,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 Thank you very much for printing all these  
16 e-mails out and leading us through them. I particularly  
17 appreciate the commentary because on the screen  
18 particularly it's difficult for me to follow.

19 But it's my understanding that that  
20 original statement that they could not support any use of  
21 their right-of-ways was before you went back to them and  
22 said, well, what about this little shorter link.

23 Am I correct in that?

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. And then when you

1 asked them to consider the shorter link, they said go  
2 talk to our engineer, and we'll continue the  
3 conversation?

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. And then my other  
6 question is when the engineer looked at it, they kind of  
7 came to a little bit different conclusion than ADOT did  
8 originally when you originally asked for the whole -- the  
9 whole section or presented to them the whole S4.

10 And not having seen in person the drainage  
11 channel, is the drainage channel from I to K wider,  
12 bigger, than the drainage channel south of that from D,  
13 G, I?

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Member Little, it's the  
15 opposite. The drainage channel between Nodes I and K  
16 from South Mountain Avenue to the LACC is much more  
17 narrow and shallower than the remainder of drainage  
18 channel system between Nodes I, G, and D.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: And it is that width that  
20 makes it more difficult to design a transmission line  
21 using that right-of-way; is that correct?

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: It is the existing state  
23 today is not ideal for a transmission line being that it  
24 is the right-of-way's mostly sloped for the drainage  
25 channel. And we as a utility prefer not to place

1 transmission lines in sloped retention or drainage areas  
2 due to access concerns.

3 MEMBER LITTLE: I'm just wondering if you  
4 went to that same engineer and said what about D, G, I,  
5 how can we design that, if they wouldn't come up with  
6 some reasonable way to do that that ADOT might consider.

7 And I recognize that that would require you  
8 to speculate, but it's a question that came to my mind.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Right. And, Member Little,  
10 there's still the concern of ADOT of having poles --  
11 transmission-sized poles within their right-of-way and  
12 the difficulty that can create when maintaining that  
13 drainage channel.

14 So, again, I'm assuming here from ADOT's  
15 perspective they may be looking at this as a shorter  
16 segment, three poles within their right-of-way versus up  
17 to a dozen poles in their right-of-way.

18 So we'd essentially only need three poles  
19 between Nodes I and K. We could need up to a dozen poles  
20 between Nodes D, G, I, and K to accommodate a  
21 transmission line of this length.

22 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. Thank you.

23 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

25 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Hernandez, I may have

1 missed this, but they say "We ask that you continue with  
2 Option 1."

3 What is Option 1 again?

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Great question, Member  
5 Gold.

6 So Option 1 was presented on June 7 and was  
7 captured in my e-mail on June 21, which is -- I'm looking  
8 for the page. Page --

9 MR. DERSTINE: Page 29?

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: It starts at 29. And  
11 Option 1 was the transmission pole alignment on the west  
12 side of the Loop 202 freeway residing in private property  
13 but overhanging aerially into ADOT right-of-way.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: So that's you're talking  
15 about Nodes from, like, B -- or C, F, H --

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: -- et cetera? Okay.

18 MEMBER GOLD: Wait a second. Let me go  
19 find that.

20 You already have B, F, H as your Preferred  
21 Route Number 2 in green; correct?

22 CHMN STAFFORD: It's C, F, H.

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Which map?

24 MEMBER GOLD: C, F, H.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Which map are you referring

1 to in green?

2 MEMBER GOLD: Well, let's go to your  
3 SRP-27.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Was that a question,  
5 Member Gold, or was that a comment?

6 MEMBER GOLD: That was a question.

7 C, F, H was your Option 2, your Preferred  
8 Option 2. So that's telling you instead of going on the  
9 west -- on the east side of 202 to put a double -- two  
10 double lines on the west side?

11 I'm not understanding that.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: So the e-mail that was sent  
13 to ADOT back in -- back in June on June 21 referenced  
14 some early options we were considering along the ADOT  
15 right-of-way.

16 And so Option 1 is shown as an attachment  
17 to SRP-25. If we can pull that on the screen. It's at  
18 the very back. That is the option that they are  
19 referring to.

20 Essentially what they're stating is on that  
21 e-mail on October 10 stating that they were not in favor  
22 of the S4 route or the route on the east side of the 202  
23 but were still in favor of Option 1 as we had discussed,  
24 which is this option in front of you.

25 Essentially is what they're saying is they

1 are still in favor of us hugging the west side of the  
2 freeway keeping our poles in private property but  
3 overhanging our conductors into their right-of-way.

4 MEMBER GOLD: Are they looking at two sets  
5 of poles for each line -- you know, for the lines, or are  
6 they just saying we really like it just to have one set  
7 of poles?

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Their only concern was the  
9 encroachment into their right-of-way.

10 MEMBER GOLD: Of how many poles?

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: It would be one pole line.

12 MEMBER GOLD: But you need two.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: The other would be -- start  
15 at either A and B and go to E, H, J. And those would  
16 both be on the west side of the 202.

17 Everything south of South Mountain Road  
18 would be on the west side of the 202.

19 MEMBER GOLD: So how would they get C, F, H  
20 as the second pole line to get to the substation?

21 You still have to cross 202 somewhere.

22 You'd either have to cross at H, I or J, K. Either case  
23 you're running either two parallel pole lines between H  
24 and J or you're running one pole line between H and J and  
25 a parallel pole line on the opposite side between I and

1 K; correct?

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct. ADOT's  
3 position, I believe, is in reference to their  
4 right-of-way and nothing else.

5 MEMBER GOLD: Well, that's very nice of  
6 them, but you still have to get the pole lines there.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

8 MEMBER GOLD: So which did they indicate  
9 would be more feasible? Would crossing at H, I and  
10 doing on the west side I, K?

11 Would they be amenable to that in your  
12 opinion?

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Time will tell, I believe,  
14 Member Gold. I think that what his testimony is that if  
15 you're looking at -- what is it -- 27.

16 MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. So the only -- the  
18 first -- the blue line ADOT's not concerned with because  
19 it's on the west side of 202.

20 So the whole conversation is that that  
21 second line, which on 27 is the C, F, H section --

22 MEMBER GOLD: Correct.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: -- which is going to be on  
24 the west side, and that's the portion I understand that  
25 he was talking about would be on private property but



1 would be encroached slightly into the right-of-way I  
2 guess the --

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Aerially.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Aerially. Right.

5 And so -- and then -- so now the issue  
6 going forward -- and I'm assuming this is why they have  
7 the alternate segment there to go to H, J instead of H,  
8 I, K is if they're in the process of trying to persuade  
9 ADOT to allow them to build on the east side between I  
10 and K.

11 And if that doesn't pan out, they're going  
12 to have to do it on the H, J side because ADOT doesn't  
13 have a concern with the west side as it's currently  
14 proposed; is that correct?

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

16 MEMBER GOLD: Okay. So you definitely have  
17 a route H, J if they don't allow I, K?

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is the contingent  
19 preferred that we are asking for.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Okay. But ADOT is not  
21 against that one, is it?

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: They are not.

23 MEMBER GOLD: Okay. Okay. Now it's clear.

24 So you don't have a choice. There's  
25 nothing -- no other options but these two.

1                   Your preferred is I, K, but worst-case  
2 scenario you'll go to H, J if ADOT says you can't do I,  
3 K, and you will have a parallel area two sets of poles  
4 parallel to each other, which is also doable. It will be  
5 harder for you to maintain because of the proximity  
6 between the poles, but it's doable.

7                   MR. HERNANDEZ: It is doable and it has  
8 more of an impact to the school and the multifamily  
9 development, which is not -- which is why they're not  
10 preferred routes for SRP.

11                  MEMBER GOLD: Understood.

12                  Okay. So your hands are really tied?

13                  You're telling them what you want to do to  
14 do the least harm to everybody else, but if ADOT says no,  
15 then the school doesn't have a choice if it wants to have  
16 power.

17                  MR. HERNANDEZ: No, I wouldn't state that.  
18 The school's power wouldn't --

19                  MEMBER GOLD: No. I meant the area's  
20 power. You have to run power by 2027.

21                  MR. HERNANDEZ: Correct.

22                  MEMBER GOLD: So the line has to be done.  
23 And if you can't do it on the east side, you'll do it on  
24 the west side.

25                  MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

1 MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill, you had a  
3 question.

4 MEMBER HILL: I remembered my follow-up  
5 question. Thank you.

6 So I'm just looking at page 1 of the --  
7 after the Tuesday, November 5 meeting ADOT said, "In  
8 short, we need a more defined proposal for us to review  
9 as it affects both the contract and ADOT maintenance in  
10 the future."

11 What is that defined proposal that he's  
12 referencing there?

13 What sections?

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: So he -- I believe he's  
15 pointing to the meeting minutes, and I do not see a copy  
16 of the meeting minutes unless I missed it that ADOT  
17 produced.

18 MEMBER HILL: I didn't see them either.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: But essentially what the  
20 meeting minutes described was us performing the drainage  
21 study. So if -- earlier on I described we used J2 Design  
22 to conduct a preliminary analysis.

23 ADOT on November 5 asked us to go ahead and  
24 perform the full-blown analysis, full-blown study showing  
25 what the current volume needs are. And the reason I say

1 "current" is because it has changed.

2 When this freeway -- as we've been talking  
3 about, when this freeway's initially constructed in late  
4 2019, that freeway was constructed and included the  
5 drainage channel to accommodate runoff in the entire  
6 area.

7 But as development is occurring, as you  
8 guys saw firsthand yesterday on the tour, those  
9 individual parcels as part of their permitting process  
10 with the City and/or county depending on where those  
11 parcels land they too are required to capture some of  
12 that runoff on their property, not all of it, but some of  
13 it.

14 Some of that runoff is still spilling into  
15 that drainage channel. That's why ADOT wants us to  
16 revisit and re -- and have the same firm that performed  
17 the original drainage study perform a current or new  
18 drainage study to account for the lesser -- the lesser  
19 runoff that would now occur due to all the development  
20 that's occurring adjacent to the east side of the 202.

21 So they want that drainage study done along  
22 with some preliminary designs done to show options to  
23 widening that road system to accommodate the transmission  
24 line and the access road needed to maintain the  
25 transmission line but also the modifications that would

1 need to be had to the existing channel within the short  
2 1500-foot stretch that could be done and still maintain  
3 this reduced amount of volume that they believe and we  
4 believe exists today as a result of all that development  
5 occurring.

6 MEMBER HILL: And just for the record to  
7 clarify, that more defined proposal and the analysis that  
8 you're doing is for Node I to K for feasibility there?

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

10 MEMBER HILL: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

12 BY MR. DERSTINE:

13 Q. All right. Mr. Heim, did you want to -- I think  
14 this -- the back-and-forth with ADOT raises the issue of  
15 in terms of gaining ADOT's permission what sort of risk  
16 that puts into the schedule and if we were to decide to  
17 fight it out with ADOT even for putting aside I to K,  
18 which they seem to be open to considering based on  
19 subject to the additional feasibility and design work  
20 that Mr. Hernandez just spoke to, just in general if you  
21 have thoughts on if we were to try to fight with ADOT  
22 further to deal with -- to place the line between D to G  
23 to I on the east side.

24 I think you had commented over our breakfast you  
25 raised -- excuse me, you had some thoughts and concerns

1 about the kind of risk that that creates.

2 A. (Mr. Heim) Sure. So I think Mr. Derstine's --  
3 or Mr. Hernandez's testimony does a good job of just  
4 explaining how robust our engagement has been with ADOT  
5 to date. And that's not unusual for SRP and ADOT. We're  
6 partnership agencies. We work together quite a bit. And  
7 so we have a good understanding for each other and what  
8 their constraints are and what ours are.

9 With respect to this project, I spoke yesterday  
10 around some of the drivers from an industrial load  
11 perspective and our need to just be in close proximity to  
12 that development with our facilities in order to feasibly  
13 serve it.

14 Another layer to that is the timing aspect of  
15 the drivers from an economic development perspective. So  
16 the underlying purpose of this project or one of them at  
17 least is to support the City of Phoenix's goals for  
18 economic development within the area. And in going  
19 through those efforts, the City is engaging potential  
20 developers, potential clients as they would call them to  
21 develop these sites within the industrial area. And that  
22 is a competitive environment for the City of Phoenix as  
23 they compete with other cities and other municipalities  
24 who may be courting the same entities to develop within  
25 their area.

1           So from that perspective, the timely  
2 construction of SRP's facilities to serve that industrial  
3 load growth is an important aspect of the City's economic  
4 development plans.

5           So Mr. Derstine's point if we were to continue  
6 to engage with ADOT and push further to go along the east  
7 side of the 202, that is something that we can do, and  
8 we've demonstrated the efforts that we've gone through to  
9 do that so far just for this short segment between I and  
10 K.

11           But doing that further south with ADOT having  
12 already communicated their resistance to that is just  
13 going to inject additional schedule uncertainty into the  
14 project and overall risk, which is to the detriment to  
15 the City of Phoenix's goals for economic development  
16 perspective.

17           So we want to include that perspective as part  
18 of the totality of the effort that we've gone through and  
19 the reason that our assessment from both a physical  
20 engineering, electrical engineering perspective as well  
21 as the schedule management perspective that's staying to  
22 the west side of the 202 is for the betterment of the  
23 project and for the betterment of the City of Phoenix.

24           MEMBER HILL: Can I ask a question?

25           Thank you, Mr. Heim.

1 I too was thinking, wow, if we -- if the  
2 blue line has a lot -- and I'm calling it the blue line  
3 because it is the most recent exhibit that I'm looking at  
4 SRP-27. If the blue line -- and we might want to change  
5 the color because blue says river to me.

6 But if the blue line is -- has less  
7 conflicts and you can move forward with that pretty  
8 quickly because it feels like there's less conflicts  
9 minus the school, which is probably worth talking about,  
10 but I think as a perception of power lines not steeped in  
11 science, would that enable you guys to meet the economic  
12 need more quickly and then maybe work through the green  
13 line, or do you guys anticipate constructing both of  
14 these at the exact same time with the same contractors?

15 I'm just kind of curious, like, if we're  
16 looking for the best alignment, could these projects be  
17 offset and maybe the blue line goes forward and meets the  
18 economic development need and the green line comes along  
19 over time?

20 I'm just kind of curious of your thinking  
21 on that.

22 MR. HEIM: Sure. Member Hill, thanks for  
23 the question.

24 I just want to revisit the -- kind of the  
25 underlying plan for this project.



1 I had testified on Tuesday that what we're  
2 actually constructing with this project with both the  
3 blue and the green route is a continuation of a loop. So  
4 we have the existing Anderson-Orme 230kV line that I'm  
5 highlighting on the left screen. That is an existing  
6 loop within SRP's system.

7 With the system that we are proposing here  
8 what we're in essence doing is we're going to break part  
9 of that loop, so at Baseline and 59th Avenue the  
10 transmission line circuit will no longer continue there.  
11 We're going to effectively have a detour that comes via  
12 our green route here down to our new substation, and then  
13 back up via our blue route to connect in with that  
14 existing loop.

15 So from perspective -- an electrical  
16 perspective, they're a package deal. There's no phasing.

17 MEMBER HILL: Okay. That's helpful. I'm  
18 sorry. It's been a long week. I didn't retain all of  
19 that. Thank you.

20 BY MR. DERSTINE:

21 Q. I think while we were on -- so I'm thinking back  
22 to the end of the day yesterday. We just walked through  
23 the issues with ADOT and our, you know, negotiations,  
24 communications, efforts to bring ADOT along at least in  
25 terms of supporting the route on the east side of the 202

1 and where we ended up and why we are where we are.

2 I think Member Little also went back to her  
3 question, and I think it's a valid one, and I just want  
4 to make sure that we've fully answered it concerning why  
5 we didn't connect along Baseline. And I assume Member  
6 Little -- and she'll -- I'm sure she'll tell us, but I  
7 assume Member Little's thoughts on connecting at Baseline  
8 is one way of avoiding putting the line along the LACC.

9 But regardless of that whether that's the  
10 genesis of her thoughts and questions about Baseline, I  
11 think Mr. Hernandez has spoken to the constraints along  
12 Baseline and the concerns that the City has about putting  
13 the line there.

14 But, again, Mr. Heim, you do some of your best  
15 thinking over breakfast, and you raised a number of  
16 thoughts about some of the issues with putting the line  
17 along Baseline in addition to the space -- well, part of  
18 the space limitations but maybe in a different vein.

19 A. (Mr. Heim) Sure. So we've established so far  
20 that maps and breakfast are a big component to --

21 Q. It's your big add to the case.

22 A. (Mr. Heim) Thank you.

23 So, yeah, so just to enforce what Mr. Hernandez  
24 had touched on yesterday. So he talked about the  
25 physical constraints that exist within the Baseline

1 corridor at this point.

2           So new buildings constructed with not a  
3 significant setback from Baseline itself, which really  
4 puts SRP in a position where if we were to construct a  
5 transmission line within that area, we would be moving  
6 our line into a road right-of-way sort of a placement.

7           And there's a big distinction when we talk about  
8 an ADOT right-of-way versus a city roadway or arterial  
9 road right-of-way in the sense that everything we've  
10 talked about so far with respect to ADOT if we encroach  
11 on their right-of-way with our transmission line, what's  
12 occurring there is that we're overlapping a portion of  
13 their right-of-way that is not an active roadway. It's  
14 an area that they're using for their own maintenance  
15 access or for drainage or things like that.

16           When we talk about placing a transmission line  
17 within an arterial right-of-way for a city roadway, we're  
18 placing that facility within an active roadway  
19 environment, which means really two things. From a  
20 construction and a public perspective, the construction  
21 process will close lanes of traffic on Baseline Road.

22           Baseline Road at this point is a major  
23 connection to the 202 freeway, and therefore that's going  
24 to create congestion and challenges from a public  
25 perspective.

1           It's also placing our construction personnel  
2 within an active roadway closure. From a safety  
3 perspective that is not a preferred approach for us,  
4 particularly in comparison to the other routes that we  
5 are proposing here where we'd be working outside of an  
6 active roadway environment.

7           Pivoting to the long-term maintenance of that  
8 facility. So construction is a point in time and has a  
9 fixed duration. Maintenance occurs throughout the  
10 lifecycle of those facilities.

11           And for a transmission line, maintenance is not  
12 a once-in-20-years thing where we circle back and replace  
13 an insulator or clean something, that kind of a thing.  
14 It's a -- it occurs at any point in time when that  
15 transmission line has a disruption in its ability to  
16 operate. So that can be things like storm damage. It  
17 can be things like -- mylar balloons are a common enemy  
18 of electric system reliability. In those situations we  
19 need to be able to respond quickly to whatever it is  
20 that's causing that outage.

21           So, for instance, if a balloon causes an outage  
22 on a line that's within a road right-of-way, we need to  
23 take lane closures to access that issue at whatever point  
24 in time that is. So that may be conveniently at 2:00  
25 a.m. when there's no traffic. It can also be at

1 four o'clock during rush hour.

2 And we do not control that. We contend with  
3 that in other parts of our system. But the main takeaway  
4 here is that by creating that circumstance it does delay  
5 our ability to respond to those types of outages. It  
6 introduces an additional safety and congestion risk for  
7 our personnel and for the general public.

8 And in the context of a project that is serving  
9 an industrial load growth area like this that has a high  
10 demand for reliability, those delays to our ability to  
11 maintain and restore lines is overall a disruption to the  
12 purpose -- for the underlying purpose for the project in  
13 general.

14 So for those reasons those are just added to the  
15 physical constraints that go along with constructing  
16 along Baseline.

17 Q. And I guess we also need to mention that if we  
18 were to place the line and extend up along Baseline, that  
19 would require that -- oop, wrong button -- that would  
20 require that we run the second line up to Baseline here  
21 using my laser pointer on the screen on the right in the  
22 hearing room, which would put two lines on the west side  
23 of the hospital parcel; correct?

24 A. (Mr. Heim) In the instance that we were using  
25 the Baseline route as a way to avoid using the LACC, that

1 is correct.

2 Q. Okay. And I think Ms. De Blasi and her witness  
3 will speak to it, but it's our understanding that while  
4 the hospital and the Banner Health system is open to one  
5 line along the western edge of their parcel, that having  
6 two lines there creates impacts that they don't want.

7 Is that your understanding?

8 A. (Mr. Heim) That is my understanding.

9 Q. Okay.

10 MR. HILL: Mr. Chair.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: So -- so -- one second.

12 So the section you're talking about would  
13 be the J to N that's the part to have both lines there?

14 MR. DERSTINE: If we were to -- yeah, if we  
15 were to connect up to Baseline, we would have to -- we  
16 wouldn't go all the way to N, but the segment from Node J  
17 to Baseline Road and then crossing the 202 to connect to  
18 Baseline as an alternative or way to avoid the LACC would  
19 put a second line on the western edge of the hospital  
20 parcel.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

22 Member Hill.

23 MEMBER HILL: Thank you, Mr. Heim, for  
24 talking about the challenges of Baseline. I definitely  
25 see the challenge of construction in that corridor and

1 the need to shut down traffic and other things.

2 Your comments on power lines along  
3 corridors when there's an outage kind of confused me  
4 because I feel like that gives easier access to address  
5 an outage when it happens.

6 So I just -- I want to make sure that the  
7 concern about Baseline was probably more about  
8 disruptions to traffic flow and things during  
9 construction but not during an outage. Because all of  
10 these power -- many of these power lines are going to be  
11 along roads, and roads I thought were your preferred  
12 right-of-way, so I just want to be careful about that as  
13 part of the record.

14 MR. HEIM: Sure. I can clarify where I'm  
15 coming from with that.

16 From a physical access perspective and from  
17 a siting perspective, yes, roadways are a preferred  
18 option and a linear feature that we like to follow. And  
19 in general our alignment would be outside of the  
20 right-of-way for those linear features, so that in order  
21 to perform maintenance we're not actually encroaching on  
22 the linear feature but just following it from a siting  
23 perspective.

24 MEMBER HILL: Thank you.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: And I seem to recall from

1 your earlier testimony that the issue along Baseline was  
2 the fact that between -- I guess it's between where your  
3 J, N segment and your L interconnection point, along that  
4 point -- portion there was significant, like, new  
5 development there. They had just built these buildings  
6 without power lines running along that portion of the  
7 street, and plus the setback is really -- I seem to  
8 recall it was really limited.

9 MR. HEIM: That's correct.

10 So along Baseline between 59th Avenue where  
11 our existing Anderson-Orme 230kV line is, so extending  
12 west from that along Baseline to the Loop 202 both the  
13 north and south side of Baseline has been developed with  
14 new commercial buildings. And those buildings are  
15 situated relatively close to the right-of-way for  
16 Baseline Road.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Because the City wasn't  
18 planning on having a power line there when they had --  
19 let them build there and gave them the setbacks that they  
20 were required to follow; right?

21 MR. HEIM: I think it is safe to say that  
22 they were not anticipating that when they established  
23 those setbacks.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

25 //



1 BY MR. DERSTINE:

2 Q. Okay. I think that covers our going back to  
3 some of the issues that were raised towards the end of  
4 the day yesterday both as to the east side of the Loop  
5 202 and why we didn't present a route connecting along  
6 Baseline Road.

7 Mr. Hernandez, that takes us back to your  
8 testimony. And we've got a couple chapters or sections  
9 to cover yet before we complete the record on the project  
10 and the project description.

11 I'll give you a second to find your spot. It  
12 seems like that was two weeks ago, but --

13 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Okay. I'm good.

14 Q. Okay. You're going to start us off with  
15 discussing the structure types. And in doing that, I  
16 think the Chairman wanted to see a turning structure  
17 which are not in your slides, but then we'll reference  
18 that and go to that. It's in the application. So if  
19 you'll incorporate that into your discussion of  
20 structures, please.

21 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Okay. Sure.

22 So we'll start with slide L47 on the left.

23 So what that slide represents are four pole  
24 profiles. The two on the left-hand side are described as  
25 the 500kV poles. And these are just typical structures

1 that could be used on the 500kV scope. Again, that is a  
2 nonjurisdictional part of the project at the substation,  
3 which is essentially the tie from the 500 source that  
4 exists today along the -- along the grid boundary. Those  
5 poles could be used for that scope.

6 The majority of the project, however, would most  
7 likely -- the majority of the 230kV scope would most  
8 likely look similar to the two poles pole profiles on the  
9 right. Those both are 230kV with 69kV underbuild tangent  
10 structures.

11 Chairman Stafford did ask yesterday about what a  
12 230kV dead-end structure could look like for this  
13 project. And specifically along the existing  
14 Anderson-Orme 230kV line located along Baseline and 59th  
15 Avenue.

16 And so we do have included within our  
17 application in Exhibit G specifically Figure G-4 of  
18 Exhibit G. I apologize because we don't have that built  
19 as a slide in this presentation.

20 But for those that have a copy of the  
21 application -- so if we go back to R47 on the right,  
22 Mr. Heim just pointed out that the pole on the right is,  
23 in fact, a dead-end structure. So what's represented in  
24 Figure G-4 of Exhibit G is similar to the photo shown on  
25 the right and on slide R47.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: And that's the structure  
2 you'll use to connect the new lines to the existing  
3 Anderson-Orme 230kV line?

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: It will look comparable to  
5 that, correct.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Excellent.  
7 Thank you.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: So staying on R47, these  
9 are actual photos of SRP transmission poles in our  
10 system. These depictions just show you what, you know,  
11 the six conductors on top representing the two 230kV  
12 conductors along with six conductors along with six  
13 conductors on the bottom in the underbuild position  
14 representing the capability of the underbuild 69 that  
15 we've designed into the project.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And then am I  
17 correct you -- I think when you were explaining something  
18 to Member Hill earlier about the time line for the  
19 project you said once both lines are constructed in the  
20 interconnected Nodes O and L, that chunk of the existing  
21 Anderson-Orme line between O and L would be removed?

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

23 There are approximately three to four  
24 spans. I don't remember the exact number. If we were to  
25 connect -- if the committee approves the preferred routes

1 and we interconnect into the existing transmission system  
2 for the 230kV Anderson-Orme line at Nodes O and at Nodes  
3 L, essentially the 230kV spans of conductor between those  
4 two Nodes, again, I believe it's three to four spans,  
5 could be removed or would be removed as part of this  
6 construction effort because they would no longer be  
7 needed.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. Thank you.

9 Member Fontes, you have a question.

10 MEMBER FONTES: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted  
11 to know have you guys consulted with ADOT on the  
12 encroachment permit due to the underbuild?

13 The concern is on the structural load for  
14 the combined with the 69kV underbuild and the 230kV and  
15 then the circuit on that stretch of the 202.

16 So where are you at on that?

17 And then how are you incorporating your  
18 design that you're presenting here as you looked forward  
19 to that encroachment permit that you have to get for the  
20 ADOT?

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Member Fontes, good  
22 question.

23 My response is we have not approached ADOT,  
24 the City of Phoenix, or Maricopa County on encroachment  
25 permit needs just yet. And we will do that once the

1 routes are certificated.

2 It feels a little preliminary to start  
3 those discussions in terms of where the lines are going  
4 to cross and the encroachment permit needs without having  
5 that CEC approved.

6 But you are correct in stating that when we  
7 do apply for that encroachment permits, we will certainly  
8 have to consider our phase to ground clearances and  
9 potentially go with taller structures on each side of the  
10 freeway system to ensure that we maintain adequate space  
11 from the bottom conductor, whether that's the 69 or 230kV  
12 conductor, to the ADOT freeway system.

13 MEMBER FONTES: Have you done any weight  
14 and mechanical stress analysis as part of prefeasibility?

15 Because we -- we're looking at this from  
16 safety, environmental compliance, structural integrity  
17 are -- are serious factors here as we look at the 202 and  
18 giving you a certificate of environmental compatibility.

19 So are you presenting that as evidence?

20 I mean, that would seem prudent that you  
21 would at least have prefeasibility along those lines.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: So it's my understanding  
23 that all the exhibits or all the poles profiles included  
24 in Exhibit G consider the capability of underbuild 69  
25 line on those poles.

1                   And all of those pole profiles are  
2 essentially modeled into our preliminary design. And so  
3 they would have considered loading of those poles based  
4 on the amount of conductors and the weight of those  
5 conductors.

6                   MEMBER FONTES: And so the poles' placement  
7 structures and all of that was factored into that  
8 preliminary design analysis as well on the proposed  
9 locations?

10                  MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

11                  MEMBER FONTES: Okay. That's very helpful.  
12 I appreciate that. Thanks for the clarification.

13                  Nothing further, Mr. Chairman.

14                  CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Fontes.  
15 Quick follow-up question.

16                  Is the entire -- is the entirety of both  
17 lines one and two going to have the 69kV underbuild or  
18 just certainly portions of it?

19                  MR. HERNANDEZ: All route segments showed  
20 on the preferred routes include the capability of  
21 underbuilding double-circuit 69.

22                  CHMN STAFFORD: Right. But it's  
23 capability. But you're not -- when you initially build  
24 the lines, you're not going to have the 69kV underbuild  
25 immediately or would that come later as is needed?

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Correct. That would come  
2 later as needed.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right.

4 But I think that's Member Fontes's point  
5 that when you put them in there without this 69kV  
6 underbuild capable, it's they're -- they're designed  
7 ready to put the 69kV on on day one even though you may  
8 not do it for months, years, whatever until the load is  
9 necessary to expand that 69kV system; correct?

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

12 Yes, Member Drago.

13 MEMBER DRAGO: Yes. Mr. Hernandez,  
14 referring to the right screen R47, left photo, is the  
15 highest point of that pole for communications?

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good question. You'll  
17 notice you have two cables on the very top of the pole on  
18 some smaller steel arms. Those cables would be optical  
19 ground wire cable, OPGW, which is a combo of both a  
20 ground wire and a fiber for telecommunications.

21 MEMBER DRAGO: Thank you.

22 BY MR. DERSTINE:

23 Q. In addition to the structures that you've just  
24 talked through with the committee, it's important, I  
25 think, to touch on the corridors and the right-of-way for

1 the project.

2 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Sure. So as we mentioned or as  
3 I mentioned in the testimony on Tuesday, every -- every  
4 route we are proposing, especially the preferred routes,  
5 we are asking for 350-foot-wide corridor that'll allow us  
6 the flexibility to work with the adjacent property owners  
7 to find a suitable location for the transmission line.

8 Although we're asking for a 350-foot-wide  
9 corridor, we will need -- we will only need up to  
10 100 feet in transmission line easement per pole line.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Wait. So it's 350 corridor  
12 for each line?

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Now, when they're -- if  
15 they were to run parallel say, for example, between J and  
16 H, would that mean you need a 700-foot corridor for the  
17 two lines, or is it something less?

18 And what would the right-of-way be for a  
19 section of the line if they're both collocated, for  
20 example, if they both run from H to J?

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: So I'll answer your first  
22 question.

23 So we are asking for 350 feet, but there  
24 would be some overlap obviously with those alignments  
25 between the western pole line and the eastern pole line.



1 I don't have that figure in front of me in terms of how  
2 wide of a corridor would be needed if the pole lines were  
3 adjacent to each other or parallel to each other, but it  
4 would be greater than 350-foot. I'm not sure if we  
5 accounted for that in the application. I believe  
6 Ms. Gilbert is looking for that.

7 To answer your second question, would we  
8 still need 100-foot-wide transmission line easement if we  
9 were to place these pole lines in parallel adjacent to  
10 each other, my initial response would be that we would  
11 look for opportunities to reduce those transmission line  
12 easements. Specifically in this area, as I mentioned  
13 earlier when working with ADOT and proposed Option 1,  
14 which would allow us to locate our poles essentially up  
15 against their right-of-way and overhang into their  
16 right-of-way, right off the bat that allows us for a  
17 smaller footprint for that first pole line, and really  
18 that was the intent of that discussion was to minimize  
19 impact to private properties on the west side of the 202.

20 So specifically between Nodes H and J,  
21 although we are asking for the capability of acquiring up  
22 to 100-foot in transmission line easement width, more  
23 than likely we would not require that as a result of the  
24 collation with ADOT, but also we would look for design  
25 opportunities similar to what you're seeing on the screen

1 here.

2 I showed two different pole profiles on  
3 L47. The right side depicts what we call the stacked  
4 configuration meaning put all conductors on one side of  
5 the pole.

6 And so initially when we had met with the  
7 elementary school and the multifamily development and  
8 Banner, we had shared with them that we would look for  
9 opportunities to go with that far right configuration to  
10 minimize impact to the property by, you know, requiring a  
11 smaller width of an easement.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So then if you're  
13 using both the poles on the far right of L47 and they  
14 were facing opposite directions, you could have a shorter  
15 distance between poles because there's a required  
16 distance between conductors.

17 And if they're both on all one side on  
18 opposite sides, you would be able to fit that in a  
19 smaller right-of-way than you would otherwise if they  
20 were both at the same type of the -- at the penultimate  
21 structure on L47.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.

24 Member Fontes, you have a question.

25 MEMBER FONTES: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

1 Mr. Hernandez, with respect to 230kV  
2 circuits, the ones that I'm used to seeing in terms of  
3 development and financing are 125 to 150-foot, especially  
4 if they have an underbuild with a 69kV there's additional  
5 allowances for NERC and NESC standards in most utility  
6 design.

7 How did your process factor that in knowing  
8 that the standard is 125 to 150 on a straight 230kV but  
9 yet you've got a 69kV underbuild?

10 And what I'm looking for here is just  
11 safety clearance. How -- what's your -- what was the  
12 engineering analysis and the process so we capture that  
13 for the record here?

14 A little more granular detail would be  
15 appreciated.

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: So good question, Member  
17 Fontes.

18 I believe we have a typo on R47. I believe  
19 in the application we state that the typical height will  
20 range between 120 and 185 foot in height.

21 Did we state 100? We did state 100.

22 MEMBER FONTES: I'm talking about the  
23 right-of-way. Sorry.

24 Did I mention height? I thought I was  
25 focused on the right-of-way width ranges.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I could have  
2 misunderstood your question.

3 So your question was in regard to  
4 right-of-way width?

5 MEMBER FONTES: Yeah. Because typically on  
6 the -- again, my background is in transmission. 230kV is  
7 120 to 150 feet. And then when we have an underbuild of  
8 69kV, we allow for additional allowances to blow out  
9 standards for maintenance and then building for NESC and  
10 for -- obviously for O&M for the NERC standards.

11 What is the thinking and what was the  
12 engineering analysis to get to just 100-foot right-of-way  
13 given that background and the typical standards for the  
14 230kV with the underbuild that I just outlined?

15 MR. HEIM: Mr. Fontes, thanks for the  
16 question.

17 So the 100-foot right-of-way is an SRP  
18 standard for our urban 230kV transmission corridors.

19 The roots of that standard come from a  
20 number of factors. So in general within an urban  
21 environment, we tend to see span lengths that are a  
22 little bit shorter than what you would see in an  
23 environment where we were just going through unencumbered  
24 terrain for lack of a better term.

25 The result of that is shorter spans lead to

1 a decreased amount of blowout associated with our  
2 right-of-way, and therefore we're able to constrain the  
3 width of the right-of-way from that perspective.

4 In terms of this specific project and just  
5 due diligence around making sure that that is an adequate  
6 right-of-way, part of the analysis step that  
7 Mr. Hernandez was describing that led to Exhibit G, which  
8 is the examples of our proposed structures and the  
9 simulations that the committee has seen with potential  
10 pole placements, all of those are the result of a  
11 preliminary design of the actual transmission line  
12 through which our engineers evaluate our ability to stay  
13 within a 100-foot right-of-way and still meet the NESC  
14 clearance requirements. So we have evaluated that and  
15 accounted for it.

16 MEMBER FONTES: Just a clarification. Have  
17 your engineers typically just done single-circuit 230kVs  
18 with 100-foot or also doubles?

19 And do those ones that you refer to also  
20 have underbuilds of 69kV?

21 MR. HEIM: The standard of a 100-foot  
22 right-of-way does incorporate double-circuit 230kV.

23 One additional aspect to that urban  
24 environment that I referenced is that with the shorter  
25 span lengths in general the NESC clearance associated

1 with blowout is not the governing circumstance  
2 surrounding right-of-way width at that point. It is our  
3 ability to fit the equipment necessary to maintain those  
4 lines within that right-of-way distance.

5 So, in essence, through the design of a  
6 line we actually have a fair amount of additional  
7 clearance buffer just because we have reduced blowout  
8 from shorter span lengths, and it's really just the  
9 physical constraints of maneuvering maintenance equipment  
10 that retains the need for that 100-foot right-of-way.

11 MEMBER FONTES: Mr. Heim, Mr. Hernandez, I  
12 really appreciate you capturing this for the record.

13 I think it's important for the public to  
14 know the details behind that analysis because it's an  
15 urban area. It's very congested.

16 So I thank you for your additional  
17 information and testimony.

18 And I just wanted to go back to you,  
19 Mr. Chairman, that I think we need to capture that here.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

21 I think we've been going for at least 90  
22 minutes now, and I think our court reporter could use a  
23 break, so let's take a 15-minute recess.

24 (Recess from 10:51 a.m. to 11:18 a.m.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the

1 record.

2 Mr. Derstine, I believe you're almost  
3 wrapped up. The only things that I have left for you to  
4 cover would be the Commission Staff's response, the data  
5 request and response to my letter to them.

6 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, I think Mr. Hernandez  
7 is going to quickly take us through the project schedule  
8 and the project cost, and then we'll clean up our last  
9 exhibits that we need to introduce through him and then  
10 we're done.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: And then Ms. De Blasi,  
12 we'll be ready for your cross.

13 BY MR. DERSTINE:

14 Q. I see it on the screen, Mr. Hernandez. Let's  
15 talk about the project schedule.

16 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Sure. So moving on to slide  
17 R49 shown on the right is a high-level time line of the  
18 entire project schedule. You'll notice where we are  
19 today in regard to the hearings shown in the middle block  
20 labeled "Permitting."

21 We anticipate -- we are hopeful that the Line  
22 Siting Committee will approve the preferred routes that  
23 we are proposing. We're hopeful that it will get before  
24 the ACC by early 2025, ideally in January-February time  
25 frame. And a decision will be made by or within that

1 time frame.

2 That will allow us to start the detailed  
3 engineering of the line design in early 2025. The  
4 ultimate goal is to have the line design completed,  
5 permits acquired by early 2026, summer 2026 worst case,  
6 and construction started on the transmission lines by  
7 summer of 2026.

8 The ultimate goal is to have both transmission  
9 lines fully constructed and in service by late spring of  
10 2027.

11 Q. All right. What about cost?

12 A. (Mr. Hernandez) In terms of cost for the  
13 transmission lines, we are looking at approximately  
14 \$4 million per mile per double-circuit pole line. And so  
15 on the screen in front of you on slide R50 you'll notice  
16 what the costs could be based on those various routes  
17 that we presented.

18 In total for the preferred routes that we  
19 presented for both transmission line pole lines, we're  
20 looking at approximately \$8.4 million in cost to design,  
21 procure, and construct the two separate transmission pole  
22 lines.

23 Q. My recollection from the application is that the  
24 two preferred routes are each -- are just over two miles  
25 in length each, roughly; is that true?



1 A. (Mr. Hernandez) I believe the average between  
2 the two is around two miles. Just over two miles;  
3 correct.

4 Q. Okay. All right. The chairman sent a letter --  
5 well, let me start here.

6 Do you have your exhibit binder in front of you?  
7 I'm going to take you through a couple exhibits if we  
8 have a minute.

9 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Yep.

10 Q. Commission Staff served a set of data requests  
11 on SRP relating to -- asking for information relative to  
12 the South Mountain Transmission Project. SRP's responses  
13 to Staff's first set of data requests are found at  
14 SRP-14. Would you flip to that and just confirm that  
15 those are, in fact, SRP's responses to the data requests?

16 A. (Mr. Hernandez) These are the responses.  
17 Correct.

18 Q. Okay. And then committee chairman, as he does  
19 in all cases, sent a letter to Commission Staff  
20 requesting their input concerning the project. That's  
21 marked as SRP-16. Do you see that?

22 A. (Mr. Hernandez) I do.

23 Q. And Commission Staff response is found at  
24 SRP-17. Can you turn to that, please?

25 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Okay. I've got it.

1 Q. Have you had an opportunity to review that Staff  
2 response?

3 A. (Mr. Hernandez) I have.

4 Q. Can you just briefly summarize Staff's  
5 conclusions regarding the South Mountain Transmission  
6 Project?

7 A. (Mr. Hernandez) So I'll read the last sentence  
8 which essentially states, "Staff believes that the  
9 proposed project could improve the reliability and safety  
10 of the grid and the delivery of power in Arizona."

11 Q. All right. Does that -- I'm sorry. Oh, I  
12 thought you had a question. Does that conclude your  
13 testimony, Mr. Hernandez?

14 We've covered a lot over several days including  
15 a route tour yesterday. But I think that takes us to the  
16 end of your testimony. Anything you wanted to add as  
17 final concluding remarks?

18 A. (Mr. Hernandez) Not at this point, no.

19 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. Well, I think in the -- in  
20 the interest of time, I appreciate that.

21 And that concludes our case in chief,  
22 Mr. Chairman. Do you want to go through exhibits now or  
23 do you want to wait on that?

24 CHMN STAFFORD: I think that concludes your  
25 direct, so your witnesses are available for

1 cross-examination?

2 MR. DERSTINE: They are available for  
3 cross-examination.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's let Ms. De Blasi do  
5 her cross and then we can admit your exhibits, and then  
6 you'll be prepared to put your witness on after that;  
7 correct?

8 MS. DE BLASI: Correct.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. Ms. De Blasi.

10 MS. DE BLASI: Thank you, Chairman. The  
11 applicant has done a terrific job running through the  
12 evidence so far. We do not have any cross. I think any  
13 of the questions that have been raised with respect to  
14 Banner we can answer with our witness.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. All right.  
16 Then SRP Exhibits 1 through 29 are admitted.

17 (Exhibits SRP-1 through SRP-29 were  
18 admitted.)

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. De Blasi, would you  
20 like to call your witness at this time?

21 MS. DE BLASI: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.  
22 Can we just have a quick five minutes to get him set up?

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Certainly. Let's go off  
24 the record.

25 (Recess from 11:25 a.m. to 11:28 a.m.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the  
2 record.

3 Ms. De Blasi, would you like to call your  
4 witness.

5 MS. DE BLASI: I would. Chairman, we would  
6 like to call Troy Freeman from Banner Health.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Freeman, do you prefer  
8 an oath or affirmation?

9 MR. FREEMAN: Oath.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Do you swear the testimony  
11 you will give in this matter will be the truth, the whole  
12 truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

13 MR. FREEMAN: I do.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Please proceed,  
15 Ms. De Blasi.

16

17

TROY FREEMAN,  
18 called as a witness on behalf of Banner Health, having  
19 been previously affirmed or sworn by the Chairman to  
20 speak the truth and nothing but the truth, was examined  
21 and testified as follows:

22

23

DIRECT EXAMINATION

24 BY MS. DE BLASI:

25 Q. Mr. Freeman, please state your name and business

1 address.

2 A. Troy Freeman, vice president of real estate for  
3 Banner Health. Business address is 2901 North Central  
4 Avenue, Suite 160, Phoenix, Arizona 85012.

5 Q. And did you prepare or direct to be prepared  
6 Banner exhibits marked as BH-1 and the presentation  
7 marked as BH-2 for your testimony?

8 A. Yes. That is correct.

9 Q. And is that content true and correct to the best  
10 of your knowledge?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Can you please briefly discuss your professional  
13 experience?

14 A. Sure thing. I've been in the corporate real  
15 estate, commercial real estate business for over  
16 20 years. I've been at Banner Health as the vice  
17 president of real estate for the last three, three and a  
18 half years.

19 Prior to that, I ran real estate for Wells Fargo  
20 west of the Mississippi and prior to that spent 13 years  
21 at Jones Lang LaSalle in the corporate solutions business  
22 unit representing real estate projects and needs for a  
23 number of large national and global occupiers of space  
24 including Bank of America, Kaiser Permanente, General  
25 Motors, and Stericycle.

1 Q. Okay. Great. Do you have any changes to the  
2 presentation in BH-2 as filed?

3 A. I do not.

4 Q. Okay. So this is the presentation that's up on  
5 the screen. Referring to your slide presentation, can  
6 you please provide an overview of Banner Health and the  
7 Banner Health Laveen property on Slide 2?

8 A. Yeah. Sure thing. Let me go ahead and advance  
9 the slide.

10 So Banner Health acquired this 23-acre parcel  
11 back in late 2010 [sic] in the midst of COVID. As you  
12 can see on the screen, the property is bounded by  
13 Baseline Avenue on the north, 59th Avenue on the west.  
14 We've got a bit of a jagged southern boundary that you  
15 can see in blue there. And then bounded by the Arizona  
16 Loop 202 on the east.

17 We've got some residential proximity west across  
18 59th Avenue. Otherwise, the arterial transportation  
19 highway and a green field site owned by an entity  
20 controlled by Kitchell Developments sits to the west of  
21 us.

22 Q. Can you talk a little bit more about Banner  
23 Health?

24 A. Happy to. Banner Health is a fully integrated  
25 health system based in Phoenix, Arizona. We currently

1 operate over 500 locations, 30 acute care hospitals,  
2 hundreds of clinics, 50 urgent care locations, and dozens  
3 of multispecialty and outpatient clinics.

4 In total we operate in six states, again roughly  
5 500 locations, and care for people from birth into the  
6 post-acute space. So, again, fully integrated health  
7 system, hundreds and hundreds of assets, multistate  
8 scale.

9 Q. And just back to Slide 2 quickly because I want  
10 to make sure that everyone understand the property  
11 boundaries, can you just outline for everybody the  
12 property boundary --

13 A. I will.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 A. So, again, shown here in blue, again, our  
16 northern boundary, Baseline Road. Eastern boundary, Loop  
17 202. Southern boundary if you will is the LACC. Our  
18 southwestern boundary, again, this sort of jagged shape  
19 and then our western boundary, far western boundary, 59th  
20 Avenue.

21 Q. Okay. Great. Proceeding to Slide 3, can you  
22 discuss some of the planned features of the medical  
23 campus at the Laveen property depicted on Slide 3 and  
24 what type of services would be provided to the community?

25 A. Yeah. Let me take that in a couple of pieces.

1 So let me just start with just big picture.

2 This 23-acre campus was purchased with the intent to  
3 build a future acute care hospital with outpatient  
4 services. At its simplest form there's really two pieces  
5 of the proposed project. On the northwest portion of the  
6 site is an outpatient medical office building of roughly  
7 30,000 square feet. That outpatient facility would be  
8 intended to house primary care, specialty care, lab,  
9 outpatient imaging and similar outpatient functions.

10 On the eastern and southern portions of the site  
11 is where the acute care portion, hospital portion of the  
12 intended development would be built.

13 This building itself is really broken into two  
14 separate pieces. The first piece that you see here  
15 labeled as item B is the diagnostics and treatment  
16 center. That's a two-story structure with the emergency  
17 department, imaging, and those immediate acute functions.

18 And then portions C and D as you look at screen  
19 are the proposed patient towers. Patient tower C as  
20 labeled on the slide would be the first patient tower and  
21 as scale dictated over time, building D would be the  
22 expansion of the patient towers.

23 In total this concept design would have 156  
24 licensed beds.

25 Zooming out for a second here, just to touch on



1 a couple of other elements, we really thoughtfully think  
2 through the design of these facilities based on our  
3 experience operating 30 hospitals across six states, and  
4 we've learned a lot over time.

5 We specifically try to separate both the  
6 pedestrian -- I'm sorry, patient, visitor and staff  
7 entrance and flow onto the site through a separate  
8 entrance from emergency vehicles. So let me call out  
9 those two locations.

10 Patient, visitor access is proposed at location  
11 G as designed. Visitor -- I'm sorry -- emergency vehicle  
12 access would come through location H. What that enables  
13 is emergency vehicles to quickly navigate without as much  
14 traffic and get to the emergency, to vehicle drop-off and  
15 parking at the back side of the diagnostics and treatment  
16 building.

17 While I'm in that area, just two other features  
18 here on this map to call out. These facilities are  
19 required to have a helipad. The helipad here is shown as  
20 letter E on the site. The current concept design we're  
21 showing, this helipad was pushed as far east and south as  
22 possible, given some feedback from residents over  
23 concerns of noise.

24 Very typical feedback we get when designing and  
25 developing facilities like this, so again, intentionally

1 situated along the canal and as far east as we could push  
2 it from the residents to the west across 59th Avenue.

3 And then last thing to call out, this building F  
4 located here on the slide is our central utility plant,  
5 again, this is intentionally put at the back of the  
6 facility to limit noise. We screen this in, just from an  
7 aesthetic standpoint.

8 What we try to focus on is building the front  
9 door to the diagnostics and treatment building, locating  
10 the patient tower and future patient tower to develop in  
11 phases without confusing those that might come to the  
12 facility by having to relocate our front door over time.  
13 Again, a learning as we've developed -- as we've  
14 developed numbers of these facilities.

15 Q. And just to orient everyone again, can you  
16 please just point out the streets around that facility?

17 A. Happy to. We've got 59th Avenue here on the  
18 west as shown on the prior slide, you've got residential  
19 west along 59th Avenue.

20 Baseline Road here to the north.

21 ADOT's Loop 202 on our eastern boundary.

22 The LACC on a portion of our southern boundary,  
23 if you will, and then undeveloped land owned by an entity  
24 controlled by Kitchell Development here where I'm showing  
25 on screen.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Pardon me. You said 59th  
2 Avenue? Do you mean 63rd Avenue?

3 MR. FREEMAN: I'm sorry. Yes. I'm sorry,  
4 Chairman. 63rd Avenue. I've heard 59th Avenue too many  
5 times today and now it's stuck in my head.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: I was --

7 MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for clarifying.  
8 63rd Avenue, yes, we --

9 CHMN STAFFORD: -- the 202 --

10 MR. FREEMAN: We didn't relocate. My  
11 apologies.

12 MS. DE BLASI: Chairman, you got there  
13 right before I did, so thank you for that.

14 MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for that  
15 clarification.

16 BY MS. DE BLASI:

17 Q. And can you briefly discuss the current status  
18 development of the property?

19 A. Yeah, so we -- we typically acquire land and the  
20 paths of development for future growth of our system.  
21 This search started back prior to COVID. Our close of  
22 escrow occurred during COVID in 2020.

23 And through COVID, like so many other businesses  
24 and the world as a whole we've learned a lot and a lot of  
25 things have changed. We do intend to develop this site

1 in the future. As of this moment the timing for that is  
2 to be determined, that will really be dictated by growth  
3 in the market, the amount of need that we forecast as  
4 well as other priorities across our system.

5 Typically when building a facility like this, we  
6 would start with the outpatient component. Again, that's  
7 this 30,000-square-foot, what we brand as a health  
8 center, outpatient facility. And then grow the acute  
9 care function later in time as that demand grows.

10 Q. But in terms of zoning the property is ready to  
11 be utilized?

12 A. Yes. So this site has an existing C2 zone in  
13 the city of Phoenix. The hospital and outpatient uses  
14 are actually approved in the underlying zone.

15 When we acquired this property, what does also  
16 exist in that underlying zone is a 56-foot height  
17 restriction. The patient towers as we design and build  
18 them are typically 60 feet in height, so while there  
19 wasn't, again, while the use is approved in the  
20 underlying zoning, we did obtain a use permit from the  
21 City of Phoenix to allow the 50 -- the 60-foot building  
22 height versus the 56-foot limit.

23 Q. Okay. And this plan has been submitted to the  
24 City as part of that?

25 A. This plan was submitted to the City of Phoenix.

1 I want to tell you that was back in 2020-ish.

2 Q. Okay. So moving on to Slide 4. So yesterday  
3 the committee drove past the Banner property at Baseline  
4 and 202 during our tour several times. Can you please  
5 explain the different setbacks portrayed on the site plan  
6 on Slide 4 and some of the prior issues that we discussed  
7 with SRP when they were studying lines around the  
8 property?

9 A. Yeah, can do. So we've had a number of  
10 conversations with SRP and really appreciate their  
11 willingness to work with us and evaluate the potential  
12 impacts to our proposed development.

13 The line shown on screen -- I'll just describe  
14 them as bowling alleys. Number 1, 2, and then 3 and 4  
15 are all representative of a conceptual 100-foot easement  
16 impacting three sides of this site.

17 And then on the eastern boundary, the potential  
18 of a dual route 100 times two setback or right-of-way on  
19 that portion of our site.

20 What we, you know, a couple of things. The  
21 first route maps we saw showed, you know, the potential  
22 for multiple impacts. And so we with our designers and  
23 others really wanted to look at what is the potential  
24 worst case, and then take each of these individually.  
25 But this overlay gives a pretty good example of what some

1 of those initial route maps would have done to our site.

2 And at its simplest form, these are significant  
3 material impacts that would either seriously restrict or  
4 negate our ability to develop our intended project.

5 You can see in the top right corner the  
6 approximate impacts as far as acreage of each of those  
7 areas, and again I'll put in context by saying this is a  
8 23-acre site.

9 Stepping back for one second, this plan is based  
10 upon Banner Ocotillo, which is a roughly 120-bed acute  
11 care facility we built in South Chandler that opened  
12 right in the midst of COVID.

13 That specific hospital is actually the smallest  
14 we build in today's current environment from an acreage  
15 perspective, and so this 23 acres was purchased with the  
16 thought process and the concept of Ocotillo in mind;  
17 right?

18 That is what this is built -- based upon, and so  
19 we've got some images and a site plan of that facility  
20 later in this presentation to help just illustrate that a  
21 little bit further.

22 But to Michelle's question, the initial plans  
23 that we saw from the applicant with the route maps had  
24 the possibility for impacts on all three portions, all  
25 three sides of our site, everything but that southern

1 boundary, and they are significant.

2 This, if you think about the design of this  
3 site, the access separating access for emergency  
4 vehicles, flight paths for helipad coming in and out of  
5 the facility, orientation, location of buildings, the  
6 potential for electromagnetic fields and placement of  
7 sensitive equipment in this facility.

8 And again, whether that's real or perceived, we  
9 can argue about, but there are specifications in our  
10 equipment we must navigate when designing these. You're  
11 really I'm trying to illustrate that impact was  
12 potentially significant to this site.

13 The 3 and 4, and I think Michelle will get there  
14 in a second, paralleling one another you can see, you  
15 know, run right down the middle of the proposed patient  
16 towers and would force us to push this facility west. I  
17 think when you look at the amount of parking required to  
18 support this facility, the orientation of buildings,  
19 again that potential impact is material and adverse to  
20 us.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Freeman, we spoke  
24 yesterday with Mr. Hernandez with regard to certain of  
25 the potential customers there on the west side of the 202

1 being direct purchasers of electricity from the towers  
2 that we're speaking about today.

3 Are you a potential direct purchaser? I  
4 mean, is Banner here for this, a direct purchaser from  
5 the 230s that are being proposed? Or are you not?

6 MR. FREEMAN: No, good question. We are  
7 not. We acquired this site again with a long-term vision  
8 for development, and our analysis at the point in time  
9 this land acquisition was completed was that we would  
10 have adequate service from the existing SRP distribution  
11 to support this facility as it grew over time.

12 Banner, just given our scale particularly  
13 here in Arizona, has a significant relationship with SRP,  
14 APS and other utilities. We don't consume electricity  
15 like an industrial manufacturer or a data center. We're  
16 not at that scale. And so we find in most cases existing  
17 infrastructure has more than adequate capacity to support  
18 our needs.

19 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. I was  
20 just recalling the Tucson series that we went through  
21 several months back where I believe you were a potential,  
22 you have your own -- you buy directly from the 230 that  
23 went through there, I believe. But that's irrelevant to  
24 this project. Thank you.

25 MR. FREEMAN: Sure.



1 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, Member Mercer, yes.

5 MEMBER MERCER: I have a question,  
6 Mr. Freeman. About the helipad, that normally goes on  
7 top of a building. This one is at ground level?

8 MR. FREEMAN: Yeah, I would say normal may  
9 not be an accurate statement in my history with our  
10 facilities. In the case of Banner Ocotillo, which we're  
11 going to show you later today, you will see that that is  
12 a roof-mounted helipad. But a number of our facilities,  
13 I daresay the majority do have ground mounted. And there  
14 are several current facilities we are developing today  
15 where ground mounted is the preferred deployment.

16 MEMBER MERCER: Thank you.

17 BY MS. DE BLASI:

18 Q. Mr. Freeman, let's move to slide No. 5. So can  
19 you just describe general orientation and what this slide  
20 is portraying?

21 A. Yeah, this is my opportunity to get things  
22 right. So apparently this is 63rd Avenue here on the  
23 west, Baseline Road to the north, Loop 202 on our eastern  
24 boundary, LACC land not owned by Banner.

25 Again, in the top left corner this is the same

1 site plan you just saw, this is cleaned up just to show  
2 what the potential of a singular route impacting our  
3 eastern boundary would look like within a roughly  
4 100-foot setback which is what we've been discussing with  
5 SRP, the applicant.

6 Q. And can you just briefly describe how this  
7 route, which appears to be now Route 1 on the new map,  
8 would impact the property.

9 A. Yeah. Yeah. I mean, again, we -- we -- as I  
10 mentioned earlier Banner Ocotillo was squeezed into a  
11 20-acre parcel. This net site acreage is 23 for a  
12 comparable-sized facility, so any unplanned impacts such  
13 as this, you know, are concerning to us.

14 You know, again, SRP did a nice job of working  
15 with us understanding our needs. The fact that this is a  
16 future proposed development and we think that we can live  
17 with this potential impact and shift some pieces around  
18 on site and still complete our intended development.

19 All that being said do we have concerns that  
20 remain? The answer is yes. I mean, viewshed for one. I  
21 don't know that anyone loves the view of power lines  
22 especially when your business is health and wellness of  
23 others. But, again, we're hopeful we can orient and do  
24 some things with this future design that will help negate  
25 those impacts.

1           We're going to have to look, again, at the  
2 location of the helipad, inbound, outbound flight  
3 appearance based upon where these lines get situated.  
4 Again, as I mentioned pushing this facility further to  
5 the west brings the helipad closer to residents that may  
6 not be thrilled with that potential outcome.

7           I do think it's worth noting for this proposed  
8 facility the air traffic is assumed to be relatively  
9 light. This would not be a Level 1 trauma center, and so  
10 most of the flights would be outbound leaving this  
11 facility to higher acuity locations. Not a lot of  
12 inbound traffic.

13           But again, it is still something, you know,  
14 seconds matter in those cases and so we've got to really  
15 be thoughtful around the placement of that.

16           We have not fully studied every possible  
17 potential impact of this, but if there are impacts to  
18 location of our drive, particularly along Baseline Road,  
19 traffic implications, other things, those would require  
20 further study.

21           MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

22           CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

23           MEMBER KRYDER: A question, Mr. Freeman.  
24 With regard to the runoff since you're sitting on the  
25 edge of the LACC, does the land run toward the LACC?

1 Does it run toward the 202? What direction was the flow  
2 of the rain water go?

3 MR. FREEMAN: Committee Member Kryder, I  
4 don't know that I've got that information available with  
5 me today. I would tell you this site is relatively flat.  
6 There's not a lot of elevation change and the storm water  
7 runoff and which way that would be slated to go, I don't  
8 have that detail here today.

9 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. It's  
10 not critical. I was just wondering with the lay of the  
11 thing, 23 acres of water is a lot of water when you get a  
12 monsoon.

13 MR. FREEMAN: I assume a lot of it --  
14 there's a couple of different storm water retention  
15 locations shown on site. There's one here at the  
16 southern boundary of our property. I believe there's  
17 some other on-site retention which is a little bit hard  
18 to see on this plan here. But, again, something I  
19 would -- I don't want to speak out of school.

20 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. I --  
21 that was exactly the reason for my question. I didn't  
22 see the retention pond there that you pointed out, the  
23 print's too fine for me to read, but, okay.

24 So rather than run into the LACC, you've  
25 got a retention pond right in front of it.

1 MR. FREEMAN: That's right.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you. Thank you,  
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 BY MS. DE BLASI:

5 Q. So you've talked about some of the different  
6 considerations that go into planning these facilities  
7 that provide medical services to the community.

8 Can you just go into a little bit more detail?  
9 I think we have some considerations on the next slide to  
10 talk through.

11 A. Yeah. And so I think I've said a lot of these  
12 things, but again, this is acquired with the intent to  
13 build a potential mixed-use outpatient acute care  
14 hospital on this site.

15 Our time line still to be determined, as I  
16 referenced earlier, this was based upon -- really kind of  
17 structured based upon Banner Ocotillo and learning across  
18 the most recent campuses that we've developed.

19 Just from a context perspective Banner Ocotillo  
20 has a staff of about 800, sees in excess of 4,000 acute  
21 care cases per year.

22 And I reference the helipad volume, roughly, you  
23 know, somewhat limited and minimal which is I think great  
24 for residents, although sort of a required nuisance at  
25 some points, but 150-ish outbound flights are estimated.

1           You know, we talked about it and showed on the  
2 earlier slides it is a bit of an irregular shaped parcel,  
3 you've got the LACC to the south, Loop 202 to the east.  
4 And so that's forced some creativity in terms of how you  
5 move these various pieces around on the site.

6           I remain optimistic, you know, based upon the  
7 outcome of these hearings that we'll be able to mitigate  
8 as much of this as possible. But again really keeping in  
9 mind as we design these accessibility inflow for  
10 emergency vehicles, placement of sensitive equipment,  
11 particularly imaging equipment are key considerations for  
12 us.

13          Q.    You mentioned you have some examples from other  
14 facilities. Do you want to walk through those?

15          A.    Sure. Again, here's just two quick images. So  
16 this is the front view of the Banner Ocotillo Medical  
17 Center. Again, this is roughly 120 beds located at the  
18 southeast corner of Loop 202 and Alma School Road in  
19 Chandler.

20                This facility opened during COVID but is a  
21 really good representative example of what was in mind  
22 when we acquired this site in Laveen and designed that  
23 facility.

24                This is the outpatient -- I'm sorry -- this is  
25 the inpatient, this is the patient tower you're currently

1 viewing, so that is that four-story structure.

2 If I move to the next slide, this is an example  
3 of the outpatient clinic. This is a single story -- this  
4 is a roughly 40,000-foot outpatient clinic, the Laveen  
5 site plan actually calls for roughly 36,000 square feet.

6 Again, you can see a similar architectural  
7 aesthetic, but this is situated on site to be a more  
8 convenient ingress/egress for patients that don't need to  
9 come to the hospital. They may be coming in to see a  
10 primary care physician, a specialist, having some lab  
11 work done, et cetera.

12 And then finally, this is a site plan of Banner  
13 Ocotillo and a lot of the themes that I referenced in our  
14 Laveen project hold true here.

15 Building A is the health center or outpatient  
16 clinic. You can see the intentional separation from the  
17 diagnostics and treatment building and the existing  
18 patient tower.

19 We have access to this site, our primary staff  
20 and visitor and patient access coming through an entry  
21 off Alma School Road. Our emergency vehicles actually  
22 sneak back around and up this back drive to an emergency  
23 vehicle drop-off, so very similar -- we're trying to not  
24 mix that emergency vehicle access with others coming from  
25 the facility.

1           One of the committee members referenced earlier  
2 the rooftop-mounted helipad, which in this case on the  
3 patient tower up on the top of that fourth floor is item  
4 D, our central utility plant, again, contained and sort  
5 of buried back behind the building for aesthetics and  
6 other reasons.

7           But, again, this is just a good representative  
8 example of what Laveen could look like for us in the  
9 future.

10          Q.    Okay.  If we could have the SRP placemat showing  
11 the PAD map on the right screen, and Troy, if you could  
12 go back to Slide 5.  Oh, we're there.  Perfect.

13                So I'd like to walk through the different route  
14 alternatives and talk about why Banner Health may or may  
15 not be supporting those different routes.

16                And I'm going to have Troy Freeman refer to them  
17 in nodes understanding that we have new maps in play, so  
18 if there are any questions, just let us know.

19                So can you talk about looking at the placemat,  
20 let's just orient first on the right screen, can you  
21 please just orient everyone where Banner's property is  
22 and just for reference for the record you're pointing  
23 to --

24          A.    I am pointing to the site with the red cross  
25 identified on it.



1 Q. And that is parcel number 6; correct?

2 A. Correct. And that image actually looks like  
3 it's showing our site plus a portion of the adjacent  
4 Kitchell site, which I am pointing to here on screen. It  
5 looks like it's encompassing the entirety, not just our  
6 portion of the site. But as you can see, our eastern  
7 boundary is totally of what's being shown in that image.

8 Q. Okay. Great. And hopefully you can see that.  
9 If not, you have it in front of you, but can you just  
10 talk about which routes Banner supports that are near the  
11 Banner campus?

12 A. Yeah. Banner supports route N2 from Nodes  
13 J to N to O. And N3, hybrid route N3, N4, Nodes J to K  
14 to L or M.

15 Q. Which is now referenced as Route 2 on the new  
16 map or the green route.

17 So let's discuss Banner's positions on the  
18 different routes.

19 With respect to route N2, which is as you  
20 pointed out J to N to O, you've talked about some of the  
21 impacts of that route, and sort of its impact on the  
22 Banner facility. But can you just talk through those one  
23 more time and with respect to the impacts of that route  
24 on your property?

25 A. Yeah. So, again, we're showing a conceptual

1 view of that potential, you know, 100-foot impact to our  
2 site, Slide 5 in our exhibits. And, again, it's not lost  
3 on Banner that this overall infrastructure project is  
4 really a good thing for this part of Phoenix.

5 And so we want to be supportive in the context  
6 of also, you know, maintaining our ability to develop  
7 what we think is a critical piece of infrastructure here  
8 to serve the community, and, again, working with SRP,  
9 this route is supportable because we think at this time  
10 we can still redesign with the limited impact on our  
11 eastern boundary to accommodate our future intended use.

12 As I referenced, we still have concerns. You  
13 know, this is conceptual, we recognize that, you know,  
14 until this gets set in stone we won't fully be able to  
15 redesign this site.

16 But based upon our understanding, we think we'll  
17 have the ability to redesign this site, keep our intended  
18 development in place subject to any learnings and changes  
19 we may need to make in the future.

20 The viewshed, the optics of these lines are, you  
21 know, remain of a concern but, again, something we think  
22 we can manage in the context of updating this plan.

23 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

25 MEMBER GOLD: A question for Mr. Freeman.

1 Your emergency entrance is on the east  
2 side. The other side --

3 CHMN STAFFORD: That's the west side.

4 MEMBER GOLD: Oh, that's the west -- oh,  
5 not your emergency entrance, your patrons' entrance is on  
6 the east side; correct? By the buildings?

7 MR. FREEMAN: It is coming in off of  
8 Baseline Road. Oops, I hit the wrong button there.  
9 Yeah, thank you.

10 MEMBER GOLD: The patients come in there  
11 and where do they park?

12 MR. FREEMAN: It depends on where they're  
13 going. If patients are coming into the outpatient  
14 building, there's a parking field here that surrounds the  
15 outpatient building. If patients are coming into the  
16 acute care facility, the hospital, they'll likely try to  
17 park as close to the front door of the building as  
18 possible.

19 But you can see the parking fields that  
20 extend to the north of the proposed building as well as  
21 down along the western side of the building, it's very  
22 likely some of this will be reserved for Staff and  
23 physicians at some point in time as we further refine  
24 this plan. And then what doesn't show particularly well  
25 with the bowling alley-driven line over top, is there is

1 parking as well down this boundary.

2 MEMBER GOLD: That is exactly what I was  
3 going to ask, if they're going to have power lines there  
4 that means the whole area is going to be pretty much  
5 vacant on the ground. And I was wondering if you were  
6 going to have parking there. Now I see that you are. So  
7 that's fine. Okay. You answered my question.

8 BY MS. DE BLASI:

9 Q. And also Mr. Freeman, just talking about  
10 viewshed for a minute, is it your experience when siting  
11 power lines near a hospital with a helipad that you have  
12 red ball markers that make that power line even more  
13 visible?

14 A. Yes. That could be the case and, again, depends  
15 on the specifics of the situation. And that's something  
16 we'll have to study further. But yes, any movements of  
17 what we're showing here are going to require us, and  
18 again, in context of the broader power lines as they're  
19 developed in this area to rethink, you know, take in and  
20 takeoff and landing for the helipad and all the logistics  
21 surrounding it.

22 Q. But this alignment would allow you still access  
23 to those areas?

24 A. At that point we believe that is the case.

25 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

2 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Freeman, would you point  
3 at the helipad? All right. That's quite a ways away  
4 from the towers. Okay. Thank you.

5 And how tall is that building that the  
6 heli -- is that helipad on the ground?

7 MR. FREEMAN: That is a ground-mounted  
8 helipad.

9 MEMBER GOLD: Gotcha. Okay.

10 MR. FREEMAN: And just from an orientation  
11 context perspective, diagnostics and treatment is a  
12 two-story roughly 30-foot facility. The patient towers  
13 are four-story, 56 feet -- I'm sorry, 60 feet.

14 MEMBER GOLD: And the power lines are going  
15 to be about 100?

16 MR. FREEMAN: I think maybe even more is my  
17 understanding.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe up to 199 feet.

19 MR. FREEMAN: That's what I saw, yeah.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: I think it's -- I think the  
21 height of it is going to be greater, I think it's for  
22 crossing the highway, not -- this would be running  
23 parallel, so I wouldn't think that they would be that  
24 height for this segment.

25 //

1 BY MS. DE BLASI:

2 Q. Okay. Let's move on to alternative route --  
3 preferred route N3-N4 now referenced as Route 2 on the  
4 view map. If you could just orient us to those on the  
5 right screen. And just talk to us about what you're  
6 referencing and by node, please?

7 A. Yeah. So this is hybrid route N3-N4, Nodes J to  
8 K to L or M as shown.

9 Q. And that's along the LACC; correct?

10 A. Correct. That's along the LACC and so, again,  
11 from our perspective, we -- this is a route where we  
12 think the impacts are negligible to our site that will be  
13 ultimately be dictated by the placement of poles as they  
14 come across the 202 and the LACC, but, again, our  
15 understanding today is that will be a negligible impact  
16 to our site.

17 Q. Okay. And then let's move to what's referenced  
18 on this map on the PAD route N1 and that's going from  
19 Nodes J to N to P.

20 You've referenced it a bit in the Slide 4, but  
21 if you could please talk about why you are not supportive  
22 of this route.

23 A. Yeah, so the -- I think our biggest concern is  
24 the risk of having two parallel lines running along that  
25 eastern boundary to our site, and as we showed earlier in

1 the presentation I believe on Slide 4, that requires the  
2 potential for two separate 100-foot impacts to our site  
3 which at that point just given the acreage impacted we  
4 believe will materially and adversely impact our ability  
5 to develop the site as intended.

6 Q. And we've had those discussions with SRP;  
7 correct?

8 A. That is correct. Yeah. This has all been well  
9 vetted over multiple discussions with SRP who, again, has  
10 been a great partner and has really been helpful to  
11 communicate and work with us through this process.

12 Q. And if you could just go back on the left  
13 screen, go back to Slide 4. If there were two lines  
14 shown in this configuration even with the tight -- you  
15 know, if they each had a hundred-foot easement would that  
16 prevent you from building as planned here? Might it  
17 prevent you from building at all?

18 A. Yeah, based upon our current review of these  
19 impacts, the answer is yes.

20 Q. To both?

21 A. Yes. Correct.

22 Q. All right. Thank you. And I assume it's the  
23 same additional impacts with two lines there, with the  
24 underbuild of the 69kV would increase impacts to  
25 viewsheds and EMF and everything you've mentioned?

1 A. 100 percent. Again, that just is going to  
2 require such a significant redesign that our initial  
3 perspective is that would preclude our intended use of  
4 the site. For just any number of any reasons.

5 The amount of land taken, again, we're here to  
6 promote health and wellness and healing, and so layering  
7 two sites of two rows of power lines out those windows, I  
8 mean, there's so many adverse impacts that we think are  
9 incongruous with what we're trying to achieve here.

10 Q. Okay. Great. And then with respect to the  
11 other route alternatives that are shown on the right  
12 screen with the PAD map, does Banner have opinions about  
13 any of those routes to the south?

14 A. No. We do not.

15 Q. And is that because they're not impacting the  
16 property?

17 A. That is correct. I mean, again, we want to be  
18 thoughtful neighbors. As we've shown throughout this  
19 presentation we've had to do a lot of investigation and  
20 analysis on the potential impacts to our site. And so we  
21 really concerned our focus on working with SRP and  
22 identifying options and alternatives to mitigate the  
23 potential impacts to our intended project.

24 MS. DE BLASI: Chairman, I don't have any  
25 additional questions.



1 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Ms. De Blasi. I  
2 just -- quick follow-up question.

3 So Banner's position is that if both lines  
4 travel from Node J to Baseline, that creates the  
5 significant problem that you want to avoid?

6 MS. DE BLASI: Correct.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: One line from J to Baseline  
8 you can work with? But it's the siting of both of them  
9 which is problematic?

10 MS. DE BLASI: Correct. That Mr. Freeman's  
11 testimony.

12 MR. FREEMAN: Correct. That is correct.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. Thank you.  
14 That concludes your direct, Ms. De Blasi?

15 MS. DE BLASI: Yes, it does, Chairman.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Derstine, any  
17 cross-examine.

18 MR. DERSTINE: No, Your Honor.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Ms. De Blasi,  
20 you've had two exhibits, BH-1 and 2. Those are both  
21 admitted.

22 (Exhibits BH-1 and BH-2 were admitted.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: It is now after the noon  
24 hour. I think up next -- do you have any further  
25 testimony to present, Mr. Derstine?

1 MR. DERSTINE: We do not.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. With that I  
3 suggest that we take our lunch break and we come back and  
4 we can get closings from both parties.

5 MR. DERSTINE: Very good.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe that's -- and any  
7 of other loose ends we may have to tie up, I think it  
8 pretty much concludes everything except for closing  
9 arguments.

10 MR. DERSTINE: I think you're correct.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Excellent.  
12 With that let's take our lunch recess. Return here at  
13 12:15. We stand in recess -- 1:15. Excuse me. We stand  
14 in recess.

15 (Recess from 12:07 p.m. to 1:21 p.m.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the  
17 record.

18 The applicant has presented its case as did  
19 the intervenor, Banner Health. Are there any further  
20 questions from members before the parties give their  
21 closing arguments?

22 (No response.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: And Mr. Derstine, you had  
24 decided not to call your second panel?

25 MR. DERSTINE: Correct.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: And the purpose of that  
2 panel was primarily to address?

3 MR. DERSTINE: If we had any strong or  
4 credible evidence raising issues with fields or health  
5 impacts from transmission lines, we just didn't know how  
6 the testimony in the case would go or whether we would  
7 have intervenors, so out of an abundance of caution we  
8 identified that rebuttal panel, but I don't see any need  
9 to call them and --

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, because there wasn't  
11 any evidence presented on that. The only thing that I  
12 think really talked about at all was the resolution from,  
13 was it the school district that was attached to, in your  
14 Exhibit 18 that that had communications --

15 MR. DERSTINE: Yes, the school board  
16 resolution which I don't remember what exhibit that was.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe it was SRP-18.

18 MR. DERSTINE: It's included in 18, right.  
19 There's a number of whereas clauses in that resolution.  
20 One of them, you know, raised, I think made a vague  
21 reference to an EMF study. But I think in general it was  
22 more focused on the perception of potential health issues  
23 and that was the basis for the school district not  
24 wanting the line close to the school on South Mountain  
25 Avenue.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. But they did not  
2 intervene or present evidence to this committee.

3 MR. DERSTINE: That's correct.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So I just want  
5 to confirm you feel that any allegations of that nature  
6 have not been sufficiently alleged to merit a response  
7 from your second panel of witnesses.

8 MR. DERSTINE: Exactly right.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

10 Anything -- any further questions from  
11 members before we proceed to closing arguments?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Derstine, please  
14 proceed.

15 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. I'm clicking my  
16 clicker but it's not -- maybe I'm advancing the left  
17 slide without the right, if we can get me back on track.  
18 That's the place to start, yep.

19 All right. We'll see if I make this button  
20 work as we move forward.

21 Every case is different, and I made mention  
22 of it before and I'm sure you all remember, it wasn't  
23 just two weeks ago that you heard a case that involved a  
24 single radial 230kV transmission line moving over open  
25 land, grazing land, administered by the State Land

1 Department.

2                   And here you are roughly two weeks later  
3 looking at a project that involves two sets of  
4 double-circuit 230kV lines that are being sited in a  
5 rapidly changing and growing urban area within the City  
6 of Phoenix. And so I just wanted to start by thanking  
7 the committee, all the members here and appearing  
8 virtually, for your willingness and your ability to dig  
9 into the issues of every case and consider those  
10 different issues and always come up with thoughtful and  
11 well-reasoned decisions. So thank you for that.

12                   I'm still having issues. I'm just  
13 advancing maybe one slide. Does that work? Can you back  
14 up the right screen? Just take me to closing and then  
15 it's matched with the map, no, right? Yep. Back up one.  
16 Maybe it'll go together from here on out. If not, I'll  
17 abandon the clicker and the slides and I'll just talk to  
18 you.

19                   So I think as I mentioned at the outset,  
20 this case is about serving growth in Laveen. And if you  
21 were on the tour you saw how this area is rapidly  
22 changing. But for a long number of years, including up  
23 until recently, there's been residential growth but  
24 really the area has remained largely agricultural or  
25 undeveloped.

1                   And that's changed. It's largely changed  
2 as a result of two things. One, the completion of the  
3 Loop 202 in 2019. And then the City's designation of the  
4 southern area on the west side of the 202 as the tech  
5 corridor, South Mountain tech corridor.

6                   That designation by the City that includes  
7 a change in their general plan that just occurred in 2024  
8 is intended to attract industrial and high-tech customers  
9 that typically have high energy demands, require a lot of  
10 energy. And so much of this case involves constructing  
11 and finding the best place for the new 230 facilities  
12 that are intended to facilitate that growth and allow the  
13 City to attract those businesses, high-tech industrial  
14 customers that have high load growth or high energy  
15 demands.

16                   So as I mentioned in my opening, I think  
17 the easy part of this is understanding the need which  
18 I've touched on. And then understanding what we need to  
19 build. We need two sets of double-circuit 230kV lines.

20                   The difficult part and you understand the  
21 challenge of having to come up with the right routes, two  
22 routes, for the two sets of double-circuit 230kV lines.

23                   And I appreciate your patience with us and  
24 your willingness to dig into all of our colors and  
25 letters and the map and decipher and understand those

1 routes as we presented them, the routes in the  
2 application, and then ultimately the preferred routes  
3 that we are asking you to approve for this project.

4 I think the one key issue that you all  
5 understand I think certainly now is that every one of the  
6 routes that we presented and including the preferred  
7 routes, they all have differing impacts. There's no  
8 single route that's clean and everyone supports and  
9 thinks is great.

10 But the preferred routes that are presented  
11 in the application are the two routes that best meet the  
12 needs of this project and I think do the best job of  
13 balancing those impacts in terms of getting close to the  
14 industrial load by being on the west side of the 202 and  
15 trying to avoid impacts to residences and the hospital  
16 and even the school. We've done our best to minimize  
17 those impacts.

18 And in addition to try to avoid and  
19 minimize having to place two lines on one parcel that  
20 have one parcel owner, like the hospital have to bear two  
21 transmission lines which could significantly impact their  
22 development plans.

23 If I can get one of these slides up. If  
24 you can take me to the slide that identifies Preferred  
25 Route 1. Keep going. And one more. Right there.

1 I think that gets me to the heart of the  
2 matter, Preferred Route 1 and Preferred Route 2 here in a  
3 bit.

4 But so we've -- Preferred Route 1 as we've  
5 identified it in our route map -- in our new map that is  
6 an exhibit to the proposed CEC as we've talked about,  
7 starts at Node B, continues to E, continues over to H,  
8 then moves north to J, then to N, and over to O.

9 That route, Preferred Route 1, with the  
10 contingent segment or route which is here from A and then  
11 makes the turn to E, is what we're asking that the  
12 committee consider and approve for our first preferred  
13 route, Preferred Route 1.

14 You know, I think the one area of  
15 discussion and I think, you know, understandably concern  
16 was this leg on South Mountain Avenue. But I think the  
17 route tour was helpful. It certainly was instructive to  
18 me in looking at South Mountain Avenue today. It sounds  
19 like a nice, big street but it's a dirt farm road.

20 And the parcels on either side of South  
21 Mountain Avenue are undeveloped. And so before the  
22 school district closes on that parcel, which they haven't  
23 yet, or after they close but before they build their  
24 school, South Mountain Avenue will have to be developed,  
25 and it will be widened.



1                   And once South Mountain Avenue is developed  
2 and widened into an actual road or surface street, a  
3 major collector street as Mr. Hernandez has indicated,  
4 that will increase the separation of the transmission  
5 line on this leg of the preferred route across South  
6 Mountain Avenue over to Node H. And I think it also  
7 gives the school district time to adjust their site plan  
8 to accommodate and create more distance from the  
9 transmission line.

10                   But, again, the plan is to place the  
11 transmission line on the south side of South Mountain  
12 Avenue which will be then some distance once the road is  
13 actually built and created to the requisite width and  
14 whatever setback is required for the school to place its  
15 building.

16                   So in terms of, again, balancing the  
17 impacts and the advantages and disadvantages, our view is  
18 that this route, Preferred Route 1, remains the best  
19 route notwithstanding that the line does follow  
20 South Mountain Avenue.

21                   And I think what you heard from Ms. Horgen  
22 yesterday is it may be the school district was not fully  
23 aware or understanding of our intention to place the line  
24 on the south side of South Mountain Avenue and to get it  
25 as far as away from the school as possible, and that

1 they're willing to consider that.

2           So the other part of Preferred Route 1 is  
3 the contingent route which are these moving from A to E,  
4 and you heard a fair amount of testimony from  
5 Mr. Hernandez and Mr. Heim about the optionality and  
6 the -- that that contingent route gives us to work with  
7 those industrial high-tech customers to get the  
8 transmission lines closer to their interconnection points  
9 or their substations that will serve their load. And so  
10 we're asking that as part of the approval for Preferred  
11 Route 1 that you approve that contingent segment or route  
12 from A to E.

13           So if we can move to Preferred Route 2,  
14 please. Preferred Route 2 starts at Node C, moves to F,  
15 then to H then crosses the 202 at this link from H to I.  
16 Then moves up on the east side of the 202 between I and  
17 K, and then follows our hybrid path along the Laveen area  
18 conveyance channel.

19           And as Mr. Hernandez has testified to, will  
20 start on the south side to avoid the tree line there at  
21 the beginning of the conveyance channel, but then  
22 transition over to the north side as we move east along  
23 the conveyance channel to the connection point at L.

24           The only caveat, and as you heard, you  
25 heard a fair amount of testimony and you saw the e-mail

1 package of the ongoing discussions and communications  
2 between Mr. Hernandez and ADOT, this Preferred Route 2  
3 includes our contingent route, which is really our backup  
4 route to allow us to still build and follow, have a good  
5 route to get over on to the conveyance channel.

6 If ADOT is unwilling to approve I to K,  
7 then we would be forced to put for this short segment two  
8 lines in parallel, which, again, is not what we would  
9 like to do, it's not our preference. We want to try to  
10 avoid placing two lines on any parcel and having two  
11 lines there does create some significant impacts.

12 Well, it puts two lines along the east side  
13 of the school, but it also creates impacts to the  
14 development that's planned for the north of the school  
15 and that's on that parcel. But that may be all we're  
16 left with if ADOT doesn't approve the I to K link.

17 I think you've heard as much and you know  
18 as much as I do about where we are in those discussions  
19 with ADOT. I think SRP is cautiously optimistic that  
20 ADOT will allow us to build on the -- on that east side  
21 along that link -- that segment, but, again, the  
22 contingent route or that contingent segment from  
23 Nodes H to J is important to allow us to complete a  
24 second line route or a pole route for the project.

25 Oh, H, J, K, oh, the link, I was skipping

1 the link there, so getting us across. So the contingent  
2 route plus the northern link to get us over to the  
3 conveyance channel.

4 Those are the routes. Those are the  
5 preferred routes. Those are what we think are the best  
6 route to serve the need for this project. It took a  
7 while to walk through all those colors and letters and  
8 things.

9 But you folks always impress me with being  
10 smart and willing to help us explain to you our projects  
11 and we thank you for doing that for this case. So we ask  
12 that you grant us a CEC for the two preferred routes as I  
13 just outlined for the project and, again, thank you for  
14 your time and your thoughtful consideration.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Derstine.

16 Ms. De Blasi.

17 MS. DE BLASI: Good afternoon, Chairman and  
18 Members of the Committee. We would like to thank the  
19 committee members for their attention to hearing all of  
20 the parties' evidence this week and for their patience in  
21 working through the different route options.

22 On behalf of Banner Health we would also  
23 like to acknowledge the tremendous amount of  
24 collaboration on the part of SRP to weigh options and  
25 impacts on all of the stakeholders.

1                   Banner has worked with the applicant  
2 throughout the process and greatly appreciates the  
3 willingness of SRP to hear our concerns and address the  
4 constraints presented in this case.

5                   The entire SRP team should be commended for  
6 their professionalism and expertise in siting this line  
7 through this developing urban environment.

8                   As we heard during the testimony of  
9 Mr. Freeman, Banner has invested in property for the  
10 development of a medical campus for the Laveen community  
11 that is adjacent to the routes being considered.

12                   The decision on the routes near the medical  
13 campus in this case does not just impact Banner, but it  
14 also impacts the ability of the greater community to  
15 receive emergency and medical services from the medical  
16 campus as a critical resource to the community.

17                   Initially the lines being studied near the  
18 medical campus would have prevented Banner from  
19 developing the site, so we worked with SRP to find a  
20 route that would minimize interference with the  
21 development of a medical campus.

22                   As you heard through the testimony of  
23 Mr. Freeman, Banner believes that SRP's preferred routes  
24 2 -- N2, which is Nodes J to N to O, which is now  
25 Route 1, and N3-N4 which is Nodes J to K or L to M, which

1 is now newly labeled Route 2 near the medical campus,  
2 will balance that interference by alleviating impacts to  
3 access for its emergency flight operations, for any  
4 aboveground lines sited directly to the east of the  
5 medical campus, and to other critical safety and viewshed  
6 issues related to the operation of the medical campus.

7           Alternative route N1 following Nodes J to N  
8 to P would require too much of a utility easement to  
9 allow for development of the site if sited along the east  
10 of the medical campus with Route 1. And would create  
11 impacts to the residents to the north of Baseline.

12           Therefore, Banner opposes alternative route  
13 N1 and supports the new preferred routes 1 and 2.

14           Again, Banner thanks the committee for its  
15 time and expertise in hearing this important project as  
16 well as the applicant and other stakeholders for  
17 conferring with us on the issue throughout the process.

18           Thank you.

19           CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

20           All right, Members, before we pull up the  
21 draft CEC, which I still have to -- yet to finish before  
22 we put them up here, I'd like to have kind of a general  
23 discussion so I can kind of take the temperature of the  
24 members and where we're going with this.

25           We had a lot of different routes, a lot of

1 different colors. I really I can't say how much I like  
2 this new map, SRP-27. I think -- I think looking at this  
3 map I think this gets us where we need to go.

4 From my perspective, I think this is the  
5 route -- with the routes, plural, with the two lines with  
6 the two contingent segments I think it kind of balances  
7 the equities of the case before us and I think all the  
8 options considered provide the best outcome.

9 I mean, we have different segments that  
10 were opposed by different groups. For example, looking  
11 at the segment from E to H, the east-west portion along  
12 South Mountain Avenue that was -- that was opposed by the  
13 planned school, the D, G, I segments of Route 4 I think  
14 was opposed by the City. BRIO filed a limited appearance  
15 in this matter, and ADOT.

16 Segment F to H I think the City had  
17 concerns about billboards along the 202. But their  
18 concern was only if both lines were colocated in that  
19 same location.

20 Similarly as you heard from Banner it was  
21 that section from J to N -- well, actually for them just  
22 J to Baseline, that a single line is acceptable but  
23 collocating both lines for that segment would be  
24 problematic for them.

25 And then the one in the segment I to K was

1 opposed by all the property owners that it borders, PADs  
2 11, 12 and 13. But it has to go someplace. I think the  
3 need for the project is abundantly clear. These lines  
4 are necessary and they have to go someplace.

5 And I'm interested to hear from members but  
6 I think, again, this map SRP-27, I think it gets us to  
7 where we need to be.

8 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

10 MEMBER HILL: I like the map, too. In  
11 order to proceed, are you looking for a motion from us to  
12 include the two preferred routes including their  
13 alternate --

14 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm not looking for a  
15 motion at this time. I'm just kind of after we have our  
16 discussion we're going to take a recess and I'm going to  
17 go get Chairman's 1 and 2 prepared. And then we'll  
18 start -- we can start voting on it.

19 But I want to kind of get an idea of how  
20 much work I'm going to be doing between during that  
21 recess before we come back and vote on it.

22 MEMBER HILL: The only reason I asked is  
23 because I was trying to recall the last time we had  
24 multiple routes and we kind of went through and  
25 eliminated them over time. And so I didn't know if you



1 were looking for some process similar to that or if you  
2 were looking for just general feedback.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: I think general feedback.  
4 I remember that case that you're referring to, and that  
5 lasted 10 days of hearing. I think we were much further  
6 along in this one. I was hoping to avoid having to go  
7 through each section and eliminate or accept.

8 I thought that the map, the SRP-27, I think  
9 that gets us to where we need to be. If we need to have  
10 further discussion and other members don't agree with  
11 that, then now is the time. But I'm just trying to get a  
12 general sense of where the committee's headed.

13 MEMBER HILL: Okay. So if you're going  
14 down the row, I'll just say I support the preferred  
15 routes and the contingent segments. Kind of like to see  
16 a different color on the map but I do like the map. I  
17 just think that blue tends to be associated with river  
18 systems and green with parks. So my only suggestion is  
19 to change the colors. But it's not a requirement.

20 And the other edit that we might want to  
21 include or be referenced somewhere in the CEC is the  
22 intent to remove the power lines associated with the  
23 Anderson-Orme 230kV, that section along Baseline and  
24 59th. So that there's someplace that reflects that those  
25 will be removed.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

2 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

4 MEMBER GOLD: Remembering a previous CEC  
5 that I worked on where we weren't told until the very  
6 end --

7 MEMBER KRYDER: Closer to your mic, Jon.

8 MEMBER GOLD: Reflecting on a previous CEC  
9 that most of us worked where we weren't told until the  
10 very end that there was a higher authority who said this  
11 is where it has to start, I think this applicant told us  
12 what the constraints were up front after a little  
13 prodding.

14 And they explained to us why any  
15 alternative routes would not work. So I think what  
16 they've done is they simplified the map, couldn't have  
17 done better myself, and they've demonstrated the two  
18 routes that wouldn't work best. And I have no objection  
19 to exactly what's going on now.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Member Little,  
21 you have your hand raised.

22 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
23 also like the map. I concur that the colors might be  
24 better in different than green and blue, but I am also  
25 fine with green and blue if that's the way you want to

1 leave it.

2 I can also agree that some indication that  
3 that segment between O and L of the Anderson-Orme line  
4 should be indicated that it's removed somehow or other,  
5 whether it's on this map or whether it's in the CEC.

6 I would like to see what the feeling of the  
7 members of the committee is to include as an alternative,  
8 another alternative E, F, H as opposed to E, H. And my  
9 feeling is that that would give -- I have a sense that  
10 the conversations between Laveen planning -- the Laveen  
11 planning group, SRP, and the school district are not --  
12 have not concluded. And my thought is that that would --  
13 if we put that as an alternative that would also give the  
14 applicant the option to go that route if they choose to.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: What were those nodes  
16 again, please? I didn't write that down fast enough.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: It would be to cross from  
18 E to F and then from F to H as opposed to the current  
19 E, H routing proposal.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Gold.

22 MEMBER GOLD: I understand what Member  
23 Little is saying, but if you remember what they said  
24 before about two parallel sets of poles next to each  
25 other creates a safety issue for the maintenance crews.

1 And I think that's the reason that they  
2 went to South Mountain Avenue instead of jumping across  
3 A, D, F. That does not require the parallel route that  
4 they don't want to do.

5 They may be forced to do one between  
6 H and J but I don't know that we would want to enter  
7 another option between F and H because if you go to E, F  
8 then you have to go F, H. And I think that parallel  
9 route would cause a problem.

10 Mr. Derstine, am I understanding your  
11 concerns from earlier?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Is that an accurate  
13 recollection of the evidence presented?

14 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, Member Gold, I  
15 think you are correct that in terms of having two  
16 parallel lines along that segment of that parcel impacts  
17 the development plan for that parcel, and I think there  
18 is testimony, and we saw in the City's letter I believe  
19 raised and I'll look to Mr. Hernandez and/or Ms. Pollio  
20 or any of our witnesses to help me out and put more  
21 detail on it.

22 But I think the biggest issue is having two  
23 parallel lines along the 202 there essentially prevents  
24 that developer from pursuing the option and what has been  
25 approved as being billboards along the edge of that, of

1 their parcel. Where one route does not, having two lines  
2 along that eastern edge of that parcel will essentially  
3 prevent them from proceeding with their development plans  
4 and that impacts the development agreement with the City  
5 of Phoenix for funding park improvements.

6 Do I have that right, Mr. Hernandez or  
7 Ms. Pollio?

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct. One line  
9 we feel like we can mitigate any concerns in terms of the  
10 location of the line and proximity to the billboards. We  
11 do not feel like we can do that with two transmission  
12 lines hugging the eastern boundary of that parcel between  
13 Nodes F and H.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

16 MEMBER LITTLE: May I respond?

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, please.

18 MEMBER LITTLE: I understand the reasons  
19 for not wanting to put two lines parallel. I'd just as  
20 soon not see there be two parallel lines between H and J  
21 either, for lots of reasons.

22 However, and I hear what is being said  
23 about the billboards and blah, blah, blah.

24 However, as a representative of the public,  
25 I just think that at least having the option to go a

1 different route because we are placing the perceptions  
2 that parents and/or children may have -- may have a  
3 little bit heavier bearing on this than billboards. I've  
4 had my say. Thank you.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Little.  
6 Member Fontes, you have your hand raised.

7 MEMBER FONTES: It's just an item for  
8 clarification. The map refers to existing 69kV and  
9 existing 230kV. During testimony, the applicant had  
10 represented that they're going to have an underbuild on  
11 some shared pole structure.

12 For clarification in the legend, and on the  
13 map I think it would be useful both for the public and  
14 for others who may use this map to annotate those where  
15 there's going to be a shared pole structure with an  
16 underbuild on the same pole. And then the existing, just  
17 a little more precision on that I think is value added in  
18 the legend and on the map.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Fontes, my  
20 recollection of the testimony was that the entire route  
21 for both lines will be underbuild capable, but neither  
22 will have any 69kV lines underbuilt until at some point  
23 in the future that is as yet undetermined.

24 MEMBER FONTES: So the entire pole  
25 structure will have the ability to add a 69kV but there

1 will be a separate 69kV as well?

2 CHMN STAFFORD: No. When they construct  
3 the lines, there will be two double-circuit 230kV lines  
4 that are -- they have -- that are 69kV underbuild  
5 capable. But they will not have the 69kV lines there at  
6 all initially.

7 MEMBER FONTES: Initially.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. At some point in  
9 the future, I think they weren't able to say when, but  
10 they wanted to have the capability from the gate but not  
11 utilize it until it became necessary. That is my  
12 recollection of the testimony.

13 Mr. Derstine, is that accurate?

14 MR. DERSTINE: I think that's correct. I'm  
15 seeing head nods from across the way. Yes.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

17 MEMBER FONTES: So for clarification we  
18 only have 69kV structures in the northeast quadrant of  
19 the map that are existing?

20 CHMN STAFFORD: That is my understanding.  
21 They are -- they said they have the -- it's yellow. It's  
22 kind of hard to see on the map, but it is there. It's  
23 the existing 69kV transmission line that connects to the  
24 Cheatham Substation.

25 MEMBER FONTES: So all that will be in

1 operation on completion of this project will be two 230kV  
2 double circuits?

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Correct. Mr. Derstine, is  
4 that accurate?

5 MR. DERSTINE: That's correct.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

7 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

9 MEMBER HILL: I want to go back to  
10 Member Little's comments and test my own memory of the  
11 first day of testimony with Mr. Hernandez and the SRP  
12 team.

13 I seem to remember that the City had some  
14 agreement with the billboard developer that there would  
15 be some mitigation for the billboard that might include  
16 some park space or something. They're talking amongst  
17 themselves, so maybe they kind of remember what I say.

18 But I thought there was concern from the  
19 City about disrupting an agreement that they had. It  
20 wasn't just billboards at stake. Not to -- I absolutely  
21 understand where Member Little's coming from in  
22 considering this alternative, but I just wanted to make  
23 sure that I understood the agreement with the City.

24 MS. POLLIO: I was going to address two  
25 parts to this parcel.



1           The first is that our understanding, and  
2 this is based on the letter, that identifies and, again,  
3 somebody else in the panel may have a little bit more  
4 detail.

5           But our understanding is that the money  
6 from the billboards would be used to assist in funding  
7 park facilities, which is what obviously Laveen village  
8 and the City would like to happen. So I think that is an  
9 arrangement that to my knowledge we're not a party of or  
10 we're not exactly sure of the arrangement but that has  
11 been made clear and I think the person that spoke about  
12 this parcel and Linda, who was a public comment, made  
13 that notion about parks. And that was what she was  
14 referring to.

15           I also wanted to bring up one more point  
16 about this parcel. We did -- we talked a lot about this.  
17 Obviously we do have two lines on there. One of the  
18 other considerations for this parcel is it is an oddly  
19 shaped parcel and obviously working with the developers  
20 that was pointed out, if you notice, the -- how narrow it  
21 is at the bottom.

22           So one consideration or one thing that was  
23 definitely discussed is, you know, the willingness to  
24 take on a line, two lines would be very difficult just  
25 because of that if you look at where it is on Dobbins,

1 that would be the primary entrance into that planned area  
2 development.

3 It is very narrow so two lines would take  
4 up a lot more space than one. So it's a similar -- it's  
5 similar to what obviously was presented by Banner. You  
6 know, two of them parallel more encompass much more land.  
7 Here I think you can see the way the property is aligned.  
8 It would be more of an impact versus, you know, H to I.

9 Again, you know, we're trying to minimize  
10 those two lines but that has a much bigger I'll just say  
11 base. It's more square which does make design of your  
12 site plan a little bit easier.

13 So I just wanted to point that  
14 consideration out.

15 MEMBER HILL: Thank you.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Member Hill, I was just  
17 going to refer you to SRP-22 which is the City's letter  
18 dated November 7th, and the second bullet kind of  
19 outlines and maybe gives more information about the  
20 City's concern.

21 MEMBER HILL: Okay. I just wanted to bring  
22 that up for the discussion. Member Little's proposal.

23 I'm not opposed to adding it as long as  
24 it's -- I mean they have the preferred routes. I'm not  
25 opposed to adding that alternative.

1 I do think, you know, to your point it's an  
2 awkward-shaped parcel, under the preferred routes it's  
3 completely surrounded by transmission lines, I guess.  
4 But whatever the owner's preference is, whatever you can  
5 negotiate with the owner I think it's a challenging  
6 parcel to work around in general.

7 I'm not opposed to the addition of other  
8 contingent routes. I'm supportive of the preferred ones  
9 as well.

10 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

12 MEMBER GOLD: Regarding what Member Little  
13 brought up, maybe I have a misunderstanding. I believe  
14 that when I heard Mr. Hernandez speaking about the  
15 alternate line between H and J as opposed to the I to K  
16 for Preferred Route 2, that one of the reasons that you  
17 didn't want to do that was putting two lines close to  
18 each other was a problem for your maintenance people.

19 But you didn't mention anything like that.  
20 You were just talking about the billboards are the only  
21 problem. Is there a maintenance issue? Or is it just  
22 the billboards? Because if it's just the billboards I  
23 have no objection to Member Hill's request to add it as  
24 an alternate.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

1 MEMBER GOLD: Member Little's request to  
2 add it as an alternate if it's only for the billboards.  
3 But if it's a safety issue or maintenance issue, that's a  
4 different story. Which is it?

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Member Gold, from what I  
6 recall the discussion was around 50-foot of separation  
7 between pole line and pole line, and whether that would  
8 be adequate.

9 My response was no, I do not feel 50 feet  
10 between pole lines would be adequate and preferably we  
11 would like up to 100 feet between pole line and pole  
12 line, if pole lines are located in parallel and adjacent  
13 to each other.

14 So that condition would be true anywhere on  
15 this project if we had to place two transmission lines in  
16 parallel and adjacent to each other, we would prefer to  
17 have adequate spacing between pole lines for the safe  
18 maintenance of those lines.

19 MEMBER GOLD: Okay. As I'm looking at the  
20 distance between E and F, I see approximately 400 feet.  
21 Looking at your key. Now, I can be off by 25 or 50 feet,  
22 but that's what it looks like. And if you wanted  
23 200 feet between them you would have poles that would  
24 literally block any access from Dobbins Road to that  
25 industrial complex. Is that a correct assumption?

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: I think your assumption is  
2 correct, that placing a second transmission line on that  
3 property, essentially PAD number 4 as described on the  
4 placemat would definitely impact the planned development  
5 for that property and potentially even an entry into that  
6 property from the south.

7 MEMBER GOLD: Okay. In that case,  
8 Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to adding route E, F based on  
9 what Mr. Hernandez just informed me of.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: I had a similar question.  
11 Can we pull up SRP-26 in the left screen,  
12 please? While I do appreciate giving the applicant  
13 flexibility, I think that we should not give them too  
14 many alternatives, because then looking at the CEC the  
15 public wouldn't know exactly where it's going to go if it  
16 can go in three different spots, one spot, six spots. I  
17 think the bigger that number the more potential confusion  
18 of what the committee actually decided, I think.

19 Looking at the map, SRP-7, ideally there  
20 would be no parallel lines. The only time you would see  
21 it in this situation would be if ADOT was unwilling to  
22 cooperate with SRP and utilize the section H, I, K.

23 If ADOT goes along with that, then this CEC  
24 would result in no colocated parallel power lines. I  
25 thought that was kind of the desire and the way to best

1 mitigate the impacts because the two of them together  
2 take up a lot of space and interfere with utilization of  
3 the property they're on, especially when you're looking  
4 at that parcel number --

5 MR. DERSTINE: PAD 4.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: -- 4, yes. Yeah. So, and  
7 the other question I had is looking at the map on the  
8 left, SRP-26, the gray area is the industrial park. I  
9 seem to recall testimony that the whole point of the  
10 A to E alternate segment was to get the power closer to  
11 the load. And I think that's another feature of the  
12 E to H route is that it's the development to the west  
13 where you will see that load be constructed.

14 If that line, the E to the northwest  
15 section of E to H is moved over to run F to H, you have  
16 the same problem of having the line further away from  
17 where the potential load would be. Instead of being  
18 right at the edge of the development, the industrial  
19 complex, it's further away and closer to the highway,  
20 which I think creates its own issues as well.

21 I appreciate what Member Little wants to  
22 do, but I'm inclined to agree with Member Gold that I  
23 think the two lines as drawn out on the map with the two  
24 alternative segments I think minimizes the impacts the  
25 best, and I think if we approve it without the

1 alternative section for line 2, that the H, J, K would be  
2 even better.

3 But, again, I don't want to eliminate that  
4 option because of the issue with ADOT. I would hate to  
5 have them have to come back to the committee to get a new  
6 chunk of line approved because after pursuit of good  
7 faith efforts with ADOT they were unable to persuade them  
8 that that was the better route for the line.

9 I guess, Mr. Hernandez, I asked a question  
10 a while back and I kept talking, but I wanted -- I guess  
11 the question again is that would locating the line, one,  
12 from, if you take away the E to H segment and have it run  
13 F to H, does that create another problem for serving the  
14 load in the industrial area?

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, it would create a new  
16 set of challenges for us. I believe Mr. Heim lined that  
17 out yesterday, that in taking Nodes A to E to H will  
18 allow us the opportunity to balance the load, the  
19 industrial load across multiple circuits, whereas if we  
20 limit the most westerly transmission line, we're put in a  
21 place of having to figure out how to serve the industrial  
22 load from one pole line instead of two pole lines.

23 And really we're asking for the optionality  
24 to be able to do just that, to plan for the future to  
25 have the capability of serving all that industrial load

1 from multiple circuits spread across both pole lines.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

3 MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'll  
4 add or speak to Member Little's concern. I know as a  
5 member of -- who represents the public, she takes that  
6 role very seriously.

7 I guess I would simply note in looking at  
8 SRP-22, which is the letter from the City of Phoenix and  
9 in that second bullet where it reads, "that SRP must  
10 continue its outreach to the property owner for the  
11 parcel located at the northwest corner of the Loop 202  
12 and Dobbins Road," that's that PAD 4 that we're speaking  
13 about, "to ensure that route S3 from the F to H nodes  
14 does not impact the parcel owner's development agreement  
15 with the City regarding funding for a park improvement  
16 project in the area based on the proposed freeway  
17 billboards."

18 And so I would assume that the City is also  
19 looking out for the public's interest in terms of funding  
20 for this park improvement project, and that there's some  
21 public interest in that. And as I mentioned we're  
22 balancing and weighing different impacts and different  
23 benefits from each -- from each route.

24 And so I simply offer that as maybe an  
25 indication from the City that they view that the benefits



1 flowing from this development agreement that they have  
2 with the owner of PAD 4 is important to the City and  
3 presumably the residents of the area who would be served  
4 by that park.

5 And then beyond just the simple issue of  
6 serving the load by having two lines in parallel making  
7 it -- requiring line crossings or other issues with  
8 regard to serving these high-load customers, you have the  
9 issue of putting two lines in parallel that not only  
10 impact them, I would assume, presuming the billboards,  
11 but as we noted take up much of that parcel by placing  
12 two lines along that eastern edge.

13 So, again, nothing -- nothing is easy.  
14 We're having to weigh differing impacts and benefits. I  
15 think we continue to land on the idea that the preferred  
16 route is presented as the best route.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Little.

18 MEMBER LITTLE: I just wanted to say that  
19 this is the discussion that I wanted us to have to get a  
20 sense of how everybody felt about that. I still would  
21 like to see it. However, I appreciate everybody's  
22 opinions and thank you.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Little.

24 Any other questions, suggestions,  
25 discussion points from members?

1 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, is that just about  
2 the routes?

3 CHMN STAFFORD: No, any -- I think the next  
4 step if we're done talking about what we want to do is to  
5 take a recess and I will prepare chairman's exhibits and  
6 then we'll come back and we can start discussing  
7 conditions, like details.

8 For example, I think we talked a number of  
9 things about the proposed route for how do we want to  
10 reflect that the section between O and L of the existing  
11 Anderson-Orme line would be removed upon completion of  
12 construction of these two lines.

13 The section K to L, the portion from  
14 K to 59th Avenue would be in the south side of the road  
15 and from 59th Avenue to L would be on the north side of  
16 the road along the Laveen area conveyance channel.

17 And then the segment running east to west  
18 from E to H along South Mountain Road would be on -- that  
19 segment would be from the 90-degree turn to H would be on  
20 the south side of the road.

21 I think we need to kind of think about how  
22 we want to include that in the order and about how it's  
23 going to reflect in where the corridor is located.

24 For example, I think the request was to  
25 have a 350-foot corridor for each line and then the end

1 result would be a 100-foot easement or right-of-way for  
2 each line.

3                   So I mean the corridor from K to L, how  
4 much differentiation do we need between the segment  
5 between K and 59th Avenue and then 59th Avenue to L. I  
6 mean, if you have -- if you have 350-foot-wide easements  
7 centered on the LACC, is that going to accurately reflect  
8 what's going to happen? Does it need to be shifted to  
9 the -- that's the kind of -- I think that's the next step  
10 and we can address that when we get to the nitty-gritty  
11 of the language of the order -- the certificate I should  
12 say.

13                   But leading up to that, is there any other  
14 big-picture things we need to discuss before I get the  
15 draft CEC ready for us to vote and discuss?

16                   MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

17                   CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

18                   MEMBER GOLD: Just a quickie. I don't see  
19 color well. But both Member Hill and Member Little had  
20 an objection to the color blue, and I did not understand  
21 the objection.

22                   CHMN STAFFORD: Well, because there's --  
23 the LACC is reflected in blue on the map as well as is  
24 the Anderson-Orme line. So I think -- I see their point,  
25 I think perhaps -- I really like this map. I appreciate

1 this map. But I still think we can fine tune it a little  
2 bit. Like, for example, I think we want to refer to it  
3 instead of Preferred Route 1 it would be Line 1. And  
4 Line 2.

5 MR. DERSTINE: I think we're open to  
6 getting out the crayon and --

7 CHMN STAFFORD: I think the green is fine.  
8 I think just the blue one, if it was red, maybe that's  
9 like more holiday colors, we're running into the holiday  
10 season.

11 MS. POLLIO: We went with the Phoenix Suns,  
12 so this a Phoenix Suns map, so that was -- but we are  
13 open and we are ready to make any changes necessary.

14 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I like your  
15 idea of red and green. I can see red lights; I can see  
16 green lights. And if that's members are referring to, I  
17 think that might be a good idea.

18 MEMBER HILL: I love it.

19 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: With kudos to  
22 Mr. Derstine's university daughter, perhaps we could,  
23 tongue in cheek, get her as a consultant on our color  
24 strategy.

25 MR. DERSTINE: She seems to focus on a lot

1 of neon and bright colors. I'm not sure those would work  
2 for this.

3 MEMBER KRYDER: Sounds like my kind of  
4 lady.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Is there  
6 anything further from members? I think we'll take a --  
7 I'm going to guesstimate, I'm going to be conservative  
8 and say an hour recess to make sure I can get this, get  
9 it to Tod, get it to the parties and the AV team so it's  
10 ready to be projected and loaded onto the laptops so the  
11 members can read them more easily as opposed to on the  
12 big screen.

13 I'm hopeful that that will be enough time.  
14 But I would like to get that -- get to the consideration  
15 of the certificate and the vote this afternoon.

16 It's only 2:19. I think it's within the  
17 realm of possibility.

18 Anything further, Members, before we go to  
19 recess?

20 MEMBER GOLD: I think 3:30 would be a great  
21 time to come back, Mr. Chairman.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. That will work.  
23 Let's take a recess until 3:30, and then at that time  
24 we'll be able to -- we should be able to ready to  
25 consider the certificate and vote. Thank you. We stand

1 in recess.

2 (Recess from 2:19 p.m. to 3:52 p.m.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Let's go back  
4 on the record.

5 Up on the screen we should have Chairman's  
6 Exhibits 1 and 2. I believe the PDF is on the left  
7 and 2, the Word document, is on the right.

8 Members should all have a copy of  
9 Chairman's 1 on their laptop in front of them.

10 Member Little, I see you -- did you receive  
11 the Chairman's exhibits from Tod?

12 I'm seeing a nod.

13 Member Fontes thumbs-up.

14 Member French thumbs-up.

15 Excellent.

16 All right, Members, if you could review the  
17 introduction, please.

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

20 MEMBER KRYDER: In order to get this on the  
21 table so we can talk about it I move acceptance of the  
22 introduction as shown.

23 MEMBER DRAGO: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 Has everyone read it already, or do you

1 need a few minutes to do that?

2 (No response.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Of course, the only thing  
4 we have to fill in at the end is the vote count and the  
5 grant or deny.

6 The introduction has been moved and  
7 seconded.

8 Further discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

11 (A chorus of "ayes.")

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the  
15 introduction was adopted.

16 It will probably take you a few minutes to  
17 review the project description, make sure it's lined up  
18 with reality.

19 MEMBER KRYDER: What we want.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Derstine, just  
21 confirming the right-of-way is 100 feet for each line and  
22 a 350-foot-wide corridor for each line?

23 MR. DERSTINE: Ms. Gilbert is in charge of  
24 the CEC, so I'll have to defer to her.

25 MS. GILBERT: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

1 100-foot for each line and 350-foot for each line.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: I'm sorry, I can't hear  
3 you.

4 MS. GILBERT: That as written paragraph B  
5 lines 1 through 7 are correct.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: So let's --

7 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

9 MEMBER GOLD: Why are we listing the Laveen  
10 shopping center when we don't have it listed on the map  
11 and we haven't discussed it?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: I think it's not on the  
13 map, but we did discuss it because that is the section --  
14 let's see.

15 What line are you looking at?

16 MEMBER GOLD: I'm looking at line -- where  
17 did it go? It starts on 14 and 15.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Of page 3.

19 MEMBER KRYDER: Page 3.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, that's describing  
21 where the line from Node N to O is.

22 MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: That's where the In-N-Out  
24 Burger was when we went on the tour. Remember?

25 MEMBER GOLD: No.



1 MS. GILBERT: Where the Starbucks stop was  
2 potentially. Is that in that area?

3 MEMBER GOLD: Starbucks, that I remember.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: That you remember, yeah.

5 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

7 MEMBER HILL: In your description you say  
8 that in line --

9 CHMN STAFFORD: It's been moved and  
10 seconded; right?

11 MEMBER HILL: No.

12 Shall we move --

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's do that.

14 MEMBER HILL: Okay. I move approval of the  
15 project description.

16 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: I think that's already been  
18 done.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, it's double done now  
20 so we can move on to further discussion.

21 MEMBER HILL: Further discussion.

22 In line 11 --

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Page 3.

24 MEMBER HILL: -- on page 3, "then travels  
25 east on West South Mountain Avenue."

1                   Were we going to say on the south side of  
2 that?

3                   And I'm just recalling a conversation we  
4 had before we recessed.

5                   CHMN STAFFORD: Right. I did have some  
6 notes to say if we wanted -- I didn't include all that in  
7 the description yet. I just tried to clarify it so we  
8 could make sure we had all the nodes and then how we  
9 referred to the lines consistently.

10                  Yes. Because I did have a note that we  
11 had -- did have a discussion when it came time to vote on  
12 the CEC about there were several sections. There was the  
13 portion of the route from Node E to H, the part that runs  
14 east-west along South Mountain Road my understanding is  
15 that was -- that line was to be placed on the south side  
16 of the street there. And then that was for Line 1.

17                  And for Line 2, between Nodes K through the  
18 59th Avenue the line would be located on the south side  
19 of the LACC, and then it went across 59th Avenue. It  
20 would then be located on the north side of the LACC.

21                  The other thing was the corridor is  
22 350 feet wide.

23                  Is that off the center line of the road or  
24 the LACC?

25                  Do we need to drill down and further

1 clarify that description?

2 Member Fontes.

3 MEMBER FONTES: We also had some discussion  
4 with respect to aviation and the proximity of Banner.

5 Is there a requirement for a height as we  
6 have had on other transmission lines that we've approved  
7 here that's appropriate, Mr. Chairman?

8 CHMN STAFFORD: I didn't add that in. I  
9 figured one of my colleagues would bring that up, and  
10 we'd be able to address it when we voted.

11 MEMBER FONTES: There you go.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: And then the other thing  
13 was for the FAA I believe that is encompassed in  
14 Condition No. --

15 MS. GILBERT: 16.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: That sounds right. Yes.  
17 Compliance with FAA regulations is in 16,  
18 correct.

19 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.  
21 Do you want to -- should we address it by  
22 paragraph?

23 MEMBER HILL: Maybe that would be the best  
24 way.

25 I do have a broader general question

1 because I'm not an attorney and you are.

2 Some of these roads don't exist. I assume  
3 that there's right-of-way for those roads, but they kind  
4 of don't -- they're not currently roads or avenues or --  
5 so I'm usually a precise person, but I will leave it to  
6 you as to whether or not this reads accurately.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Derstine -- or, excuse  
8 me, Ms. Gilbert.

9 MS. GILBERT: Yes.

10 I might ask, Ms. Pollio, could you speak to  
11 as focusing on South Mountain Avenue and the need for --  
12 how a 350-foot corridor was informed by our understanding  
13 of that being a dirt road today but potentially developed  
14 out later.

15 MS. POLLIO: Correct.

16 So I do think the term -- and I'm not sure  
17 if this gets to the question, but term alignment because  
18 we know that there is an alignment on 63rd Avenue and  
19 there is an alignment, and I think the City typically  
20 uses that as kind of a -- because I agree it's not  
21 accurate with just road, but I think alignment would be  
22 appropriate.

23 MEMBER HILL: Thanks for offering that. I  
24 like that.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So let's -- the

1 entire section has been moved and seconded. Let's take  
2 it paragraph by paragraph.

3 I'm looking at the first paragraph of the  
4 project description, and I think it would be prudent to  
5 add the word "wide" after 100 feet and before each line.

6 (Reporter clarification.)

7 MEMBER KRYDER: Which line are we talking  
8 about, please?

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Line 5, page 3.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. And so where would  
11 you add "wide"?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: On line 5 after  
13 right-of-way is 100 feet add the word "wide."

14 MEMBER KRYDER: Oh, thank you very much.

15 So do you need an amendment at this point  
16 for that, or are you going to do them one at a time or  
17 how do you --

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, please. Let's -- can  
19 I have a motion to make that change?

20 And then we'll proceed paragraph by  
21 paragraph because I think we'll need to change the road  
22 to alignment in the next paragraph.

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: But I just want to kind of  
25 take it a chunk at a time, and so --

1 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move we amend  
2 it to read 100 feet wide.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

7 (A chorus of "ayes.")

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
11 carries.

12 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

14 MEMBER GOLD: What is Exhibit A?

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Exhibit A will be the map  
16 that was in SRP-27, but they have circulated a new  
17 version of it with different colors with the red and  
18 green so there's no -- the only blue on the map is going  
19 to be the LACC.

20 MEMBER GOLD: So that is now Exhibit A?

21 CHMN STAFFORD: It will be once we adopt  
22 it, but that is the intent.

23 MEMBER GOLD: In that case, Mr. Chairman,  
24 as we discussed earlier, you're mentioning locations and  
25 items that are not -- don't exist on Exhibit A.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, the nodes do.

2 MEMBER GOLD: The nodes exist.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

4 MEMBER GOLD: But the other things don't.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: What other things?

6 The only thing -- you're talking about the  
7 shopping center?

8 MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, I think that's just  
10 for context, but it says between Node N and Node O.

11 MEMBER GOLD: Oh, I have no problem with  
12 the N and the O. But I have a problem, you know,  
13 referring to something in Exhibit A which doesn't exist  
14 on Exhibit A.

15 I mean, that may be something that is  
16 irrelevant. I don't know. You're the lawyer.

17 What is the correct way to do that?

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Let me see. So let's look  
19 at the -- so we're looking at "Preferred Route, Line 1"  
20 starting on page 9 -- page 3, line 9.

21 So those are the correct Nodes B, E, H, J,  
22 N, O?

23 MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: So it would start "the  
25 northeast corner of the New Substation site at Node B."

1                   Okay. And then it says, "runs north on  
2 South 63rd Avenue."

3                   That's where you would need to -- what was  
4 your suggestion to put alignment where, Ms. Gilbert?

5                   MS. GILBERT: After avenue.

6                   MEMBER KRYDER: What line, please?

7                   CHMN STAFFORD: Line 11.

8                   MEMBER KRYDER: Line 11, page 3. Thank  
9 you.

10                  MS. GILBERT: And the same recommendation  
11 for after South Mountain Avenue beginning at line 11 and  
12 into 12.

13                  CHMN STAFFORD: So after avenue on 12 and  
14 also add the word "alignment."

15                  MS. GILBERT: And to Member Gold's concern  
16 regarding the Laveen Spectrum shopping center as you  
17 noted, Mr. Chairman, we -- it's really just descriptive.  
18 We could remove that if that is a preference of the  
19 committee.

20                  MEMBER GOLD: I don't feel very strongly  
21 either way. I'm just curious if we're referencing  
22 something that doesn't appear what I'm referencing it on.

23                  CHMN STAFFORD: No, it doesn't appear in  
24 Exhibit A, but this paragraph doesn't say that it does.  
25 I think it's just for context --



1 MEMBER KRYDER: Right.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: -- of what's -- what N and  
3 O, what that line where it is and what's below it on the  
4 map. I think it's in -- you could probably see it on --  
5 let's see. It's listed on the handout in SRP-01B from  
6 the application; correct?

7 MS. GILBERT: That is correct.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: It has -- it lists that's  
9 Section 10, which is commercial space. It doesn't  
10 reference the -- what it's called.

11 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

13 MEMBER HILL: Could I offer that it runs  
14 adjacent to the Cheatham Substation parallel to and  
15 adjacent to the substation which is on the map to  
16 interconnect with the Anderson-Orme Road?

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, but this is N, O.  
18 It's not anywhere near the Cheatham Substation.

19 MEMBER HILL: Oh, I'm looking at the  
20 wrong -- hence, I don't know where the shopping center  
21 is.

22 MEMBER GOLD: Because it's not on the map.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, let's first -- can we  
24 get a motion to add the word "alignment" in those places,  
25 one on line 11 and the other one on line 14?

1 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

2 MEMBER FONTES: Second.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

6 (A chorus of "ayes.")

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
10 is adopted. So we've added the word alignment twice.  
11 Oh, excuse me, it's at 11 and 12, not 14.

12 So then on line 14 it goes, "past West  
13 Baseline Road, then turns east just north of Laveen  
14 Spectrum shopping center at Node N to connect to the  
15 Anderson-Orme line at Node O."

16 So I guess we could either leave in the --

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: -- "just north of the  
19 Laveen Spectrum shopping center" or take it out, because  
20 if we took it out, it would read, "then turns east at  
21 Node N to connect to the Anderson-Orme 230kV transmission  
22 line at Node O."

23 Did you want to make a motion to remove  
24 that or not?

25 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: It's the pleasure of the  
2 committee.

3 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion  
4 to remove that or add it on to Exhibit A.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: I can't hear you. Can you  
6 please use your microphone.

7 MEMBER GOLD: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.  
8 I make a motion to remove something that  
9 doesn't exist on the exhibit. Remove "just north of the  
10 Laveen Shopping Center." I think it's "turns east just  
11 north of Node N" is right on the map.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Or it would be just "turns  
13 east at Node N."

14 MEMBER GOLD: That's fine with me,  
15 Mr. Chairman.

16 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

20 (A chorus of "ayes.")

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the  
24 amendment's adopted.

25 Let me see the -- scroll back up. I can't

1 see what we just did. I think that reflects what we just  
2 did. Okay.

3 All right. Now on to the next paragraph  
4 starting on line 17.

5 Member Gold.

6 MEMBER GOLD: Just a question. We have  
7 these nodes on this map, which is going to be Exhibit A.

8 Do we need to say where the nodes actually  
9 are in relation to the ground? This is -- I've never  
10 done anything with nodes before in this committee, so I'm  
11 not sure. I'm asking.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Neither have I.

13 Ms. Gilbert, I guess we need to refer back  
14 to the application.

15 How -- how specifically are the nodes  
16 described other than the map?

17 I don't recall.

18 MS. GILBERT: I believe the map is probably  
19 the best reference point. Each route -- and remembering  
20 that the application was drafted with N1, N2, S5. That  
21 does describe road -- the route in relationship to  
22 roadways. But the nodes were not described as sitting on  
23 West Baseline Road or on Dobbins, if that makes sense.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

25 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: Just as a comment, if we  
3 fast forwarded five years as an example and set the  
4 Exhibit A in front of a new reader, I think that the  
5 nodes show up quite well, and I think that it eliminates  
6 a lot of potential misunderstanding.

7 So I commend Ms. Gilbert and whoever else  
8 put this together. I think it's a fine job. And I  
9 certainly feel comfortable in simply referring to them as  
10 you have done.

11 MEMBER GOLD: And I agree with that,  
12 Mr. Chairman. If they're referred to earlier in the  
13 application or later in the application that describes  
14 where they are, that's fine.

15 MS. GILBERT: Thank you.

16 MEMBER GOLD: Thank you.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So let's see.  
18 We're looking at lines, let's see, 17 through 26 on  
19 page 3.

20 Do we need to say when -- on line 21 we  
21 talk about West Dobbins Road and 63rd Avenue.

22 Do we need to use the word alignment again?

23 MS. GILBERT: Ms. Pollio or Mr. Horgen, do  
24 you recall is Dobbins an alignment or is that road built  
25 out at that point?

1 MS. POLLIO: That's a built out road.

2 MS. GILBERT: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So that addresses  
4 Dobbins.

5 What about South 63rd Avenue?

6 MS. POLLIO: 63rd would be alignment.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So we need a motion  
8 to add the word "alignment" to line 21, page 3. After  
9 "South 63rd Avenue," it should say "alignment."

10 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

11 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
19 passes.

20 Let's look at the next paragraph.

21 And you just said West Dobbins Road has an  
22 actual road; correct?

23 MS. POLLIO: Correct.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So then on to  
25 page 4, line 1 we reference South 63rd Avenue.

1 Will that need the word "alignment" after  
2 it as well?

3 MS. POLLIO: Yes.

4 MEMBER GOLD: So moved, Mr. Chairman.  
5 Second?

6 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Mercer.  
8 Further discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

11 (A chorus of "ayes.")

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the  
15 amendment's adopted.

16 Then we go on to -- all right. Do we want  
17 to --

18 MS. GILBERT: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

20 MS. GILBERT: South Mountain Avenue in  
21 line 2, could you highlight it on the screen? That would  
22 also need alignment.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Which -- are you talking  
24 about page 4?

25 MS. GILBERT: Line 1 to 2.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

2 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. We did 63rd Avenue.

4 Now we need South Mountain Avenue.

5 Is that what you're saying?

6 MS. GILBERT: Yes. Please.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. We have a

8 motion from Member Hill.

9 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment

17 is adopted.

18 Should we remove the Laveen Spectrum

19 shopping center from this one?

20 I think we should to maintain consistency.

21 MEMBER GOLD: So moved.

22 MEMBER HILL: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."



1 (A chorus of "ayes.")

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
5 is adopted.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: Could we scroll back up a  
7 bit so we can read that in its entirety?

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Do you want to go back to  
9 page 3?

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes. Up to the top of that  
11 paragraph or wherever that starts. Thank you. Right  
12 there. And then down a bit, please.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, wait, I see a change we  
14 need to make.

15 MEMBER KRYDER: Did I miss it?

16 CHMN STAFFORD: No. It's on page 3,  
17 line 24. I took out the preferred reference to all the  
18 alternate segments.

19 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Very good.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: So we need to remove the  
21 word "preferred" on line 24, page 3 before "Segment A-E."

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move.

23 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

2 (A chorus of "ayes.")

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
6 is adopted.

7 Okay. Did you get a chance to read through  
8 that, Member Kryder?

9 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes, sir.

10 MEMBER FRENCH: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member French.

12 MEMBER FRENCH: On line 1 of page 4, it  
13 says, "runs north on South 63rd Avenue."

14 Would it be better served to have it state  
15 "runs north along South 63rd Avenue"?

16 MEMBER KRYDER: Well said.

17 MEMBER GOLD: So moved.

18 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

22 (A chorus of "ayes.")

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment

1 is adopted.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

4 MEMBER KRYDER: Following Mr. French's  
5 comment, let's look at line 2, "travels north on" and  
6 change the word "on" to "along."

7 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, also on line 1,  
8 it has the same character east on West Mountain and  
9 change that to "along" for consistency.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, then we probably need  
11 to go back to the beginning of the project description  
12 and start over and change the ons to alongs. Otherwise,  
13 we're going to be keep jumping back and forth.

14 MEMBER GOLD: Agreed, Mr. Chairman.

15 MEMBER HILL: I'll offer and add to that  
16 that we also didn't say what side of the street some of  
17 these are traveling on.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. We haven't got to  
19 the -- I don't think we've gotten to that section yet.

20 MEMBER HILL: Well, we've talked about  
21 South Mountain Avenue and didn't say travels east on the  
22 south side of South Mountain Avenue.

23 MS. GILBERT: That would be line 11 on  
24 page 3?

25 MEMBER HILL: That's correct.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I think for the  
2 "on/along" can we make kind of a general motion to make  
3 those changes where appropriate?

4 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

5 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

6 MEMBER FONTES: Second.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

10 (A chorus of "ayes.")

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. I'll make a  
14 note to make sure when I finalize this.

15 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Could you not cover all of  
18 those in your scribbler's at the end. That's the sort of  
19 thing one might do.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. But I think we  
21 could say on or along, either one. I think just now that  
22 the committee's made the motion and it's been adopted to  
23 change "along" instead of "on" for the project  
24 description I can make -- we don't have to go line by  
25 line and change each one. I can just do that later.

1 MEMBER KRYDER: Exactly.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.

3 So now, let's see, the issue that Member  
4 Hill was raising was about -- okay. So we're talking  
5 this is the Preferred Route, Line 1, South Mountain  
6 Avenue. So let's see.

7 MEMBER KRYDER: It needs to be read in its  
8 entirety before simply going through it globally and  
9 changing "on" to "along" because sometimes it works and  
10 sometimes it doesn't. Therefore, I would suggest you  
11 consider you do it, Mr. Chairman, at the end as part of  
12 your scribbler's.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, I believe the motion  
14 that passed was to change "along" instead of -- use  
15 "along" instead of "on" where appropriate for the  
16 description. Not every word "on" is going to be replaced  
17 with "along." It's just --

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Absolutely correct.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: That's the motion that's  
20 already passed, so I'll --

21 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: -- clean that up at the  
23 end.

24 MEMBER KRYDER: We don't need to do this  
25 now.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. That was the point  
2 of the motion to not go line by line and decide which  
3 "on" should be "along."

4 MEMBER KRYDER: Correct.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: The issue now is going to  
6 address the alignment between -- along South Mountain  
7 Avenue from the -- between E and H, the section that runs  
8 east-west along South Mountain Avenue. So we're looking  
9 at line 11.

10 MS. GILBERT: And I think what may have  
11 been mentioned earlier was to "then travels east on the  
12 south side of West South Mountain Avenue."

13 CHMN STAFFORD: So line 11 would read,  
14 "site at Node B runs north along South 63rd Avenue  
15 alignment, then travels east along the south side of West  
16 South Mountain Avenue alignment."

17 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

19 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

23 (A chorus of "ayes.")

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's see. So we have --  
25 so that addresses the next -- that's the -- that's the

1 portion of line 1. The other section about the north and  
2 south side is line 2.

3 Oh, yes, line 3 -- oh, page 3, line 24.

4 Let's see. Did we do that already?

5 Yes. Okay. The "preferred" is out.

6 This looks like on page 4, line 1 it should  
7 be "runs north" on south -- "along South 63rd Avenue  
8 alignment, then travels east on the south side."

9 MEMBER HILL: "Along the south side."

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Along -- on -- "travels  
11 east along the south side" -- would you say on or along  
12 in that sentence? I think "on."

13 MEMBER HILL: You said along in the  
14 previous one, so that's the only reason that I --

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Did I?

16 MEMBER HILL: -- interjected.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: This is the very issue of  
18 trying to wordsmith each of these without having it all  
19 in front of us.

20 MEMBER HILL: Line 11.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: That "east on the south  
22 side" is consistent.

23 Is there a motion?

24 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

25 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

4 (A chorus of "ayes.")

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

6 (No response.)

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the  
8 amendment's adopted.

9 So it now reads, "along the south side at  
10 West Mountain Avenue alignment to Node H."

11 MEMBER HILL: I'm feeling really good about  
12 Preferred Route Number 1.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Looking at  
14 "Preferred Route, Line 2" begins on page 4, line 7.

15 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, we didn't  
16 finish -- I don't think we finished Preferred Route 1  
17 going to its termination.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe we did. I think  
19 we finished -- we made -- the last change we made was on  
20 page 4, line 5 that took out the Laveen Spectrum shopping  
21 center.

22 MEMBER GOLD: Oh, that's right and goes to  
23 Node H.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

25 MEMBER GOLD: No.



1 CHMN STAFFORD: No, to N.

2 MEMBER GOLD: Node N and then to Node O?

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

4 MEMBER GOLD: Got it. Thank you,

5 Mr. Chairman.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: So now starting at page 4,  
7 line 7, "Preferred Route, Line 2." So that's Nodes C, F,  
8 H, I, K, L.

9 And I'll make the changes from "on" to  
10 "along."

11 MS. GILBERT: Mr. Chairman, should at  
12 line 11 on this page "through Node C" should that be  
13 "through F"? I'm kind of looking across here at  
14 Mr. Hernandez or Ms. Pollio to -- it says, "site at Node  
15 C and runs north."

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. That's a typo. It  
17 should say "F."

18 Yeah, because originally you had went from  
19 Node C to Node H.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

22 MEMBER LITTLE: I'm thinking it might be  
23 appropriate to replace the word "goes" in line 11 of that  
24 first paragraph to "proceeds" so that it reads "and  
25 proceeds north on the east side of Loop 202."

1 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. "Goes" is on line 12  
3 of the -- when you're doing amendments, go off the page  
4 and line from Chairman's 1 because that doesn't change.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. That's the PDF;  
6 right?

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. That's the PDF.

8 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: And that's consistent  
10 across all devices for the members.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. I'll get that one  
12 open. Thank you.

13 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. The motion is to  
15 change "goes" on line 12, page 4 to "proceeds."

16 That has been moved and seconded?

17 MEMBER MERCER: Yes.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

21 (A chorus of "ayes.")

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
25 passes.

1 Okay. So we're looking at page 4, lines 13  
2 and 14. It says, "Preferred Route, Line 2, then travels  
3 east along the LACC."

4 Should it say "along the south side of the  
5 LACC up to 59th Avenue"?

6 I believe that's where the crossover will  
7 be from the south side of the LACC to the north side.

8 MS. GILBERT: Mr. Hernandez, could you  
9 confirm is it about -- is it exactly 59th Avenue, or are  
10 we -- would it be helpful as you continue to discuss with  
11 City of Phoenix to approximate?

12 MEMBER GOLD: Or near.

13 MS. GILBERT: Near.

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: I think approximate --  
15 approximating is the better route to take being that we  
16 have yet to design this alignment.

17 In fact, I was just chatting with  
18 Ms. Pollio about having flexibility and not being tied to  
19 the south or north side of the channel.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: So the applicant's  
21 preference would not be to reference the side of the LACC  
22 for the alignment at all?

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Because ultimately it will  
25 be you'll work with the City to determine which side

1 works best for them.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct. It will  
3 be at the City's discretion to agree to the north or  
4 south side since we will be there by permit.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I think it makes  
6 sense not to constrain them in this fashion because -- to  
7 allow the flexibility to work with the City to put it  
8 where the City wants it whether it's the north or south  
9 side.

10 MEMBER GOLD: And the word "along" would  
11 handle that.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. But we wouldn't ask  
13 specific like we did for the section along South Mountain  
14 Avenue. That's what we were talking about doing, but I  
15 think we're not going to do that.

16 Do we have a separate motion to change --  
17 because we changed "goes" --

18 MEMBER GOLD: I move.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: -- before?

20 Do we want to add -- do you want to make  
21 that change to replace the word "goes" on line -- where  
22 is it?

23 MEMBER GOLD: 12.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: 12. I think we did that  
25 one already. It was there's another one down below. I

1 saw it.

2 Oh, no, okay. It was line 1 we changed to  
3 "goes," so, yes, you're correct it's line 12.

4 MEMBER DRAGO: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Drago.

6 MEMBER DRAGO: Not a strong opinion, but I  
7 liked Member Little's suggestion to change "goes" to  
8 "proceeds." But if you read on, we use the word  
9 "travel."

10 Would it be fair to be consistent and just  
11 use the word "proceed" throughout?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: No. I like to have a  
13 little variety, a couple different synonyms so it doesn't  
14 read like a robot wrote it.

15 MEMBER HILL: Although some AI would be  
16 really nice right now.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Careful what you wish for.  
18 They are notoriously horrible in any kind of legal  
19 document.

20 MEMBER HILL: Ironic these transmission  
21 lines will make that possible.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: So we wanted to change the  
23 "goes" to "proceeds" on line 12 in the -- for the  
24 "Preferred Route, Line 2."

25 Has that been moved?

1 MEMBER HILL: Yes. Seconded and already  
2 voted on.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: We changed it twice then.  
4 We voted on it twice? Because we did it for section --  
5 for line 1 already. I remember that. I thought we were  
6 talking about changing it for the description of line 2,  
7 but --

8 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move if we  
9 didn't do it before we should do it now. If we did it  
10 before, we don't have to.

11 MEMBER KRYDER: This is crazy.

12 MEMBER HILL: Second.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

14 (A chorus of "ayes.")

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, "goes" has  
18 been replaced with "proceeds" in the description of  
19 line 2.

20 So the rest of that description Node I. It  
21 should be Node L, excuse me.

22 All right. So then starting on page 4,  
23 line 16 the "preferred route, Line 2, contingent segment  
24 H, J, K." It says, "through Node F" on this one.

25 MEMBER HILL: Yeah, it does.

1 MEMBER GOLD: It looks good.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Are we ready to  
3 move the project description as amended?

4 MEMBER GOLD: So moved.

5 MEMBER HILL: So moved. Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

11 On to conditions.

12 MEMBER HILL: I move approval of Condition

13 No. 1.

14 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

15 MEMBER FONTES: Second.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

19 (A chorus of "ayes.")

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 1  
23 is adopted.

24 Number 2.

25 MEMBER GOLD: I move Condition 2.

1 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

3 As you can see I added the "City of  
4 Phoenix" and "all persons who made a limited appearance"  
5 to the list.

6 Any comments from the applicant?

7 MS. GILBERT: No comments.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Condition 2 has  
9 been moved and seconded.

10 Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 2  
17 is adopted.

18 Number 3.

19 MEMBER FRENCH: Move Condition 3.

20 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Could we roll it up and see  
23 the bottom of that, please?

24 CHMN STAFFORD: You can look at it on your  
25 tablet.



1 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Will do.

2 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, has Condition 3  
3 been moved?

4 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe it's been moved  
5 and seconded.

6 MEMBER GOLD: Okay.

7 MEMBER KRYDER: Call the question.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 3  
13 is adopted.

14 Number 4.

15 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move  
16 Condition 4 be adopted.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?  
19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
21 (A chorus of "ayes.")

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?  
23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 4  
25 is adopted.

1 Number 5.

2 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move  
3 Condition 5.

4 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

6 MEMBER HILL: Yes.

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little, you're going  
9 to add and regulation -- and regulate -- no, not  
10 regulations but "and recommendations," aren't you?

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Yep. And mitigation. Yep.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Can you put that in the  
13 form of a motion, please.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: I can. I would like to add  
15 at the end of Condition 5 "The applicant commits to  
16 follow the mitigation measures outlined in Exhibit" -- I  
17 believe it's C-1 -- or wrong binder here. Too much stuff  
18 here -- "Table C-3 of the application" --

19 MEMBER HILL: Second.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: -- "as applicable and  
21 feasible."

22 MEMBER HILL: Second.

23 MS. GILBERT: Mr. Chairman, could we add  
24 "to follow the mitigation measures"?

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. I think that would be

1 prudent.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes, please. I meant to  
3 say that. I was busy looking for the table.

4 I would just like to say that I feel  
5 strongly about this for several reasons. First of all,  
6 we have been adding it recently to CECs.

7 In addition, that table is referenced  
8 throughout the biological sections of the application as  
9 mitigation measures that will take care of potential  
10 issues of various different kinds. So I think it's  
11 important that they be followed and that they be outlined  
12 in the conditions. Thank you.

13 MEMBER HILL: Further discussion?

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. I'm looking to the  
15 applicant for comment.

16 MS. GILBERT: One moment, please.

17 No further comment from the applicant on  
18 the recommendation.

19 Could we add a dash to C-3?

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, between the C and 3?

21 So the new sentence at the end of  
22 Condition 5 starting on page 6, line 24 of Chairman's 1  
23 would read, "The applicant commits to follow the  
24 mitigation measure in Table C-3 of the application as  
25 applicable and feasible."

1 MEMBER LITTLE: I think there needs to be a  
2 comma after the capital A application.

3 Yeah. Thank you. That's my motion.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. It's been  
5 seconded.

6 I believe Member Hill you seconded it?

7 MEMBER HILL: Yeah.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Further  
9 discussion?

10 MEMBER HILL: Yeah. My question is I was  
11 mostly just wanting to make sure that the burrowing owl  
12 work got covered in this. And I know the applicant has  
13 committed to that. I just want it to be reflected in the  
14 CEC that that will get done.

15 So I think sometimes when I see things like  
16 guidelines for handling protected animal species and  
17 burrowing owls do have special status but they're not  
18 endangered. So I'm just kind of curious if you guys want  
19 to comment on whether or not you think that the burrowing  
20 owl piece is covered with this.

21 MS. POLLIO: I do -- in the table we do  
22 have a mitigation measure that does say specifically to  
23 conduct preconstruction burrowing owl surveys within  
24 30 days prior to commencement of construction and goes on  
25 to talk about active burrowing or active burrowing being

1 detected and the coordination of that with AGFD and U.S.  
2 Fish and Wildlife Service.

3 MEMBER HILL: Super. I was going to  
4 reference the Game & Fish letter, but I'm great with this  
5 table as well.

6 MS. POLLIO: And that came -- what he did  
7 is we cross-referenced that letter to put them into the  
8 table.

9 MEMBER HILL: Super. All right. Thanks.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: What -- I'm looking at C-3,  
11 and that's the letter.

12 Where's the table? Is that like --

13 MS. POLLIO: The table is on page C-21 in  
14 the application.

15 Is this what you're asking?

16 So table C-3 is on page C-21.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Because I'm looking  
18 at Exhibit C-3.

19 How do I get to where you're talking about  
20 from there?

21 MS. POLLIO: Oh, so I apologize.

22 So the table is actually not in the  
23 Exhibit C-3. It's actually in the text.

24 So if you go in C, C behind tab C, page --  
25 physically page C-21.

1 And then the letter is actually on  
2 Exhibit C-3.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, okay. I see. Okay.

4 MS. POLLIO: So the table actually includes  
5 a little bit -- mitigation measures are little bit more  
6 robust than the actual letter itself because some of them  
7 are SRP's best management practices.

8 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Five years from now,  
11 someone who has not participated in this, could they find  
12 that page? That's the question to Ms. --

13 MS. POLLIO: Yes. My -- I would say  
14 because it references table is the keyword C-3 versus  
15 Exhibit C-3, I think we're good.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: I think we could maybe  
17 provide further clarification to say --

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Following the word  
19 application capital A.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, if you're looking  
21 at -- it's Exhibit C-1 to the application. And it's on  
22 page 21 of Exhibit C-1 to the application.

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Add that page.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: I think if we refer to it  
25 in that manner, it will be more clear what we're talking

1 about, because it took me -- I needed assistance from  
2 Member Hill to find Table C-3.

3 MS. POLLIO: And it is the terminology of  
4 "exhibit" versus "table."

5 But I agree I think that if you put table  
6 C-3 I would say in Exhibit C on page C-21 to be very  
7 exact.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Of the application?

9 MS. POLLIO: Yes.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Scroll back.

12 Okay. So the sentence would read, "The  
13 applicant commits to follow the mitigation measures in  
14 Table C-3 in Exhibit C on page C-21 of the application as  
15 applicable and feasible."

16 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Mercer.

18 MEMBER MERCER: I move that we accept  
19 Condition 5 as amended.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: We did pass the amendment;  
22 right?

23 Okay. That's what I thought.

24 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

1 MEMBER KRYDER: As a final point, in  
2 line 25 that is in front of us, Table C-3 (in Exhibit C  
3 on page 21). Like that, would that clarify and not  
4 confuse?

5 CHMN STAFFORD: How does that look to you,  
6 Member Little?

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Looks fine. Thank you.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Is that your motion, Member  
9 Kryder?

10 MEMBER KRYDER: That is.

11 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the  
19 amendment's adopted.

20 Could we move 5 as amended.

21 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

22 MEMBER HILL: Second.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 (No response.)



1 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

2 (A chorus of "ayes.")

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 5  
6 as amended is adopted.

7 Number 6.

8 MEMBER GOLD: I move Condition 6,  
9 Mr. Chairman.

10 MEMBER HILL: Second.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

12 I took out the word "interconnection  
13 facility" because the whole project is an interconnection  
14 facility.

15 MEMBER HILL: Fair point.

16 MEMBER KRYDER: Well done.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

18 Number 6 has been moved and seconded.

19 Further discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

22 (A chorus of "ayes.")

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 6

1 is adopted.

2 Number 7.

3 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, I just have a  
4 question for you.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

6 MEMBER HILL: I don't really care where we  
7 put this. I just wanted to reflect the applicant's  
8 commitment to do the phase 3.

9 MEMBER KRYDER: Speak into your microphone  
10 just a bit more, please.

11 MEMBER HILL: Oh, absolutely. My  
12 apologies.

13 I'm not sure where this goes, but it's kind  
14 of in the section of SHPO and the applicant's commitment  
15 to do the phase 3 cultural resource study in the  
16 corridor.

17 So I'd just like to -- I'm not sure where  
18 that should be included. I feel like that's an attorney  
19 question. So --

20 MEMBER LITTLE: I agree.

21 MEMBER HILL: Apparently Mr. Drago has a  
22 suggestion.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Drago.

24 MEMBER DRAGO: Yeah. No, I agree.

25 Thank you, Member Hill.

1 I noticed it in SRP-06 L75 where that  
2 commitment was made. In that section it reads, "A new  
3 Class III survey will be conducted prior to  
4 construction."

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Where is that?

6 MEMBER DRAGO: It was in SRP-06 L75.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. But I agree with  
8 Member Hill I'm not sure where to put either it either.

9 MS. GILBERT: I think it's a bit ahead of  
10 us, but Condition 8 might be a clean spot to add a  
11 sentence on preconstruction -- the Class III cultural  
12 survey.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: I agree.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: So Number 7, we don't need  
16 to make any changes to that.

17 MEMBER HILL: Great. I move approval of  
18 Section 7.

19 MEMBER DRAGO: Second.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

23 (A chorus of "ayes.")

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Number 8, this is where you  
25 want to add the language?

1 Let's move 8 and amend it.

2 MEMBER GOLD: I move 8.

3 MEMBER HILL: Second.

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

6 MEMBER LITTLE: I move that we add a  
7 sentence at the end of Condition 8 that reads, "The  
8 applicant will conduct a new Class III survey of the  
9 proposed facilities and the selected alternative  
10 transmission line corridors prior to construction."

11 CHMN STAFFORD: How about the "final  
12 right-of-ways prior to construction"?

13 MEMBER LITTLE: As long as it says "final  
14 right-of-ways," I could go along with that.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Gilbert, thoughts?

16 MS. GILBERT: I think "final right-of-ways"  
17 could work.

18 And just to make sure we're understanding  
19 it, the sentence, Member Little, is "The applicant will  
20 conduct a new Class III survey of all final right-of-ways  
21 prior to construction"?

22 If I got that wrong, please let me know,  
23 but --

24 MEMBER LITTLE: Well, the way it's written  
25 in the application is, "For these reasons we recommend

1 that SRP conduct a new Class III survey of the proposed  
2 facilities and the selected alternative transmission line  
3 where feasible prior to construction."

4 I guess you're not going to actually  
5 conduct a survey of the proposed facilities themselves.  
6 So the way that it's worded there might be better --  
7 yeah, I'm okay with that sentence.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So the motion  
9 before us is the applicant -- is to add the sentence,  
10 "The applicant will conduct a new Class III survey of all  
11 final right-of-ways prior to construction" to be added to  
12 the end of Condition 8.

13 MS. GILBERT: Just one -- sorry,  
14 Mr. Chairman, can we have just one moment?

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Please.

16 MEMBER FRENCH: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

18 MEMBER FRENCH: Is ROW previously defined?

19 CHMN STAFFORD: No. But it's just an  
20 abbreviation. I can fix that with scrivener's.

21 MEMBER FRENCH: Understood.

22 MEMBER FONTES: Mr. Chairman, Member Fontes  
23 here.

24 Can we add chair clarity of that "Class  
25 III" to "Class III cultural survey" since that is in

1 isolation here?

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Good point.

3 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chairman, my only other  
4 thought is that might need to be the first sentence just  
5 because then it goes on to say if anything is -- of  
6 significant is discovered. So I just want to suggest  
7 that it precede the paragraph.

8 MEMBER LITTLE: I agree.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent suggestion.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: Yep. I agree.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Do we want to do a  
12 new motion to change the location?

13 MEMBER HILL: Or the applicant might  
14 have --

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Or are we just kind of --  
16 oh, yeah, we're still waiting on the applicant.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I amend my  
18 motion to say include a new sentence at the beginning of  
19 Condition 8 that reads, "The applicant will conduct a new  
20 Class III cultural survey of all final right-of-ways  
21 prior to construction."

22 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Gilbert?

24 MS. GILBERT: Nothing further from the  
25 applicant.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: That language works for  
2 you?

3 MS. GILBERT: That language works for us,  
4 yes.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.  
6 The amendment has been moved and seconded.  
7 Further discussion?

8 MEMBER FRENCH: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member French.

10 MEMBER FRENCH: Is it rights-of-way or is  
11 it right-of-ways.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: I think it's rights-of-way,  
13 isn't it?

14 MEMBER LITTLE: I think it is  
15 rights-of-way, yes.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Further  
17 discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

20 (A chorus of "ayes.")

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
24 carries.

25 Can we get a motion to adopt Condition 8 as

1 amended?

2 MEMBER GOLD: So moved.

3 MEMBER LITTLE: So moved.

4 MEMBER FRENCH: Second.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: We have an abundance of  
6 motions and seconds for this one.

7 Further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
10 (A chorus of "ayes.")

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 8  
14 as amended is adopted.

15 Number 9.

16 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move  
17 Condition 9 be adopted.

18 MEMBER HILL: Second.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
22 (A chorus of "ayes.")

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 9



1 is adopted.

2 Number 10.

3 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

5 Condition 10.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

10 (A chorus of "ayes.")

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 10

14 is adopted.

15 Number 11.

16 MEMBER HILL: Move approval of

17 Condition 11.

18 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

20 Ms. Gilbert, one of the changes that I made

21 to this was you had removed -- the first paragraph A

22 reads, "If human remains and/or funerary objects are

23 encountered during the course of any ground-disturbing

24 activities related to construction." I think you had

25 stricken "or operation." I added it back in.

1 It occurred to me that there could be some  
2 situation where in repair of the line there's some kind  
3 of an excavation mishap that could disturb ground that  
4 could uncover something.

5 Does the applicant have a problem with  
6 adding the "or operation" back into the condition as I  
7 have?

8 MS. GILBERT: No. I think we'll be okay.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Condition 11 has  
10 been moved and seconded.

11 Further discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

14 (A chorus of "ayes.")

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 11  
18 is adopted.

19 Number 12.

20 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move  
21 Condition 12.

22 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

1 (A chorus of "ayes.")  
2 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?  
3 (No response.)  
4 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 12  
5 is adopted.  
6 Number 13.  
7 MEMBER HILL: Move approval Condition 13.  
8 MEMBER GOLD: Second.  
9 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?  
10 (No response.)  
11 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
12 (A chorus of "ayes.")  
13 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?  
14 (No response.)  
15 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 13  
16 is adopted.  
17 Number 14.  
18 MEMBER HILL: Move approval Condition 14.  
19 MEMBER GOLD: Second.  
20 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?  
21 (No response.)  
22 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."  
23 (A chorus of "ayes.")  
24 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?  
25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 14  
2 is adopted.

3 Number 15.

4 MEMBER HILL: Move approval Condition 15.

5 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 15

13 is adopted.

14 Number 16.

15 MEMBER HILL: Move approval Condition 16.

16 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

21 (A chorus of "ayes.")

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 16

25 is adopted.

1 MEMBER HILL: Move approval 17.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move 17.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

7 (A chorus of "ayes.")

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 17  
11 is adopted.

12 Number 18.

13 MEMBER HILL: Move approval Condition 18.

14 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

15 MEMBER DRAGO: Second.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

19 (A chorus of "ayes.")

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Number 19. I added this  
21 back in. It said -- it had inadvertently had come out  
22 draft CEC, I think.

23 The only thing I would mention is is this a  
24 place where Member Fontes would like to add a maximum  
25 height of the structures?

1 MS. GILBERT: And maybe just some further  
2 clarification on what this condition is intended to  
3 obligate us to do.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Nothing. It's just because  
5 you have a corridor that's bigger than your final  
6 right-of-way. This has been a standard condition for --

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Three years.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, for almost every  
9 transmission line.

10 Because we give you -- and it's more  
11 relevant in other cases where we have say a  
12 1600-foot-wide corridor and you have multiple entities  
13 trying to enter the same substation, and you have to  
14 coordinate, so it gives them quite a bit of latitude of  
15 where to go.

16 But it makes a note that the final right  
17 of -- they don't control that 1600-foot corridor. They  
18 only actually have the exclusive rights to the final  
19 right-of-way, which is typically 100 to 200 feet  
20 depending on the -- mostly to the line is. I think it's  
21 250 in some of them. But I'd have to go back and look.  
22 But for this case it's 100-foot right-of-way.

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

25 MEMBER KRYDER: A moment ago we spoke about

1 Member Fontes' concern about the height and such. But  
2 back in Condition 16, it includes the FAA regulations. I  
3 think that might address all of the concerns that he had.

4 Is Member Fontes still on?

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

6 MEMBER FONTES: I am indeed, Member Kryder.

7 Mr. Chairman, I'm just looking for

8 consistency because we have included height in

9 descriptions previously on all CEC hearings.

10 So I will defer to you if you want to  
11 include that for consistency. Else, I do agree with  
12 Member Kryder that it's addressed.

13 MEMBER KRYDER: In 16.

14 Thank you, Member Fontes.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: I think that has more to do  
16 with the NERC standards for the heights of towers; is  
17 that correct?

18 The FAA requires certain things be added to  
19 lines over a certain height or they won't allow them in  
20 flight paths is my understanding.

21 Is that correct, Ms. Gilbert?

22 MS. GILBERT: That's -- the FAA piece of  
23 that is also my understanding.

24 Mr. Heim or Mr. Hernandez, are you aware of  
25 any NERC standards that dictate height?

1 MR. HEIM: Can we just go back to 16 just  
2 so I can take a peek at it?

3 MEMBER KRYDER: It talks about NERC  
4 standards, but then there is a comma after the word  
5 standards and adds FAA or Federal Aviation Administration  
6 regulations.

7 That might be the balls that were on the  
8 lines near the Banner hospital and such as that that  
9 Ms. De Blasi spoke about. I'm not certain. But I simply  
10 wanted to make sure that Member Fontes' concerns were  
11 addressed one place or the other.

12 MR. HEIM: Of these standards the only one  
13 that would say anything about the upper limit on the  
14 height of transmission structures would be the FAA  
15 regulations.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, the other ones would  
17 be, like, the height of the conductor above grade then?

18 MR. HEIM: All the others -- specifically  
19 the NESC. The others have to do with more planning  
20 standards.

21 So the NESC would dictate the minimum  
22 clearance for a conductor from things within the  
23 right-of-way and therefore the what you might call the  
24 minimum height for transmission.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, which one regulates



1 the distance of conductors from another conductor for a  
2 different line or voltage?

3 MR. HEIM: That is the NESC.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I think the maximum  
5 height is more relevant to what the scope of the CEC  
6 authorizes. I mean, if the scope of the CEC said the  
7 maximum height is 150 feet, you'd have to get a change to  
8 build higher than that.

9 So I think the application says 199 feet is  
10 the maximum height.

11 MEMBER KRYDER: Correct.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: So if we just added a  
13 sentence to the end of -- sometimes we put it in the  
14 description, sometimes we put it in 19. We can add a  
15 sentence that says, "The maximum height of the structures  
16 shall be" -- "The maximum height of the structure shall  
17 not exceed 199 feet."

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Seems fine.

19 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

20 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

24 (A chorus of "ayes.")

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

1 MS. GILBERT: I'm not opposed to the last  
2 sentence, but I have a question about the first.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Hang on. Hearing none, the  
4 amendment carries.

5 MS. GILBERT: Okay.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Gilbert.

7 MS. GILBERT: The Exhibit A, the new red  
8 and green route map, doesn't depict the corridors. It  
9 really just shows the lines, the line routes.

10 Could we --

11 CHMN STAFFORD: We'll get to Exhibit A and  
12 clean that up at the end when we're finished with the  
13 certificate itself.

14 MS. GILBERT: Sure. But the sentence here  
15 at the line -- I don't have the PDF here. Paragraph 19  
16 begins with the designation of the corridors and the  
17 certificate as shown in Exhibit A. The corridors aren't  
18 depicted in Exhibit A.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: What are the blue lines  
20 then and the green -- well, I guess they're red and green  
21 now.

22 MS. GILBERT: They are really the routes.  
23 I don't -- looking at Ms. Pollio I don't think those are  
24 depictive of 350 feet or meant to be.

25 MS. POLLIO: They're not depicted of I will

1 say probably not 350 or 100. I mean, at this point that  
2 is a, you know, for graphic depiction only. So maybe not  
3 reference Exhibit A there.

4 MS. GILBERT: I think that would -- we  
5 could --

6 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm more inclined to  
7 describe the corridors in the exhibit and leave this  
8 language as it is.

9 Members?

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes, sir. I think that's a  
11 good idea.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Would that -- if we have --  
13 if we add to the Exhibit A where it describe -- we have  
14 the description of the red line it says, line 1 corridor  
15 350 feet wide.

16 MS. GILBERT: In the legend?

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

18 MS. GILBERT: So add --

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, we can do that at the  
20 end. I'm just saying.

21 MS. GILBERT: We can put it there.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: That should solve the  
23 problem?

24 MS. GILBERT: I think that would solve it.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Excellent.

1 MEMBER HILL: And it's consistent with  
2 other CECs, so --

3 MEMBER KRYDER: Agreed.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. The amendment  
5 has been passed.

6 Can we get a motion to adopt Condition 19  
7 as amended?

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: So moved.

9 MEMBER HILL: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, condition as  
17 amended is adopted.

18 Number 20.

19 And October 1, 2025, that is the filing  
20 date for the -- is that -- does SRP have a general filing  
21 date for all its compliance filings or -- I know APS does  
22 that. Other projects do do it on a -- other entities do  
23 it on a project-by-project basis.

24 MS. GILBERT: I think our goal is try to  
25 move to having this project-by-project basis done. So

1 October 1 would be great for us.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So, like, the  
3 October 1, 2025, that's --

4 MS. GILBERT: Would be filing number 1.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

6 MEMBER HILL: Move approval of  
7 Condition 20.

8 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

10 (No response.)

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

12 (A chorus of "ayes.")

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 20  
16 is adopted.

17 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move  
18 Condition 21.

19 MEMBER HILL: Second.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

23 (A chorus of "ayes.")

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 21  
2 adopted.

3 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move  
4 Condition 22.

5 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 22  
13 is adopted.

14 Number 23.

15 MEMBER HILL: Move Condition 23.

16 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

17 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

21 (A chorus of "ayes.")

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 23  
25 is adopted.

1 Number 24.

2 MEMBER HILL: Move Condition 24.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

7 (A chorus of "ayes.")

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 24  
11 is adopted.

12 On to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions  
13 of Law.

14 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move Findings  
15 of Fact and Conclusions of Law Number 1 be adopted.

16 MEMBER HILL: Second.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

18 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

20 MEMBER LITTLE: I would like to ask the  
21 committee members if they feel that they have received  
22 enough information to make the statement that this  
23 project will aid the state and the southwest region of  
24 the United States in meeting the need for adequate,  
25 economical, and reliable supply of electric power?

1 The statement that we got from the Staff of  
2 the Commission is Staff believed the proposed project  
3 could improve the reliability and safety of the grid and  
4 the delivery of power in Arizona.

5 You know, that's one piece of information  
6 that we received, which is the only way that any of us,  
7 including those of us that could read the results of the  
8 study were it provided to us, the system's impacts  
9 studies, that's the only information that we have as far  
10 as the system impact studies go.

11 MEMBER HILL: Member Little.

12 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes?

13 MEMBER HILL: Are you suggesting that maybe  
14 it should read "the project 'could' aid the state and the  
15 southwest region"?

16 MEMBER LITTLE: I would like members to ask  
17 themselves if they feel confident in saying that it does  
18 or whether they would prefer to have the word "could" in  
19 there.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

22 MEMBER GOLD: I understand what Member  
23 Little is saying. And let me see if I understand the  
24 rest of this.

25 I'm not an expert. I'm certainly not as



1 expert as Member Little. But the panel, the applicant  
2 has experts who are sworn under oath to make statements  
3 to us, and they said this was necessary.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: I think --

5 MEMBER LITTLE: That is true.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: I think one of the reasons  
7 for the statement is -- I mean, it stems from a  
8 requirement from the statute that we need -- the  
9 Commission ultimately needs to balance the need against  
10 the impacts.

11 And I think -- I think from a legal  
12 perspective, this finding is required for the  
13 Commission's ultimate determination to be able to stand  
14 up to challenge or scrutiny.

15 Mr. Derstine, Ms. Gilbert, do you have any  
16 legal thoughts on the matter?

17 MS. GILBERT: What you just described is my  
18 understanding as well.

19 Mr. Derstine, do you have anything to add?

20 MR. DERSTINE: Well, I think your statement  
21 concerning Finding of Fact Number 1 is the reason that  
22 it's there.

23 The question is did the applicant through  
24 its testimony and its slides and its exhibits concerning  
25 why this project is being built, that is the need for

1 this project.

2 Did we establish that there is a need and  
3 that, in fact, by SRP constructing this project that it  
4 helps to satisfy the need to serve the industrial-load  
5 customers that are being attracted to and developing in  
6 the South Mountain high-tech corridor?

7 And I think the evidence does.

8 MS. GILBERT: I think in addition Member  
9 Little pointed out Staff's response -- SRP's responses to  
10 Staff's data request were also in the exhibits. And the  
11 second response addresses maybe some of that broader need  
12 regarding the state and region. That's a helpful data  
13 point too.

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I think  
15 that -- I appreciate this conversation.

16 And I think Member Gold's point is well  
17 taken.

18 In addition to just the letter from Staff,  
19 which only refers to the -- their examination presumably  
20 of the system impact study, we have received a great deal  
21 of information, which was given to us under oath that --  
22 that would help us in making that decision for Number 1.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Findings of  
24 Fact and Conclusions of Law Number 1 has been moved and  
25 seconded.

1 Further discussion?

2 (No response.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

4 (A chorus of "ayes.")

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

6 (No response.)

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of

8 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 1 is adopted.

9 Number 2.

10 MEMBER HILL: Move approval of number 2.

11 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of

19 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 2 is adopted.

20 Number 3.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

22 Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 3.

23 MEMBER FONTES: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

2 (A chorus of "ayes.")

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
6 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 3 is adopted.

7 Number 4.

8 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move  
9 Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 4.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

14 (A chorus of "ayes.")

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
18 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 4 is adopted.

19 Number 5.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move Finding  
21 of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 5 be adopted.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

1 (A chorus of "ayes.")

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
5 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 5 is adopted.

6 Number 6.

7 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move  
8 Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 6.

9 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
17 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 6 is adopted.

18 Number 7.

19 It's back in this time, huh, Mr. Derstine?

20 MS. GILBERT: I put it in without him.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: That's fine. I think it's  
22 completely appropriate to have this in.

23 So has it been moved and seconded?

24 MEMBER GOLD: Second. Or did someone move?

25 I thought I heard --

1 CHMN STAFFORD: No one moved it yet I don't  
2 think.

3 MEMBER GOLD: I move it.

4 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

6 (No response.)

7 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

8 (A chorus of "ayes.")

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

10 (No response.)

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
12 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 7 is adopted.

13 Number 8.

14 MS. GILBERT: There's just a small typo in  
15 8.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's move it and second  
17 it, and then we can amend it.

18 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman, I move  
19 Condition 8.

20 MEMBER FONTES: Second.

21 MEMBER MERCER: It's not condition.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

23 Ms. Gilbert.

24 MS. GILBERT: Could we change "than" to  
25 "that" in the line 4.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, I see that. That's a  
2 scrivener's error. We can fix that later. We don't need  
3 to --

4 MEMBER HILL: Scribbler's. I like it.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Gold.

6 MEMBER GOLD: The project doesn't have  
7 500-kilovolt transmission lines.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, it does.

9 It has two that, I believe, will tie into  
10 from the new substation into the existing Jojoba-Kyrene  
11 500kV line.

12 MS. GILBERT: That is correct.

13 MEMBER GOLD: Ah.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe there are two  
15 500kV lines, and they're both -- I think they're going to  
16 be almost I think entirely -- they're less than a mile  
17 and entirely contained on the New Substation property.

18 MS. GILBERT: Looking at Mr. Heim,  
19 Mr. Hernandez to confirm.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: That's my recollection of  
21 reading the application.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Thanks for including that,  
23 Mr. Chairman. I missed it entirely.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Kryder.  
25 Mr. Heim.

1 MR. HEIM: That's correct. There's one  
2 existing 500kV line. By looping it in and out of the new  
3 500kV station you would create two new 500kV circuits.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: And they're both less than  
5 a mile long?

6 MR. HEIM: Absolutely.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: And the entirety of the  
8 line is on the New Substation property as shown in  
9 Exhibit A?

10 MR. HEIM: That is correct.

11 MEMBER GOLD: And we have jurisdiction over  
12 substations?

13 CHMN STAFFORD: No, we do not. That was  
14 the prior finding of fact and conclusion of law we just  
15 adopted. That's how the statute defines them.

16 MEMBER GOLD: If we don't have jurisdiction  
17 over this, why are we including it?

18 CHMN STAFFORD: What do you mean?

19 MEMBER GOLD: If --

20 CHMN STAFFORD: We're explicitly saying we  
21 don't have jurisdiction. That's what Number 7 does.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Member Gold.

23 MEMBER GOLD: I apologize. I got it.

24 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And then we



1 sometimes don't include those. Sometimes we do. It  
2 depends on what the applicant prefers whether it's  
3 necessary or not.

4 I mean, the statute says what it says, and  
5 it means what it means whether we acknowledge it in the  
6 order or not. I think the whole issue of including it  
7 was because the statutes never included substations in  
8 the jurisdiction of this committee. However, over time  
9 it became a practice to approve substations in the CEC  
10 locationally. And a couple years ago the Commission  
11 adopted a policy calling out the statute specifically  
12 saying you don't need to do that, the substations aren't  
13 jurisdictional.

14 And that was the genesis of including this  
15 because I think -- I think it was more for developers  
16 than for, you know, incumbent utilities because their  
17 investors felt squirrely about having seen prior CECs  
18 that did mention the substation location to not having  
19 it.

20 This was intended to provide them  
21 assurances, that, yes, you know, the Commission's  
22 interpretation is right, this is what the statute says,  
23 substations are not jurisdictional.

24 MEMBER KRYDER: Or the absence of --

25 MEMBER GOLD: I'm sorry, Member Kryder.

1 MEMBER KRYDER: That's absolutely correct.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. Now  
3 we're still on Number 8.

4 Has it been moved and seconded?

5 I lost track. I thought it had.

6 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Yes.

7 MEMBER GOLD: We were discussing.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

9 Further discussion?

10 (No response.)

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

12 (A chorus of "ayes.")

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of  
16 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 8 is adopted.

17 Moving on to Exhibit A.

18 We'll need to add the certificate of  
19 mailing information, but I think that's something Tod and  
20 I can handle. Don't need to spell that out now.

21 All right. The applicant has distributed a  
22 new map with the preferable colors to the members, the  
23 red and green. So the only blue on the map is either the  
24 LACC or the Anderson-Orme line.

25 MEMBER FONTES: Is that the sent-out,

1 Mr. Chairman?

2 CHMN STAFFORD: You should already have  
3 that. Has it not been sent to the members?

4 I thought it -- it should be -- did it come  
5 with the Chairman's 1 and 2? I think it was attached to  
6 that.

7 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

9 MEMBER HILL: Was that the new map on the  
10 screen?

11 CHMN STAFFORD: I think that's the next  
12 step is to pull it up on the screen.

13 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: But I thought -- I'm just  
15 waiting to see if the members had it in hand or  
16 electronically.

17 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, apparently it did not  
18 go out with Tod's e-mail.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

20 MR. DERSTINE: So I'm just seeing the two  
21 versions.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right.

23 MEMBER FRENCH: We have SRP-26 and 27,  
24 Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. It's identical to 27

1 except the main difference, well, other than the legend,  
2 I think. And then we're going to make some changes to  
3 that, I think, now.

4 But I think the main -- the primary  
5 difference between SRP-27 and what is being proposed as  
6 Exhibit A is the color of the line 1. It is now red  
7 instead of blue.

8 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: May we consider it or shall  
11 we wait until the members online receive this?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, they can see it on  
13 the screen now, can't you, Members?

14 MEMBER LITTLE: We can see it. We can't  
15 read the words on it.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: But you do have SRP-27?

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, it's not 27. Excuse  
19 me.

20 MEMBER GOLD: Yeah, it is 27.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: 27? Okay. Yes, sorry.

22 MEMBER LITTLE: 27.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: SRP-27. Here it is.

24 Other than the legend, which we're going to  
25 address in a minute, just looking at the map itself and

1 the -- it's the same. The only difference being -- the  
2 primary difference being the color of line 1 being red  
3 instead of blue. Oh, and the green looks brighter too.

4 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

5 MS. GILBERT: I think it's just because of  
6 the screen.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Pardon?

8 MS. GILBERT: I think it's just because of  
9 the digital.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: I thought you maybe you got  
11 neoned up on us a little.

12 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, I'm looking for  
13 feedback from folks.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, let's move this as  
15 Exhibit A.

16 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

17 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Further  
19 discussion?

20 MEMBER HILL: So we talked about the  
21 obligation to remove the section of the Anderson-Orme  
22 line, and it looks like they've identified two new 230kV  
23 interconnection points. But there's nothing in the CEC  
24 obligating them to remove those towers or the towers and  
25 the lines. I don't know if this is adequate to address

1 that.

2 Do you have thoughts or does anyone else  
3 have thoughts on that?

4 CHMN STAFFORD: I have thoughts, and I like  
5 to hear from the applicant after I give them.

6 MEMBER HILL: Super.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: I don't think it's  
8 necessary to include that. I think that's -- I'm  
9 assuming that that line, the Anderson-Orme line, is  
10 certificated; is that correct?

11 MS. GILBERT: Mr. Hernandez, do you recall  
12 does Anderson-Orme line have a CEC?

13 I don't think it does, but I'm hoping he  
14 can --

15 CHMN STAFFORD: If it's a 230kV line that  
16 you didn't spend at least 50 grand on before 1971, it  
17 should have a certificate.

18 MS. GILBERT: I think it might predate the  
19 siting statutes, but --

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All right.

21 MEMBER HILL: Do you have a different  
22 thought on it then, Mr. Chair?

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Is that the case? Is it --  
24 did you spend at least 50 grand on it before 1971?

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: I wasn't around with SRP in

1 1971, so I couldn't confirm that.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: I understand.

3 Just do you know the history of the line?

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: I do not, sir. I'm sorry.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

6 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, I think either way.

8 I mean, it's -- would it be -- would it benefit you to

9 keep that in place for any reason?

10 I mean, it seemed like the whole point of

11 removing that is just because it's redundant; correct?

12 MS. GILBERT: That is consistent with the

13 testimony we heard, that it's SRP's intent to remove that

14 section of the 230 transmission lines between Nodes O and

15 Node L.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

17 Well, I don't -- I'm trying to think it

18 through. I mean, that's -- we talked about that. That's

19 something they're going to do. I don't think that's

20 really necessary for the CEC. I think it's not like

21 that's the tipping point to make it compatible with the

22 area or not.

23 I'm inclined not to include that. I mean,

24 if you -- I'm -- if you have thoughts on why it should be

25 or why it's important, I'm more than happy to hear them.

1 MEMBER HILL: So as the newest member of  
2 the committee, I have a shorter reference, but with the  
3 TEP project when it was identified that they were going  
4 to remove certain lines, we included that as well in the  
5 CEC. So it was really just being consistent with all  
6 applicants was why I asked about that.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, thank you. And I  
8 appreciate that. But I think that this case is  
9 distinguishable from the TEP case on several fronts.

10 MEMBER GOLD: Mr. Chairman.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: I appreciate what Member  
14 Hill is saying.

15 And my first thought was that, yes, we  
16 should put it on there because it is going to change  
17 how -- I mean, to me it was important to understand how  
18 this whole thing was going to work.

19 However, it's not really part of the CEC.  
20 There's nothing in the CEC that said they're going to do  
21 this or they need to do this.

22 And as you pointed out, it's not really our  
23 work was not -- and our determination was not dependent  
24 on that. Whereas in the TEP case I think that we did  
25 have some -- the fact that they were going to diminish



1 the number of circuits and the number of lines and clean  
2 up the area did have some impact in our decision about  
3 whether to approve the route or not a route or not.

4 If this was a one-line diagram, it should  
5 be removed, but it's not a one-line diagram.

6 So I think it might maybe be a little  
7 confusing if we tried to put it in the exhibit.

8 And it was not referenced at all in the  
9 application that I could see. It was a question I had to  
10 ask.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, that seems to be my  
12 recollection. I didn't think it was -- the removal of  
13 that section was dispositive of anything for this  
14 particular case.

15 And I do recall that the TEP, there was  
16 discussion about reduction in total number of poles that  
17 were visible throughout the whole area as a result of the  
18 adding that new line that would negate the need for a  
19 significant amount of other infrastructure that was all  
20 aboveground. So I think for this one --

21 MEMBER HILL: I appreciate the discussion.  
22 I'm always going to be working to reduce the number of  
23 towers and lines that people have to look at, so thank  
24 you.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Now, for the

1 legend, can we zoom in on that on the screen so the  
2 members can see what I'm talking about?

3 MS. GILBERT: I do think we've made an  
4 attempt at adding the reference to corridor after pole  
5 line.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, my suggestion would  
7 be not -- the prior one before you changed the colors up  
8 on us and got the red in there.

9 Going down the list, I think where it says  
10 "Preferred Route 1" it should just say "line 1." I  
11 believe -- let's see. It's referred to as line 1.

12 And then below that you can take the word  
13 "pole" out and just "line 1, 350-foot corridor."

14 MS. GILBERT: Would you also like to spell  
15 out one and two?

16 CHMN STAFFORD: No. Just use the number.

17 MS. GILBERT: Okay.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Start -- I'm seeing  
19 stuff move around, but are you trying to access the  
20 functions of it to get to the letters to change them?

21 MR. DERSTINE: I think it's a PDF we're  
22 trying to add.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

24 MS. POLLIO: She has to open it in GIS to  
25 actually get it correct. Otherwise, since it's a PDF and

1 a very small area.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Yeah. Because that  
3 I was confused because I saw things popping and moving  
4 around, but I didn't see the language that I was trying  
5 to get to.

6 MR. DERSTINE: They're ignoring you.

7 MS. POLLIO: I promise we're not doing  
8 that.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Is this going to take a  
10 minute?

11 MS. GILBERT: No.

12 MS. POLLIO: We have got it.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: So do you need a second to  
14 get it or are you getting close?

15 MS. POLLIO: It's moving now. She's in  
16 GIS.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

18 MS. GILBERT: So we just had to be in the  
19 application versus Adobe.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Jennifer, how long  
21 have we been going this time?

22 I think it's time for a brief recess.

23 Let's take a 15-minute recess and give our stalwart court  
24 reporter a much-needed break. We stand in recess.

25 (Recess from 5:32 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Let's go back on the  
2 record.

3 We are now able to edit the legend for  
4 Exhibit A.

5 Here are my suggestions:

6 Where it says, "Preferred Line 1," just say  
7 "line 1."

8 Can we bold that? Is that bold? Okay.  
9 There you go.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

12 MEMBER KRYDER: The next line down, do you  
13 wish to continue to use pole line --

14 CHMN STAFFORD: No. No. You know what,  
15 I've got a whole list of stuff to go through here. All  
16 right.

17 So then next to the red chunk it would say,  
18 350-foot -- "line 1, corridor, 350-foot wide." Do we  
19 need a comma there or something?

20 That looks good. It's the A, E contingent  
21 segment corridor.

22 And then just take the second one. This is  
23 more complicated than I thought it was going to be.

24 We're back to where we started.

25 MS. GILBERT: Was the comma after line 1?

1 CHMN STAFFORD: No. "Line 1 corridor,  
2 350-foot-wide corridor."

3 And then the dotted section would be A-E  
4 contingent segment, 350-foot corridor -- foot-wide  
5 corridor. All right. I think that -- hang on one  
6 second.

7 All right. So the line 1 we have the  
8 designated red with 350-foot-wide corridor. The dotted  
9 line is the A-E contingent segment with a 350-foot-wide  
10 corridor.

11 The green is the line 2 corridor, 350-foot  
12 wide.

13 And then H -- the dotted green is the H, J,  
14 K contingent segment with a 350-foot-wide corridor.

15 I think that are the changes that would  
16 encompass the needs to address the width of the corridor  
17 in Exhibit A. I think it's more clear. If these are the  
18 lines that are approved, there's line 1, there's line 2.

19 Can I get a motion?

20 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: I move that we approve the  
23 legend change on Exhibit A as shown on the screen.

24 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

3 (A chorus of "ayes.")

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment  
7 to Exhibit A is approved.

8 Are there any other changes that we need to  
9 make to Exhibit A?

10 Members?

11 Mr. Derstine?

12 Ms. Gilbert?

13 MS. GILBERT: Nothing --

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Does this adequately  
15 address all of the concerns we had with the legend?

16 MS. GILBERT: Yes, it does.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.

18 Can I get a motion to adopt Exhibit A as  
19 amended?

20 MEMBER GOLD: I so move.

21 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

22 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

1 (A chorus of "ayes.")

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition  
5 [sic] A as amended is adopted.

6 All right. I think we're ready to move the  
7 certificate as we have amended it.

8 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

9 MEMBER GOLD: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 Are there any issues with the certificate  
12 that we missed, Ms. Gilbert or Mr. Derstine?

13 MS. GILBERT: No other issues.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. De Blasi, any concerns  
15 with what we have?

16 MS. DE BLASI: No concerns, Chairman.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Your mic's not working.

18 MS. DE BLASI: No concerns, Chairman.

19 Thank you.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

21 All right. Take a roll call vote on the  
22 certificate.

23 Member Kryder.

24 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Mercer.

1 MEMBER MERCER: Yes.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Gold.

3 MEMBER GOLD: Yes.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Drago.

5 MEMBER DRAGO: Aye.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill.

7 MEMBER HILL: Aye.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

9 Member Little, you're on mute.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: Apologies. I vote aye.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Member French.

12 MEMBER FRENCH: Aye.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Fontes.

14 MEMBER FONTES: Aye.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: And I vote aye.

16 By a vote of 9-0 the certificate is

17 approved.

18 Thank you all, members and the applicant,

19 intervenor, for staying late to get this thing done

20 today.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: Chairman.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: I think you're probably

23 happier than I am that we don't have to come back here

24 next week to finish this up.

25 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.



1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

2 Oh, yes, we have one more.

3 We need the motion for scrivener's errors.

4 MEMBER KRYDER: So moved.

5 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

7 (A chorus of "ayes.")

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the motion to  
11 allow the Chair to correct any scrivener's errors, which  
12 would include changing the ons to alongs in the  
13 appropriate spots, passes.

14 Well, I'd like to thank everybody again for  
15 their patience and their willingness to work late this  
16 evening and get this done.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm glad we don't have to  
19 come back next week.

20 Member Kryder.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: I want to thank the  
22 Chairman for outstanding work in putting this together as  
23 well as the other members, but particularly you did a  
24 great job, Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Thank you.

1 MEMBER LITTLE: Hear! Hear!

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

3 And I have to, again, express my  
4 appreciation to the applicant for changing the map that  
5 we used that you started out with the number 27 and it  
6 evolved to what became Exhibit A. I think that provides  
7 significant clarity for future generations to look at the  
8 CEC and understand what we're talking about.

9 I know that looking at this initially with  
10 the multitude of different routes was confusing, but you  
11 managed to get through it, and I'm glad we did.

12 Thank you all very much.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: I would like to go on the  
16 record as saying that I would encourage the applicant to  
17 continue to work with the school district and with the  
18 planning -- Laveen planning committee, whatever it is, in  
19 any way that they can.

20 Thank you.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

22 Anything further for the good of the order?

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Can we order copies of that  
24 map to put around a Christmas tree since it's so bright  
25 green and red?

1 MS. GILBERT: Whatever you want.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: You'll have the copy that  
3 they gave you, so you can take that and photocopy the  
4 heck out of it and put as many up all over the tree that  
5 you like.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: Kaboom.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: All right.

8 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you, sir.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you very  
10 much.

11 And thank you very much, Jennifer, for  
12 putting up with us and staying late this evening.

13 We are adjourned.

14 (Proceedings concluded at 5:55 p.m.)

15

16

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  
4 taken before me; that the foregoing pages are a full,  
5 true, and accurate record of the proceedings, all done to  
6 the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings  
7 were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced  
8 to print under my direction.

9 I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the  
10 parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the  
11 outcome hereof.

12 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical  
13 obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and  
14 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) and (2).

15 Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, November 18, 2024.

16  
17  
18 

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 JENNIFER HONN, RPR  
21 Arizona Certified Reporter  
22 No. 50885

23 I CERTIFY that GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC, has  
24 complied with the ethical obligations set forth in  
25 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(

26  
27 

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
29 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC  
30 Arizona Registered Firm  
31 No. R1035