BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE — LS-434

| | |
|---|---|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY, IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES §§ 40-360, ET SEQ., FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SECTION OF THE PINAL ELECTRICAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 20 MILES OF A NEW DOUBLE-CIRCUIT 230KV TRANSMISSION LINE WHICH ORIGINATES AT THE MILLIGAN SUBSTATION AND TERMINATES AT THE CONNECTION POINT WITH THE SUNDANCE TO PINAL CENTRAL 230KV TRANSMISSION LINE (CEC 136) LOCATED NEAR THE PINAL CENTRAL SUBSTATION, ALL LOCATED WITHIN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA. | DOCKET NO. L-00000D-25-0154-00247<br>LS CASE NO. 247<br>EVIDENTIARY HEARING |

At: Casa Grande, Arizona

Date: September 8, 2025

Filed: September 15, 2025

# REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

## VOLUME I
(Pages 1 through 171)

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

By: Jennifer Honn, RPR
Arizona CR No. 50558

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| VOLUME I | September 8, 2025 | Pages 1 to 171 |
| VOLUME II | September 9, 2025 | Pages 172 to 353 |
| VOLUME III | September 10, 2025 | Pages 354 to 455 |

## INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS


| ITEM | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Opening Statement of Mr. Derstine | 8 |
| Presentation of Virtual Tour | 135 |
| Public Comment Session | 168 |
| Closing Statement of Mr. Derstine | 380 |
| Deliberations | 388 |
| Vote | 452 |


## INDEX TO THE TOUR


| STOP | PAGE |
|---|---|
| 1 | 185 |
| 2 | 194 |
| 4 | 201 |
| 6 | 208 |
| 8 | 214 |

## INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS


| WITNESSES | PAGE |
|---|---|
| David Wiley, Stephen Eich, and Devin Petry - for the Applicant | |
| Direct Examination By Mr. Derstine | 28 |


## INDEX TO EXHIBITS


| NO. | DESCRIPTION | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED |
|---|---|---|---|
| APS-1 | Application For Certificate of Environmental Compatibility (CEC) (filed July 29, 2025/Amended August 15, 2025) - Page One | 34 | 371 |
| APS-2A | 2A - Updated Exhibit E | 34 | 371 |
| APS-2B | Updated Project Corridor | 35 | 371 |
| APS-3 | Witness Summary of David Wiley | 367 | 371 |
| APS-4 | Witness Summary of Devin Petry | 367 | 371 |
| APS-5 | Witness Summary of Stephen Eich | 367 | 371 |
| APS-6 | Witness Testimony Slides | 37 | 371 |
| APS-7 | Proposed CEC with Map and Corridor Descriptions | 388 | 371 |
| APS-8 | Affidavits of Publication of Notice of Hearing | 361 | 371 |


//

INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED |
|---|---|---|---|
| APS-9 | Proof of Delivery of Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility to Public Locations | 365 | 371 |
| APS-10 | Proof of Website Posting of Transcripts and Notice of Hearing | 366 | 371 |
| APS-11 | Proof of Delivery to Affected Jurisdictions of the Notice of Hearing | 363 | 371 |
| APS-12 | Proof of Delivery to Public Locations and Affected Jurisdictions of the Notice of Filing Updates to the Application for Certificate of Environmental Compatibility Regarding Exhibit E and the Project Corridor and Updated Address for ASLD | 364 | 371 |
| APS-13 | Proof of Posting: Photos of Posted Notice of Hearing Signs and Locations Posted | -- | 371 |
| APS-14 | Social Media Posting and Emails with Hearing Information | 366 | 371 |
| APS-15 | Public Outreach Summary | 366 | 371 |
| APS-16 | Newsletter Announcing Hearing Mailed August 19, 2025 | 338 | 371 |
| APS-17 | Tribal Nations Outreach January 14, 2025 February 3, 2025 May 23, 2025 August 21, 2025 | 348 | 371 |
| APS-18 | State Historic Preservation Office Consultation Package | 370 | 371 |

//

INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

| NO. | DESCRIPTION | IDENTIFIED | ADMITTED |
|---|---|---|---|
| APS-19 | Visual Simulation (updated KOP-18) | 35 | 371 |
| APS-20 | Route Tour Itinerary and Map | 163 | 371 |
| APS-21 | Letter of Support from Saint Holdings LLC | 367 | 371 |
| APS-22 | Letter of Support from Electrical District No. 2 | 81 | 371 |
| APS-23 | Letter from Arizona Corporation Commission Staff | 56 | 371 |
| CHMN-1 | Proposed Form of CEC | 368 | For Reference |
| CHMN-2 | CEC with Edits | 368 | For Reference |

BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting Committee at Radisson Hotel Casa Grand, 777 North Pinal Avenue, Casa Grande, Arizona, commencing at 1:02 p.m. on September 8, 2025.

BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Chairman

MICHAEL COMSTOCK, Arizona Corporation Commission
LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality
DAVID FRENCH, Arizona Department of Water Resources
NICOLE HILL, Governor's Office of Energy Policy
R. DAVID KRYDER, Agricultural Interests
MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public
DOUGLAS FANT, General Public
GABRIELA SAUCEDO MERCER, General Public

APPEARANCES:

For the Applicant:

Matt Derstine
SNELL & WILMER
One East Washington Street
Suite 2700
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

and

Linda Benally
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
400 North 5th Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Let's go on the record.

Now is the time set for the hearing, Docket No. L-00000D-25-0154-00247, in the application of Arizona Public Service.

I'll start by taking roll call.

Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Mercer.

MEMBER MERCER: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Fant.

MEMBER FANT: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill.

MEMBER HILL: Here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Drago.

MEMBER DRAGO: Here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member French.

MEMBER FRENCH: Here.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Present.

CHMN STAFFORD: Do we have any members attending virtually? No.

Thank you.

I have not seen any applications to intervene. Is that correct, Mr. Derstine?

MR. DERSTINE: That is correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Start with appearances. Mr. Derstine.

MR. DERSTINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members. Good afternoon. Matt Derstine of Snell and Wilmer appearing on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company.

Ms. Benally?

MS. BENALLY: Linda Benally, in-house counsel representing Arizona Public Service Insurance company. Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Mr. Derstine or Ms. Benally, would you like to make an opening statement?

MR. DERSTINE: Yes, please. Thank you.

I guess given my -- at least the appearance that I see in the mirror in the morning you might be surprised to learn that I have one kid remaining to get through college. Lauren is at the University of Arizona, and until she changes her mind again she's an anthropology major.

So we make the drive from Phoenix to Tucson pretty regularly for move-in and visits and family weekends, et cetera.

And as I make that drive, I am vaguely aware that as I pass the signs for Coolidge, Casa Grande, Florence, that I am passing through Pinal County. But as I became involved with this project, the Pinal Electrical Improvement Project, I discovered I don't know a lot about Pinal County, and so I did a little reading and a little research and I'll share with you a little bit about Pinal County.

So Pinal County has an ancient history. This area, along with the Phoenix area and other parts of Arizona are -- were home to the Hohokam, an ancient farming civilization of the Southern Arizona deserts.

One of the archeologists termed the Hohokam as the "Masters of the Desert," given their miles and miles of irrigation systems. I think the largest and most extensive irrigation system of any culture in the new world, I guess north of Peru maybe.

And Pinal County happens to be home to the Casa Grande ruin, The Great House, that dates to around 1350 AD.

The Great House or the Casa Grande Ruin is a four-story, eleven-room structure, the outer perimeter is around three stories tall and then the inner column is four stories, and it's the only surviving example of a multi-story great house structure from the Hohokam

culture.

And the Casa Grande Ruin National Monument was the first archeological reserve at the time, and now a national monument in the U.S., and it was created in 1892.

My project team was quick to point out to me that the Casa Grande National Monument is about nine miles away from our project. We don't impact the project in any way. But I think it's an important part of Pinal County history.

So there's also a territorial history to go along with the ancient history of Pinal County. The county was formed in February 1, 1875, by the Eighth Legislative Assembly for the Territory of Arizona. Arizona didn't become a state until 1912.

And at that time, the residents oftentimes lived along the Gila River Valley, had to travel a long distance either to Phoenix or to Tucson all by horseback. And you may not be able to read it, and I'll read it from my -- maybe I can read it from my slide. But their petition says, "We undersigned citizens and taxpayers of the Gila Valley, composed of portions of the counties of Pima and Maricopa, would most respectfully represent to your honorable body that in consequence of the great distance from, and unavoidable expense of travel to and

from our respective county seats, and the vexatious delay which must necessarily occur in the transaction of business which we are compelled to transact at those places, we are put to great inconvenience and outlay of money which many of us are unable to bear.

"Therefore, we would respectfully ask your honorable body to form a new county out of portions of Pima and Maricopa Counties including the settlements in the Gila Valley to be called Pinal County."

I don't know that anyone knows exactly where the Pinal County name came from. It could be the Pinal mountains to the -- on the eastern side of the county. I think there was also a Pinal Apache tribe. But it became Pinal County and at the same time they designated Florence as the county seat.

You know, Pinal County's early growth was largely based on farming and ranching in the Gila River Valley. The first cotton gin was erected in Coolidge in 1925 after electricity arrived to that area in 1923.

But the county also experienced significant growth right at the time of its formation. A month after Pinal County was formed, the Silver King mine was discovered, which is the richest silver mine in Arizona.

It operated, as you see there, 1875 to about 1900. But in addition to silver, you have the

copper belt running along the eastern side of Pinal County.

It was in the vicinity of the towns of Superior, Kearny and San Manuel. And even today now you have new copper mines that are being developed with the price of the copper commodity and the extensive use of copper in all sorts of our modern day tech devices and conveniences.

So farming, in particular cotton, one of the five Cs, and then also copper, another one of the five Cs that Arizona's known for, were the drivers of the economy of Pinal County in the early territorial days.

So about Pinal County today? It's termed a and considered a hub for manufacturing and logistics. So this modern chapter for Pinal County is very different from the -- its roots in mining and agriculture.

Although I will note that Pinal County remains in the top 1 percent of cotton producers in the country. But it's now known for its growth, 7 percent growth between 2018 and 2023, one of the fastest growing counties in the state and in the country.

And quoting from this article on the left screen, which was Arizona Big Media which is a publication of the Arizona Business magazine, "This scale of development in Pinal County is reshaping the Phoenix

to Tucson corridor into a high-value industrial and innovative engine."

So Pinal County now hosts multibillion dollar manufacturing plants. There is the Lucid electric vehicle plant. You have LG Energy Solutions battery manufacturing plant which is in Queen Creek, which I walked in with Member French and I said, "Is Queen Creek in Pinal County?" And he said, "A small piece."

So Pinal County claims a portion or maybe all of the LG Energy Solutions battery manufacturing plant.

You also have the Kohler manufacturing plant where they are manufacturing a lot of bathroom fixtures, et cetera. FrameTec wood component plant, which is a wood truss manufacturing facility. And the Procter & Gamble fabric care facility where they manufacture the various washing machine pods and different consumer products that Procter & Gamble makes.

And the county is also home to some of the large logistics and warehouse projects in the state. You have the Inland Port of Arizona, or IPAZ, which is a large freeway and rail-served industrial park on approximately 1600 acres. And you have NSR Logistics, a 69,000-square-foot specialty chemicals distribution center that's developed on 80 acres.

So that's the modern Pinal County. It has ancient roots and history. It has a territorial history. And its modern history is focused on a lot of manufacturing, logistics, and growth. And that growth is one of the things that's driving this project.

Let me talk a little bit about the project. I have here on the slide, "What's in a name?" I asked the team when we first started talking about this case, you know what, the Pinal Electrical Improvement Project, can we just give it a name, I don't know, Buckeye or something?

But I understand that the Electrical Improvement Project is a large project that consists of a number of different components. So it's a group of transmission and substation projects that are needed to support growth in Pinal County that I just touched upon.

The overall PEIP Project, Pinal Electrical Improvement Project, includes both 69kV and 230kV facilities. And APS combined the public and stakeholder outreach for these different elements of the PEIP project, the 69 lines, the new 230kV lines, and the new substations that are being planned to support those new transmission lines, because they're all being sited and constructed in the same general area.

But as you -- as this committee is well

aware, only the 230kV lines require a CEC, and that's the focus of our testimony in this case today.

So what are the considerations? What's driving the need for the project? Well, I just touched on it in terms of the manufacturing growth, which is driving the need for jobs.

So you have large manufacturing, logistic centers that have high electrical needs. Some of these are very high load manufacturing facilities.

And then you also have the new residents that are moving here to take those jobs. So supporting the growth in the county is the major need for the project, but the project also allows APS to connect to its Sundance power plant, or connect the Sundance power plan to an APS transmission system.

That Sundance power plant was originally sited and constructed by Pennsylvania Power and Light, and then APS later acquired it. And the PPL relied on WAPA to provide the transmission for the plant. And the WAPA transmission system today currently serves the plant.

But there are, as you'll hear from Mr. Wiley in his testimony, there's some concerns with the scheduling and capacity of the WAPA transmission lines, and so the secondary or maybe the additional need

for this project is to allow APS to have the transmission -- its own transmission system serve this plant.

And finally, by connecting the PEIP, the new 230kV lines at the Milligan Substation, the project boosts system reliability in general in the county.

Let me spend just a minute kind of describing what we're proposing to build.

So the 230 side of this project is a double-circuit 230kV transmission line that will accommodate a double-circuit 69kV underbuild.

As you'll see on the map on the left, Slide 12, and that map will be carried forward through not only my opening but much of the testimony in the case. You'll see that we're presenting a single preferred route that's approximately 20 miles long, it's shown in black on our maps.

I think it's important to point out that although we're presenting a single route for consideration by the committee, you're going to hear extensive testimony on the siting effort that was done to get us to this one single route.

Mr. Petry and Mr. Eich will testify about the early considerations that went into the siting for this project, the multiple links that were considered but

then were then used to develop segments, and those segments were then used to come up with our preferred route.

Initially that preferred route was a bit different than what we're showing you today and, in fact, the two subroutes, and you'll see those on -- if you look at Slide 12 -- see if I can use my laser -- is it that thing that says "danger"? Oh, no, I got it. I didn't press the danger button.

So you have two subroutes. One in the north. That subroute is an artifact of what was originally the preferred route shown in yellow and black.

After the initial preferred route went out to the public, the -- we had feedback from the landowner in this area. One is a resident, and the other landowner expressed concern that that subroute on the north is a solar project, the Selma Solar Project, who had concerns with that -- that route which is the northern or Subroute A.

The second subroute which is an artifact of our original preferred route at the southern end of the project, you see that in the red and black, and my laser is not working. But you'll see it at the southern end of the project near the Milligan Substation and you can also maybe see that better on your -- using your placemat.

That -- oh, thank you. Here. Thank you, Member Kryder.

That subroute, originally the preferred route followed that subroute across to Milligan, but there is a mixed-use project that's going in in this area, and you'll hear pretty extensive testimony from Mr. Eich and Mr. Petry about that. As well as there's potential for realignment of some of the main artery in this area.

So the City of Eloy and the developer of this mixed-use project which includes a number of residential homes urged that APS create a new route, and that's this new route here that bypasses the old piece of the -- which was the original preferred route.

So we have a preferred route, single preferred route, the subroutes on the northern and southern end are really artifacts of the original preferred route that we now think in terms of the preferred route that the project is better served by having this new alignment that avoids those two subroutes, given the stakeholder and landowner concerns.

So the new 230kV transmission line interconnects at the APS Milligan Substation on the south here. And then travels north along here, here, north. This hatched area, and you can see the cursor there, is a

future site of a new substation, the future TS-25 Substation.

That new substation site is in relatively close proximity to what is planned for the IPAZ, or Inland Port. And therefore having the connective and a substation at that location to serve the high loads that are anticipated that need to be served in that area, that substation location works very well on the preferred route, folds right in and allows us to connect into that TS-25 Substation.

The route then travels north, comes across, again, avoids this subroute which was the old preferred route and then travels north and then back west over to where it's making a wires-to-wires connection with the Sundance transmission line, which is a fully permitted transmission line. I think it was authorized in CEC 136.

But we'll be connecting to that line directly and that essentially completes the Sundance line. It's known as the Sundance to Pinal Central Line and connects this loop to allow connection at Milligan all the way up to the new Sundance transmission line.

So you'll note from my slide 13 on the right, the first, it's a double-circuit 230kV line, the first circuit is planned to be in service by 2027.

The second circuit will be constructed

based on need, load growth, all the kind of things that go into the decision to spend the money to string that second circuit.

The structures will be double-circuit capable, but the plan is to build the first circuit, energize that first circuit, and then to add the second circuit based on need and load growth, which I think the current are 10 to 20 years out.

So the environmental impacts, Mr. Petry will testify about the environmental studies that were performed for this project. His testimony will indicate that the preferred route results in minimal impacts to land use. That the preferred route parallels existing and planned major infrastructure. It limits the impact to sensitive land uses.

And that the alternative Subroute A and alternative Subroute B will result in slightly greater land use impacts, primarily for the reasons I indicated. We have landowners who are affected by the route, were we to adopt the Subroute A and Subroute B who oppose that, and we were able to come up with a new routing solution that avoids those land use impacts.

And I think that Mr. Petry's general conclusion will be that the project is environmentally compatible with existing and future land use.

His testimony will also indicate that the project will have low impacts on biological resources. The preferred route as well as the subroutes are not expected to have any adverse impacts on cultural resources.

Although he will indicate that there are some known cultural sites that are in the corridor for this project, and his testimony will cover how we plan to address those sites and ensure that we don't adversely impact those cultural sites.

The preferred route and the alternate subroutes will result in a range of low to high visual impacts, dependent on the viewing location and duration of the view.

You will see some of the -- if you've looked at the application and we'll get into it through Mr. Petry's testimony -- that there's at least one location where one of our structures is going to be in very close proximity to a home.

And there aren't any easy or elegant solutions to putting that structure somewhere else further away from that house. But you'll see the simulation and we'll talk about and testify to why that structure is there and why there are no good alternatives to that location.

Finally, the project is compatible with existing and planned recreational resources and there's minimal noise impacts from the project.

I mentioned the public outreach and engagement. Mr. Eich is going to testify about the comprehensive planning process while Mr. Eich and Mr. Petry both, about the planning process that was designed to identify feasible route options and minimize impacts.

In the early stages it was defining the study area and then identifying potential links, gaining feedback from residents and landowners, and then those links that kind of rose to the top were then used to build segments. And that planning process throughout was shared with the public and the stakeholders to gain feedback and have them identify their concerns.

The project team used newsletters, in-person open houses, a virtual open house, e-mails to customers who have shared their e-mail addresses with us, a project website and social media to publicize the project, the open houses, and to gain feedback.

And then the project team also conducted agency and local official briefings to gain their feedback throughout the planning process.

And I will add to that that we also had a

very robust tribal engagement program and we'll have the witnesses testify to that.

That's the project. How we're going to present it to you, we'll have a witness panel of the three gentleman you see sitting across from you. We have Mr. Wiley, Mr. Eich, and Mr. Petry. They'll introduce themselves here in a bit.

They will also be using PowerPoint slides to support their testimony. I referenced the placemat. You have that if it's easier to see the map that's on the placemat. One side is our basic map showing the preferred route alone, and then the reverse side has the corridor that we're requesting and it's a variable width corridor, and Mr. Eich will explain why the corridor narrows and/or expands in different locations, and why we ended up with those decisions on that corridor width.

We will have a virtue flyover that Mr. Petry will narrate that hopefully will give the committee a good understanding of the project, and then we have prepared a route tour.

When I pulled into the parking lot and got out of my car, I don't know why I was surprised but I was surprised at how hot it was. We'll have to make a decision about, you know, how many stops you want to take. How many times we want to get off the bus and

stand in the heat, or if we can accommodate and provide testimony while staying in the air conditioned bus, we're open to doing that as well.

So we can have a conversation about that in terms of the committee's decision to take a route tour and how you want to manage the route tour.

We'll also have a -- I think it's going to be several hours long for us to travel the entire route, but we have a stop planned for a bathroom break, et cetera. So we can talk about that when we get there.

At the end of the case, you won't be surprised that I'm going to request that you grant us a CEC for this project. We're not requesting approval of the subroutes, we're asking you to approve the preferred route.

We're requesting a 10-year term for the first 230kV circuit, that's the standard term in that's in all of the committee's CECs. And we're going to ask that you consider giving us a 20-year term for the second circuit. Again, the structures are double-circuit capable.

But we don't know when there's going to be sufficient need to string that second circuit on those same structures. And so the -- in terms of environmental impacts, obviously trucks will have to be rolled and work

will have to be done to string the second circuit.

But the impacts are largely set by the construction of the line and the structures that are used to carry the first circuit. So we ask that you consider the 20-year term for the second circuit.

I appreciate your time. I'm glad to see some new faces and old faces here and we're looking forward to present -- I don't mean old in terms of age. That was a reference to myself. But familiar faces would be a better choice of word. But glad to have you all here. We appreciate it and we look forward to presenting our case to you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Derstine.

I see that we have a few members of the public here with us. They're welcome to watch. We will be taking a public comment this evening at 5:30, and we will stay until at least six or until everyone who has showed up to make comment is heard.

In the meantime I would admonish them that the ex-parte rule is in effect and that the public is not to speak to the members about the merits of this case off the record.

That's what the public comment is for. You'll be able to express your thoughts and concerns to the committee in the public comment session. You are

free to speak to the applicant. If you have any questions about the project you can speak with the applicant. You just can't discuss it with the members.

With that, Mr. Derstine, would you like to call your panel?

MR. DERSTINE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the panel is -- would you like to swear them first or do you want me to have them identify themselves for the record first.

CHMN STAFFORD: I was going to have you call them and then I'll swear them in.

MR. DERSTINE: All right. Fair enough. I'd like to call our witness panel. Mr. David Wiley on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company.

Mr. Stephen Eich on behalf of Arizona Public Service Company.

And Mr. Devin Petry.

Why don't you both go -- all three of you go through and identify, give us your name for the record and your business address and then we'll move on to having you sworn.

CHMN STAFFORD: Let's get them sworn. You've identified them, they've been called, swear them in and then they can introduce themselves.

MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

CHMN STAFFORD: We'll start with you, Mr. Wiley. Do you prefer oath or an affirmation?

MR. WILEY: Oath.

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

MR. WILEY: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Eich, oath or affirmation.

MR. EICH: Oath, please.

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

MR. EICH: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Petry, oath or affirmation?

MR. PETRY: Affirmation, please.

CHMN STAFFORD: Do you affirm the testimony you will give in this matter will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, taking into consideration the penalty for perjury in the State of Arizona?

MR. PETRY: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Please proceed,

Mr. Derstine.

MR. DERSTINE: Thank you.

DAVID WILEY, STEPHEN EICH, and DEVIN PETRY, called as witnesses as a panel on behalf of Applicant, having been affirmed or sworn by the Chairman to speak the truth and nothing but the truth, were examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. You're sitting in the middle, Mr. Eich, we're going to start with you. State your name for the record and give us your business address, please?

A. (Mr. Eich) My name is Stephen Eich. My business address is 2121 West Cheryl Drive, Phoenix, Arizona 85021. I am a siting consultant for APS and the project manager for this project.

Q. Thank you. Using your -- you have a slide there, Slide 4 that outlines your professional experience. Why don't you introduce yourself to the committee, please?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. So I have 19 years of experience at APS. For four years I was a survey instrument operator. I served one year as a service

coordinator. And six years as a right-of-way agent, where I acquired land rights such as easements and deeds for APS facilities on privately owned lands as well as permits, grants, and leases on government lands for those APS facilities, working with federal agencies, the Arizona State Land Department, as well as local municipalities and jurisdictions.

For the past eight years, I have worked as a transmission siting consultant, and I am a senior right-of-way professional in the International Right-of-Way Association, and I have testified in two previous cases, case No. 193 and 209.

Q. Mr. Eich, my understanding is that the main topic that you plan to cover in your testimony will be the siting studies and outreach that were used to develop the preferred route and the subroutes and that you also cover the corridor right-of-way project costs and public outreach for the project. Do I have that right?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

Q. Okay. Mr. Wiley, why don't you state your full name and business address for the record, please?

A. (Mr. Wiley) My name is David Wiley. My business address is 2122 West Cheryl Drive, Phoenix, Arizona 85021.

Q. Why don't you introduce yourself to the

committee, please.

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. I received my bachelor of science in electrical engineering from Arizona State University in 2013. I also received my master's in electrical engineering, also from ASU in 2014, with an emphasis in energy and power systems.

I've worked for APS for the past 11 years. The first four years I was a transmission planning engineer performing transmission reliability studies.

I was a supervisor of the transmission planning and engineering department for five years, overseeing all the transmission studies as well as the development of APS's 10-year transmission plan.

I'm currently the manager of transmission development, overseeing the siting and public engagement activities as well as land acquisition, engineering and design, and construction activities related to APS's large transmission projects.

I am a licensed professional engineer within the state of Arizona. I was APS's subject matter expert in the 11th and 12th biannual transmission assessments and previously provided testimony in line siting cases 193, 198, and 209.

Q. Thank you. Mr. Wiley, it's my understanding that you plan to start us off with an overview of the

background of APS.

You're going to discuss the project area in terms of the electrical infrastructure. You'll provide an overview of the PEIP project and the main considerations that are driving the need for the project. And I think you also plan to cover the transmission studies that were performed for this project as well as the 10-Year Plan filing. Is that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That's correct. As well as noise and communication interference.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Petry, that gets us to you last but not least. Your name and your business address for the record, please?

A. (Mr. Petry) Yes. My name is Devin Petry, my business address is 20 East Thomas Road, Suite 1700, that's Phoenix, Arizona 85012.

Q. I see a long list of case there on your -- on your slide but why don't you go ahead and take the time to introduce yourself to the committee.

A. (Mr. Petry) Yes, thank you. Well, again, my name is Devin Petry. I'm a principal project manager with SWCA Environmental Consultants. I have a bachelor's in geography from the University of Arizona, and have about 17 years of experience working within the industry.

Most recently working for SWCA Environmental Consultants. I have served as the environmental project manager and contributed to studies for many CEC cases before. But 11 prior cases I have provided expert witness testimony.

Q. Okay. Thank you. I'm going to let you give the committee an overview of the topics you plan to cover in your testimony if you would, please.

A. (Mr. Petry) Certainly. I plan to show the committee a virtual tour of the project area, project components to give you a nice bird's-eye view of what we're proposing here with some details.

I'll include an overview of the siting study that we developed to come up with the preferred route. It's included in the application. I'll provide you some input and insight on the existing and future land use that's proposed within our study area.

I'll talk a bit about biological resources within our siting or study area here as well, and I'll also give some testimony around the scenic areas, historic sites and structures, and the archeological sites as well as the visual components associated with Exhibit E in the application.

And then additionally we'll give some testimony around recreation within our siting area as well. I'll

also provide my professional opinion based on these findings regarding the overall environmental compatibility of the project.

Q. Why don't you give the committee a little bit of an understanding and background of what SWCA Environmental Consultants is and does and your role with the company.

A. (Mr. Petry) Yeah. SWCA is now an international environmental consulting company. We're based here in Phoenix. Our headquarters are here in Phoenix, and it was started in Arizona almost 45 years ago up in Flagstaff.

We provide comprehensive environmental planning, permitting, regulatory compliance, natural and cultural resources management, and general environmental services here in Arizona, across the United States, and now the world.

SWCA was retained by APS in this case to assist with the siting and the alternatives development and analysis process for the project. Assist with the public involvement activities, assist with the preparation of the application for a CEC, and perform the environmental studies that are part of that application.

We completed the studies, gathered the available data, completed resource assessments for Exhibits A

through H and J of the application. And I managed or oversaw those efforts for SWCA.

Q. Thank you.

Mr. Eich, I think we're going to have you start us off and cover the application. The application filed by APS is marked as APS Exhibit 1. Do you have that in front of you?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

Q. Okay. As the project manager you were responsible for overseeing the coordination and all the various studies and then the drafting of the application itself for this project; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. Okay. Do you have any corrections to the application that we need to cover here before we get started and move forward?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, actually I do have about three updates I'd like to touch on.

First, the CEC application was updated on August 15, 2025, to include changes to Exhibit E based on feedback from the State Historic Preservation Office, specifically regarding historic and archeological sites. Details of these updates will be provided by Mr. Petry in his testimony. And this update is found in Exhibit APS-2A.

Second, the proposed project corridor was also updated and the latest version is shown in the updated project corridor map as found in Exhibit APS-2B. The updated corridor is also found on one side of the laminated placemats before each committee member. And I'll be providing details regarding this update later on in my testimony.

And then, lastly, one of our simulated photos was updated to include transmission structures that Selma Energy Center, a subsidiary of NextEra, plans to build for their solar site along Selma Highway.

We've been coordinating with them to ensure that our line will not conflict with theirs. And the updated KOP-18 includes their structures to provide a more complete depiction of that simulation. Mr. Petry will also speak to that later in his testimony.

And this update can be found in Exhibit APS-19.

Q. All right. It's my understanding that the committee if they're viewing the application on their iPads, the application includes those updates, the update to Exhibit E, the updated corridor map, and the revised simulation for KOP-18.

So the committee should have those updates before them. And I think we have included those in the printed binders at least to the extent we had a couple

copies. I think the Chairman has that and there may be a few others that asked for a printed copy of the application, and we -- I think we've done our best to include that. If we've missed it in a copy that you have we'll make sure we get it updated.

Other than those three items, the Exhibit E update, the corridor update, and the revision of simulation KOP-18, are there any other changes you need to address to the application which is APS Exhibit 1?

A. (Mr. Eich) No.

Q. Okay. So aside from those updates, the information presented in the CEC application, APS Exhibit 1 is true and correct to the best of your knowledge?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

Q. Okay. With that matter out of the way, having laid the foundation for the application, Mr. Wiley, do you want to start us off with a little bit of background on Arizona Public Service Company?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Certainly. APS has served Arizona for over 125 years. We have approximately 1.4 million customers and reached an all-time peak demand of 8,631 megawatts on August 7, 2025.

Our system includes approximately 500 substations, 300,000 transformers and more than 550,000

poles and structures. APS has approximately 6,000 miles of transmission lines. We serve 11 of Arizona's 15 counties with a service territory covering approximately 35,000 square miles.

If I direct your attention to the left-hand screen, you will see a map of Arizona Public Service's territory. The white represents the area that we serve and the gray is non-APS territory. You see that we serve a vast portion of the state, starting off in the Holbrook region near APS's Cholla power plant.

Over to Flagstaff and on up to the Grand Canyon Village, the Verde Valley area of Yavapai County, portions of La Paz County out to Parker. Yuma in Yuma County, Casa Grande, Eloy and neighboring entities in Pinal County. And the southern portion of Cochise County near Douglas.

APS also serves approximately half of the Phoenix metro area.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Wiley, the map you're referring to, that's page 13 of APS-6; correct?

MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. And thank you for that, Mr. Chairman.

So the slides that you are going to use,

Mr. Wiley, and that the other witnesses Mr. Eich and Mr. Petry will use, those are all found in APS Exhibit 6; correct?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay. And you've had an opportunity to review those slides with -- at least certainly the slides that you're going to sponsor and use to support your testimony, and if there's any corrections as we move along, you'll let us know; is that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Correct.

Q. Okay. With the overview of APS, I think you wanted to give the committee an understanding of kind of the electrical infrastructure, that's, you know, transmission facilities and substations that are in the vicinity of the project?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Correct. So the left-hand screen shows our project region map. I'll start by orienting you to the map.

On the left-hand side here you'll see Interstate 10 running northwest to southeast. You also see the SV 87 running north-south towards the right-hand side of that diagram.

The black line represents APS's preferred route. There's also a couple of subroutes on here which we'll talk about more in more detail throughout our testimony.

For the northern region, we see Subroute A noted in orange and black and towards the southern end of our project area Subroute B in red and black.

I'd like to point out some of the larger infrastructure in the project area. This is one 230 to 69kV substation of APS and that is the Milligan Substation, showing this location towards the bottom of the screen.

There are also two 69 to 12kV substations serving a local load. These are the Arica Substation and the Toltec Substation.

There's also one planned 230 to 69kV substation which is at the northern end of our project region, the TS-33 Substation. You'll see on the right-hand side of the screen a zoomed-in area showing the northern area of the project region.

In addition to the APS infrastructure in the area, there are also a few noteworthy third-party transmission provider infrastructure. On the north end you will see the Sundance Substation, which is operated by the Western Area Power Administration. And that is where APS' Sundance generation connects into. And you will see that just below the Sundance Substation.

Just south of the Sundance power plant you will see the Faul Substation. That is a substation operated

and owned by Electrical District Number 2 or ED-2. ED-2 is a joint participant in the PEIP project which I will be discussing more later on in my testimony.

And then further south in the project region is the Pinal Central Substation. That is a 500/230 substation operated by Salt River Project and is the northern terminus for the CEC.

Q. So Mr. Wiley, just to make sure I understand. If I'm looking at your Slide 15 of APS Exhibit 6, the right side of the screen, I gather, is a blowup of the infrastructure that's shown in the red box on the map on the left side. Is that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay. So what we're looking at on the right side of Slide 15 is a much more visible and expanded version of that north end of the PEIP project, and you identified the various plants and substations that are located in that northern region including the Pinal Central Substation which is kind of at the southern edge of that north edge. Do I have that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman?

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Would it be possible to

have a copy of this page of that exhibit when we do our tour? Please.

MR. DERSTINE: Yes.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: I have a quick question. I'm looking at the map on Slide 15, the closeup showing where the preferred route intersects with the other lines. I'm looking at the picture, it looks like the preferred route stops short of the Pinal Central Substation, and it's -- I see there's a 69 and a 115kV. It almost appears like you're connecting to those. And then there's the 500kV that goes the other way.

Can you describe more fully how your connection's going to occur?

MR. WILEY: Yes. Mr. Chairman, I'll be covering that in more detail in the following slides. But as seen on this map in this gray dashed line, you will see the Sundance to Pinal Central 25kV line. That line was previously sited in case 136. The PEIP project will connect into this line just outside of the Pinal Central Substation.

CHMN STAFFORD: And then the CEC 136, that one goes directly into the Pinal Central Substation, then.

MR. WILEY: Correct. It was sited as the

Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. I think you're going to get into this a little bit later when we talk about the transmission studies, Mr. Wiley, but am I correct in understanding that APS is currently evaluating whether or not it still makes sense to interconnect the Sundance line CEC 136 line into Pinal Central, given the congestion at that location, and yet the other projects that are all working, trying to connect at that point and maybe further evaluation whether the CEC 136 line actually interconnects at Pinal Central or whether you simply start the line there at the Sundance Substation? Am I -- do I have that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) APS will be connecting the PEIP project directly into the Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line. It's actually meeting up with the corridor that was sited in case 136. At this time APS does not have plans to connect directly into the Pinal Central Substation.

Q. Okay. Do I have the reasons generally correct in terms of the decision not to connect to Pinal Central? Can you explain that?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. There are a few reasons why we're not looking to currently interconnect into the

substation. As I'll testify later on, the studies that were performed for this actually showed adverse reliability impacts with connecting into the Pinal Central Substation.

Previously when that line was sited, those issues didn't exist because the transmission infrastructure at the time was different from what it is today.

The topology of the system has changed. The load growth in the area has increased. And there's been a large influx of generation resources into the area such as the SunZia project.

Q. And so the changes you just described and identified, the Sundance to Pinal Central line with its CEC 136 was sited in 2008 and much has changed since 2008. Is that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I'm a little confused. Case 136, the Sundance to Pinal Central, does it currently go into the substation?

MR. WILEY: Member Little, Mr. Chairman, that project has yet to be constructed. It was sited in

136, but construction has not commenced for the Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line.

MEMBER LITTLE: And so it will not go into the substation when it is built?

MR. WILEY: That is correct. It will not terminate into the Pinal Central Substation.

MEMBER LITTLE: So that CEC will have to be modified?

MR. WILEY: I'm unsure at this time if that requires an amendment or not.

MEMBER LITTLE: But that is a change to the original plan for that project?

MR. WILEY: I believe that is correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. Interesting. Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Little.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Wiley, any more you wanted to cover on Slide 15 in terms of explaining to the committee the infrastructure, plant, substations and lines that are shown in the northern section of the project area?

A. (Mr. Wiley) I would like to note that the project area contains other electrical facilities owned and operated by various entities.

During the virtual as well as the route tour

you'll see electrical infrastructure, both lines and substations owned and operated by others including electrical districts, the San Carlos Irrigation Project, Salt River Project, Western Area Power Administration, and Tucson Electric Power.

Q. Okay. With that, do you want to now give the committee a little more of a description of the PEIP project?

A. (Mr. Wiley) The Pinal Electrical Improvement Project or PEIP is a group of projects needed to support the growth in Pinal County, specifically in the area surrounding Casa Grande and Eloy. The PEIP siting efforts included both 69kV as well as 230kV infrastructure.

I'd like to point you to the diagram on the left screen to orient you to the map. You will see Interstate 10 running northwest to southeast as well as Interstate 8 running east to west towards the left side of the map.

The lines shown in green are 69kV facilities, and the lines shown in blue are 230kV facilities.

You will also see this purple hashed area as the future location of the APS TS-25, 230 to 69kV substation.

As seen on the map, the project consists of four components. Number 1 is a 69kV line connecting the Arica

Substation to the L-10 Substation.

Number 2 is a 69kV line connecting the Arica Substation to the future TS-25 Substation.

Number 3 is a 230kV line connecting the TS-25 Station to the Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line. Again, this line was sited in case 136, but is yet to be constructed.

CHMN STAFFORD: And this is the map on Slide 19?

MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

And lastly, number 4 is a 230kV line connecting TS-25 to APS's Milligan Substation.

Although the 69kV infrastructure is not subject to the CEC requirements, these projects were bundled together for the purposes of public engagement activities.

To ensure consistency and to lessen stakeholder confusion with multiple projects occurring in the same vicinity at the same time, outreach materials including newsletters and open houses included all aspects of the PEIP project.

This brought siting efficiencies and ensured the project looked through a holistic lens and the projects were not developed in silos.

//

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. So I think throughout -- well, we have included discussion and description of not only the new 230 facilities but also the 69kV lines as part of the broader PEIP project, just to give the committee an understanding of the larger project.

And I think Mr. Eich and Mr. Petry will also spend a little bit of time talking about kind of those early siting efforts that also include the 69kV facilities.

But this is, again, background for the committee and the real focus of our case and the CEC application will be limited to the 230 facilities but we wanted to give the broader overview of PEIP. Do I have that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: The line that's shown as an existing transmission line to be rebuilt between future L-10 and the Toltec Substation, what voltage is that?

MR. WILEY: Member Little, Mr. Chairman, that is a 69kV line.

MEMBER LITTLE: And it will remain 69kV?

MR. WILEY: That is correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Oh, yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I would just like to make a comment I appreciate so very much having an engineer on the panel. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Well, Mr. Wiley, I'm sure I'll hear about that at the next break.

With the overview of the broader PEIP project, do you want to talk about the main considerations that are driving the need for this project, please?

A. (Mr. Wiley) I'd like to start off with some history surrounding the PEIP project.

In 2001 the Sundance Energy Project was approved in CEC 107. That plant was developed and constructed by PPL in 2002 and was later acquired by APS in 2005. The Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line was approved in case CEC 136 in 2008.

It was a seven-mile 235kV line connecting the Sundance Substation to Pinal Central.

The line was needed for three primary reasons: Number 1, it allowed for the scheduling of the full output capability of the Sundance generation; number two, it provided an economically viable alternative to the

existing WAPA transmission system; and number three, it increased local capacity.

The PEIP project is a continuation of the Sundance to Pinal Central project. The PEIP project allows for the full utilization of the Sundance generation.

The project connects APS generation to APS transmission, eliminating the need to be reliant on WAPA as a third-party transmission provider. This provides long-term certainty for resource deliverability.

In addition to resource deliverability, this project will support the growing energy needs in the area. The preferred route traverses through a large industrial and logistics development which provides option for future load growth that can be served via the TS-25 Substation.

The connection into Milligan also boosts overall system reliability for the area. In summary, the project ensures resource deliverability and enhances grid reliability.

Q. Can you just expand a little bit at a high level, you know, what's driving the concerns over having the WAPA currently handle all of the output from the Sundance power plant?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Certainly. Today, APS utilizes

WAPA as a transmission provider for taking the generation produced at Sundance and delivering it to APS customers.

There is uncertainty to the long-term availability of WAPA's transmission system and therefore uncertainty regarding the deliverability for APS's Sundance generation. But adding a direct connection to APS infrastructure, there is guaranteed certainty around the deliverability for the Sundance generation long-term.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Just curious, what is the uncertainty? Is it committed load on the WAPA line? Is it -- what is it?

MR. WILEY: Member Little, I'm unsure of the reasons why that may not be available long-term from WAPA. But what we have heard from WAPA is that the current agreements that we have may not be able to be renewed based on limitations of the system.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Wiley, when does that relationship that you currently have with WAPA run out?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, I believe the expiration of that agreement is at the end of 2027.

MEMBER KRYDER: '27, okay. So the hookup is to give you assurance, then, that you'll be able to continue using Sundance? Is that short version?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, that is correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: What is the size, just to review, I was not a part of this Sundance approval, I don't believe. What's the generation capacity for Sundance?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, I don't know offhand. I believe it's in the ballpark of 600 megawatts.

MEMBER KRYDER: 600. Okay. So it's significant.

MR. WILEY: Yeah.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Am I correct in my recollection, Mr. Wiley, that the Sundance plant was originally approved for 12 units? I think PP and L originally constructed 10 of those. They're peaking units, LM 6000 units, two additional units were to be constructed when there were certain improvements done to resolve some sort of capacity issues on the WAPA system.

And so that delayed the construction of those two remaining units, but we -- I don't have the date, but

we can dig it up in terms of APS went back and secured approval to go ahead and construct those two remaining units.

So there's 12 units total. And as soon as those two remaining units will be completed we'll be at the full generation capacity for Sundance. Is that -- do I have that correct?

A. (Mr. Wiley) You are correct, Mr. Derstine. The Sundance Energy Project was approved with case 107 as 12 units. Phase 1 being 10 units that was developed by PPL. The remaining two units were not developed at that time.

When APS acquired the plant in 2005, we didn't see the need for those units. Since then the conditions have changed and we have gone back and renewed and amended that case 107 to allow us to build out those remaining two units.

MEMBER KRYDER: Just as a sidebar, Mr. Derstine, is that the project that we'll be looking at at the end of the month? The Sundance project? If you don't know, that's -- ignore the question.

MR. DERSTINE: I don't think so. Do you have a plant siting -- it won't be an APS project, so it must be a different project.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, because Sundance is --

they've already conducted the initial 10 units. And then, I think it was last year you got the Commission's approval to, I think the CEC to construct the last two had expired, so they went to the Commission to request leave pursuant to ARS 40-252.

And the Commission amended its prior decision and allowed them another, I think another 10 years, I don't know off the top of my head, additional time to construct those units.

I would be curious to know if those additional two have been constructed yet or what the time frame is. And then once those two are in service, what the total output of the plant would be.

I mean, obviously you don't know off the top of your head, so at some point we're going to take a break here, like, probably like 20 minutes and then if they could lock that down and give it to us when we come back after the break, that would be appreciated.

MR. DERSTINE: We'll dig into that information and be prepared to share it with you when we come back from our break.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

CHMN STAFFORD: Any other questions from members?

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: If we could go back to slide 19 just to satisfy my own curiosity, the footprint of the future substation seems to encompass part of Picacho Reservoir. If we ever get a wet year again and water comes back to that, is that going to be a problem for you, Mr. Wiley?

MR. WILEY: Member Comstock, this initial map does show a very large area for TS-25. However, the substation will not be that large and we'll cover in testimony by Mr. Petry and Mr. Eich the exact location of where we're planning that TS-25 Substation. But it will not be within the Picacho Reservoir.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Derstine.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. All right. Well, Mr. Wiley, let's transition to another topic that I'm sure is near and dear to Member Little's heart. What about transmission studies for this project under your 10-Year Plan filing?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. Reliability studies have been performed for this project. Initially we evaluated building just the permitted Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line. However, given the changes in system

topology, load growth, generator interconnections in the area since that line was approved back in 2008, our reliability studies showed adverse reliability impacts with building just that segment.

Studies were then performed for building the permitted Sundance to Pinal Central 230 line along with a Pinal Central to Milligan 230kV line. Again, these results showed negative impacts to the reliability of the interconnection.

It was ultimately determined that the best mitigation was to extend the Sundance to Pinal Central 230 line and connect that line into the Milligan 230kV substation, bypassing Pinal Central.

The reliability analysis for the system impact study has been conducted. The results of that study showed no adverse impacts to reliability of the transmission system. And this was for the Sundance to Milligan 230kV line with bypassing Pinal Central.

Q. So the system impact study that you're referring to studied the Sundance -- you previously testified that the PEIP project is largely an extension of the Sundance to Pinal Central line, and you're saying that system impact studies covered both the Sundance line and the PEIP line all the way from the -- on the north, the direct interconnection between PEIP and the Sundance

line, then traveling south along the preferred route to the Milligan Substation. Is that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. And those studies support your conclusion there on Slide 28 of no negative reliability impacts?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes, that is correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Just to confirm, I'm reading from the Staff response August 26.

CHMN STAFFORD: That would be Exhibit APS-23.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. The conclusion and recommendations. I think all of us have it, but it's based on Staff review blah, blah, blah.

However, the system impact study which was mentioned in the response to the data request is complete at this time. If it is completed at the time of the hearing, the Staff recommends it should allocate adequate time during the hearing for full discussion of it.

I wanted to clarify that this has been completed; is that correct?

MR. WILEY: Reliability analysis has been completed and shows no adverse impact. As an affected system we are sharing the results in the study report to

the Western Area Power Administration.

At this time we have not received their final comments, but have not received any opposition to the project or they have, up to this point have not noted any adverse impacts to the reliability of their system.

MEMBER KRYDER: So without the final document in hand, you feel confident, though, in your professional opinion that it is reliable and everything is okay?

MR. WILEY: I do.

MEMBER KRYDER: I wanted that on the record. Thank you.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Along, to continue Member Kryder's questioning, I'm assuming that if WAPA does have comments that you will work with them to mitigate whatever their issues are.

MR. WILEY: Member Little, that is correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Also, I have a question about the future TS-25 Substation, and I think you're going to talk about that to some extent later.

But in your models, in your system studies how did you model that? Is that going to be a 230 to 69kV substation? And is there load there? Or do you

have other interconnections there? I was just wondering what your models showed for that. Right now it just looks like it's kind of a -- goes in and out of the substation, the line. I'm sure that's not the case.

MR. WILEY: Member Little, I do not believe the TS-25 Substation was modeled directly in the system impact study. The purpose of that system impact study is for the 230kV line that is looking to be constructed and placed in service by 2027.

By working with the developers in the area, and I think Mr. Petry will testify to this in his slides later on, is there is a very large logistics park in the area, the Inland Port Arizona. We've worked very closely with that developer to locate this substation to serve future load that is expected to be in this location.

At the time that that load materializes, we will essentially, as you said, cut in and out that 230kV line and have 69kV transformation to connect to APS's local 69kV network.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. My concern is that -- and perhaps this isn't the place to address it. Because it's a substation -- well, I'll ask my question when we get to substation discussion. Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: I have a quick follow-up question.

So the system impact study is mostly done? You're waiting on feedback from WAPA before it will be finalized? Is that an accurate statement?

MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. All the analyses for the system impact study are complete. We're waiting the review from the Western Area Power Administration.

CHMN STAFFORD: Is there a time frame for them to respond, or are you at their mercy?

MR. WILEY: More the latter.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So I'm thinking that when we get to the conditions we'll want to have it so that when the system impact study is finally completed, after you hear back from WAPA that you can share with Commission Staff and they'll be able to look at that and ask any questions of you that they may have regarding that. So, all right. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. To the Chairman's question and point, Ms. Benally reminded me that we did share the system impact study with Commission Staff, but I think we sent the report over to Staff maybe on the same day they issued their letter. Do I have that right?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay. So Staff has the completed system impact

study, but that completed study has yet to be reviewed and approved by WAPA, and that's what we're waiting for to call it final?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. Okay. Anything else you wanted to add on the system impact study?

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: This is a pretty significant piece of the sandwich here. Is this something that might require a condition that we get back from Staff somehow before this -- I'm at a loss, but it seems to me that this is really important to have the final impact study, and I don't know how to fit that into our hearing.

CHMN STAFFORD: I guess that would depend on what WAPA says. I mean, if WAPA says yes, you're right, what you've done primarily is going to be the same as the final, because they have no changes or recommendations or concerns, then I think Staff already has the system impact study; correct?

It's only if there's a change to that that WAPA says, hey, it raises some red flags and we've got to do something differently. Then I think at that point if that was the case, then it would be brought to Staff's

attention.

I think, I know a lot of times when we have these cases we typically include a condition that says, hey, when you complete the system impact study you'll share with Staff.

I think we can probably do the same for this. I guess we can talk about when we get to the conditions I think we can wordsmith it, because I think we might want to say yes, they've already got it, but they're just waiting, they've already received the system impact study, they're just waiting for the quote/unquote finalized one after WAPA gives us its two cents, and so we're just waiting on them. So it would just be if APS could just share what WAPA says with Staff once they get it themselves.

MEMBER KRYDER: Ideally we would all like to have it happen nicely. But that's the reason we're here is because sometimes the wheels fall off the wagon at just the wrong time. So let's make sure that we address that when we get to conditions. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Member Kryder.

MR. DERSTINE: Thank you, Member Kryder. Chairman.

//

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. I think the other piece of this topic had to do with the 10-Year Plan. Do you want to cover the 10-Year Plan filing?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. APS first included this project in a supplemental filing to APS's 2022 10-year transmission plan. That filing occurred on October 17, 2022. The project was also included in subsequent 10-Year Plan filings on January 31 of 2023, 2024, and 2025.

Q. Having covered the transmission studies and the 10-Year Plan filing, let's go back to me having you give the committee a little more detail about the PEIP project and describing the preferred route. And so the committee has that information when we move on to talk about the siting studies and all of the siting work that brought us to the final preferred route?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Certainly. Referencing to the left-hand screen again, this is Slide 33. This same map can also be seen on the placemats as our preferred route and alternative subroutes.

So you will see our preferred route outlined in black. Starting at the Milligan Substation we head south out of the substation to Phillips Road where the line heads east and then turns north on La Palma Road. At

this location the line crosses over the interstates and as well as the Union Pacific Railroad.

On Alsdorf Road the line heads east until it meets up with the Vail Road alignment. From that location heads north and in this hashed area you will see the location of the TS-25 Substation.

Q. Can you -- my apologies there, just speak to that location. It's a much smaller hashed pineapple area that what we saw on some of the other maps. What is driving currently the location of the TS-25 Substation?

Is it the proximity to load or do we have a landowner who's willing to allow us to purchase the land for the substation? Talk briefly about the factors that were taken into account for that location.

A. (Mr. Wiley) Certainly. The land in this location is owned by Saint Holdings, and is for the development of that Inland Port Arizona logistics park.

We've worked very closely with the developer over the years and through coordination with them we've identified this location to be the best area to put a substation for serving their future load.

Q. And one of the considerations in having that new TS-25 Substation in proximity to the IPAZ or the Inland Port Arizona is that, as I understand it, there are anticipated to be or planned to be a number of high-load

customers that may be locating on that large project that encompasses hundreds of acres as I understand it. Is that true?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That's correct, and Mr. Petry will provide more testimony in regards to the IPAZ.

Q. Okay. Thank you. Continuing north from the site of the TS-25 Substation.

A. (Mr. Wiley) We'll head north until we reach Selma Highway, at which point the route turns to the west until it reaches La Palma Road, and it will turn north at this location and then west along Earley Road. And lastly, it will turn north on 11-Mile Corner and meet up with the permitted Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line.

Q. And is there, the interconnection between the Sundance line and the PEIP line, is that going to happen at a substation or is that going to be a direct wires-to-wires interconnection?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That will be a connection directly into the line.

Q. So you've walked us through the preferred route. Do you want to spend a little bit of time talking about the subroutes and why APS is not seeking their approval?

A. (Mr. Wiley) There are two subroutes shown on the map. Subroute A is noted in orange and black. And Subroute B noted in red and black.

Those were initially part of the preferred route, but based on stakeholder feedback they've been presented here today as subroutes, and we'll cover this later on in our testimony between Mr. Eich and Mr. Petry.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Again, a little expansion on that if you would, Mr. Wiley.

I'm looking specifically at the subroute or Alternative B, I believe it's called. Is that correct? That's Alternative B here?

MR. WILEY: That is correct. Subroute B.

MEMBER KRYDER: I notice two mile -- is that, looks like about a mile there and another mile here of additional line. Somewhere in the application I seem to have read that there was, like, a two and three-quarter million dollar addition -- additional cost part in construction and part right-of-way to make that jog, I'll call it for lack of a -- that's a good electrical engineering term, I'm sure.

Give me some more background on that just in a few words, okay?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, there are a few reasons why that Subroute B is no longer the preferred

route.

One of those reasons is feedback from the City. They requested us to move the line --

MEMBER KRYDER: I'm sorry, which city is this now?

MR. WILEY: The City of Eloy.

MEMBER KRYDER: Eloy, okay.

MR. WILEY: There is also a development planned for that area. Residential and mixed-use development. I believe it's on the order of 400 units that is planning to go in in that area.

And lastly, there's some engineering considerations in terms of crossing Interstate 10. The preferred route where it now crosses north-south at a more perpendicular crossing is much preferred by ADOT rather than, the I'll call it slanted, if you will, crossing of Subroute B.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So there's a new housing development being built in this area; is that correct?

MR. WILEY: That is correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. And from a person who lives in a housing development, I'd much rather the poles were in before the house was built than afterward. I'm still somewhat confused. Were there a lot of people

waving their hands in the air and shouting at you and so on, or what was going on?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, I believe the majority of the feedback was, again, from the City of Eloy as well as the developer of that residential and mixed-use area.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Okay. Thank you. It seems, again, you dropped two and three-quarter million dollars and added a bunch of extra wires and poles and so on. I was just wondering, somebody must have had a pretty good arm on it.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Well, and to Member Kryder's -- his initial question was, I think he's correct, Mr. Wiley, in that by realigning the preferred route to avoid what was our original preferred route on that southern end of the project, it is longer, about 2. -- yeah, it is longer and it is more expensive by approximately $2.75 million; correct?

A. (Mr. Wiley) I believe that is correct, and we do include the costs later on in the slides.

Q. Okay.

A. (Mr. Wiley) Although longer is desirable of both the city as well as the developer and, again, helps with some of the engineering challenges that the

alternative Subroute B would have brought with the crossing of Interstate 10.

Q. Right. But that is the -- those are the trade-offs that we often encounter in many cases, and in this particular case, we have a longer route at a higher cost, you know, the longer distance drives the cost of the line.

And we're balancing that against the impacts and the impact -- and the input that we received from the City of Eloy and the developer. And we have the -- we brought the preferred route forward. We think it's the best route. And Mr. Eich will testify to that. But it's a trade-off and it's something that the committee's going to have to consider; correct?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct. And Mr. Petry I think also has some further details around the Subroute B and the justifications and the feedback that we got surrounding that particular subroute.

A. (Mr. Petry) Thank you, Mr. Wiley.

So in addition to the input from the City of Eloy regarding the planned future mixed-use development, it's an approximate 400-unit mixed-use development that includes residential, commercial, other land use types.

As part of that development, the City of Eloy's input indicated there may be some future redevelopment of

Milligan Road at the interchange with Interstate 10.

So we can see some potential roadway redevelopment through that area as well, that could potentially drive additional costs in the future if the transmission line then needed to be relocated at the time of that future road and mixed-use development.

So those were -- those were some of the additional reasons that through the City of Eloy as well as the developer's input we did change the preferred route at this location.

Q. Mr. Petry, I guess to be clear for the record, the committee has that subroute before it. It's part of our application, and if the committee were to decide that that is a better route given -- taking into account the costs, et cetera, that that's a decision the committee can make and we included it in the application for that reason.

A. (Mr. Petry) Absolutely.

MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. That's quite helpful, both of you.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Is it early to address easement with, or do you want to -- it is a better time

coming up, or do you want to talk about it now?

MR. DERSTINE: We're going to cover it, but Mr. Eich, why don't you just in general, I think using the placemat if you can speak to, you know, the variable width and the callouts for the right-of-way, and at a high level because I know you're going to cover it in detail in your testimony a bit later, but kind of what drove some of those decisions.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Eich, if I may, what I'm looking at is you're going from a 400-feet easement to a 2800-foot easement on the north end of that road. And that's a big jump, and I was just curious why that's going to happen.

CHMN STAFFORD: I think that's going to be the corridor, where they're authorized under the certificate to put the line. When they actually do site it, it will be -- the actual right-of-way will only be, I think, I'm guessing, 150 feet, 200 feet?

MR. EICH: Mr. Chairman, Member Comstock, it is narrower and you are correct, this is the CEC corridor and not the right-of-way easement that we will be requesting. And the extent of that is 120 feet.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. We provide them with a larger corridor to give them flexibility of where to put it when they negotiate with the landowners and the

city, county, whoever's in charge of the zoning.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: We've been going for about 90 minutes. I think it's time for a break. I'm certain the court reporter is ready for one. So let's take a recess and come back at 2:45.

(Recess from 2:34 p.m. to 2:50 p.m.)

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

Mr. Derstine, please continue.

MR. DERSTINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Wiley, before we move forward with your testimony, the Chairman had a question about the Sundance power plant and its total rated capacity, and then the in-service date for the two additional units that were I think approved in December of 2023 through an amendment of the CEC for the plant.

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. For the in-service date of the two remaining units it's anticipated to be Q1 of 2026 with commissioning activities occurring this fall for a total capacity with all 12 units, that includes the two that are currently in construction, they'll have an output of approximately 540 megawatts.

Q. Can I just ask, because I don't really know what

that means when you say commissioning activities. Is that a ceremonial breaking of a champagne bottle on the side of a unit or what's involved with commissioning?

A. (Mr. Wiley) There will be some testing activities including energizing the unit, pushing some of the megawatts onto the electric grid. Some of those activities will commence this fall, but commercial operational in-service date being Q1 of 2026.

MR. DERSTINE: Mr. Chairman, did that answer your question?

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, it did. So as you said it's going to be 450 megawatts including the two, the last two units; correct?

MR. WILEY: 540 megawatts.

CHMN STAFFORD: 540. Okay.

MEMBER LITTLE: What kind of plant is that?

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little, can you get a little closer to the microphone, will you?

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

MEMBER LITTLE: Is that combined cycle or --

MR. WILEY: Member Little, they're single-cycle gas turbines.

MEMBER LITTLE: They're all LM 6000s;

right?

MR. WILEY: Correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. All right. I have in my outline for your testimony that you're going to cover the preferred route and the subroutes. You were then going to move on to the interconnection of the line, well, at Milligan as well as the other intermediate interconnection points?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct. The project will consist of a 230kV interconnection at the Milligan Substation and connect to the permitted Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line on the northern end of the project area.

There will also be the future interconnection of the 230/69 substation which is the TS-25 Substation.

Q. Okay. Do you want to talk a little bit about the circuits that will -- that this line will carry? My understanding is we've got -- you're asking for a double-circuit 230kV line, but there's also an underbuild element. Do you want to talk about that, please?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct. The line will be built to be double-circuit 230kV capable, as well have the capability to add double-circuit 69kV underbuild to the 230 positions.

Q. In terms of you mentioned the timing for commercial operation of the Sundance plant, what about the anticipated commercial operation of the PEIP's 230kV line?

A. (Mr. Wiley) For the initial buildout, one of the 230/60 -- I'm sorry, one of the 230kV circuits will be constructed and the anticipated in-service date for that circuit is 2027.

Q. I mentioned in my opening where because of the anticipated in-service date for that first circuit that the 10-year term that's standard in CECs is acceptable to APS; correct?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

Q. So move on and talk about the timing for the second circuit and what you'd like the committee to consider timing-wise for the term.

A. (Mr. Wiley) The second 230kV circuit has a future need date that is not currently identified in APS's 10-year transmission plan. Building structures capable of double-circuit capability is best practice when building in developing areas. This minimizes future environmental and land use impacts by collocating circuits on the same set of structures.

Q. So when you say you have -- a future need date is not currently identified, do you at least have

projections in terms of when you think that second circuit will be needed?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. The second circuit won't be constructed until there is a need. And that need is largely based on load growth and resource interconnections in the area. Given the high likelihood for development of the area, it is expected to be needed in the 10- to 20-year time frame.

Q. And that's why you've suggested and we'll be asking the committee to consider granting a 20-year term for that second circuit?

A. (Mr. Wiley) That is correct.

MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill.

MEMBER HILL: Thanks, Mr. Wiley. I'm curious, the system impact study that you did, was that for one 230kV line or for both?

MR. WILEY: Member Hill, the system impact study was for one 230kV line. Future studies would be performed for that second 230 line when the time comes to interconnect that one.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. So would the CEC that you're requesting, if we give you the 20-year typically line for the second circuit, it could be subject to a system impact study that has the outcome that we need to

feel comfortable with grid reliability?

MR. WILEY: Member Hill, I think that could be the case based on some of the prior discussions around a potential condition.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. Great. Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: To follow up on Member Hill's question, and the request that the second line would be in place as many as 20 years out, doesn't that fit into the whole question of the security and all of the things that come into that SIS normally?

I mean, how could -- is the 20-year out portion of a line that is the second loop of it, is that going to be included in the document that you said was sent to Staff?

MR. WILEY: Member Kryder, I think the document you're referencing is the system impact study. We provided that following some data requests from Commission Staff.

The second circuit was not analyzed as part of that study. That study was for the purposes of the first 230kV circuit. Prior to constructing the second circuit at a future need date at this time estimated to be in the 10-to 20-year time frame, a subsequent or a

future system impact study would be performed.

MEMBER KRYDER: So, Mr. Chairman, that would be something we would definitely have to include, then, as a condition, I would suspect. Because we can't write a check that's payable up for 20 years out, I don't think. Do we?

CHMN STAFFORD: I see what you're saying, yeah. That's something we probably want to discuss when we get to the conditions to where, you know, because the second system impact study will be required prior to adding the second line. There will be a -- and that new one should also be provided to Staff. I think that would be appropriate.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Wiley.

CHMN STAFFORD: And I have a quick follow-up question.

So the line before us today, case 247, it won't make sense to build that unless CEC 136 also is constructed; correct?

MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And what is the time frame for that one? Is that intended also going to be constructed by the end of 2027?

MR. WILEY: That is correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. I see a couple more sub-bullets on your Slide 34 of APS Exhibit 6. Is there more you wanted to cover in terms of giving the committee a good overview of the project before we move on to talking about the early siting studies and the planning that was done for this project?

A. (Mr. Wiley) On the bottom of this slide, I do note that the circuits will be built on steel monopole structures. Mr. Eich will be covering and showing you some examples of what those structures will look like throughout his testimony.

Nothing further beyond that, Mr. Derstine.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill -- I mean, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: What is the difference in price between a steel double-circuit 230kV monopole structure and a steel single-circuit 230kV monopole structure?

MR. WILEY: Member Little, I don't have the price difference in front of me right now. What I can speak to is the number of structures is what largely drives the costs for the project.

With 69kV underbuild, it's not likely that you would have any different span length, for example, meaning you require the same number of strength.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Wiley, could you speak into your microphone just a little closer, please.

MR. WILEY: I do not believe that the span or the number of structures that would be utilized for a single-circuit versus a double-circuit configuration would change significantly as a result of that.

I will also state that you're certainly not doubling the cost of the project. There is a cost savings and an economics scale in place when you build double circuit versus single-circuit structures.

MEMBER LITTLE: Well, that makes sense to me. The reason I ask is because we are approving the construction now of something that may or may not be used in the future. And we're looking at ratepayers paying any difference.

I don't know how many times I have driven around and seen these beautiful, big transmission lines with only a single circuit on them and then a whole bunch of them. And I've often thought why don't we do a double circuit. That makes a whole lot more sense to me, so I appreciate that very much.

However, with the uncertainty of the

future, I would hate to see us spend a whole lot more money now for something that may or may not be used in the future. And what you have said about the costs being mostly determined by how many structures you have, the span length being pretty much the same makes a great deal of sense to me. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Wiley, is that something that we can -- you can dig into that price differential at a break in terms of, I assume there is a difference in costs between a monopole that's being designed to carry only a single circuit and the monopole that's being designed to carry two circuits along with 69kV underbuild.

I think it would be -- at least it's data point for Member Little and the other members of the committee in terms of what that price difference is.

But I think the upshot of your testimony is is that there is certainly cost savings by our ability to consolidate not only the two 230 lines, but also the 69kV lines on a single pole line.

It reduces environmental impacts as well as the cost of bringing in those additional circuits. Is that a fair statement?

A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes. There's also the added cost savings for when that second circuit is needed of not

having to go and remove the single-circuit structures and rebuild that with double-circuit structures.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I notice that the applicant received a letter from ED-2 indicating that APS is cooperating with ED-2 in perhaps using -- allowing ED-2 to use the poles for some of their 69kV circuits. Is that correct?

MR. WILEY: Member Little, that is correct. Electrical District 2 provided a letter of support, that is APS-22. ED-2 is a joint participant of this project. A portion of this route traverses through the ED-2 service territory, and as a joint participant they will have their wholly owned 69kV line as one of the underbuilt positions. So --

MEMBER LITTLE: Well -- I'm sorry -- I didn't mean to interrupt you.

MR. WILEY: No, I was just going to state that instead of them building a separate set of structures, they could collocate on our 230 structures, again, limiting the environmental and land use impacts.

MEMBER LITTLE: I think that's a great idea. Will they be paying for part of the construction, or will they be paying rent? Or is it just a cooperative

deal?

MR. WILEY: There is a cost allocation for ED-2 on the project.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Wiley, anything more from an overview of the PEIP project before we move into the early planning and siting for the project?

A. (Mr. Wiley) No.

Q. All right. This is going to be as I understand kind of a tag team effort between you, Mr. Petry and Mr. Eich. You were both involved in the planning for the PEIP project. So as I understand it, Mr. Petry, you're going to cover with the early siting studies and analysis that were performed, and then Mr. Eich is going to bring us forward using some of the links and segments that were then used that came out of that early siting work to develop the preferred route for the project.

Is that kind of where we're going with this testimony?

A. (Mr. Petry) That's correct.

Q. Okay. Well, start us off with covering the early siting work and how you approached this project and solved the problem of how to get from A to B.

A. (Mr. Petry) Sure. So the siting process for

this project is summarized in our environmental and siting process summary report, also known as our siting report. It's contained in Exhibit B in the CEC application, which is APS-1.

The siting report really summarizes the preliminary review and siting efforts completed for the project, and as part of that, as indicated previously, we were not only working to identify appropriate locations for the 230 and 69kV transmission lines, but also the future TS-25 Substation.

As part of that effort, we completed compatible -- the efforts we completed to find a compatible route for this proposed project include initially establishing a preliminary siting area, analyzing the identified opportunities and constraints for siting the transmission lines within that area, performing an analysis of detailed links, individual connections that can be put together to create full routes.

An analysis of those detailed links that include preliminary compatibility and feasibility analysis, the elimination and retention of some of those links, an iterative analysis and refinement process for any of those links still in play.

And then from there developing full routes,

right, those full connections that get us from point A to Z, not just A to B, B to C, so on and so forth.

And as part of that development of the routes we identified initial alternative routes. We then analyzed those further with stakeholder input and refined those.

And then ultimately landed on the preferred routes and subroutes that are identified in the application today. And I'll get into further detail in all of those steps, but that's just an overview of the process we go through.

Q. So step one was establishing or identifying your preliminary siting area and then some of these early preliminary links. Do you want to take us through that process?

A. (Mr. Petry) Yes. The preliminary siting area which is shown in the map on your left screen was the geographic boundary for the consideration of potential links and routes for the project.

It was initially defined to be large enough to identify a reasonable range of opportunities for the project route. But limited to a size that was reasonable and minimized any overly long, complex, costly or impactful alternatives.

For this project, because the objectives, again, for the siting study included 230, 69 facilities as well

as the substation. We identified an area that included all the locations of those needed transmission connections.

Again, large enough to entertain a reasonable range of opportunities for those features. This preliminary siting area, again, shown on the map on the left -- is approximately 160 square miles, a very large area, includes portions of the City of Casa Grande, the City of Coolidge, the City of Eloy, as well as portions of unincorporated Pinal County.

Once we identified that preliminary siting area, we moved forward with the identification of what we call opportunities and constraints. Opportunities, generally those areas that are less favorable, or excuse me, more favorable for the siting of the transmission lines.

And constraints of course are those areas that are constrained where we want to preferentially stay away from. And to do this, we evaluated existing and future land uses identified through each of the jurisdictions' general or comprehensive plans, as well as biological, cultural resources, and visually sensitive areas within the siting area as well.

Thinking through all of those resources, again, to identify those areas that may be more or less accommodating for the siting and construction and

operation of a transmission line.

Some examples of those areas that we identified as more constrained that will show up in red on the map, right, those are areas that are more sensitive, higher constraint, include areas such as the Eloy airport. It's in the central portion of our siting area here.

CHMN STAFFORD: And this is Slide 43, the map you're referring to?

MR. PETRY: That's correct. In the very center of the overall opportunities and constraints map shown on map 43, the Eloy airport, you see in the very center of the map, there's a red strip there. That's a great example of one of the higher sensitivity areas we wanted to preferentially stay away from.

All right. Other sensitive areas include some of the residential areas as well as Picacho Reservoir Mr. Comstock brought up earlier, located in the northeastern portion of our preliminary siting area as well. You can see that's an area shown in red, as well, as a more -- if I can find it, here we go -- as a more sensitive or higher constraint, higher sensitivity area.

We also identified opportunities, areas that are better suited for the siting of those facilities, and those are generally shown on the map in some of the blue-lined areas you can see. You see a

pretty consistent grid pattern throughout that map.

And that grid you see largely overlaps with most of the major roadways we have out here as well. Those are identified as opportunities for siting these transmission lines.

We look to existing linear facilities such as roadways, transmission lines, canals, some of those existing linear disturbances in the landscape that we can site adjacent to looking for those compatible locations for siting.

Another area that we identified as a really good opportunity for siting this transmission line is the planned ADOT north/south freeway. That is a planned freeway project ADOT is working on now and we'll give you a little further input on that as we move forward.

But you can see the opportunity area identified for that planned north/south freeway in the eastern portion of this map, and it's a hatched line that runs north to south, purple hatching, the eastern portion of this map.

And again, that's a 1500-foot corridor that ADOT has identified for further study for a future freeway infrastructure within this region. And we identified that as a great opportunity for colocation or siting nearby to minimize those disturbances in the

landscape.

From there, once we identified those initial opportunities or constraints and identified areas we wanted to preferentially site near or further away from, we created what we call preliminary links. And those preliminary links are discrete segments that when added together with other links can create a full transmission line map.

The map on the left shows the preliminary links that we identified for this project initially. This includes over 700 links that we had identified for potential facilities. And, again, that included areas for analysis for both the 230kV transmission lines as well as the 69kV transmission lines.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Petry, could we go back to the previous map.

MEMBER KRYDER: A little closer to your mic, please, Tobie.

MEMBER LITTLE: Can we go back to the previous map, please, the more brightly colored one.

CHMN STAFFORD: The one on Slide 43?

MEMBER LITTLE: Yeah. What are those squiggly purple lines toward the top?

MR. PETRY: Those are canals --

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MR. PETRY: Member Little. Yeah, those are areas of some of the canal infrastructure that runs throughout the project area and we do consider canals opportunities for siting these lines.

While we often can't site within the canal right-of-way or immediately adjacent to the canal, we can site close to that existing right-of-way in order to minimize some of those disturbances.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MR. PETRY: So as I mentioned, once we got through the opportunities and constraints process we identified over 700 preliminary links that we analyzed further.

Those links were created based on the opportunities and constraints analysis, and those links, again, generally favored areas of higher opportunity, right, major existing roadways, transmission lines, canals, future transmission facilities or transportation facilities.

And really tried to stay away from those areas of lower or higher sensitivity, lower opportunity.

Once those preliminary links were established, we completed a detailed analysis of the

environmental and engineering compatibilities for each link. We at SWCA reviewed the environmental factors. Those included land use, biological, cultural or archeological resources as well as visual sensitivities within the project siting area.

And APS reviewed the engineering, the right-of-way, the constructability and maintenance as well as the vegetative maintenance factors for each of those preliminary links as well. And we did that in order to identify the overall compatibility for each of those links.

The links were then ranked based on all of those compatibilities and provided an overall compatibility. Links that were determined as least compatible were eliminated. We didn't look at them any further.

Isolated links or links that no longer provided a connection based on those initial removals were also eliminated for further analysis.

In general, as part of this process, stakeholder input revealed preferences for avoiding residential areas, collocating with existing power lines, siting near those areas of existing or planned industrial areas, and really trying to stay near linear existing or planned linear facilities.

Examples of this input included the City of Coolidge expressing preference for siting the 230kV facilities as well as the future TS-25 Substation east of State Route 287, which is generally located running north to south in the eastern portion of our siting area.

287 running right along through here generally. And the City of Coolidge was interested in most of these facilities being sited east of there, east of 287 and east of the railroad, where both future freeway and the IPAZ and other industrial infrastructure that's been mentioned is planned.

Additionally, and we've given you some input on this as well, the City of Eloy as well as some of the private property owners and developers down in the southern portion of our siting area down near Milligan Substation expressed preference for where the project might cross Milligan Road and at I-10 as well.

Again, links that were not eliminated during that siting process or during the link analysis were then retained for the next step of the process, which included the route development and analysis.

And Mr. Eich will now review, provide you some additional input on that route development process.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Before I have, or you have Mr. Eich go through

the route development process, I'm curious, this siting process that you've now walked the committee through that developed 700 links, and I assume that was both for the 69kV side of the project as well as the 230kV side of the project; is that right?

A. (Mr. Petry) That is correct.

Q. So this process that you used, is that unique to this case? Is that something you do in every case? I'm just interested in -- I'm not sure that I recall a case in which we had 700 links that were then analyzed with the same depth that you analyzed them here.

A. (Mr. Petry) I appreciate the question. I smile because this is one of the favorite parts -- my favorite parts of my job is the siting work, wherein we can look at a broad area and really dig into what areas work well, what areas don't work well for proposed infrastructure such as this.

This is a very normal process, very typical process that we would complete for any transmission line siting project. When we're trying to find a compatible location, right? If we don't already have a route identified we want to go through the process to find the most compatible location. These are the steps that we take.

We don't often see a process like this with this

many links, and part of the reason for that, Mr. Derstine, is as you noted, we were siting both the 230kV transmission facilities as well as the 69.

And we're looking at a very broad region. 160-square-mile siting area. And based on the opportunities that we identified in this area, we wanted to make sure that we gave it a good look throughout.

It was a lot of work to go through 700-some links, we but really strongly believe that the result of that process is a very strong project route.

And while the committee may have seen some other siting reports before them, maybe not with quite as many links, this is a very typical process with the opportunity and constraints analysis, the link development process, and then a route development refinement process from there.

Q. All right. Thank you for that.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: I'm looking at, let's see, it's called Exhibit A-3, future land use that's in the proposal. And it marks out the freeway, I think you addressed it before. It's called on the map here South Fast Track Road that would appear to appear to run somewhere kind of like up through here.

And I'm looking at your 700 links, and that Fast Track Road is going to run right across some of them. I know you're not department of transportation, but are these -- these potential links, are they homes, are they businesses? What kind of links are they?

MR. PETRY: Member Kryder, Mr. Chairman. So Member Kryder, you referenced Exhibit A-3 in the CEC application, APS-1. You're correct in that future land use map identifies the ADOT north/south freeway corridor. It's a 1500-foot corridor at this time based on ADOT's analysis.

They're working to refine that down to a smaller width corridor and we'll have some more testimony around that process and the land uses out here.

What I'd like to point out is that that corridor within our project study area and siting area is largely aligned along the center line of Vail Road.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

MR. PETRY: The South Fast Track Road that you're seeing in that map is a road further to the east of Vail, and as that future north/south freeway extends out of our project study area it will move a little to the east and be aligned with that South Fast Track Road.

Within our study area, the north/south freeway is largely aligned with Vail Road.

To answer your question around the links along Vail Road and South Fast Track Road, most of those links were eliminated through the process, many of the remaining links along the alignment of Vail Road are retained and became what is now our proposed route.

MEMBER KRYDER: Were the links homes or businesses?

MR. PETRY: The links themselves were not homes or businesses. When we talk about a link in this context, what we're referring to is connection points, right? We broke down our overall siting area into somewhat of a grid based on those opportunities that we identify.

And when we see an existing linear opportunity such as a roadway or a canal or an existing transmission line, we will draw a link, a preliminary link. That link can be connected together with other links to make a full route.

And so when we talk about a link here, it's just a hypothetical line on the map that would be a future transmission line connection potentially.

MEMBER KRYDER: And so the white spots here are not existing or potential customers? They are dots on your electrical grid?

MR. PETRY: Member Kryder, the white spots

that we see there are what we refer to as the link identifiers. So if we were to zoom into that map more closely, in each of those white spots you'll see a unique number.

And the point of those numbers is so that we can track each individual link throughout the process. So that we can speak with detail and some precision on this particular location. We can say this link that extends from point A to point B is link number 1, for example, and we talk about link number 1 on its own. Does that answer your question?

MEMBER KRYDER: It helps. I'm still pretty dizzy about it, but that's me, not you. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PETRY: I'd be happy to clarify further.

MEMBER KRYDER: I'm not even sure of the question, let alone the answers. But that's my life, not yours.

MR. PETRY: Thank you, Member Kryder.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. I guess on that point, that you and I had the same question as Member Kryder about all the little postage stamps all over those links, and so those, that's a number or some sort of way of identifying each link.

And then did this go to the public and did the

public provide APS and SWCA feedback concerning any or all of those links using the identifier? Is that how the process went?

A. (Mr. Petry) That was the idea, yes. The point of including those link identifiers is to allow specific comment on a single link. And this information did go out to the public and that's one of the ways we really try to get those detailed comments back from the public, around a specific location, all right, is through the use of those link identifiers. And we did receive comments as part of the process. Some comments that included individual link numbers where there was a preference expressed for or against.

Q. When you say it went out to the public, this map was sent to the public through a newsletter or what was the manner of communication?

A. (Mr. Petry) During our public open houses, which Mr. Eich will get into a little more detail around the timing and extent of those open houses, but in those public open houses, we provided this map and many similar that showed all of those preliminary links that were under analysis.

We later, as the process moved forward, were able to then share more detail on all of the preliminary links that were analyzed, those that were eliminated, and

those that remained for further analysis. Which is what this map on Slide 51 shows.

We show many links shown in black as well as a number of those links shown in an orange color. Those links shown in orange shows those that were retained for further analysis and retained. Those in black are those that were considered and eliminated from further analysis.

MEMBER KRYDER: So, Mr. Petry, when you explained this to the public, I wasn't at the meeting, and did you define link? That's what maybe I'm lacking here. Tell me what a link means. I thought that was measles on a map.

MR. PETRY: We did. We did define link. And when we -- in our presentation materials. And, again, when we talk about a link in this context, we're referring to a discrete connection that can be made with other discrete connections to create a complete route.

For example, we have a need to connect point A to point Z. We may break down that full connection into 26 unique links that would go from point A to B, B to C, so on and so forth.

The links individually would be added together to create a full route.

//

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Can you use your laser pointer, Mr. Petry, and for -- on Slide 56 just illustrate what is a link on that map? I realize it's not necessarily zoomed in, but what's a link and what's not a link for purposes of Member Kryder's question?

A. (Mr. Petry) Yes. So referring to Slide 51, if we look down in the lower left corner, that would be a southwestern portion of our preliminary siting area shown here. I'm highlighting the edge of two black lines that intersect.

At that point of intersect, we have a line extending to the north and a line extending to the east.

If we look to the east, that would be a single link that extends from that corner to the next point of intersect. That's a single link that can then be added to the next link adjacent to it to create a more complete route. It can then be added to the next link to the north of it. We can connect those links together to create the route.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So you said that you were the person who said yea or nay on these. Is that right?

MR. PETRY: I oversaw the process, Mr. Kryder, that led to the decisions around --

MEMBER KRYDER: You made a recommendation. Sure.

MR. PETRY: That's correct. So --

CHMN STAFFORD: One at a time. Let him finish the answer before you ask the next question.

MEMBER KRYDER: Sorry. Sorry.

CHMN STAFFORD: Please continue.

MR. PETRY: I was just confirming that's correct.

MEMBER KRYDER: So do you have an algorithm or do you have in your mind somehow to connect as you said A to B to C to D and so on? Is that decision based on then the number of properties that are along the lines where the links are? Or the number of customers or potential visual problems or whatever?

MR. PETRY: Yeah. Member Kryder, I appreciate that question. There are a number of factors that go into that decision.

Some of those factors were identified through an analysis completed by SWCA. Those would include the environmental factors that we look at each individual link through. Those environmental factors included existing and future land use and the compatibility of each link with those future or existing land uses. That would include visual resources and

biological resources and cultural resources along with the existing and future land uses.

Additionally, we looked at resources through the lens of APS and those included the engineering, the right-of-way, to your question around number of parcels or residences, et cetera, that's part of that analysis in terms of the engineering and right-of-way review.

And then also looked at the constructability and maintainability of those facilities as well as the ability for vegetative maintenance to occur as well.

So there are many factors that we use to assess each individual link.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you. It's coming together for me. Maybe I'll not be confused by Tuesday or Wednesday. Thank you very much.

MR. PETRY: Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. I guess I wanted to maybe tease out in terms of the decisions about what links were brought forward and what links were eliminated. I gather your analysis may result in say two, three, four links that are all connected and appear to work together and might be used to develop a segment for a route, but then you may have a

link at the end of that four-link run that is -- has either electrical issues or environmental issues and that it's a link that has to be eliminated. And as a result you have maybe an isolated segment of two, three, four links and that won't work as a connection point.

Do I have that right in terms of part of your analysis?

A. (Mr. Petry) That is correct. We refer to those remaining links that go longer have a full connection as consequential eliminations, right? After we do that first pass and eliminate any of those links that just don't perform, that don't show enough compatibility, well, sometimes we have some left behind that still show fine but no longer create or allow for that full connection. And so consequently we will eliminate those links as well from our future study.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thanks, Matt.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. All right. Well, Mr. Eich, Mr. Petry has taken us through how we got to 700 links, and then we got rid of a bunch of those 700 links, but the ones remained were used to develop, I gather, I don't know what the definition is, how many links are required to create a segment, but you strung together a series of links to

create one or more segments that you then use to develop the route for this project. Do you want to kind of take us through that piece of the process?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. Mr. Petry just described the beginning steps to finding these routes. Again, this starts by evaluating those short discrete links within our project area. And identifying those links that would work well for building an overall project. Overall transmission line.

Those short links that worked well, again, are shown on this map on the left in orange. The black links, again, as Mr. Petry explained, are those that were not carried forward for further consideration.

Now, over the next few slides, what I'll explain is how we go from this cluster of links shown on the map on the left, this orange cluster, to a fully formed route in -- as shown in black on the map on the right --

CHMN STAFFORD: And that's Slide 55?

MR. EICH: This is Slide 55, yes.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. And that map that's Slide 55, Ms. Benally was kind enough to point out to me is Figure 12 in the application. Is that right, or you can take my word for it, because --

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

Q. -- she showed it to me and she is right.
A. (Mr. Eich) I believe you.
Q. Okay.
A. (Mr. Eich) Thank you. But, again, just to reiterate, all those orange links, those cluster of links on that map on the left included the 69kV line as well as the 230kV line that we were in process of siting.

As we began to connect those orange short discrete links together end to end, both for the 69kV line and the 230kV line, we were able to sort of develop four segments, two for the 69kV line and two for the 230kV line.

Now, as we connected them end to end and developed these four segments, we then determined to better identify those four segments on a map shown on this screen.

Q. And this screen is Slide 57?
A. (Mr. Eich) This slide is Slide 57, correct.

Those four segments, again, include two that are 69kV, and those were identified by what we'll call the red-themed segment in the middle as well as the yellow-themed segment. Those were both related to the 69kV portion of the project.

The blue in the southeast area of the project as well as the magenta in the northeast area of the project,

both of those segments were related to the 230kV line.

So, again, this map is essentially a zoomed-in version of the previous map that once showed orange clusters of links. This is now showing those clusters of links connected together end to end, forming these different-colored segments.

Each segment includes a darker shaded line representing a preliminary preferred route for that segment. It's kind of hard to see on this map but there are lighter shaded lines surrounding each segment of that same color.

So, for example, this blue segment which is a 230kV segment, the dark line is the preliminary preferred alignment, and there are several other lighter shaded lines around that as route alternatives to that preliminary preferred alignment.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: To build off Mr. Kryder's question earlier. When you work from the 700 links down to, say, this phase, where's public input considered through this process?

MR. EICH: Member Comstock, Mr. Chairman, public input essentially begins back in the link analysis section that Mr. Petry was describing.

We invite the public to come and learn more through various forms of outreach, including newsletters, e-mails, social media, newspapers and inviting them to come and learn more. We also include links to our web page that includes this information as well. And links to the virtual open house. So there's various forms in which they get that invitation.

We can then explain to them further of what they're seeing here at those in-person open houses.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Mercer.

MEMBER MERCER: So at this point how many links have been eliminated?

MR. EICH: I don't know, Member Mercer. I don't know that I have that number. We can probably look into that and find out a number for you, if you'd like.

MEMBER MERCER: I guess my interest is to find out how many links were eliminated to come up with the black route. Just the preferred route. I know at this point on this slide you can still see a bunch of preliminary links.

MR. EICH: Yes, that's correct.

MR. PETRY: To address that question a little further, if we might step back one slide to show

the remaining links slide. Just as a point of comparison, we can see all of the blank links shown on the map on the left, Slide 55 here.

The majority of the 700 links that were initially identified were eliminated. The vast majority were eliminated. What was then retained and carried forward for route analysis including some preliminary subroutes was by far the minority, as compared to that 700-some total links. And the largest area I guess where we saw link eliminations were really in the northwestern portion of our preliminary siting area there.

It was driven largely by the potential points of interconnection with the 69 lines. We also didn't look all the way over to the far western and northwestern portion of our preliminary siting area for 230kV facilities, understanding where the points of interconnection for those facilities were needed.

And so it wouldn't necessarily be an apples-to-apples comparison in terms of the total number of links that were analyzed preliminarily as compared to the number of links that were retained to form those full routes.

So if you're interested, we could give you some general numbers but, again, it won't really be a direct true comparison between the number of links

initially identified and those that are still -- were remaining to create the preferred route.

MEMBER MERCER: Yeah, I was just curious because you can see in that map all those white little spots like Member Kryder said it looks like some illness.

CHMN STAFFORD: Chicken pox.

MEMBER MERCER: Chicken pox. Measles. I was going to say sarampion in Spanish. It's the only thing that came to my mind.

But so you eliminated a bunch to come to Slide 57, but it's still you're going to eliminate a bunch more when you come to show us the preferred route.

And I guess I was just curious of how many out of the 700 were finally eliminated. And also what, I know that you have talked about input from the public, input from the City of Casa Grande, the City of Eloy -- no, not Casa Grande, the City of Eloy, Pinal County and other jurisdictions that were mentioned.

So you take into consideration all of those inputs to come up with the eliminating all these other chicken pox.

MR. PETRY: That is correct. Along with the environmental and engineering right-of-way, other factors that we look at the individual links on a case-by-case basis with, public input is a factor as

well. And as I mentioned in my testimony previously, we did receive some comments from members of the public with preferences expressed around individual link numbers.

Where we see I think most of the engagement, and Mr. Eich will get into more of this in his public involvement portion of the testimony, but I think where we saw more engagement, and we tend to see this with most projects, is when we have more concrete lines drawn on a map that we tend to see more involvement and engagement from the public.

And when you get to a stage like this, like is shown on Slide 57 now where we have some of those preliminary route alternatives shown, that's when we often see more engagement from the public and we did in this case as well.

So we often see at the early stages less improvement and less specific input from members of the public, and as we get further along in the process, more refined product for public consumption and review, we tend to get much more input and feedback. And we saw the same here.

MEMBER MERCER: One more thing. So when you talk about public input, do you have, like, a specific not-in-my-backyard kind of a thing?

MR. PETRY: That's something, and Mr. Eich

can get into some of this further, too, but we do often hear that, just the general idea of we don't want to see this around where I live and work and play, understanding that there is a need for the infrastructure. That's a pretty common sentiment. And that's encountered on most projects.

We also will often see some specific comments that come in around that idea; right? So it's -- people can provide individual comments that say I don't like link number 1, 2, 3 because it's located at this location in proximity to my area of interest. Right? We'll often see a little more nuanced version of those comments that generally express the same idea as well.

MEMBER MERCER: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: I have a quick question about we're looking at the map on Slide 57.

You stated the 700 links, that was for not just the 230kV project, it was also the 69kV project which is a part of the Pinal Electrical Improvement Project, but not subject to the CEC which is only for the 230kV lines; correct?

MR. PETRY: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So I'm looking at the map on Slide 57 from APS-6. That includes the 69kV

route in addition to the 230kV route; correct?

MR. PETRY: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And so just to make sure I'm understanding you. So while the entirety of the 230kV double-circuit line will have 69kV underbuild, there's more to that 69kV project than just that underbuild.

MR. EICH: Mr. Chairman, there are actually two separate projects going on. There's a specific need for the 69kV connections, I'll say, connecting at different substations and different locations.

So while there is a need for that specific 69kV element for that purpose, the 230kV main driver is the 230kV line itself. The 69kV underbuilt is that added benefit for any future of a 69kV line in that general location, which we felt would be important especially as it traversed within the IPAZ corridor.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. But there's been a lot -- now, is the 69kV system going to be built onto the first circuit or the first 230kV when the 230kV circuit is constructed? Or does that come later?

MR. EICH: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that that future 69kV will for the large part come later. However, there -- as Mr. Wiley spoke to, there are joint use agreements with ED-2 to utilize

one of those circuits for a portion of the overall route.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And there'll be I'm looking at the map, it looks like the 69kV line is going to extend quite a bit further west than the 230kV project, and that's for -- is that for your customers? For ED-2's customers?

MR. EICH: For the 69kV portion I believe that would be for APS customers.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. But then a part of the underbuild would be utilized by ED-2 and that would be at some point in the future, not necessarily as soon as the 230 line gets constructed.

MR. EICH: My understanding is there is a segment on the north end of the project that ED-2 is essentially prepared to move forward with shortly after we build our line or even in conjunction with the build of that line.

CHMN STAFFORD: And that would be single or double circuit?

MR. EICH: Mr. Wiley -- single circuit.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I'm just trying to get it straight in my head how this project's going to shake out. The first thing that's going to have to happen is the 230kV line will have to get built.

And then it looks like a portion of the

underbuild will happen for ED-2 shortly after that's constructed. In the meantime, APS is going to have to construct additional 69kV circuits to serve this area at the same time it's constructing or near -- near in time to the construction of the 230kV. Is that an accurate statement?

MR. PETRY: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you. So it looks like, so the 230 first circuit, that's going to happen, you may add a second circuit 10 years, up to 20 years down the road potentially depending on what the growth is.

You're going to have to build out the 69kV at least single-circuit initially, and a part of that's going to be underbuild for ED-2, but you need your own 69kV system upgraded, expanded and that may -- the initial single circuit will happen. And then eventually as load grows you'll add the second 69kV; is that correct?

MR. EICH: Mr. Chairman, that sounds accurate.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you very much. I feel like I have a better understanding of what's going on here. Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: I appreciate the clarity that you brought in that.

What it seems to me, and I'd ask Mr. Eich or Mr. Petry, somebody, we really have four projects going in one. Does that -- I mean, as Mr. Chairman spoke a moment ago, the driver is the first 230 line; right? Or I've forgotten what the voltage is. The higher voltage. What is the higher voltage?

MR. EICH: Member Kryder, it's 230.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So the main thing you're building is a 230 single circuit. And then you're asking permission to build a second circuit on the same poles somewhere up to 20 years out.

And then part of the 69kV will be built immediately; some of it will be built in the near future. Some of it will be built in the further future. How far out does this go? Is this another check for 20 years? What's the last 69kV line going to be pulled?

MR. EICH: We, again, similar to that second 230kV circuit, it could be at any point as the demand is needed in the future.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. So up to I guess what -- I want clarity as to what you're asking for before we give approval, and that was I think where the

Chairman was driving this a moment ago.

So is it the assumption that the last 69kV line could be extended out as far as 20 years as well?

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder, we don't have jurisdiction of the 69kV lines. The only thing before us today is the 230kV line.

MEMBER KRYDER: Pardon me. Pardon me.

CHMN STAFFORD: They're providing the information for the 69kV, it's kind of color and background to show what's going on in the area. It's not just the high-voltage line. There's the subtransmission system is also getting built out, but we don't have jurisdiction over the 69kV lines.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thanks for your clarification. I knew that and plum forgot it.

CHMN STAFFORD: No problem.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. EICH: Not at all. Mr. Chairman, thank you for summarizing that.

In the next slide, I will remove the 69kV elements just for ease of conversation moving forward. That may help.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. At the risk of getting myself more confused, can you use your laser pointer and circle the -- you said the

various links, you had 700, a lot of those links were eliminated. The remaining links were then used to develop two route segments that -- those two route segments for the 230kV transmission line and two route segments for the 69kV transmission line. Do I have that piece correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. Is this, what's shown here in the middle of Slide 57, those are the two segments that were brought forward to form the new 69kV pole line; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. Okay. And the links that were brought forward to form two segments for the 230kV line, they're shown on the outer edge, can you use your laser pointer to show us that, trace that?

A. (Mr. Eich) I'll start in the south. Again, the preliminary preferred route at the time traversed this alignment in blue to the future TS-25 Substation site.

Again, this site had not been, the location had not been confirmed yet. We did know it needed to be in this area. That's why a much larger area is hatched there.

But that connection needed to take place as well as this magenta connection from the future TS-25 Substation as it traverses north ultimately to the future

Sundance to Pinal Central line that it would connect to.

Q. So what you're showing on Slide 57 is what came forward through this detailed siting process that Mr. Petry testified to and that you've then advanced in your testimony for two pole lines, two separate projects, but are all bundled under the PEIP heading and label, which is a new 69kV pole line shown in the middle of Slide 57; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. And those -- that new 69kV pole line is separate and apart from the 69kV underbuild that will be constructed at some point using the 230kV pole line; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. And then we have a separate side of the PEIP project, which is the 230kV pole line which is shown in the blue and the magenta that extends from Milligan up north where the line then will interconnect with the Sundance line; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. So to Member Kryder's point, and in line with Mr. Wiley's testimony, the PEIP project is a combination of projects, two separate pole lines. One's a 69kV pole line that APS needs to serve 69kV load. And you have a separate 230kV pole line which you're using which is

before the committee today and that we're requesting a CEC for.

And the 230kV pole line will carry the underbuild and you're asking for authorization to have that as a double-circuit 230kV line with the 69kV underbuild.

So if you think of all those different buckets of facilities that we're planning as part of this PEIP project, there's a lot going on. The focus before the committee is the 230kV pole line that you're now going to transition us to.

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, that's correct.

Q. And you and I went back and forth, I said, Stephen, we've got to stop talking about this 69kV pole line because it's not before the committee, it's confusing to me, and if it's confusion to me, it probably isn't confusing to anybody else, but I'm confused about it, let's not talk about it.

But you were I think correct in that we need to talk about the larger siting process. This was a combination of projects that are all wrapped up under the PEIP banner or label.

It's important for the committee to understand what role the 69kV lines and the facilities played in our public outreach and in our siting work. But now we're

going to move on to the matter that's before the committee which is just the 230kV pole line, double-circuit 230; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. Okay.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: If I may, I just want to tell you thank you for putting the entire footprint of the project out there. I think that's important for the public and the entities that are involved to see it. And it creates a lot of transparency in the process. So I think it's a good thing.

I mean, now I that understand what you did with the links and all that and where it went, I think it's good to have this on there, even though we don't have jurisdiction on that. So thank you for doing that.

MR. EICH: Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. So Member Comstock is telling you you were right and I was wrong.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: I didn't want to say it, but --

MR. DERSTINE: I understand completely. It's not the first time.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Okay. Take us forward now, we're going to just focus on how we ended up with this preliminary preferred route for the 230kV pole line and then how that was adjusted based on public input and feedback, getting more to Member Mercer's comment, like how were these decisions on the route, the preferred route, given by public input.

A. (Mr. Eich) Sure. And, again, to better focus on the 230kV elements, I've removed the 69kV segments from this map so that might help in our conversations as we move forward here.

Again, this map only shows the preliminary preferred routes for the 230kV segments as well as alternative subroutes in the lighter shades of those colors.

CHMN STAFFORD: And this is the map on Slide 59; correct?

MR. EICH: That's correct. Thank you.

And to I guess Member Mercer's earlier question, I quickly counted up those postage notes, for lack of a better word, and found about 25-ish -- 24. Okay. Thank you. So hopefully that helps answer that question.

We presented these segments including our preliminary preferred routes in our newsletters and

during the second round of open houses. The input that we received at this stage led to further modifications to the -- to actually both of those segments, both of those 230kV segments in blue and in magenta.

Changes within the magenta segment involved relocating the alignment along Sunshine Boulevard, which is generally where my laser pointer is. Relocating that further to the east along an alternative which is La Palma Road.

This stemmed from comments and correspondence with landowners along the north and south side of Selma Highway. This included opposition of a family building a new home just north of Selma Highway, just west of Sunshine Boulevard, as well as concerns from Selma Energy regarding potential shading impacts to their facilities along Selma Highway west of La Palma Road.

And so based on that input as well as input from Coolidge and Pinal County supporting the shift to La Palma Road, this alignment did shift and we'll see that on the next slide. And it's also shown on the preferred route which is one side of the laminated placemat before you.

Regarding changes in the blue segment, the change here which has already been addressed in previous testimony from Mr. Wiley, but this segment along Milligan

Road shifted further to the south along Phillips Road.

This stemmed from strong opposition from developers regarding conflicts of the line to the planned residential development and mixed-use development site as well as Mr. Petry pointed out the potential conflicts for the I-10 interchange at Milligan Road.

So we met with the City of Eloy on this as well. They supported this change to Phillips Road. And so that I guess is the second big change from what we see here when we originally presented this at our open house.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Eich, can I pause you there for a moment just so I better understand what the comments were and who they came from?

So the magenta segment on the north end of Slide 59, that was adjusted to relocate the line from Sunshine Road to La Palma Road. And the reason for that is you have a family who was building a home and you received, as I recall correctly, letters from the mother, father, and maybe some of the older children of this family all urging you to move the line away from their new home; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. And the other piece of the feedback you received for relocating the magenta segment off of Sunshine to

La Palma was from you said the Selma Energy Project. That's a solar project that's being developed by NextEra; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. And NextEra reached out and said we'd like you the move your line because we are concerned about your structures impacting the energy production from our panels.

A. (Mr. Eich) Correct.

Q. Then the relocation of the line on the blue segment, the southern piece of what will or became your preferred route, you heard from a developer -- I think you mentioned developers as a single developer who's planning this mixed-use development that includes some commercial industrial as well as residential dwellings as part of that project? Is it one developer?

A. (Mr. Eich) My understanding is it's a developer. We heard from two different partners of that development.

Q. Okay. And then that feedback we received from the developer was backstopped and supported by the City of Eloy who had urged us in the same manner to move off of the Milligan Road alignment and move our line over to Phillips Road. Is that right?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct.

Q. And another consideration, I think Mr. Petry pointed out that in relocating off of Milligan Road to Phillips Road was that the potential for future realignment of I'm not sure what road it is, but a road in that area; correct?

A. (Mr. Eich) That's correct. That is Milligan Road with the I-10 interchange there.

Q. Okay. All right. So those were the drivers of the modifications to the two segments that were used that were connected to create what was your preliminary preferred route for the 230kV pole line; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

Q. All right. So I think now you're going to show us what those adjustments looked like.

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. That led to what we see here on the map on the left, essentially connecting those two alignments together, the blue segment and the magenta segment. And while we were refining the segments for the preferred route, we were also able to narrow down a site for the TS-25 Substation on a parcel owned by Saint Holdings, LLC, as Mr. Wiley mentioned previously.

Saint Holdings is a large landowner and developer along the Vail Road alignment, and they are -- have designated that as a spot that they own that would work well for the TS-25 Substation.

Q. I think, number one, Saint Holdings is developing the IPAZ logistics project, which is a very large, hundreds of acres project as I understand it. But they are also interested in having sufficient energy and power delivered to that site for the various manufacturing and other businesses that will -- that they anticipate will be taking up residence on the IPAZ project; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) Correct.

Q. So they suggested that site for TS-25. It's on land that Saint Holdings owns, Saint Holdings is the developer of IPAZ, and they're interested in -- well, they suggested that's a good location for your substation, one, because we control the land and we can negotiate to give you the rights to that project, but it also gives us the connectivity or ensures connectivity for this large project which may have a number of large load customers?

A. (Mr. Eich) Correct. Yes.

Q. Okay.

A. (Mr. Eich) And I will point out that they do own large amounts of land along Selma Road as well, and are in favor of that entire alignment throughout.

You may recall there were alternative routes that would have crossed through various portions of other

parts of their land that they did prefer this alignment that we had identified here.

I would also say that as Mr. Petry has stated, we worked with the cities and the county, the City of Coolidge and Pinal County specifically are in support of this alignment along Vail Road as well. That largely traverses through those areas.

We also met with ADOT's north/south corridor team regarding the alignment along Vail Road. And we met with them regarding their future north/south freeway and coordinated with them regarding this preferred alignment in this area.

So, again, the changes that were made are shown on this map as the bold black line. And this alignment is the result of a comprehensive siting study including implementing the public input and stakeholder input from the cities of Eloy and Coolidge, Pinal County, Saint Holdings, LLC, the solar development along Selma Highway, and ADOT's input in coordination efforts along their future north/south corridor at the Vail Road alignment.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: I would like to commend the applicant in this process. It's very thorough. Particularly in -- I read all the comments. In

considering the comments from the public it's clear that they knew enough to make valid comments and that you guys listened. And I really -- I feel like you did a good job and I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. EICH: Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: I have a couple quick questions.

MR. DERSTINE: Yeah.

CHMN STAFFORD: The future TS-25 Substation, would that be on land owned or leased by APS?

MR. EICH: I believe we typically own those substations.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So then the -- so I'm assuming that by talking to the Saint Holdings, LLC, they are willing to sell you an appropriate acreage of land for that substation, then?

MR. EICH: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: And you said that they were also developing an industrial or commercial complex there, they would want delivery of power from APS?

MR. EICH: That's correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: Would that take it off the 69kV system or would they be larger customers that would take it off the transmission system?

MR. EICH: I don't know that I have all the

details at this time. My understanding is current plans are likely going to be 69.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: That leads to the other question that I had about that substation, and that is that what -- I think you -- I think you answered part of the question so I won't ask that.

But what approvals and public input will happen when that substation is ready to be constructed?

And will there be -- is that in the county and will -- you'll have to follow county guidelines on how -- what the public is -- whether the public has an opportunity to know that it's happening and make comments?

MR. EICH: Member Little, perhaps Mr. Petry might know fully on the land ownership of that area.

MR. PETRY: I believe the bulk if not all of the TS-25 site is within the City of Coolidge jurisdictional boundaries, and as part of our overall siting study as was shown on some of the early maps, we had a progressively smaller TS-25 siting area that was shown to the public throughout the transmission line siting process.

We really didn't see much input from the public in terms of preferences around the siting of TS-25. But that was the intent of including that as part of this overall siting process was to obtain as much public input preference as we could on the substation portion of this along with the 230 and 69kV lines.

As far as any entitlement process that might be completed for the substation itself, with the local jurisdiction, I don't have details on that, Member Little. I apologize.

But we could look into what that process might be and what that public involvement outreach component might be as part of that local process as well associated with the substation if you would like.

MEMBER LITTLE: I'd appreciate knowing that. I know that it is -- we do not have jurisdiction over that substation. However, in this area in particular, my experience on the committee has been that we often get the public coming in and segments I didn't know anything about that solar project, substation, things that we didn't have jurisdiction over, but they didn't know anything about that part of it until they got information about the CEC process.

And it concerns me that although we don't have jurisdiction, there really -- the public needs to

know what's going on. So I appreciate that. Thank you.

MR. PETRY: Member Little, if I may add as well, as has been testified to previously, and I'll have additional detail around this when I discuss land uses in this area as well, but the TS-25 Substation area is central.

It's centrally located within an area planned for future industrial and what they call employment development which is a more intensive land use, much like industrial. And it's also central in the portion of the proposed IPAZ or Inland Port Arizona that future logistics park and heavy industrial use facility that is located there because of the proximity to both rail service and the state route.

So this is an area planned for heavy industrial use in the future with the substation in that central portion of that industrial future use.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you. That's helpful.

MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

MEMBER HILL: While we're talking about entitlements, I guess my first question is I know this is a planned industrial area. Have comp plans been approved, have zoning changes been made? Is all of that already done and so you guys are coming in at this point

in the project?

MR. PETRY: Member Hill, I think -- I can't speak about the entire area consistently in terms of what entitlements exist. Because I think there are some various parcels that may be at various stages of the entitlement process.

MEMBER HILL: Okay.

MR. PETRY: And you can see in our future land use map the portions that are under the jurisdiction of either Coolidge or Pinal County are through their general or comprehensive plans planned for those industrial or employment uses.

MEMBER HILL: So that's a great opportunity for citizens to also be involved in the conversation about the future land uses around them.

MR. PETRY: Absolutely. And in those entitlement processes, there's typically the land use plan level, right, at a higher level where you speak to the general land uses within an area. And then as we get down further you get into the zoning process; right? And both of those are public processes where citizens, members of the public can engage.

MEMBER HILL: Yeah. My follow-up on entitlements around this particular project, is this the only permit that you need to build this or do you have to

go through any permitting with the County or the City to get permission to build this transmission?

MR. EICH: Member Hill, there are land use permits that we always do acquire from whatever entity owns these locations, the land in this area. I do know in this specific area it's Coolidge and Pinal County.

But portions of it also do also cross Arizona State land, which I'll speak to here in a moment, that we have met with them as well and they're aware of this project as well and have shown support so far for this project.

So entities like that. There may be others that Mr. Petry might have in mind.

MR. PETRY: Yeah, there are other discrete permits that will be required. For example, when crossing ADOT facilities, there is an encroach permit process that's required there. Direct coordination with ADOT.

We also, and we may see some additional detail on this further, we cross a couple canals in the area as well, and for each of those canal crossings there is a discrete canal crossing permitting process as well, with those canal operators or underlying agencies. Those are the primary additional permits that we'd anticipate.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. I'm mostly just trying

to feel out how many opportunities there are for public comment or public review or oversight. I think the biggest one is probably the comp plan and the zoning and all those kinds of things it's probably pretty significant opportunity for public engagement.

You guys have done public engagement for this project. I was just wondering if there were other permitting processes that had that in it. It sounds like for the most part this is the best opportunity for the citizens to come forward and have a conversation about this particular project. There probably aren't a lot of other county processes or city processes. It's this.

So I just wanted to, this is it, so I'll be interested to hear the comments we get back. So, thanks.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. I think we've been going for approximately 90 minutes. I think we're ready for another break. Let's take a recess and come back at about 4:35. We stand in recess.

(Recess from 4:21 p.m. to 4:36 p.m.)

CHMN STAFFORD: Back on the record.

Mr. Derstine.

MR. DERSTINE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

So given the hour of the day, I thought maybe it would be important for us to, one, share with the committee our virtual flyover so you have maybe a

better, other than the maps that we've been looking at today, maybe a little better sense of the project area and the transmission line route.

And then present to you what we are -- our proposal for the route tour for tomorrow morning, so the committee can decide, one, whether you want to take a route tour and how many -- we have a number of stops planned. Mr. Petry will speak to what you can see at those different stops.

We can make a decision about how many times we want to get off the bus and take testimony with the court reporter or if we want to try to do it on the bus. I think we can accommodate the court reporter on the bus for if we want to stay in the air conditioning of the bus itself.

But those are all open decisions that we can, maybe once Mr. Petry gives us an overview of the route tour you can ask him questions and decide what the committee prefers in the way of a tour.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Mr. Petry.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Do you want to start us with the flyover?

A. (Mr. Petry) Sure.

Q. All right.

A. (Mr. Petry) So we'll let this get started for a

moment here, and pause here for a just a moment, Grace.

We have a lot of white dots on this map as well, white spots here. I want to point those out. Most of those are going to be road name identifiers. On the far left you see at lot. The road names identified on the right were identifying many of the project components, as well as some of the planned facilities in the future.

We're identifying some of the existing substations that are out there today. Just a lot of particular pieces of information identified on what you see now.

When this video moves forward you'll see a lot of these callouts disappear, and in the upper right corner we're going to have a little legend that will appear. And with that legend we can match much of the line work that you'll see on the movie as we move forward.

I'd also invite members of the committee at any point if you have questions and would like us to pause, if you want to discuss any item a little further, please do. But I'll generally narrate as we move forward.

Grace, if you could go from here, please.

(Virtual tour begins.)

MR. PETRY: So as we move from here and start to zoom in, what you'll see in a moment is, again, that same big blue area. That is the project corridor.

Grace, if you could pause for just a moment.

We see our project corridor in the big blue area. You can see, again, that corresponds with the project corridor that's shown on Exhibit APS-2B. Also included on your placemat.

Within that corridor, we project the project preferred route. It largely follows through the central portion of that corridor as it extends throughout the region.

We also on this overview are showing the route alternatives. The alternative Subroute A and alternative Subroute B. In our current view you can see alternative Subroute B shown in red, the southern portion of our project area.

Some other components that we'll be showing include existing transmission infrastructure, some of the yellow, green, blue, lighter blue lines you see on the map.

We also see the future ADOT corridor. This is that future north/south freeway that we mentioned that runs in the eastern portion of our project area. It's

shown in two black lines here. We can see where that corridor extends from north to south, I'm highlighting that on the video right now.

And, again, this is the future ADOT north/south corridor, and we're showing where the project corridor overlaps with that future transportation corridor as well.

Just to orient the committee with what we're seeing here before we zoom in further.

CHMN STAFFORD: Quick question. On the highway corridor, the ADOT corridor, it looks like it starts out at Fast Track Road and then switches up to Vail Road; is that correct?

MR. PETRY: It does, Mr. Chairman. And within our project study area, most of the north/south freeway is aligned with the Vail Road center line. But when we go further to the north and actually further to the south it does extend further to the east, outside of our project area.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: You mentioned before one of the reasons why you have your preferred route here on the south as opposed to the alternative route which is shown in red, is because of a potential change in the

intersection of Milligan Road with I-10. And the potential that you might have to relocate facilities.

Do you anticipate that there might be any conflict if your line is already there when they start the construction for the north/south freeway? Do we know when they're talking about building that?

MR. PETRY: Member Little, we have been in coordination and Mr. Eich will get into more of this in his testimony, but we have been coordinating with the ADOT north/south freeway team for quite some time as part of our public outreach process.

And it was through that coordination with the ADOT team that we identified the wider corridor consistent with that future ADOT corridor as well, so that there can be continued coordination as they move forward, reduced from that 1500-foot total transportation corridor that they've identified today down to a future 400-foot width.

We want to be able to work together so that the project facilities and that future 400-foot-wide freeway corridor can co-exist. And so one of the comments that they provided actually speaks to the fact that the PEIP project as proposed will probably come into place prior to their future freeway, and they will use this project as one of the constraints and considerations

that they entertain when further siting their future freeway infrastructure.

MEMBER LITTLE: Excellent. Thank you.

MR. PETRY: Okay. So from here if he could, yeah, please, go ahead and move forward. We're going to zoom down into a little closer of the project area. And as we do this we'll see the line work change just a little bit, we'll go from some of these fatter lines down to just thinner lines.

Once that happens, we can pause for just a moment. Just keep going. There we go.

So let's pause for just a moment.

Right here we're looking at essentially a view towards the north along Eleven Mile Corner Road near Milligan Substation. The center of the northern, top portion of your screen, excuse me, is the location of the existing Milligan Substation.

The blue corridor you see extending down below is the proposed project corridor. And the red line you see going to the right or to the east would be alternative Subroute B.

As we zoom in lightly further, what you'll see is some of the proposed transmission structures as modeled. So we'll see some 3D views of those proposed transmission structures with the general center line as

identified clamped to the ground below.

So we can move forward from here. Thank you, Grace.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Could you pause it right there? Thank you.

Is, I'm thinking of the word, is the portion of land immediately adjacent and to the right of the shown substation, is that also a part of the substation, that portion that's been worked over there?

MR. PETRY: No.

MEMBER KRYDER: What is it? Do you happen to know? Looks like a mine or a gravel pit or something.

MR. PETRY: Member Kryder, I believe it to be a track, like a track facility, just sort of an ad hoc track facility where there are some, you know, either bicycle or other recreation activities going, just dispersed recreation at that location.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. PETRY: You're welcome. All right, Grace.

We will now zoom down into one of the view visual simulations that we've included with the flyover as well. This is a visual simulation completed from Key

Observation Point 16, or KOP-16. This shows Milligan Substation with the proposed project transmission line modeled right here.

From here we'll zoom back out, give a view as we extend down to the south and then travel to the east. As we travel along Phillips Road.

We will then come to La Palma Road where the project would extend to the north. This is again a portion of the proposed route. We see a red line now that runs east to west, that would be alternative Subroute B. This is the location where the project goes over the top of the Union Pacific Railroad.

We could pause here for just a moment, Grace.

This location is KOP-14 or Key Observation Point 14 which is a view from La Palma Road looking north with the project facilities added in.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. So what you're showing there on the screen, you've simulated what the 230kV structures will look like in relation to that road; right?

A. (Mr. Petry) That is correct. And when I get into my testimony around visual resources, we'll provide much more detail on each of the visual simulations that were completed and your assessment around the visual

impacts associated with each of those locations as well.

CHMN STAFFORD: So looking at this picture, so we're looking at -- this is double-circuit 230kV with both circuits on it; right?

MR. PETRY: That is correct.

CHMN STAFFORD: And a 69kV underbuild, and it looks like there's a distribution line on separate poles as well.

MR. PETRY: That is correct. In order to really understand the maximum visual impact associated with this line at full buildout, we wanted to simulate those facilities with all of those conductors included; right? Of those future circuits included.

And so what we show here, the existing condition includes the wooden structure you see on the right side of the road as well as the structure, the distribution structure on the left. Those exist today. What we've added into this image would be the project facilities you can see in the gray steel structures there.

And, again, when we get into the visual resources testimony, we'll be able to do a comparison against the existing condition photograph as well as that of the simulated condition that you see here in this image.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: If I could, along the easement of the propose alignment, is there any underground utilities that is on the same alignment with you? Gas?

MR. PETRY: There are some locations where underground utilities are located. There are locations of gas, fiber, there's some locations of water. As mentioned before, we have a lot of canals out in this area. Some of those canals are aboveground, some are belowground, piped water canals as well. So yes, there are.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Do you see any conflicts with those in your proposed alignment?

MR. PETRY: Generally, no. Any of those conflicts that we would have identified would have been identified through the initial links analysis and route alternative development process, as part of the right-of-way and engineering reviews. And as such, no, we don't see any major conflicts that can't be mitigated or addressed.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

//

BY MR. DERSTINE

Q. And I guess quickly, Mr. Eich, can you use the laser pointer and just show or identify the simulated structures? I assume they're the taller galvanized-looking gray poles, but just for the committee. So there's three of the simulated poles there within that KOP; right?

A. (Mr. Eich) Correct. I hope I'm tracing them okay with my hands --

Q. And to Mr. Petry's point, that shows what the pole line would look like when it's fully constructed as a double-circuit 230kV line with 69kV underbuild; right?

A. (Mr. Petry) That's correct.

MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill.

MEMBER HILL: I'm curious with this KOP, are we standing where the proposed South Fast Track Road extension is at this point?

MR. PETRY: No. Member Hill, we are actually on La Palma Road --

MEMBER HILL: Okay.

MR. PETRY: -- at this point slightly north of the railroad. And we're looking north along La Palma Road.

MEMBER HILL: Got it. All right. Thanks.

MR. PETRY: You bet.

Okay, Grace.

From here we move east along Alsdorf Road, to where the alignment would then extend to the north, and this is where you can see the slightly wider corridor.

As we move to the north you can see the black lines coming in from the right or the east. That is the future ADOT freeway corridor. So this is where that corridor meets with our proposed corridor.

This is the area where generally as we move north through here, the proposed IPAZ development, that Inland Port Arizona as well as future other industrial and employment land uses are proposed, as well as future TS-25 siting area.

Largely following that Arica Road alignment as we go north.

We're getting closer to the northern portion here that north/south freeway co-alignment. And from here, we will move to the west along Selma Highway. We're going to zoom down into KOP-18 on State Route 87.

This is a view to the north where the project would cross along -- cross over SR-87 along the Selma Highway alignment. Grace, if you could pause for just a moment.

In this view in the foreground we can see the proposed project structures, there we go, added to the image here. These are simulated structures here and here.

In addition to those simulated project structures, we've coordinated with NextEra's Selma Solar project developers and added into simulation their future gen-tie as well. And those are the structures you see here, here, where their gen-tie runs along the Selma Highway alignment -- Selma Highway alignment over to the east side of State Route 87 and then to the north.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Are those 115kV?

MR. EICH: If I remember correctly, Member Little, those are 230kV single-circuit only.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PETRY: From here we'll expand out a bit and give a view to the west. If we pause just a moment, this is an area of wider corridor. You can see where the corridor here, again, from north to south extends, and Mr. Eich will provide more testimony around this corridor, but it's an area of wider corridor width in order to allow us to coordinate further with the Selma Solar project; right?

As we were coordinating with Selma early on in the project, coordination around identifying areas of the minimum impact to their future facility, we wanted to expand that corridor just to allow that flexibility with them as we move forward. So that's the wider corridor you see here in the foreground.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: So there's possibility that you would be on the southern end of that corridor, then?

MR. PETRY: That is not the preferred route as of today, but there is, if the wider corridor in this area was granted, there would be the flexibility to site within that area. The coordination with Nextera to date and the Selma Solar project has identified the preferred route as shown, and any changes to that would likely require further analysis from Nextera and their project engineers.

As Mr. Eich indicated previously, one of the drivers for the preferred route in this location was minimization of impact to Selma Solar's solar facilities.

MEMBER LITTLE: Right.

MR. PETRY: And so the location we have identified today is the location that is deemed favorable by their project team as well.

MEMBER LITTLE: So it looks like there's maybe a home down here in the far right corner, lower right corner.

MR. PETRY: Yes. There is some agricultural -- there are some agricultural residences and out structures out in that -- down in that location. That is an area that the landowner -- APS has coordinated extensively with the landowner. There is future development planned generally throughout that area. Then there are no plans to run the transmission line at that location down in the southern portion of the corridor.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Question for Mr. Petry. I know in reading the proposed line was going to come quite close to someone's dwelling. Have we come to that yet or is that coming up?

MR. PETRY: We have not come to that point yet. I'll point that out here in a moment. That would be KOP-17, which would be the next KOP we'll see.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: With the corridor as wide as it is, it's conceivable that that line could be on the road that is on the south side of that solar field;

correct?

MR. PETRY: That is correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Which would be adjacent to that property.

MR. PETRY: That is correct.

MEMBER LITTLE: Have you talked -- you said you talked -- APS has talked to those people.

MR. PETRY: APS has talked to the landowners of that parcel, that property. I believe those are the same landowners that are --

MR. EICH: If I may.

MR. PETRY: Please.

MR. EICH: The landowner south; is that what you're referring to?

MEMBER LITTLE: Yeah, down in the far, yeah, on the south side of the solar field.

MR. EICH: So our conversation to Mr. Petry's point with Selma Solar, we had looked at possibly going down further closer to that early on in our conversations with them.

However, as we've worked with their engineers today our conversation is right up next to Selma Road where it's shown.

We also -- the east side of that is Selma Solar's land, on the east side of that. They're also

supportive of the corridor but regarding the south side we have not had any conversations with those on the south side of that.

I just bring all that forward to help you understand where the conversations today are. It's along Selma Highway. However, because of that initial back and forth that we had initially, we felt it would be good to include Selma Solar's property until we finalize our final engineering and design on that line.

MEMBER LITTLE: I understand that that's what it appears to be now. But with the corridor as wide as it is, if we approve that corridor, then it's possible that it could be renegotiated and moved down to the other side of their solar field. And that's what I was exploring. Thank you.

MR. PETRY: Thank you.

Grace, if we could move forward from here. Thank you.

From this location, this is where you can see the divergence of alternative B, alternative Subroute B and the preferred route, as the preferred route runs north along La Palma and then extends west along the Earley Road alignment.

Grace, if you could pause here for just a moment.

So from this view what we can see in the foreground is of course our proposed project corridor at the two lighter blue lines, the two proposed project facilities within that corridor running along the darker blue line.

You can also see a portion of alternative Subroute A, the orange line as it extends to the south. That would be the extension along Sunshine Rod, Sunshine Boulevard.

What you can't see in this image in some of the what looks to be vacant land right now is the SunZia converter station. This is where SunZia's converter station has been under construction. And if we choose to go on the route tour, you will see that prominently in this location. I just wanted to point that out that that does exist today. This is just slightly outdated aerial imagery.

What you can also see in the upper portion of the image is the Pinal Central Substation. As we extend further to the west, we'll pan around, look to the north a bit. But you can see much of that infrastructure at and around Pinal Central Substation including all of the high-voltage transmission lines.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Eich, can you use your laser point to

identify Pinal Central as well as the SunZia converter station?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. Pinal Central is this area in the rectangular portion of the screen.

And this SunZia site is generally in this area here if I remember correctly.

Q. It's not closer in proximity to Pinal Central? The planned converter station? It's hard to know.

A. (Mr. Eich) It's hard for me to tell from this, I've got to rewind this a little bit to see how close I am to La Palma Road. It may be further to the west, but --

Q. But the key takeaway here is we're showing the alignment on Earley Road as we're moving post the Pinal Central Substation; right?

A. (Mr. Petry) That's correct.

MR. PETRY: Thank you, Grace.

So we'll move forward up to Key Observation Point 17, and Member Kryder, this is the residential that you had asked about before.

And as Mr. Derstine noted early on in his opening, we do have some areas of high visual impact. This is that area. Right? This is the area where we have identified a transmission line alignment, if we could pause for a moment, near this residence. This is

the highest visual impact we see in the project.

We'll get into some further detail around some of the siting considerations and constraints, the point of interconnection that led us to identifying a route in this location near this residential structure located south of Pinal Central Substation.

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: Just to clarify, this is not the residence where all of the correspondence -- we had correspondence from the wife and the husband and the son and they're building a house.

MR. PETRY: This is not that residence, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: You rerouted the line partly in response to their concerns.

MR. PETRY: That's correct. That residence that you're speaking of where we received numerous public comments was located on the west side of Sunshine Boulevard near alternative Subroute A.

MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Thank you.

MR. PETRY: One of the reasons we removed alternative Subroute A.

This residence is located south of Pinal Central Substation on Eleven Mile Corner Road.

MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: Question for Mr. Petry.

I don't know how to quite phrase this, but what's your relationship with this landowner who's what, how many feet is he from the pole? Or from your right-of-way? 157, I thought it was. Does that sound right?

MR. PETRY: From the pole itself we estimate about 150 feet.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay.

MR. PETRY: And in terms of your original question, I don't have any particular relationship with this resident or residence. We will provide some further information around the coordination with this residence and the outreach that's occurred to them as we get further along in our testimony as well.

MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. That's interesting. Thank you.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. Mr. Eich, has APS had any conversations with this resident about the fact that there'll be a large 230kV monopole relatively close to their home?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yeah, so when we determined to take

this photo, we reached out to this resident. Particularly we talked to her about this preferred alignment. Talked to her about the project. And our desire to take a photo from her property here.

She appreciated the outreach. We provided her information to our project website, how to provide comments if she desired. And gave her a copy of the newsletter. She, again, she thanked us for that, said feel free to go out and take the photo. She even acknowledged the many lines around there. But otherwise did not provide comment for this site.

Q. Did you tell her that this pole was going to be 150 feet off their, whatever that structure is?

A. (Mr. Eich) I don't remember telling her the exact distance, because I didn't have that exact distance at the time. But that the preferred alignment would run just south of her home in that location.

Q. And are we looking at her driveway or what is that road that I'm looking at there in that image?

A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, that is the driveway coming off of Eleven Mile Corner Road.

MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Hill, and then Member Kryder.

MEMBER HILL: In that conversation were you able to establish whether she's the owner of the property or an occupant? Did you --

MR. EICH: Yes, Member Hill, that was one of the important things we wanted to establish that she wasn't just a resident. She is the owner and said that she would talk to her husband about it. We did talk to her. She was -- she said that she would talk to him. And if they had comments they would let us know. We never received any.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. A follow-up to that is I know we've modeled the placement of the poles but there's a lot more that goes into this kind of infrastructure. I mean, there's going to be brush removal, there's going to be a road for maintenance underneath potentially.

Did you show her pictures of what that impact might look like? I just feel like this is the particular residence that might be most impacted and so I just wondered how much effort you guys to put into kind of characterizing, I think a lot of people don't know what a transmission corridor means or how that might impact their quality of life.

MR. EICH: We haven't had those conversations to date. Prior to construction we would

certainly have those conversations with her.

Again, this is based on a preliminary location. We will work to locate the pole as best we can in locations if it can be done in best locations preferred to her as well. So, again, this is as best we can do for now for a simulation.

MEMBER HILL: One last follow-up question. Do you need to purchase right-of-way from her to do this?

MR. EICH: We may or may not. There might be a slight portion for access across her parcel there.

MEMBER HILL: But for right-of-way for any of the transmission lines, you don't need to?

MR. EICH: No, this is not on her parcel, no.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. It's on an adjacent parcel.

MR. EICH: Yes.

MEMBER HILL: Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder.

MR. PETRY: Oh, I'm sorry. Just to add a little bit more to Member Hill's -- response to Member Hill's question. In order to really characterize what it looks like out here and what this resident sees and may already know around transmission line infrastructure, I think a site visit would be very beneficial because this

is a location south of the existing Pinal Central Substation where there are numerous high-voltage transmission lines running along Eleven Mile Corner Road north to south, some east to west.

There is much infrastructure and I think much opportunity to see what comes along with that infrastructure as well, both for the resident as well as for us.

MEMBER HILL: I appreciate that. I think regardless of how we talk about this field trip there are a couple spots I would like to see. I don't know that I need to see all the KPIs, but I mean, this is a location I'd like to see, so I appreciate that. Thanks.

CHMN STAFFORD: And that would be the closest stop would be Stop 1, then, correct? Based on --

MR. PETRY: That is correct. That would be the first stop.

CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder, you had a question.

MEMBER KRYDER: Yes, I really have two separate questions.

First, I think Member Hill spoke to this a bit. The projected pole there, who owns that property? I mean, I guess I should phrase the question does the resident of the house own the property?

MR. EICH: I don't believe so.
MEMBER KRYDER: So it's someone else's? It's public, or you're not certain on that?
MR. EICH: I believe it's private property, and it's my understanding that she does not own that property.
MEMBER KRYDER: The second but related question is it appears that you're crossing over some series of lines there. Is this one of your tall poles, in order -- a 200-foot pole in order to get over another 230 or something?
MR. EICH: Yes. This would be one of those areas. What is hard to see or you may not see at all is just outside of the viewshed on either side of this photo are even larger existing transmission poles running generally north/south, which this line would also have to cross over.
MEMBER KRYDER: So because of potential sag and everything, you have to keep fairly close to that line you're getting over? Is that the -- I guess the question should have been can the pole be moved 100 feet to our left away from that? Or, you know, is there any flexibility in it? Maybe this is a Mr. Wiley question. I don't know.
MR. EICH: So my understanding is that

there may be some flexibility that we can work with on locating it further west, as you indicated, which would be to the left side of the screen here.

MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. I understand you've got to get over that line, okay, I understand lines sag, and so it's a bad thing when that happens and they come together. So thank you very much.

As you said, this looks like something that would be interesting to see, actually. Thank you.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: For me if I was living in that house I wouldn't care that the poles's 150 feet to my south or west or east. How am I going to have access to my driveway? How am I going to construct that safely? You're going to have some huge equipment in there. How am I going to maintain that road? If that equipment tears up the road, how does that get fixed?

All those issues for me would be priority. If I have kids, and I don't know there's children in that house, but I have kids how am I going to keep that site safe while we string poles along there and we start running wire?

It's not so much that the easement is close, it's what's going to happen during construction

and afterwards? How am I going to keep that area safe? And so can you talk a little bit how APS deals with that during those phases?

MR. WILEY: Mr. Comstock, I can take that one. APS will be in very close coordination with the property owner throughout the duration. As part of the construction activities there's various phases of the project.

We'll be out there digging holes at one point, we'll be erecting towers, stringing wire. We'll commit to communicating often and frequently with the landowner during all phases of construction of the project.

MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

MEMBER FANT: Mr. Chair.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. Member Fant.

MEMBER FANT: If you offered to buy them out can you include those funds in your cost of your project, if you just try to buy them out?

MR. WILEY: Member Fant, as Mr. Eich mentioned previously, the structures are not located on the parcel owned by this resident. They're separate parcel, adjacent parcel. We are actively working with the estate owner of the parcel for which the lines will be located.

CHMN STAFFORD: Mr. Petry, is that the end of the tour? Or is there still a little bit more?

MR. PETRY: We're very close.

Grace.

So from here, we swing back around and looking south on Eleven Mile Corner Road, this is a view from Key Observation Point 9. And this shows some of that existing, if we could pause for just a moment, Grace.

Some of that existing infrastructure that's located along Eleven Mile Corner Road today that includes 115, 69kV and distribution voltage distribution lines running north to south.

It also shows the simulated project structures. You can see Mr. Eich is highlighting one structure that would be located on the east side of Eleven Mile Corner Road with the crossings over those existing transmission lines over and to another structure he's highlighting now on the west side of Eleven Mile Corner Road.

And it's from this location where the line would extend to the north for interconnection with the Sundance line.

Grace.

We're going to make everyone dizzy here for

a moment and spin back around and get a view of where that project corridor comes near Pinal Central. You see the Pinal Central Substation.

Right here in the upper portion of the image with much of the existing transmission line infrastructure shown in the various colors as well as the project proposed corridor. Alternative Subroute A and TS-25 Substation siting area, alternative Subroute B.

And that concludes our virtual tour.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. I guess, Members, the next issue for us to decide is whether or not we want to take a physical tour in the morning.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. And Grace, can we pull up the map for the route tour, and Mr. Petry maybe you can walk us -- it's APS-20 is our route tour map, and just briefly orient the committee to the -- what we're seeing on the -- on our screen, which is APS-20, and then kind of -- presumably we'll start here at the hotel and then how we'll proceed for the route tour and how long you think it will take.

A. (Mr. Petry) Yes. So the map shown on the left screen right now, APS-20, indicates the route tour start and stop location. The route we intend to drive in order to access all of the stops, as well as the eight stop locations that we have identified as part of the tour.

To give you an overview of those stop locations, the first one is located at the intersection of Eleven Mile Corner Road and the Earley Road alignment south of Pinal Central Substation, very close to -- very close to the residence we spoke about just a moment ago. That would be --

MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

MEMBER LITTLE: It looks like just south of the preferred route as it goes east to west right there from Stop 1, it looks like there's a little like a trailer court or something there. Either that or a bunch of small homes.

MR. PETRY: South of the preferred route?

MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Where is the preferred route relative to the canal that runs through there?

MR. PETRY: There's the canal that runs south of the Pinal Central Substation that largely is north of the preferred route.

MEMBER LITTLE: Okay. Never mind.

MR. PETRY: Okay. So Stop 1 located south of Pinal Central Substation. From there, we would drive south on Eleven Mile Corner Road and head east on Selma Highway to Stop 2, which is the point where alternative

Subroute A and the preferred route converge or diverge depending on your perspective.

From this location, we can take a look at where the Selma Solar project would be located to the south as well as where the residence we heard a bit about that provided numerous comments would be located to the west.

From there we would move further to the east to Stop 3, which would be at the northern portion of the Arica Road alignment. This is going to be roughly Selma Highway and Arica Road, this is portion of the route where we'll see that north/south freeway alignment.

This is also going to be sort of the more northern portion of where we see all that future industrial and employment activity.

From there, we would move to the south a few miles down to Arica Road, where we would then again head back to the east along the Vail Road alignment. And we'd be the intersection of Arica Road and Vail Road.

This is a location where again we'll have midpoint view of that future north/south freeway corridor as well as a midpoint view of that furthest north to south portion of the Vail Road alignment.

From there we would propose to travel south down to Alsdorf Road, and again head to the east over

along the Vail Road alignment to stop 5. And stop 5 is a location where we'll be at the southern portion of the industrial corridor as well as near where that ADOT north/south freeway would extend to the east outside of our proposed corridor area.

From there we would travel over to the west down to the Casa Grande Picacho Highway and La Palma Road. And we would stop at Stop 6. And Stop 6 is the location of one of our key observation points. This is near KOP-14 we saw on the virtual tour with the view to the north as well.

This is the location where the proposed route would then travel over the Union Pacific Railroad and then further south to travel over Interstate 10.

From Stop 6 we would then travel down to Phillips Road at the alignment of Phillips Road and La Palma Road for Stop 7, and this is where we see the southernmost portion, or the southernmost alignment of the preferred route.

From Stop 7 we would head to the west along Phillips Road and then travel north on Eleven Mile Corner Road where we'll stop near Milligan Substation. And that would be the terminus of the route tour as well as the terminus of the proposed route ending at Milligan Substation.

And we also have a key observation point, a visual simulation completed from that location as well.

And once that's done we would return to the hotel. And what I didn't mention was we had identified potentially after Stop 3 or 4, somewhere between Stop 3 and 6, the potential to take a restroom break we've identified a location nearby where we can pause for a bit and take a break and then rejoin the tour.

BY MR. DERSTINE:

Q. With a restroom break and making our way all the way from Stop 1 to Stop 8, how long does it take?

A. (Mr. Petry) We anticipate approximately three to four hours to complete the tour.

CHMN STAFFORD: All right, Members. What's your thoughts on a tour?

MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

MEMBER KRYDER: It seems to me there's some significant value in going to physically take a look at these, even though the heat and all of the issues we all know about. But I would personally like to see it.

CHMN STAFFORD: I'm seeing nods around the table. I guess we will take an actual physical tour, Mr. Derstine.

I think we'll start out as planning to make

all the stops. After about Stop 4, I guess we'll have to reassess the members and see if they want to do the remaining stops or skip to Stop 1 or 2 of the additional stops which we will announce on the record at the last stop we make before we start skipping stops. Is that amenable to the members?

MEMBER HILL: Yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: I'm seeing nodding heads. All right. So we'll reconvene here tomorrow morning in this room at nine. We can get on the record and tie up any loose ends before we go and board the bus which I assume will be out in front of the hotel; correct?

MR. DERSTINE: I'm seeing nodding heads, so yes.

CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. Well, we have public comment starting in about seven minutes. So I think we're due for a recess until 5:30, at which time we'll come back for public comment. We'll give the team a chance to get set up for the public comment session.

With that, we stand in recess.

(Recess from 5:23 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.)

CHMN STAFFORD: All right, sir. Let's go back on the record now at the time set for public comment for Line Siting Case 247. There are no members of the public in the room to make comment. I do believe we have

a caller on the Zoom.

Mr. Gary Lane would you like to make public comment.

MR. LANE: Thank you. Can you hear me?

CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

MR. LANE: Okay. Great. I represent Eloy 170. We have worked with Staff on the project since its inception and I just want to put on the record in a public hearing that we're against the alternative that goes straight across Mulligan. It is not the preferred alternative, however, it is I believe a second alternative.

There is a substantial residential community that is -- that bisects that alignment that has plans and zoning, and is moving now to the platting level. And within the time frame of the project there will be residents living there and I think that the electrical -- that that alternative is detrimental to, really to the community.

As we've been working on this we have produced letters to the consultants and I will say the consultant's been very good to work with. But I do have to say for the record that we oppose that alternative, even though it would be a second alternative.

CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

All right. Are there any other members of the public to make comment? Seeing none, we will remain here until six o'clock to allow members of the public to either show up and make comment or call in or Zoom in to make comment, but until someone appears to make comment we will go off the record.

(Recess from 5:33 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.)

CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Let's go back on the record.

It is now six o'clock and no other members of the public have shown up to make public comment. With that we will conclude the public comment section of the hearing. Thank you to Mr. Gary Lane for being the sole comment from the public.

With that we will recess until tomorrow morning, we will reconvene here at nine a.m. prior to going on our tour of the physical site.

With that we stand in recess.

(Proceedings recessed at 6:01 p.m.)

STATE OF ARIZONA )
)
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me; that the foregoing pages are a full, true, and accurate record of the proceedings, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.

I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) and (2).

Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, September 14, 2025.

JENNIFER HONN, RPR
Arizona Certified Reporter
No. 50885

I CERTIFY that GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC, has complied with the ethical obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(

GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
Arizona Registered Firm
No. R1035