

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA POWER PLANT LS-436

2 AND TRANSMISSION LINE SITING COMMITTEE

3

4 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)DOCKET NO.
5 OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE)L-00000D-25-0154-00247
6 COMPANY, IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE)
7 REQUIREMENTS OF ARIZONA REVISED)LS CASE NO. 247
8 STATUTES §§ 40-360, ET SEQ., FOR)
9 A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL)
10 COMPATIBILITY AUTHORIZING THE)
11 CONSTRUCTION OF A SECTION OF THE)
12 PINAL ELECTRICAL IMPROVEMENT)
13 PROJECT CONSISTING OF)EVIDENTIARY HEARING
14 APPROXIMATELY 20 MILES OF A NEW)
15 DOUBLE-CIRCUIT 230KV TRANSMISSION)
16 LINE WHICH ORIGINATES AT THE)
17 MILLIGAN SUBSTATION AND)
18 TERMINATES AT THE CONNECTION)
19 POINT WITH THE SUNDANCE TO PINAL)
20 CENTRAL 230KV TRANSMISSION LINE)
21 (CEC 136) LOCATED NEAR THE PINAL)
22 CENTRAL SUBSTATION, ALL LOCATED)
23 WITHIN PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA.)
24)
25)

15 At: Casa Grande, Arizona

16 Date: September 10, 2025

17 Filed: September 15, 2025

18 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

19 VOLUME III
20 (Pages 354 through 455)

21

22

23 GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
24 Court Reporting, Video & Videoconferencing
25 1555 East Orangewood Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85020
602.266.6535 admin@glennie-reporting.com

By: Jennifer Honn, RPR
Arizona CR No. 50558

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

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

3

4

5

INDEX TO PROCEEDINGS

6	ITEM	PAGE
7	Opening Statement of Mr. Derstine	8
8	Presentation of Virtual Tour	135
9	Public Comment Session	168
10	Closing Statement of Mr. Derstine	380
11	Deliberations	388
12	Vote	452

13

14

15

INDEX TO THE TOUR

16	STOP	PAGE
17	1	185
18	2	194
	4	201
19	6	208
	8	214

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 INDEX TO EXAMINATIONS

2 WITNESSES PAGE

3 David Wiley, Stephen Eich, and Devin Petry
4 - for the Applicant

5 Direct Examination By Mr. Derstine 28

6

7

8

9

10 INDEX TO EXHIBITS

11 NO. DESCRIPTION IDENTIFIED ADMITTED

12 APS-1 Application For Certificate of 34 371
13 Environmental Compatibility
14 (CEC) (filed July 29,
2025/Amended August 15, 2025)
- Page One

15 APS-2A 2A - Updated Exhibit E 34 371

16 APS-2B Updated Project Corridor 35 371

17 APS-3 Witness Summary of David Wiley 367 371

18 APS-4 Witness Summary of Devin Petry 367 371

19 APS-5 Witness Summary of Stephen
20 Eich 367 371

21 APS-6 Witness Testimony Slides 37 371

22 APS-7 Proposed CEC with Map and
Corridor Descriptions 388 37123 APS-8 Affidavits of Publication of
24 Notice of Hearing 361 371

25 //

1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
3	APS-9	Proof of Delivery of	365	371
4		Application for Certificate of		
5		Environmental Compatibility to		
6		Public Locations		
7	APS-10	Proof of Website Posting of	366	371
8		Transcripts and Notice of		
9		Hearing		
10	APS-11	Proof of Delivery to Affected	363	371
11		Jurisdictions of the Notice of		
12		Hearing		
13	APS-12	Proof of Delivery to Public	364	371
14		Locations and Affected		
15		Jurisdictions of the Notice of		
16		Filing Updates to the		
17		Application for Certificate of		
18		Environmental Compatibility		
19		Regarding Exhibit E and the		
20		Project Corridor and Updated		
21		Address for ASLD		
22	APS-13	Proof of Posting:	--	371
23		Photos of Posted Notice of		
24		Hearing Signs and Locations		
25		Posted		
26	APS-14	Social Media Posting and	366	371
27		Emails with Hearing		
28		Information		
29	APS-15	Public Outreach Summary	366	371
30	APS-16	Newsletter Announcing Hearing	338	371
31		Mailed August 19, 2025		
32	APS-17	Tribal Nations Outreach	348	371
33		January 14, 2025 February 3,		
34		2025 May 23, 2025 August 21,		
35		2025		
36	APS-18	State Historic Preservation	370	371
37		Office Consultation Package		
38	//			

1 INDEX TO EXHIBITS (continued)

2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
3	APS-19	Visual Simulation (updated KOP-18)	35	371
4	APS-20	Route Tour Itinerary and Map	163	371
5	APS-21	Letter of Support from Saint Holdings LLC	367	371
6				
7	APS-22	Letter of Support from Electrical District No. 2	81	371
8				
9	APS-23	Letter from Arizona Corporation Commission Staff	56	371
10	CHMN-1	Proposed Form of CEC	368	For Reference
11	CHMN-2	CEC with Edits	368	For Reference

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that the above-entitled and
2 numbered matter came on regularly to be heard before the
3 Arizona Power Plant and Transmission Line Siting
4 Committee at Radisson Hotel Casa Grand, 777 North Pinal
5 Avenue, Casa Grande, Arizona, commencing at 9:04 a.m. on
6 September 10, 2025.

7

8 BEFORE: ADAM STAFFORD, Chairman

9 MICHAEL COMSTOCK, Arizona Corporation Commission
10 LEONARD DRAGO, Department of Environmental Quality
11 DAVID FRENCH, Arizona Department of Water Resources
12 NICOLE HILL, Governor's Office of Energy Policy
13 (via videoconference)
14 R. DAVID KRYDER, Agricultural Interests
15 SAL DICICCIO, Incorporated Cities and Towns
16 MARGARET "TOBY" LITTLE, PE, General Public
17 DOUGLAS FANT, General Public
18 GABRIELA SAUCEDO MERCER, General Public

15

APPEARANCES:

16

For the Applicant:

17

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

20

and

21

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

24

25

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

3 Mr. Derstine, I believe you had
4 approximately 30 minutes of direct left to present.

5 MR. DERSTINE: You're going to hold my feet
6 to the fire, but, yes, we'll do it.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: All right.

8

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION (continued)

10 BY MR. DERSTINE:

11 Q. Mr. Eich, we left off with you yesterday
12 afternoon. You had just covered the stakeholder
13 briefings for the project, including your tribal
14 engagement. We went through the various letters that
15 were used to communicate with the tribes over this
16 project and the responses that we received.

17 Let's go through the -- move on now to the
18 formal requirements, kind of check the boxes on some of
19 the statutory and other elements that were required to
20 present to the committee that supports our application.

21 A. (Mr. Eich) Sure.

22 Q. So the -- we filed the application on July 29,
23 and then there was the updates to the application that
24 you covered at the outset of your testimony that were
25 filed on August 15, 2025. The application is APS-1. And

1 those updates were in APS-2A and 2B. That's the
2 Exhibit E and the corridor.

3 And then we have a separate exhibit that was
4 used for the revised KOP to show the structures that were
5 used for -- or that Selma Energy Project plans to use for
6 their gen-tie, and that's found at APS-19, and Mr. Petry
7 covered that in his testimony on the visual impacts and
8 the simulations.

9 Once we filed the application, we're required to
10 publish the notice of hearing at least twice within 10
11 days.

12 Was that done for the project?

13 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. It was. The notice of hearing
14 was published in two newspapers. It was published in the
15 Casa Grande Dispatch on August 5, 2025, and the Trivalley
16 Dispatch on August 7, 2025.

17 Q. And we have evidence of the publications can be
18 found at APS Exhibit 8. Those are the affidavits of
19 publication of the notice of hearing?

20 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

21 Q. Another requirement is that we post signs within
22 the vicinity or if we can along the project route to
23 allow travelers who may not have received our newsletters
24 or seen the other communications. It's another form of
25 giving notice for this hearing that's taking place this

1 week.

2 Did we post those signs?

3 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, we did. Signs were posted in
4 13 locations in the vicinity of the project as seen on
5 the map on the left screen.

6 Q. That's Slide 199 -- Slide 199 of APS-6?

7 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, Slide 199.

8 And then an image of one of those signs can be
9 seen just to the right of that map.

10 Q. And we saw some of those signs yesterday on the
11 route tour; correct?

12 A. (Mr. Eich) Correct.

13 Q. In addition, we're required to provide notice to
14 affected jurisdictions.

15 Can you identify the affected jurisdictions or
16 what we've identified as the affected jurisdictions for
17 this project?

18 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. So the affected jurisdictions
19 include the cities of Coolidge and Eloy, Pinal County,
20 Arizona Department of Transportation, both the south
21 central district and the north/south project manager and
22 the Arizona State Land Department.

23 Q. I'm thinking back to Mr. Petry's land use
24 testimony. I guess it was there's a small piece that
25 covers ASLD land; is that right?

1 I don't remember seeing a lot of ASLD land on
2 your maps, but maybe I missed it.

3 A. (Mr. Eich) There's not a whole lot, but there
4 is some, yes.

5 Q. Okay. That's why they're including. All right.

6 And the notices that we provided to the affected
7 jurisdictions, so I think APS Exhibit 11 has the notices
8 to the affected jurisdictions, and it shows their mailing
9 on August 18.

10 Do I have that right?

11 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. The notices were mailed and
12 delivered to all affected jurisdictions between August 6
13 and August 18, 2025.

14 Q. And then what about the updates? You know, by
15 the time we had our prehearing conference the Chairman
16 asked whether we had mailed those updates to the affected
17 jurisdictions. We had not at that time, but we committed
18 to do that.

19 Did we get those mailed out?

20 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. Certified mailings and e-mails
21 were both sent to -- both through those avenues were sent
22 to the affected jurisdictions on August 26, 2025. And
23 although I believe we've received most of evidence of
24 those jurisdictions receiving that whether through e-mail
25 or certified mailings, I'm not sure that we've received

1 the latest on that --

2 Q. You mean return --

3 A. (Mr. Eich) -- response back.

4 Q. -- the return receipts for some of those
5 mailings you're saying?

6 A. (Mr. Eich) Right. I think there were two
7 lacking.

8 Q. Okay. But we did mail them. And we also
9 attempted to in addition to the certified mailings sent
10 them by e-mail; is that right?

11 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. And what we have are shown in
12 APS -- or Exhibit APS-12.

13 Q. That covers those -- the mailing of those
14 supplements to the affected jurisdictions; is that right?

15 A. (Mr. Eich) That's right.

16 Q. Okay. Also in Exhibit 12 you have evidence that
17 the copies of the application and transcripts were
18 delivered to the public locations which are libraries; is
19 that right?

20 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. Copies of the application were
21 delivered to the Coolidge public library on August 4,
22 2025, and the Eloy public library on August 5, 2025.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. (Mr. Eich) And copies of the transcripts were
25 also delivered to the same libraries.

1 Q. Okay. And I misspoke. So APS-9 is our original
2 delivery, shows proof of delivery of the application to
3 the -- to the libraries, and then included under APS-12
4 is evidence that we provided those supplements also to
5 the libraries.

6 Did I get it right this time?

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

8 Q. In addition, we're required to include our
9 various filings, the application, other newsletters,
10 et cetera, on our project website. That includes
11 transcripts from the prefiling conference and the
12 prehearing conference.

13 Did we do that?

14 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. And it does include the
15 updated CEC application on the web page.

16 Q. Okay. And then we're also required to use
17 social media to publicize this hearing. You covered the
18 social media posts and the reach and the clicks or
19 whatever the terms are on our use of social media to
20 publicize the project and gain feedback, but we also used
21 social media as required by the Chairman's procedural
22 order to publicize this hearing; correct?

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

24 And I spoke to it yesterday, but we placed ads
25 on Facebook and Instagram for a four-week period for this

1 hearing between August 12 and September 8, 2025, as well
2 as we did send e-mail notifications August 19 announcing
3 the project and providing details on the hearing and a
4 link to our project website.

5 Q. Okay. And the proof of the social media posts
6 and in addition the e-mail notifications you used to
7 provide notice of this hearing are found at APS-14?

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

9 Q. And then we -- you have a public outreach
10 summary which is in the application but updated and
11 marked as APS-15. You covered our public outreach
12 yesterday, but APS-15 summarizes that and includes
13 updates since the time we filed the application; is that
14 right?

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

16 Q. What did we miss?

17 What else do you want to tell the committee
18 before I send you home?

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Did you mention APS-10 yet?

20 MR. DERSTINE: APS-10. Let me see. I'm
21 guessing by your question we haven't. Yes, we did.
22 Well, he covered it.

23 BY MR. DERSTINE:

24 Q. But the proof of the website posting and
25 transcripts is at APS-10; correct?

1 A. (Mr. Eich) It is APS-10.

2 Q. Okay. And we covered APS-11, proof of delivery
3 to the affected jurisdictions, and then the supplement
4 that went out to the affected jurisdictions is under 12.

5 Do we have that right?

6 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes, correct.

7 Q. Okay.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: The only exhibits that I
9 don't have marked as being specifically mentioned is 21
10 and then 3, 4, and 5, which are with witness summaries.

11 You had them give those summarize when they
12 were introduced, but I don't think those exhibits were
13 specifically referenced at that time.

14 MR. DERSTINE: They weren't. Yeah, the
15 summaries, as you know, Chairman, we filed those in
16 advance to give notice of who our witnesses are and what
17 they plan to cover, but those -- yeah, those summaries I
18 think coincide with the testimony you heard during the
19 hearing this week.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: And then 21, that was the
21 Saint Holdings?

22 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, that's the letter of
23 support from Saint Holdings.

24 BY MR. DERSTINE:

25 Q. Do you want to speak that? I think you -- when

1 we covered towards the end of the day and I may have been
2 rushing you along, we -- you talked about the various
3 letters of support that we received from stakeholders or
4 agencies. One of the letters that we've received from
5 Saint Holdings. They're the developer/owner of the IPAZ
6 project; is that correct?

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

8 Q. And that letter of support is found at APS-21?

9 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes.

10 MR. DERSTINE: What else have we missed,
11 Mr. Chairman, on exhibits?

12 CHMN STAFFORD: I think that covers all of
13 your list of exhibits --

14 MR. EICH: If I may --

15 CHMN STAFFORD: -- except the proposed CEC
16 with the map of the corridor. That's the last thing.
17 But that's already been filed. You just covered that.

18 I prepared Chairman's 1 and 2 once you're
19 done presenting your case, so I think that's been
20 covered.

21 MR. DERSTINE: Right. All right. Very
22 good.

23 BY MR. DERSTINE:

24 Q. I'm sorry, Mr. Eich, you wanted to -- you had
25 something you wanted to add or cover?

1 A. (Mr. Eich) I apologize for --

2 Q. No.

3 A. (Mr. Eich) -- jumping in. I don't remember
4 talking about APS-22. Not sure if that was included.

5 Q. Oh, okay. You're right. Well, I think we --
6 Mr. Wiley covered the fact that ED-2 is a co-participant
7 in the line. They're sharing some of the costs. And
8 they plan to utilize, I guess, one of the underbuild 69kV
9 lines, but we also received a letter of support from
10 ED-2, and that's found at APS-22; is that right,
11 Mr. Eich?

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

13 Q. Okay. Thank you for catching that. We did not
14 specifically cover that.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: I had it checked off my
16 list, so it's doubly checked now.

17 MR. DERSTINE: I think what we have left,
18 we have -- there's some outstanding questions from
19 members of the committee that you wanted us to address.
20 We're prepared to do that.

21 I think that does conclude your testimony,
22 correct, Mr. Eich?

23 MR. EICH: Yes, that's correct.

24 MR. DERSTINE: So we have some of those
25 questions that we'd like to provide committee members

1 with answers to if you -- or should I formally move the
2 admission of our exhibits and --

3 CHMN STAFFORD: By all mean, please.

4 MR. DERSTINE: -- check that off?

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

6 MR. DERSTINE: Yes. We'd like to move the
7 admission of our exhibits. I think that runs through
8 APS-1 through 22 -- oh, 23. We covered the Commission
9 Staff letter. The route and itinerary map was marked as
10 APS-20. We used that on the tour yesterday, covered the
11 updated simulation.

12 BY MR. DERSTINE:

13 Q. I don't know, Mr. Petry, did we cover the State
14 Historic Preservation Office consultation package? I see
15 that identified as APS-18. That was included as part of
16 your testimony.

17 A. (Mr. Petry) I don't believe I referenced it
18 specifically, but when I gave testimony around our
19 coordination with the State Historic Preservation Office
20 it was generally speaking around what is included in that
21 exhibit.

22 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. And you did cover, I
23 guess, in some detail the communication back and forth
24 with the State Historic Preservation Office and the
25 communications we had with them and that we followed up

1 on their requests that we had, certain information and
2 sites to our application and covered those in terms of
3 our studies and analysis; right?

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

5 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. Anything else,
6 witness team, that I have missed on our exhibits?

7 (No response.)

8 MR. DERSTINE: Then I move the admission of
9 APS Exhibits 1 through 23.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. APS Exhibits 1
11 through 23 are admitted.

12 (Exhibits APS-1 through APS-23 admitted.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, I guess now do the
14 members have any additional questions?

15 And I thought you mentioned that there was
16 a couple outstanding questions to be covered.

17 MR. DERSTINE: There were. Well, if you'd
18 like, we can answer those questions that came up either
19 on day one or day two, and then if there's additional
20 questions from the committee, we're happy to address
21 those.

22 BY MR. DERSTINE:

23 Q. Mr. Eich, did you want to start us off?

24 A. (Mr. Eich) Sure.

25 Yesterday, Member Kryder, you had asked about

1 the numbers that were displayed regarding the numbers of
2 those who attended the virtual open house.

3 Q. His question was whether or not you had padded
4 the numbers by having all kind of APS employees visit the
5 site.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: We avoided the "P" word,
7 though.

8 BY MR. DERSTINE:

9 Q. Well, okay. All right.

10 A. (Mr. Eich) Thank you, Mr. Derstine.

11 But the methodology -- if I can describe it
12 clearly, the methodology used to track the visits to the
13 virtual open house site identifies unique IP addresses
14 used to visit the site and the browser through which they
15 attended the site. So although the platform can't
16 guarantee that these were all unique, but it is as close
17 to unique as we can get. So I don't know if that helps,
18 but --

19 Q. So the site visits, it only counts -- if I went
20 there five times, it would only count once, right?

21 A. (Mr. Eich) Yes. If you're using the same --

22 Q. Computer and browser.

23 A. (Mr. Eich) -- computer and browser, it would
24 only count it as one even if you went on to it five
25 times.

1 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you very much. Well
2 done.

3 MR. EICH: Thank you.

4 MR. DERSTINE: Any other questions that you
5 were going to address, Mr. Eich, or does Mr. Wiley have
6 the rest?

7 MR. EICH: I think that's all on my list.

8 BY MR. DERSTINE:

9 Q. All right. Mr. Wiley.

10 A. (Mr. Wiley) A couple different topics that we
11 wanted to come back to. First, Member Little, you had
12 asked on day one to come back with some cost differences
13 between what it would take to build a single-circuit
14 structure versus one that was capable of double-circuit
15 230kV.

16 We do have some rough order of magnitude cost
17 estimates to provide you, and this is for those
18 differences.

19 For the entirety of our PEIP project of which
20 this case is for about two-thirds of that, so we're
21 looking to build the Sundance all the way to Pinal
22 Central to Milligan. This is for that Pinal Central to
23 Milligan portion.

24 So the cost increase to go to double-circuit
25 capable structures over single-circuit is \$7.5 million.

1 That is due to the structures themselves being more
2 robust, so thicker structures, thicker steel requiring
3 more tonnage of steel to construct those. Essentially
4 we're adding more weight to the structures, additional
5 conductors. The structures need to be capable of
6 handling that.

7 Again, we don't always come forward and request
8 a double-circuit structure. We look for those
9 opportunities in a high growth and a likely area that's
10 going to see development in the future. In this location
11 we see both a high potential for load increase
12 specifically around the IPAZ area as well as a high
13 likelihood for future generation resource
14 interconnections. As we saw on the route tour, there's
15 numerous plants out there today.

16 Just some other costs I wanted to mention. If
17 we needed to come back in the future and remove those
18 single-circuit structures, that removal cost would be
19 about \$8.5 million. The cost of the single-circuit
20 structures would also be around 17 to \$18 million, so
21 those assets would no longer be utilized.

22 So in all if we had to come back and replace a
23 single circuit with a double circuit in the future, you'd
24 have approximately a little over three times the cost of
25 doing that up front.

1 In addition, a highway developing area might not
2 have the physical space to add in the future a slightly
3 larger right-of-way to accommodate a double-circuit
4 structure, and then you'd have higher land use and
5 environmental impacts by coming in and removing and
6 replacing those structures.

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you. That makes a
8 great deal of sense to me. Thank you very much. I
9 appreciate the fact that you guys have chosen to go this
10 route. I really do.

11 MR. WILEY: On a different topic,
12 Mr. Chairman, yesterday we had some discussions around
13 the canal crossings. But I believe we had stated that we
14 had not interacted with the owners of those canals at
15 this point.

16 We did want to make a slight correction to
17 that. We have engaged with George Cairo Engineering,
18 which is the facilitator of choice for both the BIA and
19 the BOR for these projects. So we have engaged with them
20 to start the permitting process for this project on
21 several of the canal crossings, and we'll continue to
22 work with them as we move forward in our detailed
23 engineering and design efforts.

24 Member Comstock, you had a couple of
25 questions yesterday regarding vegetation management. We

1 do have some information for you today on that. Our
2 vegetation management program includes a cyclical process
3 which is a three to four-year process where we would come
4 out and do maintenance in the area.

5 We do have an integrated vegetation
6 management program that includes manual, mechanical, and
7 herbicide controls. We target noncompatible species.
8 And by noncompatible I mean those that could impact
9 either reliability or the fuels in the area.

10 So all that to say we saw yesterday a lot
11 of lower lying desert shrub. Those types of species
12 would likely be able to remain, but any of the higher
13 species such as a higher growing tree, for example, would
14 need to be either trimmed or removed so that it does not
15 interfere with the clearance with our lines.

16 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

17 MR. WILEY: And lastly, I wanted to note a
18 couple of remarks regarding the interconnection into the
19 Pinal Central Substation. As previously discussed in CEC
20 136, the Sundance to Pinal Central 230kV line was sited.

21 And I mentioned that it would not connect
22 into Pinal Central. I wanted just to come back to that
23 to say that with this project we are not looking to
24 interconnect into Pinal Central, but we are looking at
25 that to still be a viable option in the future under the

1 conditions set forth in case 136.

2 We're looking for that flexibility should
3 load growth in the area change, the need for
4 interconnections of resources change, or other system
5 topologies change necessitating the need for that
6 interconnection.

7 This project is essentially combining the
8 corridors that are approved in case 136 with the
9 corridors that we've presented in this hearing. The
10 certificate of environmental compatibility evaluates the
11 environmental impacts in much detail, and those impacts
12 remain unchanged by not connecting into Pinal Central.

13 To address some of the reliability
14 concerns, APS follows and adheres to all applicable
15 standards and requirements related to transmission
16 planning and reliability of the system. That includes
17 many requirements that are separate and apart from the
18 line siting process.

19 Those are largely governed by FERC, the
20 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; NERC, the North
21 American Electric Reliability Corporation, and a specific
22 standard being TPO-001-5, which is a transmission
23 planning standard, and one of the requirements within
24 that standard requires transmission providers to
25 coordinate with other neighboring transmission providers.

1 Another governing agency is WECC, the
2 Western Electricity Coordinating Council.

3 In addition to the requirements set forth
4 by those governing agencies APS coordinates the
5 development of models that are used in reliability
6 analyses in various ways. One of those is at the Western
7 Electricity Coordinating Council level. We coordinate in
8 a base case collaboration process with all other entities
9 within WECC, so that's on an interconnection-wide
10 perspective.

11 On a more regional perspective, APS
12 participates in the WestConnect process, which is a
13 regional planning forum, and we coordinate projects like
14 PEIP are included in those planning models.

15 In a little bit more locally, we
16 participate in a group called the AZCC or Arizona
17 Coordinated Cases. In that process we coordinate the
18 details of those cases with other utilities within
19 Arizona.

20 BY MR. DERSTINE:

21 Q. Those are all the questions and answers that
22 were on your list, Mr. Wiley?

23 A. (Mr. Wiley) Yes.

24 Q. Okay. Mr. Petry, did you have any follow-ups?

25 A. (Mr. Petry) No.

1 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. I think with that
2 we'd like to thank you, but that concludes our
3 presentation, our testimony, and we appreciate your time
4 and attention.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

6 Are there any other questions from members?

7 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: I have no questions.

10 I just would really like to commend the
11 applicant on their process in siting this transmission
12 line. It's complete. I appreciate the presentation
13 leading us through all of -- all that you did to site the
14 transmission line. It was complete, professional, and I
15 appreciate the -- your cooperation with us and especially
16 your patience with all my questions and curiosity. I
17 appreciate that a lot.

18 And, of course, we cannot forget Peaks and
19 our court reporter. We could not do this without you
20 guys. Thank you.

21 MR. DERSTINE: That's right.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Would you like to give your
23 closing now, Mr. Derstine.

24 MR. DERSTINE: Well, I should probably take
25 my own advice, which is when I'm talking to associates

1 and other lawyers if it appears that the judge is going
2 your way, you should shut up and sit down, so I don't
3 want to ruin it, but maybe I'll take a few minutes and
4 try to wrap up the case here, and hopefully I don't spoil
5 whatever we had in place. Yeah.

6 MR. DERSTINE: I started my opening talking
7 about the history, the past and present for Pinal County.
8 We have the -- the county has an ancient history going
9 back to the Anasazi civilization. And then we have a
10 territorial history going back to 1875 when Pinal County
11 was formed. And the drivers of Pinal County's economy at
12 the time were mining and ranching and agriculture.

13 Today, Pinal County's history is being
14 defined by growth in the manufacturing and logistics
15 sectors of the economy. As I mentioned, Pinal County
16 grew 7 percent between 2018 and 2023, and the quote there
17 in the second bullet is from the article you see on
18 Slide 4 of my presentation from Arizona Big Media, "The
19 scale of development in Pinal County is reshaping the
20 Phoenix-Tucson corridor into a high-value industrial and
21 innovative engine."

22 And as I mentioned, Pinal County now hosts
23 multibillion dollar manufacturing plants and is home to a
24 number of large logistics projects that are planned,
25 including the 1600-acre IPAZ logistics and industrial

1 park that is being developed, and we were near that site
2 yesterday on the tour.

3 That growth in Pinal County that we're
4 seeing and anticipating is really what's driving the need
5 for this project. We have those growing energy needs in
6 terms of these manufacturing facilities, logistic
7 centers, and other businesses that have fairly
8 significant energy needs that are coming into Pinal
9 County.

10 The second part of the need that this
11 project solves is it allows APS to connect the Sundance
12 Power Plant to an APS transmission system without having
13 to continue to rely on WAPA's transmission system that
14 currently serves the Sundance plant. And Mr. Wiley
15 testified to the fact that WAPA has indicated that its
16 current transmission agreement with APS is running out,
17 and I think there's some concern and lack of certainty
18 over whether that will continue into the future.

19 And finally, the interconnection at the
20 Milligan Substation helps to improve overall system
21 reliability by adding these interconnections at
22 substations we're able to boost the overall system
23 reliability.

24 So that's the need.

25 You heard testimony from Mr. Petry and

1 Mr. Eich on the siting studies that were performed,
2 talked about the little spots on the links and what that
3 all meant. And we spent a fair amount of time on that.
4 And I was concerned we were maybe wasting the committee's
5 time, but it sounds like we were not, and you appreciated
6 hearing that and understanding that part of the story.

7 I think as Mr. Petry testified, we had over
8 700 preliminary links, each one of those little links was
9 a discrete segment that was then added together to create
10 segments, and then those segments were used to come up
11 with the transmission line route that was presented to
12 the public. And in developing those links into segments
13 into a route, we used, analyzed, and put a lot of
14 emphasis on looking for higher opportunity areas and
15 minimizing our impacts on locations that did not support
16 a transmission line.

17 So the project that we brought to you in
18 this application is a double-circuit 230kV transmission
19 line that will accommodate a 69kV underbuild.

20 The application as we've presented to you
21 carries a single preferred route. It's approximately
22 20 miles long shown on the accompanying slide here,
23 Slide 10. And we've also brought forward the two
24 subroutes. We did that because we wanted you to
25 understand kind of how the route developed and that the

1 decisions that were made in terms of the alignment of the
2 preferred route and how we took into account feedback
3 from landowners and developers and cities in the area.

4 The last bullet indicates the subroutes are
5 artifacts of our original preferred route that were left
6 behind when the preferred route was modified to get us to
7 the route that you see before you on the left screen.

8 This double-circuit 230kV line will
9 interconnect at the Milligan Substation here at the
10 south, as you know, travel following our black bold line
11 all the way to the north through the planned site for the
12 TS-25 Substation, future substation that will be
13 constructed, and this line will interconnect to when we
14 get the sufficient growth and need for it.

15 And the line continues north and works its
16 way over to the end of connection point with the Sundance
17 to Pinal Central line. Again, that's a wires-to-wires
18 connection. At that point at this stage of the project
19 and as Mr. Wiley testified in the future there may be a
20 need and support interconnection to Pinal Central itself,
21 but at this time we're not looking to do that as part of
22 this project or of -- for CEC 136.

23 Mr. Petry covered all the environmental
24 impacts of this project. He testified there'll be low
25 impacts on biological resources. We're not expected to

1 have any adverse impacts to cultural resources. Although
2 as he testified there are a number of identified cultural
3 sites within the corridor for the project. But APS will
4 use best practices and coordinate with the State Historic
5 Preservation Office in order to either span and avoid
6 those sites or coordinate in such a way so we preserve
7 those sites and do not adversely impact.

8 The project is compatible with existing and
9 planned recreational resources, and there are little or
10 no noise impacts from the project.

11 I think one of the reasons for the low
12 environmental impacts is as we saw out on the route tour
13 today we are ahead of much of the growth that we're
14 expecting in this area. It's a lot of open space at this
15 time. And so I think one of the real values of this
16 project is that we are ahead of growth. We're
17 anticipating growth. We need the ability to serve
18 growth. But we're ahead of it. And being able to site
19 this line now gives developers and landowners an
20 opportunity to understand where those electric facilities
21 are and they can plan accordingly. So I think that's a
22 real value.

23 And, again, the lack of development today
24 that we know is coming in the future allows us to site
25 this line in a way that minimizes environmental impacts.

1 And it's a good-looking group out there in the hot sun as
2 you can see from those photos. I snapped those while we
3 were out driving around.

4 Mr. Eich testified to the public outreach
5 and stakeholder outreach. We had a comprehensive and
6 extensive planning process as we touched on, and then we
7 also took as the project developed through that planning
8 process took what we found and took that information to
9 the public to gain their feedback and their input. We
10 used newsletters, in-person open houses, virtual open
11 house, project website, social media all to publicize
12 this project, and we had conducted agency and local
13 briefings, including our efforts to engage with the
14 tribes and gain their feedback concerning our project.

15 In my opening I said at the end of the case
16 we would ask that you grant us a CEC for this project for
17 the preferred route. We're requesting a 10-year term for
18 the first circuit which Mr. Wiley has testified to we
19 anticipate being in-service by 2027. The second circuit
20 will be constructed when we have the growth and the need
21 for it, when load demand requires that we have that
22 second circuit. It's important to plan for it today so
23 we have it available tomorrow and in the future and
24 without creating more environmental impacts from being
25 able to serve that growth.

1 That's the case. Thank you for your time.
2 Thank you for your attention. The work this committee
3 does is very important to the state of Arizona, to APS,
4 and we appreciate everything you do.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you, Mr. Derstine.

6 All right. If we can get the AV team to
7 put up Chairman's 1 and 2 on the screens.

8 Who will be our scrivener today? I guess
9 we should put Chairman's 2 on the screen closest to
10 Ms. McCoy.

11 Members, you have Chairman's 1, which is
12 the PDF version of the CEC on the tablets in front of
13 you. If you want to suggest an amendment, please
14 reference the page and line number of Chairman's 1.
15 Chairman 2 is the Word version. And if we make any
16 changes to that, then it's going to throw off the page
17 and line numbers.

18 Okay. I think let's take a five to
19 ten-minute break while they get this set up, and then
20 we'll come back and we will begin to deliberate on the
21 CEC. We stand in recess.

22 (Recess from 9:41 a.m. to 9:58 a.m.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. We have
24 Chairman's 1, which is the PDF version of the certificate
25 on the right screen, and Chairman's 2, which is the Word

1 version that we'll be making changes to if we so choose.

2 All the members should have a copy of Chairman's 1 either
3 on the tablet or a hard copy.

4 All right. Members, take a moment to
5 review the introduction, please.

6 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
7 adoption of the introduction.

8 MEMBER FRENCH: Second.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

10 All right. The only thing we'll need to
11 add to it is the vote count at the end.

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

14 (A chorus of "ayes.")

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the
18 introduction is adopted.

19 Moving on to the project description.

20 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Ms. Benally.

22 MS. BENALLY: Linda Benally on behalf of
23 APS. I just have one edit, which is on line 15 the word
24 "project," I propose that we change it from a lowercase p
25 to an upper case P.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Noted.

2 Can I get a motion?

3 MEMBER DICICCIO: Motion to approve,

4 Mr. Chair.

5 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

7 Further discussion?

8 Now, for this one, usually there's a lot
9 more detail in the description part, but that will be
10 accounted for in the Exhibit A. If you look at APS-7
11 after the map, there's a detailed written description of
12 the route, including describing what side of the road it
13 may be limited to and of the corridor.

14 So I think with that I intend to include
15 that in the Exhibit A so there won't be -- there's not a
16 need to spell that detail out here in the actual project
17 description portion.

18 MEMBER FRENCH: Mr. Chairman.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member French.

20 MEMBER FRENCH: In that written description
21 does it describe the structure heights?

22 CHMN STAFFORD: No. That's in a different
23 spot.

24 MEMBER FRENCH: Got it.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. So the project

1 description has been moved and seconded.

2 Can I get a motion to amend it to
3 incorporate the change raised by Ms. Benally about
4 changing the project on page 3, line 15 from a small p to
5 a capital P?

6 And I would suggest another addition in the
7 last sentence -- well, the penultimate sentence I should
8 say where after it says, "The map," we would also include
9 the word "and description." So the sentence would read,
10 "The map and description of the final approved project
11 including the project corridor is included as Exhibit A."

12 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair, I'll amend my
13 motion to include those two changes.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: We need a new motion to
15 amend. And I think Member Fant just moved that, so if
16 you would second his motion to amend.

17 MEMBER DICICCIO: Yeah.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent.

19 Further discussion on the motion to amend?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

22 (A chorus of "ayes.")

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the project

1 description is amended.

2 Can I get a motion to adopt the project
3 description as amended?

4 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

5 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, project
13 description as amended is adopted.

14 Moving on to the conditions.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I approve
16 condition -- or I move Condition 1.

17 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Further
19 discussion?

20 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mayor, just a quick
21 comment.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Please, Member Diccicio.

23 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair. Just a quick
24 point that I do like in this is the 20-year. It allows
25 them to be able to plan ahead and allows individuals to

1 be able to see what's going to be happening in an area so
2 that people that are going to be doing other types of
3 developments, housing in particular, would know that this
4 is where the line's going to go.

5 And it creates an incredible amount of
6 transparency the further out you go because it allows
7 individuals to see what's going to happen sometime in the
8 future. And I like that a lot. That's good for
9 individuals because I've seen this happen before where
10 people move into an area and say, Well, I didn't know
11 that power line was coming in here. You know, so now it
12 allows them to be able to judge and be able to make their
13 purchase decisions well in advance.

14 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. Condition 1 has
16 been moved and seconded. Is that -- further discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

19 (A chorus of "ayes.")

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 1
23 is adopted.

24 Moving on to Condition 2.

25 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move

1 Condition 2.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

6 (A chorus of "ayes.")

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 2
10 is adopted.

11 Number 3.

12 MEMBER FRENCH: I move Condition 3.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

17 (A chorus of "ayes.")

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 3
21 is adopted.

22 Number 4.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

24 Condition 4.

25 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?
2 (No response.)
3 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
4 (A chorus of "ayes.")
5 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
6 (No response.)
7 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 4
8 is adopted.
9 Number 5.
10 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair, I move condition
11 Number 5.
12 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.
13 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?
14 I'm looking to you, Member Little.
15 MEMBER LITTLE: Thank you.
16 CHMN STAFFORD: Is this -- does it have the
17 correct sections that you would like to see?
18 MEMBER LITTLE: It does. It's exactly
19 right. And thank you very much for including.
20 CHMN STAFFORD: Condition 5 is moved and
21 seconded.
22 Further discussion?
23 (No response.)
24 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
25 (A chorus of "ayes.")

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 5
4 is adopted.

5 Number 6.

6 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move
7 Condition 6.

8 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?
10 (No response.)

11 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
12 (A chorus of "ayes.")

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
14 (No response.)

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 6
16 is adopted.

17 Number 7.

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move
19 Condition 7 be adopted.

20 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

22 Mr. Derstine or Ms. Benally, so the --

23 under this condition the applicant will do Class 3
24 cultural inventories of the final right-of-way even on
25 private land; correct?

1 MS. BENALLY: That's correct.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And in your
3 conversations with SHPO, were they satisfied with this
4 condition?

5 I know they had proposed some different
6 ones in the past and we kind of went around on sorting
7 out the language, and this is where we ended up.

8 Did they have any inputs about this
9 proposed condition?

10 MS. BENALLY: Let me defer to Mr. Petry and
11 just confirm that I think that they did not have any
12 additional comments.

13 MR. PETRY: Mr. Chairman, we did not confer
14 with the SHPO on this particular CEC condition. But in
15 our coordination with the SHPO and the description I had
16 provided previously around the steps we would take to
17 avoid cultural resources the State Historic Preservation
18 Office has been in support of that approach.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Excellent. All right.
20 Condition 7 has been moved and seconded.

21 Further discussion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

24 (A chorus of "ayes.")

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 7
3 is adopted.

4 Number 8.

5 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

7 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Line 14, last word
8 "promptly" seems somewhat ambiguous to give guidance to
9 individuals during construction in the area. It seems
10 like we could tighten that up a little bit.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, that's directly from
12 the statute.

13 MEMBER COMSTOCK: That is.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: That's the term in the
15 statute is "promptly."

16 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Is "promptly" defined in
17 a time frame?

18 CHMN STAFFORD: No, it's -- I believe it
19 has to stand within the general reasonableness test.

20 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, this is from
21 the statute, then?

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, I believe so. I mean,
23 I'll ask the other lawyers in the room.

24 Mr. Derstine, Ms. Benally?

25 MR. DERSTINE: Well, I was just going to

1 pull up the statute and take a look at it.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: I think that would be
3 great.

4 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Diciccio.

6 MEMBER DICICCIO: What other word would you
7 use? I mean, I don't know -- promptly seems pretty -- I
8 mean, I'm fine with it. But I'm just curious if there's
9 another word that could be used even if we could.

10 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Comstock.

12 MEMBER COMSTOCK: In other utility work
13 promptly is not allowed to be used because it doesn't
14 give a time frame in order to notify appropriate
15 officials of the discovery or the action that's happening
16 out there. And it's usually defined by a time frame one
17 hour, two hours after the discovery of the issue or the
18 activity that's out there. That's from my past
19 experience.

20 So if it's in the statute and it is
21 relevant, that's fine. But promptly is somewhat
22 ambiguous in terms of giving direction.

23 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Ms. Benally.

25 MS. BENALLY: I'm looking at the statute

1 for ARS 41-844(a), and it does use the word promptly.
2 And I'll just read an excerpt of it. "Within the state
3 shall report promptly to the director of the Arizona
4 state museum the existence of any archaeological,
5 paleontological, or historic site or object that is at
6 least 50 years old," et cetera, et cetera.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: That's the standard from
8 the statute, so I thought it best not to deviate from
9 that.

10 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Don't change the statute.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Because we're not adding
12 any conditions that -- beyond what the statute requires.
13 We're just calling it out because one of our
14 responsibilities is to -- you know, one of the many nine
15 factors I believe in the 360.06 that says we have to
16 consider these archaeological and historical sites are
17 things we have to consider so we call it out directly.

18 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Thank you.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Has Condition 8 been moved?
20 I don't believe it's been moved yet.

21 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move
22 Condition 8.

23 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
2 (A chorus of "ayes.")
3 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
4 (No response.)
5 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 8
6 is adopted.
7 Number 9.
8 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move
9 Condition 9.
10 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.
11 (Reporter clarification.)
12 CHMN STAFFORD: Condition 9, further
13 discussion?
14 (No response.)
15 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
16 (A chorus of "ayes.")
17 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
18 (No response.)
19 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 9
20 is adopted.
21 Number 10.
22 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move
23 approval of Condition 10.
24 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.
25 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

3 (A chorus of "ayes.")

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 10

7 is adopted.

8 Number 11.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

10 Condition 11.

11 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 11

19 is adopted.

20 Number 12.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move

22 approval of Condition 12.

23 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

2 (A chorus of "ayes.")

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 12
6 is adopted.

7 Number 13.

8 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Ms. Benally.

10 MS. BENALLY: APS would like to ask the
11 committee to consider making a slight change to the
12 beginning language of Condition 13.

13 So instead of stating at least 90 days
14 before construction commences on the project, APS is
15 proposing that language to be revised to read "Upon
16 approval of this certificate by the ACC, the project --
17 that the applicant shall provide" so forth, so forth.

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
19 Should we get it on the table first?

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. She's just making
21 suggestions because we haven't moved it yet, so --

22 MEMBER KRYDER: That's right.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: She's just getting it on
24 record before we start moving and shaking and it's too
25 late and we have to go back and reopen it.

1 So if we could get a motion to adopt 13
2 then we can make those changes.

3 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I'll move
4 approval of Condition 13.

5 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Now I'll
7 entertain a motion to amend it to make the changes that
8 Ms. Benally suggested.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: So moved.

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: So let's see, let's get it
12 on the screen, and then I'll read that one sentence.

13 It would just be Commission at this point
14 in the document.

15 All right. So the motion before us is to
16 amend Condition 13 for the first sentence to read, "Upon
17 approval of this certificate by the Commission, the
18 applicant shall provide Pinal County, ADOT, ASLD, the
19 City of Eloy, the City of Coolidge, and known builders
20 and developers who are building upon or developing land
21 within one mile of the center line of the project with a
22 written description, including the approximate height and
23 width measurements of all structure types of the
24 project."

25 That is the motion.

1 All in favor say "aye."

2 (A chorus of "ayes.")

3 MEMBER HILL: Mr. Chair.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Hill. Are you
5 voting aye or nay?

6 MEMBER HILL: I have a question.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, it's in the middle of
8 a vote. You'll have to ask your question in a minute.

9 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment
13 is adopted.

14 Member Hill.

15 MEMBER HILL: Well, I thought that we
16 discussed before we voted. But I guess I just wanted to
17 understand the request of this change.

18 Is it that the Corporation Commission
19 approval may be less than 90 days before you start
20 construction?

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Benally.

22 MS. BENALLY: Member Hill, I believe that's
23 correct. The company may start construction, you know,
24 shortly after we get approval.

25 MEMBER HILL: Okay. So how much -- what, I

1 mean, as a practical matter, are you giving them at least
2 a month or two months or how shy are you of 90 days?

3 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Wiley, could I have you
4 respond to Member Hill?

5 MR. WILEY: Member Hill, I want to ensure
6 that I understand the question. I believe the question
7 was when do we anticipate commencing construction?

8 MEMBER HILL: Yes.

9 MR. WILEY: We have yet to have a
10 definitive time frame for construction. We believe we'll
11 be starting at the turn of the year.

12 MR. DERSTINE: And then how much in advance
13 of your planned commencement of construction can the
14 company provide notice? Member Hill's concern is if
15 you're not giving 90 days, how much notice are you
16 giving?

17 MR. WILEY: We would provide notice
18 following the approval of the certificate by the
19 Commission. I believe that time frame's going to be
20 dependent on when the certificate would be approved by
21 the Commission.

22 MEMBER HILL: So the Commission doesn't get
23 to this until mid-October, you would only be in a
24 position to give maybe 70 days' notice or something along
25 that line. So do you intend -- let me rephrase my

1 question.

2 Do you anticipate being able to give at
3 least 60 days' notice --

4 MR. WILEY: Member Hill.

5 MEMBER HILL: -- before commencing
6 construction?

7 MR. WILEY: Member Hill, I do anticipate at
8 least 60 days' notice.

9 MEMBER HILL: Okay. I just wanted to
10 understand the scope of this challenge for you guys, so I
11 appreciate you taking a moment to have that conversation.

12 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Diciccio.

14 MEMBER DICICCIO: Just a clarification, a
15 lot of this depends on the approval from Commission;
16 correct? So then you're dependent upon a third party --

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Move closer to your mic,
18 please.

19 MEMBER DICICCIO: You're still dependent
20 upon a separate party making that decision; correct?

21 MR. WILEY: Member Diciccio, that is
22 correct.

23 MEMBER DICICCIO: And so that's why the
24 verbiage was the way it was, that you asked for.

25 MR. WILEY: Member DiCiccio, that is

1 correct.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Under the statute the
3 Commission has to accept, reject, or modify this
4 committee's decision no earlier than 30 days and no later
5 than 60 days after we file it with the Commission. So
6 they're under a pretty tight time frame to act.

7 MEMBER DICICCIO: I did not know that.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: And so it's not like it can
9 linger at the Commission for 90 days. It's not --

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: Okay.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: That's not possible.

12 MEMBER DICICCIO: I did not know that.

13 So, Member Hill, does that satisfy your
14 concerns with the amendment to 13 or do we need to -- are
15 you going to make a motion to change it again?

16 MEMBER HILL: No, I think this is fine. I
17 just wanted to understand the scope of the challenge.
18 That's all.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. I mean, I'm
20 impressed. They'll actually begin construction that
21 quickly.

22 MEMBER DICICCIO: Good luck.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So Condition 13
24 has been amended.

25 Can I get a motion to adopt it as amended?

1 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.
2 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.
3 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?
4 (No response.)
5 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
6 (A chorus of "ayes.")
7 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
8 (No response.)
9 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 13
10 as amended is adopted.
11 Number 14.
12 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move
13 Condition 14.
14 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.
15 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.
16 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?
17 (No response.)
18 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."
19 (A chorus of "ayes.")
20 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?
21 (No response.)
22 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 14
23 is adopted.
24 Number 15.
25 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move

1 approval of Condition 15.

2 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

6 (A chorus of "ayes.")

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 15
10 is adopted.

11 Number 16.

12 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
13 Condition 16.

14 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

18 (A chorus of "ayes.")

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 16
22 is adopted.

23 Number 17.

24 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
25 Condition 17.

1 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

2 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, one minute,
4 Ms. Benally.

5 MS. BENALLY: Thank you.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: The condition has been
7 moved. Have I heard a second?

8 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

9 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion,
11 Ms. Benally.

12 MS. BENALLY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 Sorry for the interruption.

14 APS is proposing a revision to this
15 language. There's a particular reference to the system
16 impact studies, and my understanding is that there is the
17 SIS that we discussed on the record the last couple of
18 days but there's also other studies that fall under the
19 umbrella of the 10-year transmission system plan.

20 So we're proposing language that is a
21 little bit broader than just a system impact study. So
22 I'm happy to phrase that language if the committee is in
23 agreement or would like to hear the language.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah, I'd like to hear a
25 little bit more about that. I know because you've given

1 Staff the system impact study, the preliminary -- I guess
2 it's -- it'll be final until WAPA has suggestions to it;
3 correct?

4 MS. BENALLY: That's correct.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And so if they were
6 to make changes, this condition would require you to
7 submit that to Staff, not file a docket but provide to
8 Staff. And then my understanding was that before you
9 could string the second circuit you'd have to conduct a
10 separate system impact study for that. And this
11 condition would require you to file that -- provide that
12 to Staff as well.

13 You've mentioned that there was other
14 things that you would provide?

15 MS. BENALLY: So I think relative. And
16 Mr. Wiley can correct me where I misstate, but my
17 understanding is if we are going to be stringing the
18 second circuit or when we string the second circuit, the
19 studies likely will be conducted under the umbrella of
20 the 10-year Transmission System Plan, which basically
21 studies the reliability impacts of the transmission line
22 on the system. And so it's not just a system impact
23 study that will be conducted.

24 In this particular project the SIS was
25 impacted because we're interconnecting into the WAPA

1 system, so the SIS was required. But there would be
2 studies that are broader relative to the reliability
3 impacts of the system which are then, again, under the
4 umbrella of the 10-year Transmission System Plan.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

6 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member DiCiccio.

8 MEMBER DICICCIO: So, I mean, I like the
9 verbiage the way it is, but because it says that once you
10 get your receipt, but if you have to get a new one, you
11 would have to provide that information as well.

12 Am I off on this thing?

13 CHMN STAFFORD: That's what I was going
14 for.

15 MEMBER DICICCIO: It just seems logical
16 once you get your receipt, then you have 15 days to turn
17 it in. And then if you have to do any additional work,
18 you would be submitting that as well.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: I guess the difference is
20 that sometimes it's not called a system impact study, and
21 that's what you're trying clarify, I believe,
22 Ms. Benally.

23 MS. BENALLY: That is correct. We were
24 just broadening the term of the study that you're
25 referencing.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. And then are we
2 going to hear from Mr. Wiley?

3 Does he have something to share on this?

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

6 MEMBER LITTLE: Could we hear the language
7 that's being proposed by the applicant first?

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. I thought Mr. Wiley
9 was going to explain that, and then we'd see what the
10 actual language was.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Okay.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Because I assume it's going
13 to be a different term other than the system impact
14 study, and I'd like him to explain what that means before
15 we start getting into the nitty gritty of what the
16 language of the condition would be.

17 Mr. Wiley.

18 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, system impact
19 studies -- the term system impact study is not utilized
20 for all relevant transmission planning analyses as
21 Ms. Benally referenced. Sometimes these analyses come in
22 different forms such as the studies associated with our
23 10-year transmission plan and likewise the biannual
24 transmission assessment.

25 In this particular case, a study was

1 required outside of that to incorporate the changes of
2 not connecting into the Pinal Central Substation, which
3 was not directly analyzed in the 10-Year Plan study.
4 That drove the need to perform a system impact study
5 separate and apart from the 10-Year Plan and BTA studies
6 and analyses.

7 The terms here, and Ms. Benally I think
8 will read the proposed language in a second, just gives a
9 broader umbrella of all relevant transmission planning
10 analyses.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Thank you for that
12 now.

13 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: May I add to that that from
16 an engineering perspective, I think that the broader
17 studies that were referenced by Mr. Wiley are more
18 complete and give a better picture of the impact on the
19 whole western grid, if you will, or a portion of it.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

21 Ms. Benally, I think we're ready to hear
22 your proposed language.

23 MS. BENALLY: "The applicant shall provide
24 Commission Staff with a copy of all completed, relevant
25 studies that show the reliability impact of the project

1 to Commission Staff within 30 days of completion."

2 MR. DERSTINE: I think you have Commission
3 Staff twice there.

4 MS. BENALLY: I'm sorry?

5 MR. DERSTINE: I think we said Commission
6 Staff twice there.

7 MS. BENALLY: Oh, did I say it twice?

8 MR. DERSTINE: Yeah, okay.

9 MS. BENALLY: Okay. So let's just strike
10 the second Commission Staff reference.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Let's see if
12 Ms. McCoy can encapsulate that on our screens before us.
13 And then once she has, we can entertain a motion to make
14 the amendment to Condition 17.

15 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Just for my clarification,
18 we're really looking at two different significant pieces
19 here. The first is the current project SIS is not
20 complete because of WAPA, and so we want to address that.

21 And then the second piece deals with the
22 second 230 line. So we need to make sure that both sides
23 of this get captured adequately in the SIS and the
24 ancillary studies that were mentioned or addressed are
25 included here.

1 Do I have that right?

2 I guess I'm asking that of you,
3 Mr. Chairman, but it would be for Mr. Wiley.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: I think that is right, but
5 I think it also includes the impact of connecting this
6 line to the CEC 136 that is not going to Pinal Central
7 Substation as it was originally certified. I
8 think there's -- my recollection is that the route covers
9 where it is, but it allows it to connect. But instead of
10 connecting at Pinal Central at this time it will connect
11 with this line, and that's another thing that needs to be
12 addressed in the 10-Year Plan.

13 Is that correct, Mr. Wiley?

14 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that is
15 correct, that there are two components that are kind of
16 encapsulated here. One is the first circuit we will have
17 a system impact study. A study's been conducted. It's
18 awaiting final review and approval from the Western Area
19 Power Administration.

20 The second circuit likely will not have a
21 standalone call it maybe an off-cycle system impact
22 study. That would likely be analyzed through a more
23 typical means such as the 10-year transmission plan and
24 the biannual transmission assessment.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: And that would also include

1 the connection of the -- that would also address the
2 connection of the 136 line to this line as opposed to the
3 Pinal Central Substation; correct?

4 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, the system impact
5 study that we've been discussing is evaluating the
6 Sundance to Milligan connection without Pinal Central.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

8 MR. WILEY: Should we connect into Pinal
9 Central in the future, the same relevant studies, the
10 10-year transmission plan or the biannual transmission
11 assessment, would cover such interconnection to Pinal
12 Central.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So that -- so that
14 would allow -- you'd have to do additional study if you
15 decided to connect this line with -- the 136 line to
16 Pinal Central then? That could be -- because that's
17 already certificated to do that. You're not doing it
18 now. You could do that, but you'd have to do an
19 additional study for that, and that would be provided to
20 the Commission under this condition?

21 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that's
22 correct. Future interconnections into Pinal Central
23 would be updated in our modeling for the 10-Year Plan and
24 biannual transmission assessments.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Does that reflect

1 everything that you wanted to get, Ms. Benally?

2 MS. BENALLY: That's correct.

3 And then just a final statement that the
4 second circuit that has the 20-year term will require the
5 broader I think studies that are governed under the
6 10-year Transmission System Plan study.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. All right. So are
8 we ready for the language?

9 Is it ready, Ms. McCoy? All right.

10 So Ms. Benally is suggesting and a member
11 will have to make a motion to amendment Condition 17 to
12 read, "The applicant shall provide Commission Staff with
13 a copy of all completed final relevant studies that show
14 the reliability impact of the project within 30 days of
15 completion of such studies."

16 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

17 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

19 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

21 MEMBER KRYDER: Does that address the
22 several points fully? You're convinced that that covers
23 all of them?

24 CHMN STAFFORD: I believe so. I think
25 Mr. Wiley has confirmed it at least twice now, that this

1 will address the final decision of WAPA and then any kind
2 of studies that will have to be conducted for the
3 stringing of the second circuit.

4 MEMBER KRYDER: Okay. If the experts are
5 convinced of this, and their testimony is on record to
6 that end, I'm satisfied with it. The language -- not
7 being an engineer, I have to step back from looking at
8 the language in the usual contract sense. Thank you very
9 much, Mr. Wiley, and Chairman.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. The amendment
11 has been moved and seconded.

12 Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the
19 amendment's adopted.

20 Can I get a motion to adopt the condition
21 as amended?

22 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move
23 adoption of Condition 17 as amended.

24 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

1 (No response.)

2 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

3 (A chorus of "ayes.")

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

5 (No response.)

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 17
7 as amended is adopted.

8 Number 18.

9 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
10 Condition 18.

11 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

15 (A chorus of "ayes.")

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 18
19 is adopted.

20 Number 19.

21 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Comstock.

23 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Just a comment. Because
24 of the length and term of this CEC and the anticipated
25 development of the area where it is going to be

1 constructed, I have a little concern with the term of
2 existing natural gas and hazardous pipelines to be
3 assessed for electrical mitigation over the period of
4 time if they come within 100 feet.

5 There's going to be a lot of building down
6 here, and there's a going to be a lot of utility lines
7 installed, and electrical mitigation and the resulting
8 dispersal of corrosion on steel pipelines is a real
9 issue. And so it seems to me over a 30-year period there
10 should be some capability of the applicant to share the
11 cost of the associated study to make sure that those
12 adverse effects are not happening on a pipeline as it's
13 installed based on the development that's coming into the
14 area.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

16 MEMBER COMSTOCK: I'm sure it's in statute
17 that it says existing, but I just wanted to make sure
18 that's on the record.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, this isn't -- this
20 isn't in the statute. I believe this condition evolved
21 over time. I think it was added by the committee and
22 then adopted by the Commission or it may have been added
23 by the Commission and then subsequently added to every
24 CEC since the Commission's adoption of it.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: The latter is the --

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Commission added it first?

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Not the Commission,
5 Commission Staff.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Commission Staff.

7 Okay. It was their suggestion. And then it's been
8 appropriated to the one since then.

9 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, could we get
10 this on the table? If so, I move approval of it.

11 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: I thought we had moved --

13 MEMBER KRYDER: I think we did not.

14 MEMBER HILL: No.

15 MEMBER KRYDER: So now it is moved and
16 seconded.

17 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Now on to further
19 discussion of Condition 19.

20 MEMBER DICICCIO: Mr. Chair.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member DiCiccio.

22 MEMBER DICICCIO: Was the idea that any new
23 entity would have to pay their proportional impact?

24 I mean, so let's see APS or whoever paid
25 \$100,000, and then a new entity coming forward five years

1 from now would have to pay their proportionate share?

2 Is that what they --

3 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm not clear. I'm going
4 to ask the applicant. Because every CEC since I don't
5 know what year was it in the '90s --

6 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: -- early aughts, Member
8 Little?

9 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: They include --

11 MEMBER LITTLE: This is the Steve Olea
12 condition.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Pardon?

14 MEMBER LITTLE: This is the Steve Olea
15 condition.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. And it's been --
17 it's been added since I think I believe the early '90s or
18 early aughts they've been putting these. And they
19 haven't -- and it's typically -- the way I understand it
20 is that, you know, if there's an existing gas line and
21 you're going to put new transmission there, then you're
22 going to have to do the studies to make sure that it's --
23 any impacts are mitigated.

24 Now if you're building a new gas line, I
25 believe that that new gas -- the new gas line would have

1 the duty to make sure that it's mitigated and pay for
2 that as opposed to imposing those costs on the applicant.

3 Now, Ms. Benally, how is it -- how have you
4 seen this play out in real life when new gas construction
5 occurs near your existing transmission lines as opposed
6 to you building a new transmission line near existing gas
7 lines?

8 MS. BENALLY: I may have to refer to one of
9 our witnesses. Perhaps Mr. Wiley can address that.

10 My experience has been really those that
11 are existing as opposed to any new gas lines. So if
12 you'll give me a moment just to kind of contemplate or
13 Mr. Wiley may have a response.

14 MR. WILEY: Ms. Benally, I believe that's
15 correct based on my experience with this condition.

16 I'll also note that the evaluation will be
17 performed for the first circuit. The second circuit
18 would be on the same set of structures.

19 If there is a future gas line to come into
20 the vicinity, that would need to be evaluated for the
21 impacts of the first circuit, which are on the same set
22 of structures. So I think it would be captured
23 inherently with that first circuit being constructed
24 within the 10-year term.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Now, Ms. Benally or

1 Mr. Derstine, do you -- I appreciate the suggestion by
2 Mr. Comstock, but I'm -- this is a public service
3 corporation with captive ratepayers, and if under the
4 current scheme the new -- the financial obligation to
5 perform any studies for new gas line construction, if it
6 falls on the gas company, I would be loathe to shift that
7 burden of that cost to the utility -- the electric
8 utility.

9 It's they have to do this because they're
10 installing a new infrastructure, but once they're in
11 place, I think the way I understood it would be that the
12 costs of any kind of study would be borne by the new gas
13 construction, not the ratepayers of the electric utility.

14 Is that how this has functioned in the real
15 world, Mr. Derstine?

16 MR. DERSTINE: That's my understanding.
17 I'm certainly not an expert in cathodic protection
18 studies and how they're performed. But timing-wise, I
19 would think what this condition requires is that APS
20 perform the studies to judge and ensure that there's no
21 adverse impacts on any existing natural gas lines.

22 Once the line is constructed with the first
23 circuit, then that is in place, and then if there are new
24 natural gas facilities that are sited and work their way
25 in the vicinity of the project, then I think the natural

1 gas shipper or pipeline entity would have the obligation,
2 then, to perform those studies at their cost. That's my
3 understanding.

4 Is that in line with your thinking,
5 Mr. Wiley?

6 MR. WILEY: Mr. Derstine, that is correct
7 in line with my understanding as well.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

9 Does that help you with this condition,
10 Member Comstock?

11 MEMBER COMSTOCK: It explains it, but it
12 doesn't help me with it, so but I understand.

13 MEMBER FANT: Mr. Chair.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Fant.

15 MEMBER FANT: If I may make a suggestion.
16 I don't think we're worried about gas distribution
17 systems. I think we're worried about interstate or
18 intrastate pipelines.

19 Would that help if that were put in front
20 of the language natural gas or hazardous if it said
21 within the feet of -- within the feet of any -- you
22 dropped existing and put any intrastate or interstate
23 natural gas or hazardous pipeline?

24 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

1 MEMBER LITTLE: It's my opinion that the
2 intent of this condition was and should remain that if
3 somebody new comes in with something that might impact
4 something that's already there, it's up to the people
5 that are bringing in the new stuff to pay for studies to
6 ensure that there won't be negative impacts on what's
7 already there.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you. I'm inclined to
9 agree with you.

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: I'm on board with that
11 too, Mr. Chair.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: So we've moved and seconded
13 Condition 19; is that correct?

14 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Do any members wish to
16 proposed an amendment to this while we're on it?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, further
19 discussion.

20 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

22 MEMBER KRYDER: An engineering question
23 perhaps to Mr. Wiley or to Member Toby.

24 With the second 230 line would a potential
25 second 230 line change the impact that this project would

1 have on whatever existing lines, gas lines were in place?

2 Would bringing in that second line

3 potentially cause the need for a new evaluation or not?

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, that's a good
5 question, and I do not know the answer.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: Someone before the courts
7 should probably at least throw a dart at it.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: So the issue is that
9 whether -- is if -- okay. So the scenario we're looking
10 at is APS builds -- constructs the first circuit and it's
11 in service. There were no existing pipelines, so they
12 didn't perform any studies for that circuit.

13 Between the energizing of that first
14 circuit, a new natural gas pipeline is constructed within
15 100 feet of the line. The obligation or understanding is
16 that the obligation would be on the natural gas company
17 to evaluate the impacts of the line on their new
18 infrastructure. So if they determine that it's -- they
19 mitigate whatever impacts are and they do install that
20 line.

21 Then 10 years later APS decided to string
22 the second circuit. Would this condition require that
23 APS conduct a study to define -- to determine the effect
24 of that second circuit on the existing gas
25 infrastructure?

1 I guess I'm looking at the applicant's
2 lawyers first, and then maybe Mr. Wiley will have
3 something to add.

4 MR. DERSTINE: I'm looking to Mr. Wiley to
5 back me up on this. But my understanding is that the
6 cathodic protection studies that will be performed for
7 the first circuit, once those are in place, that the risk
8 of a -- you know, I think what we're looking for is if
9 there is a failure on the natural gas pipeline that you
10 don't have a cascading effect that impacts the
11 transmission facilities.

12 And so my understanding is that by once we
13 get to the point of constructing the second circuit that
14 risk is not greater and does not have to be restudied.
15 In fact, I think that depending on the phasing of the
16 second circuit, et cetera, that the risk either stays the
17 same or it's reduced such that the original cathodic
18 protection studies cover the second circuit.

19 Is that in line with your thinking?

20 Do I have that correct?

21 MR. WILEY: Mr. Derstine, I would need to
22 conference with one of our subject matter experts and
23 willing to do so if we could have a quick recess, but I
24 can't say that with certainty, Mr. Derstine.

25 MR. DERSTINE: Okay. But do you have a

1 view of we're required to perform the studies for the
2 construction of the line and the first circuit, do you
3 have a view that we'd have to then restudy it once you're
4 to the point of subjecting the second circuit or you're
5 just not -- you don't have the information to be able to
6 answer that at this point?

7 MR. WILEY: Mr. Derstine, it's more of the
8 later.

9 MR. DERSTINE: Okay.

10 MR. WILEY: I would need to conference to
11 see what the impacts of that second circuit would be.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Right. Because it seems to
13 be there's a factual issue whether or not there is a
14 marginal effect of the second circuit on the cathodic
15 protection of the line.

16 MR. DERSTINE: Right.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: So that's something that's
18 indeterminate at this point.

19 I'm comfortable with leaving this condition
20 as it is if -- I guess we can -- it's been moved and
21 seconded. I guess we can proceed with the vote unless
22 one of the -- unless a member wants to propose an
23 amendment, and we can move, second that, and discuss
24 that.

25 MEMBER KRYDER: No. I think this is going

1 to be a lot of fun in court.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, I got to think that
3 if it hasn't happened yet, then I guess it's probably --
4 it's probably less likely to happen because they've --
5 they've been -- APS has been building these transmission
6 lines for quite some time. I believe over 100 years,
7 isn't it?

8 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, over 125 years.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Yeah. So I -- and if they
10 haven't come across this problem in the real world, I
11 think we probably don't need to craft a solution to it
12 here.

13 MEMBER KRYDER: I'll find that acceptable.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

15 Condition 19 has been moved and seconded.

16 Further discussion?

17 (No response.)

18 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

19 (A chorus of "ayes.")

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

21 MEMBER COMSTOCK: No.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: One opposed.

23 The condition is adopted.

24 Condition 20.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

1 Condition 20.

2 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

4 I just want to confirm with the applicant
5 that the right-of-way is 120 feet and the maximum height
6 would be 200 feet?

7 MS. BENALLY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

11 (A chorus of "ayes.")

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 20
15 is adopted.

16 Number 21.

17 MEMBER DICICCIO: Motion to approve,
18 Mr. Chair.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Can I get a second for 21?

20 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

22 I just want to confirm with the applicant
23 that December 1, that's the correct date? I believe
24 that's the filing that APS typically makes all its
25 compilings for?

1 MS. BENALLY: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

3 (No response.)

4 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

5 (A chorus of "ayes.")

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 21
9 is adopted.

10 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move
11 approval of Condition 22.

12 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. I just want to
14 make sure that the applicant saw that the change -- that
15 the Condition 21 that we've already adopted requires the
16 compliance filings with the Commission until the second
17 circuit is actually constructed.

18 MEMBER KRYDER: Right.

19 MS. BENALLY: Yes, we did see that
20 addition, Mr. Chairman, and APS is fine with that.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Good. I just wanted
22 to confirm that because the obligation to give the
23 transmission studies for the second circuit if that
24 obligation to file expired with the installation of the
25 first circuit that would not be a very effective

1 condition.

2 Condition 22. I believe you just moved 22,
3 correct, Member Kryder?

4 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. And it's been
6 seconded by Member --

7 MEMBER DICICCIO: Sal.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: -- DiCiccio.

9 All right. Further discussion on
10 Condition 22?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 22
17 is adopted.

18 Number 23.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

20 Condition 23.

21 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

25 (A chorus of "ayes.")

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 23

4 is adopted.

5 Number 24.

6 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move

7 Condition 24.

8 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

9 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Condition 24

17 is adopted.

18 Number 25.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move

20 Condition 25.

21 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

25 (A chorus of "ayes.")

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Now on to Findings of Fact
2 and Conclusions of Law.

3 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
4 Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 1.

5 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of
13 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 1 is adopted.

14 Number 2.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
16 condition -- Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number
17 2.

18 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

22 (A chorus of "ayes.")

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of

1 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 2 is adopted.

2 Number 3.

3 MEMBER MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I move

4 Finding of Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 3.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

6 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

10 (A chorus of "ayes.")

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of

14 Fact and Conclusion Number 3 is adopted.

15 Number 4.

16 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman, I move

17 approval of Finding of Fact and Conclusions of Law Number

18 4 be approved.

19 MEMBER MERCER: Second.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

23 (A chorus of "ayes.")

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

25 (No response.)

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of
2 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 4 is adopted.

3 Number 5.

4 MEMBER FRENCH: I move finding 5.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Second.

6 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

9 (A chorus of "ayes.")

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of
13 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 5 is adopted.

14 Number 6.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move
16 finding 6.

17 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

21 (A chorus of "ayes.")

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Finding of
25 Fact and Conclusion of Law Number 6 is adopted.

1 And I'm looking to the applicant.
2 Sometimes we have a condition -- Finding of Fact and
3 Conclusion of Law Number 7 that the substations are
4 nonjurisdictional. I think it's pretty clear that's what
5 the statute says. Sometimes it's the applicant's
6 preference whether to include that or not. I'm assuming
7 because the applicant did not in this case you don't
8 think that it's necessary.

9 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman, APS does not
10 believe it's necessary because I think it's included in
11 statute now.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

13 MS. BENALLY: That language. Thank you.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Moving on to
15 Exhibit A. I believe that the Exhibit A for including
16 APS-7, that is the updated map and physical description
17 of the corridor.

18 I'm looking to the applicant for
19 confirmation. And that will be the same map that is on
20 the placemat as APS-2B.

21 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman, Exhibit 2B is
22 the map that's depicted or shown up on the screen. I
23 believe it's also included in our proposed form of CEC
24 exhibit, hearing exhibit.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. I'm comparing them.

1 They're identical.

2 And then does the 2A contain the
3 description as well?

4 I guess I'll turn to that.

5 MS. BENALLY: It's marked as APS-7 proposed
6 CEC with map and corridor description. CEC 7 includes
7 the map that's shown on the screen as well as the
8 narrative corridor description explaining the route and
9 the widths that are proposed in the CEC.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. So can I get a
11 motion to adopt the map and description attached to
12 Exhibit APS-7 as the Exhibit A for the certificate?

13 MEMBER DICICCIO: Motion to approve,
14 Mr. Chair.

15 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

19 MEMBER LITTLE: Members Fontes is not here.
20 He likes to see transmission line ownerships for lines
21 that are shown on these exhibit maps. I'm not sure how
22 everybody feels about that, but I thought I would bring
23 it up.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: I'm looking to the
25 applicant. I see we have four different colored lines on

1 the map. I don't know if we have more than four owners
2 for that combination of four lines.

3 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Wiley, would you respond
4 to that question?

5 MR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, there are
6 multiple owners in this area. These lines depict voltage
7 levels as opposed to ownership. Some of the owners in
8 the area do include APS, others including Tucson Electric
9 Power, Salt River Project, Western Area Power
10 Administration as well as some of the local electrical
11 districts. So it is a mixture that's shown on this map.

12 And to Member Little's point, we do not
13 explicitly call out the ownership of each of those
14 different lines on this map.

15 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

17 MEMBER LITTLE: Are any of the lines joint
18 ownership or are they pretty much individually owned?

19 MR. WILEY: Member Little, I do believe
20 some of these lines have joint ownership.

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Perhaps we could just
22 indicate some place -- I don't know. Multiple ownership
23 in parentheses underneath the existing transmission lines
24 in the -- down on the bottom?

25 MR. WILEY: Member Little, for some of the

1 infrastructure that APS is not the owner of, I don't have
2 that readily available, particularly on the transmission
3 infrastructure coming out of the Pinal Central
4 Substation --

5 MEMBER LITTLE: That's why I was suggesting
6 that we do parentheses (multiple owners) close
7 parentheses just to indicate that they're not APS lines.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. The map also
9 includes nonjurisdictional 69kV lines.

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: May I ask the member,
11 Mr. Chair --

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

13 MEMBER DICICCIO: -- what's the purpose of
14 knowing that is what?

15 I mean, I'm just curious what that is.

16 MEMBER LITTLE: I believe that -- I mean, I
17 like to see it just because I like to know what's going
18 on in the area electrically. But -- and I believe that's
19 his reasoning also is, you know, who owns the lines that
20 you're going to be crossing over and going under and what
21 else is going on in the area.

22 I do not feel particularly strongly in this
23 case. There are cases where I think it's important. I
24 do not feel particularly strongly that we need to have --
25 indicate that here.

1 I do think that maybe putting in
2 parentheses -- maybe after existing transmission lines in
3 the -- down on the bottom where it shows the colors just
4 put in parentheses multiple owners would indicate that
5 they're not -- they're not all APS lines, which I think
6 is important.

7 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Ms. Benally.

9 MS. BENALLY: In response to Member
10 Little's comments, I mean, APS is amenable to editing the
11 map to include the designation of multiple ownership
12 where it applies to the 115, 230, and 500kV lines that
13 are denoted on the corridor map.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Would that -- because I'm
15 looking at the color scheme. Look at the blue line, for
16 example, that's a 230kV line. There's one that runs from
17 the Milligan Substation west along Milligan Road, and
18 there's another one at the top that runs from the Pinal
19 Central Substation east along something and then heads
20 north along the railroad tracks it appears.

21 So, I mean, the way the color scheme is now
22 would you need to -- and say the ownership is -- say one
23 is an APS line, I'm assuming the one out of Milligan
24 Substation going west is an APS line, but then the one up
25 here out of Pinal Central Substation, it may not be.

1 So how would the committee like to see that
2 handled?

3 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

5 MEMBER LITTLE: I think all we need -- my
6 opinion what I would like to see is nothing more than
7 just that the existing transmission lines are owned by
8 various different owners.

9 MEMBER DICICCIO: Just a notation.

10 MEMBER LITTLE: That's all I care about.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

12 MEMBER DICICCIO: Just a notation is what
13 you're asking for?

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Thank you.

15 MEMBER DICICCIO: Okay.

16 MEMBER LITTLE: A notation to that event.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. So you're saying it
18 would just be existing transmission lines, and would you
19 have a list of the various owners --

20 MEMBER LITTLE: No.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: -- and not designating
22 which ones are held by whom?

23 MEMBER LITTLE: I would just say multiple
24 owners.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

1 MEMBER LITTLE: Not even designate the --
2 who they are.

3 MEMBER DICICCIO: May be owned by multiple
4 owners. Just a notation is all that is.

5 CHMN STAFFORD: Is that your suggestion --

6 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: -- existing transmission
8 lines (multiple owners)?

9 Would you like to make that a motion?

10 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. I so move.

11 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

12 MS. BENALLY: And, Mr. Chairman, just to be
13 clear, is that notation to be placed on the corridor map,
14 Member Little?

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes. We're looking at
16 Exhibit A. The first page of Exhibit A would be the map.
17 The second and third pages would be the physical
18 description, I believe.

19 And correct me if I'm wrong, Member Little,
20 but I believe that what you're doing would be adding
21 to -- at the legend at the bottom where it says "Existing
22 Transmission Lines" you would add in parentheses
23 (multiple owners)?

24 MEMBER DICICCIO: Well, Mr. Chair, may I
25 add one more thing?

1 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member DiCiccio.

2 MEMBER DICICCIO: May have multiple owners
3 is probably more descriptive, isn't it?

4 MEMBER LITTLE: Well, I just think multiple
5 owners.

6 MEMBER DICICCIO: All right. It doesn't
7 make --

8 MEMBER LITTLE: Because they're already
9 owned.

10 MEMBER DICICCIO: Well, okay. That's fine.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: Either way.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, it's your motion,
13 Member Little. Is that -- did I --

14 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes, that is correct.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay.

16 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Mr. Chair.

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes.

18 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Can you restate the
19 motion so that we can understand it?

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Okay. Member Little, I'm
21 going to state what your motion is --

22 MEMBER LITTLE: The motion is --

23 CHMN STAFFORD: -- and you can correct me
24 if I'm incorrect.

25 But her motion is to amend the Exhibit A,

1 the map portion, which is found in multiple places in the
2 record, but the one I'm looking at is the one
3 Exhibit APS-7. It's also on the placemat.

4 And the legend at the bottom where it says,
5 "Existing Transmission Lines," it's color coded by
6 voltage, and there's multiple owners for this section of
7 these -- all the lines that appear on the map.

8 So instead of labeling each line with the
9 owner or combination of owners, she would just add in
10 parentheses either I guess to the right or underneath it
11 where it says Existing Transmission Lines "Multiple
12 Owners," so as not to imply that all these lines on this
13 map belong to APS.

14 Sometimes when there's only one or two on
15 there we can -- it will call out the voltage and the
16 ownership of the each individual line that's in the
17 Exhibit A map, but this one has quite a bit of stuff in
18 there. And I don't know -- there's a lot of lines to --
19 and some of them have multiple owners, so it would be the
20 map could get very busy very quickly, I believe, if we
21 were to attempt to provide that level of detail in this
22 Exhibit A.

23 MEMBER LITTLE: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Little.

25 MEMBER LITTLE: May I ask for input from

1 the applicant how they feel about that?

2 CHMN STAFFORD: It's like you're reading my
3 mind. That was my next question was directed to
4 Ms. Benally and Mr. Derstine about the feasibility of
5 changing the map.

6 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Wiley, could I have you
7 respond to that question, please?

8 MR. WILEY: Yes, Member Little,
9 Mr. Chairman, I believe the request was to at the portion
10 I'm pointing to where it notes in bold and underlined
11 "Existing Transmission Lines" and adding in "(multiple
12 owners)."

13 We could make that change. It would be,
14 Mr. Chairman, to your point very difficult to add in the
15 ownership of each individual line given the number of
16 entities in the area. But making the change on the
17 legend itself as proposed is something we can certainly
18 do.

19 MEMBER DICICCIO: And, Mr. Chair, I like
20 that, and I'll explain why on my end is because if the
21 people want to really know what it is, they can go do it
22 themselves. They can do the research.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Well, with some difficulty.
24 It's not like you can stroll on down and, like, look up
25 who owns every line. It's a little more -- I'm sure

1 Mr. Petry has done some investigation and can tell it's a
2 little -- it's not a simple one stop shop to find out all
3 the information you'd probably want.

4 But I think the real driver behind making
5 this change is to make sure that anybody who'd look at
6 this map wouldn't be under the impression that these were
7 all APS-owned lines and that there are multiple owners of
8 these multiple lines and some different combination, and
9 it's just too much information to really provide that
10 level of detail for the purpose of the certificate for
11 this one particular line, I think. But I think the main
12 thing is to, you know, make it clear these aren't all APS
13 lines --

14 MEMBER DICICCIO: Agreed.

15 CHMN STAFFORD: -- looking at on the map.

16 Is that kind of -- is that the main driver
17 of your change, Member Little?

18 MEMBER LITTLE: It is. Thank you.

19 MEMBER FANT: Mr. Chair.

20 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Fant.

21 MEMBER FANT: Would you want to expand that
22 clarification to say multiple ownership including ED-2,
23 ED4, ED5, and skip APS and skip -- those are the --
24 ultimately the owners?

25 CHMN STAFFORD: I thought that Member

1 Little --

2 MEMBER LITTLE: WAPA.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: -- I think she just wanted
4 to -- she didn't need to call out all the other --
5 because I think I asked that question. Someone
6 thought -- I thought maybe it was Ms. Little said, no, I
7 don't need that much information.

8 MEMBER LITTLE: I don't think for this
9 purpose. I would like that much information, but --

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Right.

11 MEMBER LITTLE: But for the purpose of an
12 exhibit to the CEC I think this is sufficient. Thank
13 you.

14 CHMN STAFFORD: All right.

15 MS. BENALLY: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Ms. Benally.

17 MS. BENALLY: In reference to the language
18 that's proposed by Member Little, perhaps instead of
19 using the word "multiple owners" we use the term "various
20 owners."

21 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Thank you. That's
22 much more specific. That implies that each line may be
23 owned by somebody different as opposed to multiple owners
24 on each line.

25 MS. BENALLY: That's what I was thinking,

1 Member Little.

2 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. Thank you.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: So do you want to change
4 your motion to be --

5 MEMBER LITTLE: Yes. I change my motion
6 to -- so that the insert proposed in my original motion
7 would be -- would not be "multiple owners." It would be
8 "various owners."

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Do I hear a second?

10 MEMBER DRAGO: Second.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion.

12 (No response.)

13 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

14 (A chorus of "ayes.")

15 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the amendment
18 is adopted.

19 Can I get a motion to adopt Exhibit A as
20 amended?

21 MEMBER LITTLE: So moved.

22 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

24 MEMBER KRYDER: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Yes, Member Kryder.

1 MEMBER KRYDER: I would like to hear
2 clarification from the applicant is this acceptable
3 language?

4 CHMN STAFFORD: Ms. Benally.

5 MS. BENALLY: I believe Mr. Wiley indicated
6 that it is acceptable language.

7 MEMBER KRYDER: Thank you.

8 CHMN STAFFORD: And it's a change that they
9 can quite readily make.

10 MS. BENALLY: That's correct. We can edit
11 the map and provide it to the Chairman.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. Thank you.

13 Further discussion?

14 (No response.)

15 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

16 (A chorus of "ayes.")

17 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, Exhibit A as
20 amended is adopted.

21 I believe now we are ready to vote on the
22 certificate in its entirety.

23 Can I get a motion to adopt the certificate
24 as amended?

25 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

1 MEMBER HILL: So moved.

2 MEMBER KRYDER: Second.

3 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. We'll take a
4 roll call vote.

5 Member Hill.

6 MEMBER HILL: Yes.

7 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Kryder.

8 MEMBER KRYDER: Yes.

9 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Mercer.

10 MEMBER MERCER: Yes.

11 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Comstock.

12 MEMBER COMSTOCK: Yes.

13 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Fant.

14 MEMBER FANT: With a quick clarification.

15 The interaction between gas pipelines and transmission

16 lines is something to be considered 20 years from now.

17 We talked about that with Member Comstock.

18 But with that caveat I vote yes.

19 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Drago.

20 MEMBER DRAGO: I vote aye.

21 CHMN STAFFORD: Member French.

22 MEMBER FRENCH: Aye.

23 CHMN STAFFORD: Member Little.

24 MEMBER LITTLE: Aye.

25 CHMN STAFFORD: Member DiCiccio.

1 MEMBER DICICCIO: Yes.

2 CHMN STAFFORD: And I vote aye.

3 By a vote of 10 ayes and zero nays the
4 certificate is adopted, is issued.

5 Can I get a motion for the Chairman to
6 correct scrivener's errors and sign and file with the
7 Commission?

8 MEMBER MERCER: So moved.

9 MEMBER DICICCIO: Second.

10 CHMN STAFFORD: Further discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All in favor say "aye."

13 (A chorus of "ayes.")

14 CHMN STAFFORD: Opposed?

15 (No response.)

16 CHMN STAFFORD: Hearing none, the motion
17 carries.

18 Any further comments from members?

19 Member Fant.

20 MEMBER FANT: Congratulations.

21 MS. BENALLY: Thank you.

22 CHMN STAFFORD: Thank you.

23 I'd like to thank the members for sitting
24 through another three-day hearing.

25 I'd like to thank the applicant and the

1 witnesses for your testimony and the in-depth analysis
2 you undertook to determine where to place the line.

3 And, again, as always thankful to the AV
4 team that makes this possible and the court reporter, of
5 course.

6 And I'd like to thank Member French. He's
7 going to be with us for a few more of these, but not for
8 all the rest of them we have this year. So I look
9 forward to the remaining time we have and I thank you for
10 all you do.

11 MEMBER FRENCH: Thank you.

12 CHMN STAFFORD: All right. With that --
13 anything further?

14 With that, we are adjourned.

15 (Proceedings concluded at 11:11 a.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
2)
3 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

4 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were
5 taken before me; that the foregoing pages are a full,
6 true, and accurate record of the proceedings, all done to
7 the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings
8 were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced
9 to print under my direction.

10 I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the
11 parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the
12 outcome hereof.

13 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the ethical
14 obligations set forth in ACJA 7-206(F)(3) and
15 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(g)(1) and (2).

16 Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, September 14, 2025.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



JENNIFER HONN, RPR
Arizona Certified Reporter
No. 50885

18 I CERTIFY that GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC, has
19 complied with the ethical obligations set forth in
20 ACJA 7-206(J)(1)(

21
22
23
24
25



GLENNIE REPORTING SERVICES, LLC
Arizona Registered Firm
No. R1035